The House met at 9 a.m.

The Reverend Dr. Nelson Price, Roswell Street Baptist Church, Marietta, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Mr. Speaker, to you and your colleagues, it is a privilege to pray in your presence as I do often in your absence. Dear Lord, with a firm belief that our Nation was given birth because of Your concurring aid, we come again to ask Your aid. Renew within us the fervor and faith of our founders that we might truly be "one Nation under God."

Rekindle the ardor and the awe of our predecessors that we may avoid a state of spiritual impoverishment and shrunken moral aspiration. We praise You for the bounty of the land and Your blessings on the people. In gratitude we bow before You imploring You to give wisdom that supersedes knowledge to those who govern here. In Your Holy Name I ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MOAKLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) will be recognized for 1 minute. All other 1-minutes will be postponed until the end of the day.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. NELSON PRICE

(Mr. BARR of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is a wonderful pleasure and true honor along with my colleague JOHNNY ISAKSON of the Sixth District to welcome Reverend Nelson Price to this great body, the people's House, today. We also extend a welcome on behalf of the House of Representatives to his lively wife Trudy who is with him here today.

Reverend Price has been the pastor at Roswell Street Baptist Church, as the Speaker indicated, for close to 35 years. During those 35 years, he has ministered to countless thousands of God's children, both in his parish, visitors to his parish, citizens of his community, citizens of this land and indeed citizens around the world.

His voice truly, Mr. Speaker, is one of those voices that President Reagan spoke about in his second inaugural address of 1985 when he spoke of the American sound. The American sound that in the words of President Reagan echoed out across the prairies, across the mountains as the settlers moved west, as our Nation prospered, as our West was won and Godspeed.

WITHDRAWING APPROVAL OF UNITED STATES FROM AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 528 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 528

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) withdrawing the approval of the United States from the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The joint resolution shall be debatable for two hours of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Representative Paul of Texas, and Representative DeFazio of Oregon or their designees. Pursuant to section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 and section 125 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend...
his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Committee on Rules met and granted a closed rule for H.J. Res. 90, a bill to withdraw the approval of the United States from the agreement establishing the World Trade Organization. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio).

Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago this body passed legislation known as the Uruguay Round Trade Agreements. The legislation established the World Trade Organization, or WTO, which replaced the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, with a more comprehensive and workable trade agreement.

In "Democracy in America," Alexis DeTocqueville wrote that "in democracies, nothing is more great or more brilliant than commerce." In our great democracy, this United States is the world leader in the global marketplace, affecting the lives and quality of life of millions of workers, farmers and businesspeople who depend on open and stable world markets. The United States is the world's leading exporter and importer, trading over $2 trillion worth of goods and services each year in the international marketplace.

While the underlying measure would not necessarily provide for the President to withdraw from the WTO, it would call the United States global future into question. Without a solid defeat of this measure, Congress will send the wrong message to the other 135 member countries. U.S. participation and strong leadership in the WTO is an integral part of the success of the stable trade environment the organization is creating.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means reported this bill unfavorably on June 12. The committee reasoned that continued U.S. participation in the global trading system is vital to America's long-term economic and strategic interests, continued prosperity and strengthening the rule of law around the world. In reporting the bill unfavorably, the committee reinforced a fundamental fact that this is a Nation of leadership, not of isolationism.

The WTO provides a forum to lower tariffs and other barriers to international trade. This is not the time for the U.S. to move away from the global economy by sending the wrong message to its trading partners. Additionally, through the World Trade Organization, member countries have established multilateral rules for trade that provide a stable environment for businesses who export and import products. The WTO plays a vital role in enforcement and resolution of trade disputes. In fact, the WTO has been much more effective than its predecessor, GATT, in providing timely resolutions to global trade disputes. Finally, the WTO provides a forum for ongoing negotiations to reduce trade barriers and advance global trade.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that U.S. exports increased in the last 5 years under WTO. Our growth in international trade stimulates greater capital investment, higher productivity, technological innovation and more American jobs. American goods, crafts, and labor, and the fruits and lands of America's workers, are second to none. But our success in selling those goods and services in a global marketplace is assured only through free and open markets. The WTO continues to advance and create those freer and more open markets. We must keep our commitment to our workers and our businesses by allowing the U.S. to continue to be a leader in the global marketplace. Through that leadership and our success, our economy will continue to grow and more jobs will be created. Even more important, we will demonstrate our continued faith in the quality and the productivity of American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in opposition to H.J. Res. 90, the resolution that it makes in order. This rule provides 2 hours of general debate and the time is divided equally between the proponents, the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the opponents, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DeFazio) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL). This rule is necessary, Mr. Speaker, because of a provision in the Uruguay Round Agreements Act that authorized the President to accept the United States' membership in the World Trade Organization. Sections 124 and 125 of this act require that the President every 5 years report to the Congress on United States participation in the World Trade Organization.

The purpose of this report, according to the Committee on Ways and Means, is to provide an opportunity for Congress to evaluate the transition of the GATT to the WTO, and also to assess periodically whether continued membership in this organization is in the best interest of the United States. After receipt of this report, Mr. Speaker, any Member of Congress may introduce a joint resolution to withdraw the United States from the agreement that establishes the WTO. That resolution is on a fast track which requires committee action within 45 days and up to 20 hours of floor consideration within 90 days unless a rule establishing debate is enacted prior to that time. This is the rule that we are working on.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support withdrawal of the United States from the World Trade Organization and its predecessor, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, have opened many foreign markets for U.S. goods and services around the globe, particularly for farmers and farm businesses. While I have expressed opposition to the WTO's opening of its membership to countries such as China, I believe it would be a mistake for the United States to leave this organization and to isolate itself from the world's other industrial nations.

I think most would agree that the overall benefits of the WTO outweigh the costs. However, having said that, there is much room for improvement in the way the WTO operates. The 5-year report by the President to Congress serves to highlight areas where improvements could be made. A significant portion of our current booming economy is due to trade abroad through the rules of the WTO and GATT. But this organization needs to be about more than just trade and tariffs.

It needs to expand its thinking and its priorities and its rulemaking to the quality of life for those populations it is supposed to serve. The policy needs to focus on improving working conditions, not simply global trade but increased worker protection, increased environmental protection, and respect for human rights.

Mr. Speaker, these issues need to be part of any meaningful trade discussions or negotiations, and any rules regarding these areas need to be vigorously enforced. I believe the most important changes would be to lift the veil of secrecy under which the WTO functions. This organization operates almost entirely behind closed doors, and such a policy has only served to heighten the mistrust of those who already question the WTO. This mistrust can be minimized only, only if there is an opening of the agenda and opening of the minds of the membership on the WTO.

There is an urgent need for public access as well to public input into the WTO. We must address the current makeup of the World Trade Organization and particularly the total absence of representatives from labor, the total absence of representatives from the environment, and total absence from people representing human rights groups and from any other WTO advisory groups.

These entities should be given more access to this organization as it develops World Trade Organization, the ultimate impact in all of these areas. Enforcement of actions that have been negotiated by the members of the World Trade Organization must be tightened.
The creation of the World Trade Organization was, in part, an effort by the GATT to legally bind member governments to GATT’s rules.

American trade negotiators have been successful in winning trade disputes. However, there are limits to how much they can do, and unfortunately, the enforcement to correct these cases has not been satisfactory. Agreements that have been reached must be enforced for all involved parties.

Whether we like it or not, Mr. Speaker, the world is changing. We truly are moving towards a global economy. The World Trade Organization, which has a membership of 135 nations, with another 32 who seek to join this organization, I think it would be very detrimental to the United States to pull out of the World Trade Organization at this time. But that does not mean that we should turn our backs on those people and those issues that desperately need to be part of the World Trade Organization’s agenda. We can probably do more than any nation to see that these critical but overlooked matters become top priorities with our trading partners.

Mr. Speaker, let us pass the rule, but let us defeat H. Res. 90.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MOAKLEY), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who is not only an expert, but a global authority on trade issues in the WTO.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, that is kind of a frightening introduction, and I hope it did not offend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) here.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend for yielding the time; and I rise, first of all, to compliment my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL). The gentleman clearly shares my view that we need to do everything that we possibly can to diminish barriers that allow for the free flow of goods and services throughout the world. In fact, the gentleman and I were discussing this issue yesterday, and we both agreed that we very much want to diminish those barriers.

I wish that there were not a single tariff that existed in the world, because we all know that a tariff is a tax; and we, as Republicans, were born to cut taxes.

If you go back to 1947 and look at the establishment of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, it came following the Second World War, and we all know that protectionism played a role in exacerbating both the Great Depression and, I believe and most economists agree, establishing the hand of Adolph Hitler.

Following the defeat of Nazism in the mid-1940s, we saw world leaders come together and establish the GATT. They had one simple goal they put forward. What was it? To decrease tariff barriers. So with that as a goal, the GATT worked for years and years and years, decades in an attempt to bring down those barriers through a wide range of agreements; and as my friend from New York pointed out very well in his statement, we today have the World Trade Organization.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago it was established; and it was established again with the continuation of that goal of trying to decrease tariff barriers. There are not many barriers to the World Trade Organization, and I am not going to stand here and argue that the World Trade Organization is the panacea to all of the ailments of society. I am not going to say that there are not problems within the WTO. And I know that my friend from Houston will clearly point those out; but I am one who has concluded that we cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good, because clearly the goal of the WTO is to cut taxes, to decrease those tariffs.

I think that it is the right thing to do. I am very pleased to have my friend from South Boston, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules (Mr. MOAKLEY) join in support of the resolution of the WTO; and in his statement, he correctly pointed out that, when this was established 5 years ago, there was a provision in the implementing legislation that said that we could have a resolution offered that would allow us to have the debate which we are going to have today dealing with the question of whether or not the United States should maintain its membership in the WTO.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear to me that if we look at the past 5 years, since we saw the WTO established, it has been an overwhelming success; and I think that the wisest thing for us to do is to point to the economy of the United States, America and the economy of the world.

Today we have the lowest unemployment rate, the strongest economic growth, low inflation. We have very positive economic signs. I believe that that is in large part, not totally, but in large part due to the fact that we have worked to try to diminish those barriers. We very much want to find opportunities for the United States to gain access to new markets around the world. It stands to reason that as we open the world and contribute to the world and point to the fact that 96 percent of the world’s consumers are outside of our borders; and as such, we want to do whatever we can to try and find new opportunities for our workers.

We know that the United States of America being the world’s global leader has understood the benefit of imports. We allow the rest of the world to have access to our consumer market, and that benefits us. That is a win-win for us, because it allows us to have the highest standard of living on the face of the earth. So what we need to do now is recognize that the WTO is the structure through which we are able to gain access to other countries around the world.

I believe that we have a great opportunity here in a bipartisan way to send a signal that we believe in reducing taxes. We believe in reducing those tariffs, and we believe in the free flow of goods and services, and so I urge support of the rule that would allow us to go ahead and have very vigorous debate. And then as my friend from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) and my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. Traficant) I have said, we need to overwhelmingly defeat this resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Traficant).

(Mr. Traficant asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Traficant. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule. I supported the bill. When the WTO was first proposed, it was deemed unconstitutional. I believe today if it was put under a microscope, it would be unconstitutional; but Congress made it mainstream. To me that is unbelievable. But my question today is what is happening and, even worse, what has happened to America.

American troops are often under the command of foreign generals. I just think about that. The United Nations now wants to levy a world tax, the same United Nations that uses Uncle Sam like a policeman. And Uncle Sam, as a policeman for the United Nations, saves monarchs and dictators who then screw America by raising oil prices.

Mr. Speaker, then we look at Japan. Think about it. $60 billion a year every year, 20 years in trade deficits, every President from Nixon to Clinton threatened Japan with sanctions if they did not open their markets. Evidently, Japan never opened their markets, and we have done nothing about it. Now, let us look at the big one. China’s taking $80 billion a year out of our economy, buying missiles and nuclear submarines with our money, aiming the missiles at our cities and telling America keep your hands off Taiwan and do not question China’s military policies.

What has happened to America and what happened to Congress, beam me up, we pledge an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, not to the charter of the United Nations, and certainly by God, not to the World Trade Organization that has ruled against us every single year, from Venezuelan oil to Chinese trinkets.

This is not a matter of trade. This is not a matter of exclusion. This is a matter of American sovereignty. And by God, I think some common sense should infuse itself into the Congress of the United States who is acting like we are taking an oath to the Constitution of the United Nations.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).
debate this issue. The original bill allowed for 20 hours of debate. That is how important the issue was thought to be. Realizing how difficult that would be and the odds against that happening, I was quite willing to agree to 2 hours of debate. But that really is not enough. It is not much more important issue than that.

I know the opposition, those who believe in international managed trade through the World Trade Organization, would not like to have this debate at all, because I think deep down inside they know there is something wrong with it. I think that they do not want to hear the opposition.

I absolutely convinced that truth is on our side, that we will win the debate, disregarding the vote. But we have a greater responsibility here than just to count the votes. We have a responsibility to try our best to follow the law of the land, which is the Constitution; and quite clearly we do not have this authority to transfer this power to unelected bureaucrats at the WTO.

The WTO has ruled against us, stating that the Foreign Corporation tax sales credit is illegal; and we have no amendment, and this tax benefit, and unfortunately we will. I would like to know from the Committee on Ways and Means when this is going to happen, how are we going to do it, because it is going to be a $4 billion increase. This will be passed on to the people. At the same time the European Community is preparing to file a case against the U.S. in the WTO to put a tax on international sales.

In Europe there is a tax on international sales. If you buy software over the Internet, you are charged a sales tax. The Europeans said they will absolutely not reduce that tax. In America if we do not have that tax, which is wonderful. So for the Europeans, what would the logical thing be? If you can transfer value over the Internet, they buy their software from us. That is good. Since they refuse to lower their taxes, they are going to the WTO to get a ruling. Well, maybe they will rule against us. They may well call it a tax subsidy. What will we do? We are obligated, we are obligated under the rules, to accommodate and change our laws. We have made that promise. Some will say, Oh, no, we should have our sovereignty. We do not have to do it. What happens? Then the complaining nations go to the WTO who then manages a trade war. They permit it. This results in a continual, perpetual trade war managed by the WTO, something we need to seriously challenge.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFAZIO).

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

This debate is going to be constrained today in the House. It is being held at an unusually early hour, with little notice to Members, except at 11 o'clock last night; and the debate itself is constrained by this rule to 2 hours, although the legislation which passed this body, a lame duck Congress, I might add, without any amendments allowed, was to have up to 20 hours of debate.

I think this should be an important debate, with the United States running this year probably a $300 billion-plus trade deficit, something that we cannot do forever without dire consequences, although the gentleman from California wants to spend his $300 billion in this country. I think it is wonderful to import things. Of course, if you import more than you export, you are losing jobs and you are running up a tab with foreign nations, and the U.S. is running up a tab at a record rate, $300 billion a year, probably $80 billion with China this year. We are helping to finance their military expansion and other things that the dictators are doing out there with our addiction to their extraordinarily low-priced goods. But there are problems that come with those cheap exports, in addition to the loss of U.S. jobs.

But what particularly concerns me here today is the fact that the debate is constrained; it is at an early hour, and this follows the pattern. The original adoption of the legislation that bound the U.S. to the WTO was passed in a lame duck Congress, when the Democrats had just lost the House of Representatives, and it was brought up under extraordinary procedures that allowed no amendment.

Luckily, that law has not been renewed, the so-called fast track legislation, allowing a President to negotiate an incredibly complex agreement and then bring it to Congress and say oh, you can't change anything, because if you change it that is the end of it and the U.S. will be an isolationist. That is what we are going to hear again today, you are either for an isolationist or you are for engagement. I am for engagement with the world and for trading with the rest of the world, but just not under these rules, not under the secretive WTO organization not under an organization that resolves disputes between parties in secret tribunals.

Now, when I first brought this up, during the original deliberations under GATT to then Mickey Kantor, the President's special Trade Representative, I said, You know, how can the U.S. bind itself to an organization that the U.S. will be an isolationist. That is what we are going to hear again today, you are either for an isolationist or you are for engagement. I am for engagement with the world and for trading with the rest of the world, but just not under these rules, not under the secretive WTO organization not under an organization that resolves disputes between parties in secret tribunals.

Now, when I first brought this up during the original deliberations under GATT to then Mickey Kantor, the President's special Trade Representative, I said, You know, how can the U.S. bind itself to an organization that will resolve disputes in secret tribunals with no conflict of interest rules, to intervenors, not public scrutiny? How can the U.S. bind itself to that, and they can overturn our laws.

He said, Oh, you don't understand. They can't overturn our laws. All they can do is fine us in perpetuity if we want to keep our laws.

I said, Oh, that is an interesting and subtle distinction.

They are doing it in a way it works. And there is a list of U.S. laws, thus far on most people apparently do not care at all about, Marine Mammal Protection...
Act, Endangered Species Act, Clean Air Act.

But now there is one on the radar screen. They want us to change our tax laws, $4 billion-a-year subsidy. Now the Europeans have won the decision against the United States that we mandated that the United States change its tax laws, a $4 billion-a-year subsidy to the largest corporations in America.

Now people are getting a little bit excited about this process, Marine Mammals, you know, sea turtles, you know, Endangered Species Act, Clean Air Act. It did not register on the radar screen downtown with the Clinton administration. It would be different if we had a Democratic administration. I guess. But when it is a tax break for foreign corporations, now they are pulling out all stops.

Of course, the U.S. has had some victories. The U.S. banana growers, wait a minute, we do not grow bananas in the United States. Well, a large political consultant who overcontrols the company that grows bananas under U.S. corporate ownership won a major decision against the Europeans, which is decimating the small growers in the Caribbean. The U.S. has forced the Europeans to penalize the Europeans or fining the Europeans for not letting in hormone-laced beef. These are the kinds of decisions we are getting out of the WTO.

Now, this process needs to change. Even the President says it needs to change. He wants labor included. He wants environmental things included in the future in the WTO. But, guess what? This organization is not very likely to change. It would require a two-thirds or maybe a three-quarters mandate that the United States could grant debt relief to the poorest countries in the world, countries, in some cases, that had been run by thugs and crooks who had indebted their countries, and these are now countries where people are going crazy over the lives of people because of the need to make debt payments. So a very impressive coalition of religious and charitable and welfare-oriented and private sector groups have come together to press for international relief.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Appropriations last year grudgingly voted only some of the money that was necessary. This year we were hoping that we could, within the legislative authorization that is already there, get enough money to complete debt relief, debt relief that is being urged by the Pope, by every major religious organization, by every group internationally that cares about alleviation of poverty and fighting disease.

What have we gotten from the majority party? Basically, not very much. The appropriations process is going forward, and so far the result has been an unwillingness to vote the funds for debt relief.

So we ought to be clear. We have people among us, and I am not saying I have not heard from the business community, from all the internationalists, who wanted the World Trade Organization, who wanted permanent trade with China, I have not heard from them. So I have to ask the question, do we have people for whom internationalism and concern for others means a chance to make some money?

Now, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about internationalism. Many of us who have been critical of some aspects of the World Trade Organization that would particular harm on the critical of an international economic policy which consists entirely of freeing restraints on capital and paying no attention to the problems it can call for worker rights and for environmental problems, we have been accused sometimes of not caring enough about poor people overseas.

Well, I think it is time to focus on the question of who is trying to alleviate poverty overseas in its fullest, because, without question, the single most important thing that this Congress will consider, dealing with poverty overseas, grinding, abject, life-threatening poverty, is international debt relief.

Last year the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services, on which I serve in a bipartisan way, brought forward legislation that created a framework within which the United States could grant debt relief to the poorest countries in the world, countries, in some cases, that had been run by thugs and crooks who had indebted their countries, and these are now countries where people are going crazy over the lives of people because of the need to make debt payments. So a very impressive coalition of religious and charitable and welfare-oriented and private sector groups have come together to press for international relief.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Appropriations last year grudgingly voted only some of the money that was necessary. This year we were hoping that we could, within the legislative authorization that is already there, get enough money to complete debt relief, debt relief that is being urged by the Pope, by every major religious organization, by every group internationally that cares about alleviation of poverty and fighting disease.

What have we gotten from the majority party? Basically, not very much. The appropriations process is going forward, and so far the result has been an unwillingness to vote the funds for debt relief.

So we ought to be clear. We have people among us, and I am not saying I have not heard from the business community, from all the internationalists, who wanted the World Trade Organization, who wanted permanent trade with China, I have not heard from them. So I have to ask the question, do we have people for whom internationalism and concern for others means a chance to make some money?

Now, Mr. DEFAZIO, my good friend, said we need dramatic change in the WTO. I agree. I agree with that statement. I think where we differ is that I believe we need dramatic and fundamental
change in the WTO to emphasize human rights, to emphasize labor law, to enforce and implement the trade laws that we in the United States have on the books to protect our jobs in the Midwest and throughout the country, but we are not to blame the WTO, and that is what this vote is about. We do not want to mow it down, we want to modernize it. We want to improve it, not remove it.

The WTO needs to do a much better job of enforcing the trade laws that we have, whether that be the 1995 South Korean automobile trade law that I do not think is well enforced from an American perspective. The WTO needs to do a much better job of implementing trade laws, of insisting on the rule of law and transparency in our trade laws. However, Mr. Speaker, when we had the debate for the last 4 or 5 years about the United Nations, most of us said with respect to the United Nations let us change the bureaucracy and get rid of some of it; let us change what we contribute; we contribute too much today to the United Nations; let us leverage some of our aid to the United Nations to get them back to their original mission, but let us not blow up the United Nations. They do some wonderful things to help the poor, for food relief; and, as Kofi Annan said, one in five people, one in five people in the world live on less than $1 per day. One in five people do not have access to safe drinking water. We need the United Nations, but we need to reform it.

With the WTO, we need a working, viable, modernized, revolutionized, reformed WTO; but this vote would remove the WTO. So let us work together to get dramatic change. Let us work together to put more emphasis on labor law and human rights, on enforcement and implementation. Let us pass the rule, and let us defeat this underlying bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois for his remarks.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as we enter the 21st century, we see that the American dream is still alive. America is still a place where an honest day's work can get you a day's pay. But it is clear that it is beginning to be challenged. It is being challenged because America is giving up its sovereignty to foreign bureaucrats, because we are losing control over our own laws. It is being challenged because America is giving up our democratic principles to a secret multinational trade organization that does its work behind closed doors. It is being challenged by workers in other nations who cannot enjoy the same freedoms and benefits American workers receive.

Foreign workers who for pay for a penny a day, foreign workers who work in dangerous and hazardous conditions, foreign workers who work without health benefits, foreign workers who are forced to live in dirty environments, breath dirty air and drink dirty water, foreign workers who cannot organize and strike, foreign workers who do not have fair benefits. Foreign workers who, because of such conditions and through no fault of their own, turn out cheap products and dump them in the United States of America.

It is unfair for American workers to compete with foreign workers on an unfair playing field. It is also unfair for foreign workers to have to work every day in such miserable conditions.

In this world, in this type of global economy, where labor and environmental safeguards are not in place, where the majority of the World Trade Organization members continue to stall and delay and fight against real reform, all workers will continue to suffer while corporate profits skyrocket.

Remember that the American dream is just not for Americans; it is also something that is sought by many people. One day that dream will become a reality.

A number of my colleagues here in this body have urged the WTO to establish real reform and put labor and environmental safeguards into place. So far, that has fallen upon deaf ears. That is why I plan to vote for H.J. Res. 90. In its current form, the WTO only ensures economic prosperity for the elite multinationals and leaves millions and millions of workers behind. We need to send a signal to the WTO that if they do not get serious about real reform, we will push even harder. We have only begun the fight.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we need real reform of WTO. We need real reform that will bring the American dream to everyone, so workers around the world can have a real hope of achieving happiness.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The WTO provides a forum for ongoing negotiations to reduce trade barriers and advance global trade. The fact is that U.S. exports have increased by 36 percent in the 5 years since the creation of the WTO. Our growth in international trade stimulates greater capital investment, higher productivity, technological innovation, and more, I repeat more, American jobs. American goods and services are the envy, the pride, the labor of America's workers are second to none. But our success in selling those goods and services in a global marketplace is assured only through free and open markets. The WTO continues to advance and promote those freer and more open markets.

We must keep our commitment to our workers and our businesses by allowing the United States to continue to be a leader in the global marketplace. Through that leadership and our success, our economy will continue to grow and more jobs will be created. Even more important, we will demonstrate our continued faith in the quality and the productivity of the American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAkov). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Messrs. STRICKLAND, LEACH, and PALLONE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay".

Ms. GRANGER changed her vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for consideration was that it would be unwise to withdraw congressional approval of the United States from the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the House joint resolution 90 is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress withdraws its approval, provided under section 301(a) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of the WTO Agreement as defined in section 202 of that Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAACKSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 528, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 90.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Put simply, the consensus in the committee was that it would be unthinkable and illogical for the United States to withdraw from the WTO.

The WTO stands apart from many other international institutions in that it functions on a day-to-day basis almost completely in favor of American interests. In setting the rules for trade, the United States has had to make relatively few concessions in exchange for having open access to consumers in 136 other countries.

The WTO system is fundamentally American-based rules of the road for commerce that limit discriminatory trade barriers and damaging sanctions. Because of the strength of U.S. leadership since World War II, our trading partners have been willing to accept the structure of fair trade rules and principles.

Congress has been heavily involved in the development of these rules and principles since the establishment of the GATT in 1947. At the same time, the WTO cannot prevent the United States from whatever level of food, safety, or environmental protection on imports that we see fit to impose. The WTO system of fair play only requires that we apply the same standards to both foreign and domestic producers.

Since its inception in 1995, the WTO has functioned effectively, aiding our efforts to increase job-creating U.S. exports. The best engine for our impressive economic growth has been expanding international trade under the oversight of the WTO.

Since 1995, exports have risen by $235 billion. When we increase exports, in particular, we are increasing the number of high-wage high-tech jobs in cities and towns across America. There is absolutely no better strategy for improving living standards than to pry away trade barriers and grow foreign markets for U.S. products. Nearly 12 million high-wage American jobs depend on our ability to export under predictable rules.

Rules without a mechanism for enforcement would not mean much. The WTO dispute settlement system succeeds in encouraging the resolution of hundreds of trade conflicts through amicable consultations. In the 27 cases where the U.S. filed a formal challenge to foreign practices, we prevailed in 25. Our victories have won millions of dollars in increased sales for U.S. firms and workers.

In establishing the WTO dispute settlement system, Congress insisted on a mechanism with moral authority, but with no power to compel a change in our laws or regulations. Any decision to comply with a WTO panel is solely an internal decision of the United States. In the difficult WTO case against U.S. Foreign Sales Corporations that we are struggling with now, neither the European Union nor the WTO can impose any course of action on the United States.

As the world's leading exporter, the United States benefits enormously from the common sense ground rules of
the WTO, such as national treatment, nondiscrimination, and due process. This is not a perfect organization by any stretch, but to pull out now would mean reverting to a dark time 60 years ago when international trade was governed by political whim and a dangerous absence of rules and fair practices.

I urge a no vote on H.J. Res. 90.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to allow a nonmember of the Committee on Ways and Means to control the balance of the time yielded to me until I am able to return to the Chamber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it would be irresponsible for us to support this resolution and to withdraw from international trade community, and I certainly oppose this resolution. But let me point out, I think we can do a better job in this body in monitoring our participation in the World Trade Organization.

Let me just point out a couple points if I might. First, we could improve our antisurplus provisions in our own trade laws, our antidumping and countervailing duty provisions in our section 201 relief.

Last year, we had a surge of steel, cheap steel, subsidized steel into the United States which costs us many jobs around our country. We could have done a better job. In fact, we did a better job with the recently negotiated agreement with China. We have a better provision in our current law. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was instrumental in incorporating that into statute in the legislation that we approved the permanent NTR. So we could do a better job with all of our trading partners in protecting our industries from illegally imported subsidized products.

Second, we could do a better job on the review process. A 5-year review without much preparation and advance notice is not the way we should be reviewing our participation with the WTO.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I filed legislation, and I would like my colleagues to review it and hopefully join me in supporting that, which incorporates the suggestions of Senator Dole and supported by the USTR that would set up a commission composed of five federal appellate judges to review the WTO dispute settlement reports and to make a report to Congress. This Commission would, if they found that the WTO exceeded its authority, affected our rights under the Uruguay Rounds, acted arbitrarily or decided a case outside of the applicable standards, if that happened, and it has happened that the WTO has made, in the view of legal experts, decisions that do not hold with the precedent and the laws and the obligations under the WTO and Uruguay Rounds, then they would make that report to Congress.

Any one of us could file a joint resolution requesting the President to negotiate dispute resolutions within the WTO to address these concerns. If there were three such adverse rulings in a 5-year period, any one of us could file a joint resolution of disapproval of participation in the WTO.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a more effective way to deal with the review than voting on this every 5 years, when it would be irresponsible to vote in favor of it. If we did that, I think we are showing the WTO that we are watching their decision making very carefully, and their decisions will be in compliance with the international standards and the obligations that every Nation with the WTO has agreed to. It would be a more effective review process for us to decide whether we want to continue in the WTO.

I urge my colleagues to support that approach and to reject this resolution. Today the House will consider H.J. Res. 90, a resolution to withdraw Congressional approval of the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO). I voted against this measure in the Ways and Means Committee, and I urge you to join me in voting against this resolution today on the floor.

The United States’ role as the clear leader in advancing the cause of free and fair trade demands our continued participation in the WTO. At the same time, there are serious problems in the operations and deliberations of the WTO that we should seek to address. Toward that end, I ask today that you join as a co-sponsor at this point in time I have prepared which would create a WTO Dispute Settlement Review Commission.

The need for this legislation is clear. Over the past several years, we have witnessed too many instances in which unfounded interpretations of international trade law have led to WTO decisions that adversely impacted U.S. workers and industries. Specific cases involving lead bars, Korean DRAM’s, and Japanese film all raised serious issues regarding the processes and conclusions of WTO actions. We need to provide a process whereby these decisions can be reviewed by an impartial, nonpartisan panel that has the responsibility to inform the Congress and the American people of its findings.

In 1994 the United States Trade Representative (USTR) wrote to then-Senator Bob Dole to endorse the establishment of a WTO Dispute Settlement Review Commission. The bill I am introducing would revise a proposal made by Senator Dole to create a mechanism to provide that WTO decisions are carefully reviewed to assure the fair and sensible application of international trade law.

The Commission would consist of five federal appellate judges, and would review all final and adopted WTO dispute settlement reports. The Commission would review adverse WTO findings, using the following set of four criteria to determine whether the WTO panel: (1) demonstrated exceeded its authority or its terms of reference; (2) added to the obligations, or diminished the rights, of the United States under the Uruguay Round; (3) acted arbitrarily or decided a case outside of the applicable standard of review, including in an antidumping case, set forth in the GATT agreement; and (4) deviated from the applicable standard of review, including in an antidumping case, set forth in the GATT agreement.

The Commission would issue its determinations within 120 days after the report is adopted. Upon the issuance of any affirmative determination by the Commission, any Member of each House would be able to introduce a joint resolution calling on the President to negotiate new dispute settlement rules that would address and correct the problem identified by the Commission. The resolution would be privileged and considered under expedited committee and floor procedures.

While we may disagree on the appropriate remedy for responding to an adverse WTO panel decision, we all agree WTO panel decisions must treat American economic interests fairly. The Review Commission would raise the visibility of important WTO decisions that have a profound effect on the economy of the United States. I hope that the Commission would also reinvigorate the Congressional oversight role regarding trade policy, and encourage Members of Congress to seriously reflect on WTO decisions and their impact on the United States.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to vote to get out of the WTO. We joined the WTO in 1994 in a lame-duck session hurried up because it was fearful that the new Members would not capitulate and go along with joining the WTO. The WTO was voted by the House and the Senate as an agreement, and yet it is clearly a treaty. It involves 135 countries. It is a treaty. It has been illegally implemented, and we are now obligated to follow the rules or pay heavy penalties.

This is the size of the agreement that we signed and voted on in 1994. Now, if that is not an entangling alliance, I do not know what could be. It is virtually impossible to go through this and understand exactly what we have agreed to. But this is it, and this is what we are voting on today. If my colleagues vote against the resolution, they are rubber stamping this. That is what they are doing.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield that, yes, indeed the WTO is not quite perfect. But we need it. We need the WTO to manage this trade. But at the same time, they have no options. We cannot change the
Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time, and I appreciate his leadership on this issue.

I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. Supporters of it would have us believe that the United States would be better off if we withdrew from the World Trade Organization, but I believe that nothing could be further from the truth. Political leaders and statesmen who created the WTO and its predecessor, the GATT, did so for good reasons. They had lived through some of the darkest days in the history of the world, famine, poverty, war that dominated the lives of millions of people around the world.

Protectionism and economic stagnation put millions of Americans out of work. Factories closed, homes were lost, families were destroyed. They witnessed the havoc which trade wars and military wars and the protectionism that comes from trade wars can bring. And they vowed not to let it happen again. So they created an organization whose sole purpose was to open up closed markets, promote economic growth, provide a forum for the peaceful resolution of disputes. This was the GATT, the predecessor to the WTO. And it worked. Since World War II, the world has experienced unprecedented economic growth. Millions of people around the world have been pulled from economic poverty.

But the system certainly was not perfect. So, we tried to correct some of the deficiencies of the past by creating the WTO which would further liberalize trade and provide for an even stronger dispute settlement procedure. Again, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Paul) quoted from a Congressional Research Service report and he indicated the U.S. sovereignty was imperiled through membership in WTO.

As a member of the WTO the United States does commit to act in accordance with the rules of the multilateral body. It is legally obligated to ensure national laws do not conflict with WTO rules.

Not quoted, however, in this quote from Congressional Research Service is the remainder of what was contained in the quote:

However, the WTO cannot force members to adhere to their obligations. The United States and any other WTO member may act in its own national interest in spite of the WTO rules. The WTO even recognizes certain allowable exceptions such as national security.

That is a direct quote from the Congressional Research Service World Trade Organization background and issues, August 25, 1999. Membership in the WTO is not a surrender of U.S. sovereignty but its wise exercise.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Kolb).

(Mr. Kolbe asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time, and I appreciate his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield my time.
times greater than the GDP growth in that same year. When fully implemented, it is estimated that the agreement establishing the WTO will add somewhere between 125 and $250 billion each year to the GDP of this country. And all I will not perform it is an evolving institution. But what is it supporters of this resolution disapprove of? Tariff cuts? Opening export markets? Peaceful dispute resolution? Economic growth? Full employment? And this is what they disapprove of, what exactly is the alternative that they propose? It is easy to criticize, it is easy to point fingers, to lambaste, but what is the proposed alternative? I have yet to hear anyone that can prove to me that there is a better way than to proceed with the WTO.

We will be hearing a lot today about how our antidumping laws are the cornerstone of U.S. trade policy, critical to our economic growth, that they are responsible for the prosperity we experience today. I say baloney to that. Our antidumping laws are more often than not little more than special interest protectionism for select U.S. industries, protectionism that costs every single American.

I take a look at the recent editorial in the Washington Post, not exactly a conservative newspaper, entitled "Steel's Deal," and says:

"The theory of antidumping cases is that foreigners are protecting their markets, allowing firms to make huge profits at home and sell at a loss to Americans. Even where this is the case, it is still not perfect. Cheaper steel helps the U.S. carmakers and other manufacturers that buy the stuff, and these firms employ far more American workers than do U.S. steelmakers."

Mr. Speaker, I could not have said it better. The WTO may not be perfect, but it is the best that we have. I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Washington Post editorial in its entirety:

STEEL'S DEAL

Sometimes the administration sings anthems to free trade. But last week, faced with a study documenting the steel industry's efforts to hobble foreign competitors, the Commerce Department felt obliged to defend protectionist policies. Rather than concede the obvious facts, a department official pleaded that the U.S. market is relatively open and complained that the study was "totally ridiculous and absurd" because it was paid for by foreign steel makers.

It is true that tariffs and quotas that once excluded foreign steel are mostly gone, thanks to international trade deals. But the new battle has shifted to anti-dumping suits. Whenever foreign imports surge, U.S. makers allege that steel is being "dumped" on the U.S. market at prices lower than it would fetch in its country of origin. If the U.S. side can convince a tribunal that America's steel industry accounts for a tiny proportion of the national economy. But its lobby fills the campaign coffers of both parties that favor trade policy. Most American workers, employed in competitive industries that depend on open markets, suffer from this quiet corruption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am opposed to this resolution. In a word, globalization is growing. It is here to stay. The question is whether and how we are going to shape it. If you vote yes, you are saying, Don't try to shape it; throw up your hands, retreat from the process. I think the answer instead is to pursue, to persevere, to roll up our sleeves, to understand the strengths of the WTO; and where there is a need for its reform, to get in there and work for those reforms.

The WTO provides a rule-based foundation for growing international trade. There is no alternative but to have some kind of a global rule-based system. The World Trade Organization is that system that is not in the interest of the U.S. as the largest world trader. The World Trade Organization has also provided a means for us to attack nontariff barriers in addition to the traditional barriers to trade, tariffs, et cetera.

It is far from perfect. We continue to press Japan in terms of their nontariff barriers. We have made some progress through the WTO in certain areas. It also has addressed the new technologies. The World Trade Organization is not going to solve all our trade problems. But there are other ways that the WTO has not adapted to change. Now its rulings are binding. They were not under GATT. That means that the procedures have to be more open than they are. We have to eliminate the secret procedures. We should be in there and this administration has been in there fighting for those changes.

Also, more and more globalization includes the evolving economies. That is why I believe we are in a new situation. Issues of labor, of worker rights, labor market issues, issues of the environment. The World Trade Organization needs to address these issues. With the help and support of some of us, the administration has been endeavoring to do that.

So, in a word, it seems to me this is the question: If you vote yes, what are you saying? You cannot say reform. You cannot reform an organization that you say withdraw from. What else will you do? Do you let it be there and work at it. That is why I believe there needs to be a no vote.

Let me just say a word about some of the arguments that are used, for example, sea turtles and the Venezuela ruling. What the World Trade Organization said in those cases was the U.S. has to apply the same laws to others as we apply to ourselves. That is not a radical proposition.

Let me comment briefly on what the gentleman from Arizona said. The WTO does not endanger American antidumping laws. Period. The way the Uruguay Round was structured, our antidumping laws can persevere and we can pursue them.

Mr. Speaker, I think to vote yes on this sends the wrong message. It is the message of retreat. It is the message of withdrawal. A yes vote if shaped correctly, and I think we need to do it, says to the world, we are going to be part and parcel of a global organization. Where it has strengths, we will support it vigorously.

Where it has weaknesses we can work actively to change it; that is what we have been doing these last years. That is what we need to do with even greater energy and endeavor. I urge a no vote on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining? The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds. It is said that we do not listen to the WTO, but they threaten us with sanctions. Do not give us incentives. It is a threat, and we capitulate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho, (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE).

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 90, which would officially withdraw the United States from the World Trade Organization and would fully restore our sovereignty, and I think that is the heart of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, as the recent debate in Seattle clearly demonstrated, the United States has absolutely no business in a bungling international organization that can unconstitutionally raise our taxes and threaten our sovereignty. The Seattle meeting was touted to be an opportunity for nations to openly and freely discuss multilateral trade agreements.

In truth, that was simply a charade, and most of the meetings were closed door or secret, where certain bureaucrats and countries were allowed to negotiate while others were left at the
doorstep. For instance, some of our own Members of Congress, who are constitutionally responsible for the U.S. citizens they represent, were denied access to these meetings. And all of this happening while protesters were being gassed and shot with rubber bullets by law enforcement.

What a circus, Mr. Speaker. This is not the way that we should conduct trade. This is certainly not the way our Founding Fathers envisioned how we should conduct trade. When the Founding Fathers of our country drafted the Constitution, they placed the treaty-making authority with the President and the Senate, but the authority to regulate commerce was placed with the House and the Senate. As international units cannot treaty away authorities they do not have, for example, those reserved only to the States, our Constitution left us with a system that made no room for agreements regarding international trade that does not involve treaties or specific actions by Congress.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution certainly does not give the authority to treaty-making bodies to represent the American people. Yet, this is exactly what the WTO has done. The WTO recently ruled that $2.2 billion of United States tax reductions for American businesses violates WTO rules and must be eliminated by October 1 of this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution requires that all appropriation bills originate in the House and specify that only Congress have the power to lay and collect taxes. As with international units that cannot treaty away their representation, a predominant reason for America's fight for independence during the American Revolution. Yet, now we face an unconstitutional delegation of taxing authority to an unelected international body of international bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that we do not need the WTO to maintain free and fair trade. Trade negotiations occur too long before the existence of the WTO. So let us return to a system of negotiating trade that is constitutionally founded.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. (Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, although, I do not think that withdrawing from WTO is the best course of action right now, the organization must be dramatically reformed to continue to have U.S. support.

In addition to incorporating labor rights and environmental protection, the WTO needs to become far more transparent to operate in full public view. The current international treaty proceedings need to be opened to the public. Civil society needs to be allowed into the process. Developing countries need to be able to fully participate.

But lack of transparency is not just a problem in the WTO. It is a problem in the U.S. relationship with the WTO. Trade policy in this country operated behind closed doors, only a few special interests making decisions for the entire country.

Most of the advisory committees that guide the President of the United States on trade policy are made up solely of industry representatives. The meetings are closed to the public. The process is not transparent. It is not democratic, it is not right.

The recent court decision said that two Forest Industry Sector Advisory Committees need to include environmental representative. That is what the court says in terms of the public's right to know. This is progress, but it is not enough.

There are still too many committees on tobacco, on chemicals, on all aspects of trade, that are comprised only of industry representatives. And even in a few instances where labor or the environment is actually represented, it is simply a token effort.

Labor, human rights, environmental, and the public need an equal seat at the table. Before the U.S. decides to challenge another country's health or environmental standards as a barrier to trade, we need an open and transparent process. That means before the U.S. lobbies against the EU plan to protect kids from toxic toys, there should be public involvement. The U.S. agency should not just be doing the bidding of industry, they should be representing all Americans.

That is what transparency is all about. I urge my colleagues and the administration to push for greater transparency in the WTO and also in our process here at home that leads up to these treaties.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of the WTO and our colleagues, especially the gentleman from the State of Oregon (Mr. DeFazio), have indicated that support for the resolution perpetuates the weakening of our clean air rules to accommodate foreign oil producers and not the level of environmental protection.

The regulations allowed U.S. refiners three ways in which to meet the standards while giving foreign refiners only one, a clear case of discrimination.

In short, this discrimination gave an opportunity to the WTO dispute settlement panel to hear the case on the grounds of this discrimination and what their panel considered and what they concluded was the level of protection was never an issue rather the U.S., the panel determined, is free to regulate in order to obtain whatever air quality it wishes. We just cannot have that kind of discrimination between the two.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, and I rise to strongly oppose the resolution. The WTO is the key stone of an international trading system that we have belonged to and helped shape since the late 1940s.

This is an essential part of our strategy for long term for fair trade. The WTO is essential to maintaining a rules-based trading framework that is critical to the little guy in international trade, not just us, and to the small company, participating in international markets.

I have listened to the debate here, and there is no question that the WTO needs reform. We need to improve transparency and its decision making. We need to address the weak and arbitrary aspect of a trading system that I have been critical of, but these facts make the case for our involvement, not for our withdrawal, any more than a disagreement with an individual court decision makes the case for withdrawing, given that any of these individual cases make the case for our withdrawal from the WTO?

We are the greatest economy on earth, and we cannot turn our back on the rest of the world where 75 percent of the world economy is. We need to play in that arena. And the only way we can do it and shape world trade is by participating in the WTO. I have no doubt that some of our trade competitors would delight in seeing us withdraw from the WTO and create a windfall for them and a clear field for their policies.

If we are in favor of fair and open trade, if we are in favor of involving ourselves in an international system that will continue to improve our quality of life and our economy, it is critical that we engage. I have no doubt in the future if we fail to address a need for reform in the WTO, that there will be a legitimate challenge against us for our withdrawal, but that case is not been made today. Vote down this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I want to also sincerely thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Paul) for bringing this resolution to the floor. I, for one, with the greatest reluctance will oppose it. Because as advertised, WTO was to solve many of our problems. It was to be good for America. It was to be good for U.S. workers.

We have heard remarks on the floor today about how our exports have gone up over the last 5 years. What has gone up is 120 percent over the last 5 years is our trade deficit. Before the WTO was implemented, our trade deficit was $150 billion. This last year, 1999, it has increased to $330 billion. We have heard that the WTO has put money into the American economy.
I am concerned about putting money in the pockets of American workers. And from my perspective, that has not happened. In constant 1982 dollars, the average American for that average one hour's worth of work, not stock options, not bonuses, they exhaust what our president claimed one hour's worth of work is making a nickel less 18 years later, so I do not know whose pocket these profits and these renewed incomes are going into.

There has been no progress over the last 5 years, as far as improving international environmental standards. There has been no progress over the last 5 years as far as improving labor rights.

And most recently, there has been an abject failure by the President of the United States and this administration to use the WTO as advertised. It is my understanding that quantitative limitations on the import or export of resources or products across borders is violating our traditional trade policies. As we debate this moment, OPEC nations are meeting in Europe fixing the production of oil, and it is causing a crisis for the taxpayers in this country and the President has not filed a complaint under the WTO.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind those who would like to reform the WTO that we are helpless, Congress cannot do that. We need a unanimous consent vote from the WTO members. So that is not going to happen. Even the committee describes what we are talking about as a system of fair trade administered by the WTO. Fair trade, fine, we are all for fair trade, but who decides the WTO? That is not fair to the American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Stupak).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Paul amendment, and some will see that as unnecessary, and they say work with the WTO and it will only get better. But what we have seen under the WTO is a tax on our environment, our health and safety standards, and we continue to have steel dumping here in the United States.

And my concern about our American sovereignty. Our democratic form of government is threatened by trade agreements like NAFTA, Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China, and WTO, that allows claims to be made against American markets. It allows claims to be made against our natural resources without regard to laws to protect the health, safety, welfare and environment of our great Nation like our fresh water resources.

Mr. Speaker, I have raised the fresh water resources in the sale of the version of Great Lakes water and our natural resources when we have debated NAFTA, when we debated WTO, and when we talked about trade with China. But the fact remains, once these trade agreements are passed, WTO kicks in and the U.S. sovereignty is kicked out. Take the FO Corporation from Richmond, Virginia, that wanted to put MMT in Canadian gasoline. It is a gas additive, yes, we want to protect our environment. We want to protect the health and safety of our people. We do not want this stuff in our gas. They went and they filed suit.

What happened? Canadian government had to pay them $13 million to put the gas additive in, and now, in Canadian gas, we find MMT. Well, let us just take the reverse, now we have a British Columbia company trying to put MTBE, another gas additive, here in the United States. We banned MTBE in California, because of our environment. We are banning MTBE in the Committee on Commerce in which I sit because of a threat to the health and safety of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, in 1994, supporters of the Uruguay Round and GATT would influence and shape the U.S. and the global economy. They declared it would not erode U.S. sovereignty or undermine environmental health or food safety policy. It would, they promised, improve labor standards worldwide.

Five years into its implementation, though, it has become clear that these people have failed to deliver. Instead, we have suffered through global financial instability, massive ballooning of the U.S. trade deficit, and ever-increasing income inequality in the United States, and especially in the developing world.

We have engaged with developing countries in trade investment, democratic countries in the developing world are losing ground to more authoritarian countries. Democratic countries, such as India and Taiwan, are losing ground to more totalitarian nations, such as Indonesia, where the people are not free and the workers do as they are told.

In the post-Cold War decade, the share of developing country exports to the U.S. for democratic nations fell from 53 percent a dozen years ago to 34 percent today. In manufacturing goods, developing democracies' share of developing country exports fell from 60 percent to 35 percent. Companies are relocating their manufacturing bases from democratic countries to more authoritarian regimes, where the workers are docile and obedient and where unions and human rights are suppressed.

As developing nations make progress towards democracy and worker rights, as they create regulations to protect food safety and protect the environment, the American business community punishes them by pulling their trade and investment in favor of totalitarian countries and totalitarian governments, such as China and Indonesia.

The WTO has clearly undermined health, safety and environmental standards, human rights and democratic accountability. The most tangible examples is the WTO's refusal to permit poor nations to gain access to low-priced pharmaceuticals, which puts essential medicines out of the reach of hundreds of millions of people in poor nations. Hundreds of millions of people continue to suffer from diseases that are treatable.

Some governments have sought to use policy tools, including compulsory licensing and parallel imports, to make essential medicines available for poor. Compulsory licensing and parallel imports are permissible under WTO rules on intellectual property. Nonetheless, the U.S. Government has threatened to impose unilateral trade sanctions and the USTR used WTO as a hammer for the American pharmaceutical industry.

Mr. Speaker, until such time as the administration really does do an honest assessment of the WTO, the WTO remains a tool for multinational corporations and should not receive our support.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Combest), the
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Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this resolution. As the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I know how essential trade is to farmers and ranchers across the United States; but, more importantly, the U.S. farmers and ranchers recognize the importance of trade to their own success.

Withdrawing us from the WTO would have the effect of isolating American producers from the rest of the world. For an industry that exports 30 percent of its production, a resolution such as this would have a devastating impact. If this House supports this resolution, the effect will be that the United States will be applying economic sanctions to the world; and we know who feels the effect of economic sanctions first, it is the American farmer and rancher.

There are three things that can happen when agricultural sanctions go into effect, and they are all bad: exports go down, prices go down, and farmers and ranchers lose their share of the market to farmers and ranchers across the United States; but, more importantly, the U.S. farmers and ranchers recognize the importance of trade to their own success.

Trades to the WTO would continue this progress. The 1980 grain embargo on the Soviet Union is one of the examples of the effect on sanctions on U.S. agriculture. Our wheat sales were lost, while France, Canada, Australia and Argentina sold wheat to the former Soviet Union. H.J. Res. 90 can have the same or more devastating impact on American agriculture. U.S. farmers and ranchers provide much more than is consumed in the United States; therefore, exports are vital to the prosperity of the American farmer and rancher.

The WTO is not a perfect organization, and Congressional oversight is essential and needed. Nevertheless, it is superior to previous organizations, and American agriculture recognizes this. Negotiations to further improve access to markets around the world and eliminate export subsidies are now going on. Since the end of World War II, eight rounds of negotiations have reduced the average bound tariff on industrial goods from 40 percent to 4 percent. Meanwhile, bound agricultural tariffs remain at an average of about 50 percent. If agriculture is to catch up, it is essential to keep the U.S. a part of the negotiating process to convince our trading partners to talk about further reforms in agriculture. U.S. membership in the WTO is necessary to continue this process. I urge my colleagues to reject H.J. Res. 90 for the future of American agriculture.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to the gentleman from California (Ms. Pelosi).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Resolution 90, and, in doing so, associate myself with those who support the resolution.

Indeed, the WTO is in need of significant reform. Workers' rights and environmental protection are competitive-ness issues and should play a stronger role in the WTO. However, I do believe we need a rules-based approach to international trade which can create a more stable climate for U.S. workers, farmers, and ranchers who seek to export their products abroad.

The global economy is here to stay. Nowhere is that more evident than in my district in San Francisco, Mr. Speaker, which was built on trade in the days when, the clipper ships sailed the oceans and today is one of the gateways to Asia. This debate today provides an opportunity for us to get beyond the outdated, outmoded, free traders versus protectionist characterization, which I believe does a disservice to the trade issue. A new vision is needed of a more democratic way to deal with the new challenges posed by the global economy.

The old way of the WTO, of conducting trade negotiations behind closed doors, must end, and the people must be allowed to participate. We must demand transparency in the WTO. Administration gives as much weight to workers and the environment as it does to corporate America. We must enforce all of these concerns with equal vigor. We must see anyone who does not see the connection between commerce and the environment on the wrong side of the future. We must all work together to have a WTO organization that is an agent for progress and not of exploitation. We must make it work for the American workers.

President Clinton himself has said, "If the global market is to survive, it must work for working families." We must apply that standard to the WTO. In terms of transparency, very specifically, Mr. Speaker, we must insist that the WTO bring trade advisory committees to broader public concerns, notify the public before challenging other countries environmental or health laws, which would give the EPA a stronger role in settling trade and environmental policy.

Mr. Speaker, I myself am voting against this, but I understand and appreciate the concerns expressed by those who support it. We must all work together to change the WTO.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the gentleman from Texas. This is not an issue of trade. This is an issue of who gets to manage and decide whether or not an agent for progress or of exploitation. We must make it work for the American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. membership in WTO violates our Constitution. Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution delegates to Congress the sole authority to "regulate commerce with foreign nations." Our membership in WTO transfers authority to regulate trade to a foreign body. Congress does not have the authority to set aside such constitutional requirements. If in its 1998 decision regarding the line item veto, the Supreme Court ruled that Congress cannot divest itself of duties delegated to it by the Constitution, unless the Constitution is amended.

This Congress does not have the authority to set aside such constitutional requirements. In its 1998 decision regarding the line item veto, the Supreme Court ruled that Congress cannot divest itself of the duty to regulate commerce with foreign nations. This Congress gets the WTO is an entirely non-legitimate international organization. Many of its member states do not represent the people of their country. They represent the single will of the sovereign of their country. The American Constitution grants Congress the sole authority to "regulate commerce with foreign nations." Our Constitution does not grant legitimacy to an international body over and above that of our own citizenry.

To suggest by our membership that the WTO is legitimate, we must ignore our people, our citizenry, and our Constitution. However, it seems that sovereignty or legitimacy are no longer issues that many in this Congress want to address. Instead, economic power and the accumulation of wealth seem to occupy increasing amounts of attention these days. America's legitimacy rests solely in its citizens' good offices as the sole sovereign of this country. If this Congress does not protect American sovereignty, then who will? If this Congress does not reaffirm the rule of law, then who will? It is we in this Congress that must reassert the constitutional directive that Congress must have the sole authority over America's trade with foreign nations.

Vote yes, vote yes proudly on H.J. Resolution 90. Remove this Nation from the unconstitutional jurisdiction of the WTO.
The World Trade Organization imposes obligations on State and local governments which limit their ability to promote the local economy, promote employment, protect consumers, and establish environmental standards. The WTO attacks laws which give preference to companies bidding for State business if they employ State residents and use locally made products. It attacks laws that offer tax exemptions to companies to create jobs. It attacks laws that promote investment in recycled material. It attacks laws that impose bilateral local requirements or preferences for State procurement.

Mr. Speaker, 95 laws in California have been identified as WTO-illegal, according to the Georgetown University Law Center. WTO complaints from State and local governments challenging their laws under NAFTA, California’s ban of a poisonous chemical, methyl tertiary butyl ether, MTBE, is being challenged, and Mississippi is being sued for violating NAFTA. The U.S. administration wants the WTO to include NAFTA-like investor protections in the future, further undermining local and State governments.

The end result of H.J. Res. 90 is humongous. Indeed, the consequences of withdrawing from the WTO would be so severe as to be unimaginable. As this Member previously noted, since the creation of the WTO, our exports of goods and services have risen by over $250 billion. The U.S. Department of Commerce estimates that exports currently represent approximately 12 percent of the entire United States Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Overall trade represents one-third of our entire economy. Clearly, the strength of the U.S. economy today is due in very substantial measure to our ability to competitively sell U.S. goods and services abroad.

The United States could be negated at any time by the WTO, as directed by H.J. Res. 90, then foreign countries would be free to impose whatever trade barriers they want on U.S. exports. For example, U.S. agricultural exports would face prohibitive tariffs and be allocated quotas, rather than face an ad-valorem tax. Moreover, the WTO’s General Agreement on Trade in Services (GAO) shows that the U.S. has won or resolved disputes 92 percent of all cases in its favor—that is 23 of 25 times since the dispute settlement system was created in 1995. In three-quarters of the 25 cases filed by the United States, WTO members agreed to remove their trade barriers, rather than face an adverse judgment, leading to millions of dollars in increased U.S. exports. For example, one of the settlements in favor of the U.S. was related to Korea’s discriminatory standards for food imports. As a result, this market is now open to $87 million in U.S. chilled beef and $79 million in pork exports.

As a defendant in 17 WTO cases, the U.S. has prevailed or was able to resolve the case.
Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, withdrawal from the WTO would isolate the United States from the international economy. I oppose withdrawal entirely.

In today’s Internet-based, lightning-fast economy, it is critical for the U.S. to have the ability to resolve trade crises through a binding, rules-based international system. While there is room for improvement in the WTO and its dispute resolution mechanism has served the United States workers, farmers, and businesses well. Through-out the existence of the WTO, the U.S. has succeeded in winning 25 out of the 27 cases that we have initiated in the dispute resolution system.

Mr. Speaker, the Clinton-Gore years have been prosperous for our county. One of the best ways to continue this success is by pursuing international markets. The WTO’s rule-based approach guarantees that disputes will limit costly, inefficient trade retaliations, and international strife. But in today’s information-based economy, it is critical that the U.S. be able to protect our place as the world’s technology leader by protecting our intellectual property.

While I think the WTO has moved trade policy many steps forward, there are reforms that I would like to see. The WTO should increase the transparency of its operations and take into account the impact of its actions on workers and the environment. It should disclose more information, preferably on line. Were the WTO’s operations more open to the public, I believe many of it critics’ concerns could be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote down this resolution.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The Financial Times does support the WTO, but this is what they said after NTR was passed. “Already, many Washington trade lawyers are smacking their lips at the thought of the fees to be earned from bringing dispute cases in the WTO against Chinese trade practices. Says one, what will China be like in the WTO? It is going to be hell on wheels.”

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the World Trade Organization is in need of serious reform. Interestingly, while Western economists are proclaiming that foreign investment and trade have been a blessing for the world’s poor, we hear quite a different message coming from the poor themselves.

The recent meeting of developing countries from Asia, Africa, and Latin America known as the G-15 saw host Hosni Mubarak that despite assurances that globalization would lead to an improvement in living standards, instead, imbalance in the world economy is increasing instead of decreasing. In fact, in 1999, 45 percent of the world’s income went to the 12 percent of the world’s people who live in rich, industrial nations. The three richest Americans own more than the world’s 20 poorest countries.

Mr. Speaker, if these countries were sold a bill of goods, but so were we. Corporations, with the help of the WTO, have forced workers throughout the world into a deadly game of chicken. The WTO should protect basic social services and prioritize human rights and the environment into an environ-ment that is democratic and transparent. Instead, it hurts the poor, ben-efits the rich at the expense of us all, and it does it in secret and in back rooms.

Mr. Speaker, this is no way to build a new world order. We need to put our money where our professed values are: fair trade, democracy, respect for workers, sensible environmental standards, and allowing poor countries to grow.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Corporate Code of Conduct Act because I do not think that freedom, equality, human dignity and human rights are for sale. Unfortunately, the folks at WTO do not agree. They have unleashed unbridled corporate excess on all of us. The current system is wrong and in need of a serious fix.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I really do not want to withdraw from the WTO. We need to be there, but I am voting yes out of frustration.

There are two problems. At home, the issue is simply whether those in this society, the investing class, the managing elite, the venture capitalists, the multinational corporations who have so much to gain by further globalization will be willing to see a tiny fraction of that increased wealth used to help those who would otherwise be caught in the prop wash of their incredible prosperity. So far, I see very little evidence of that.

Internationally, the question is simply, who is going to have a seat at the table? Now, only the voices of the eco-nomic elites are heard at WTO. The inter-ests of workers, farmers, and the environ-ment are not adequately taken into account. In fact, the incentives present in the WTO structure on ques-tions of worker rights and environ-mental protection are in the wrong di-rec tion.

An economic system without moral foundation is not an economic system at all, it is a jungle. I cast this vote not because I want to withdraw, I do not. I am a committed internationalist. For 10 years I chaired the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. But I am casting this vote to send a signal to WTO and our representatives to it that they have to give more than lip service to the needs of workers, farmers, and the
environment. When you do, give me a call. I will be happy to change my vote.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, WTO needs reform, not withdrawal. We do have a stake in ensuring the effectiveness of WTO because it has helped to eliminate trade barriers and improve market access for U.S. goods and services in foreign markets. But this does not mean that there is no room for improvement within the WTO.

Several areas for improvement come to mind. First, we must ensure that the WTO dispute settlement system is used to work out genuine trade disputes and does not become a forum for other nations to challenge U.S. trade laws. It is my understanding that Japan has established a government agency specifically for the purpose of pursuing WTO litigation against the United States, signaling a willingness to continue to challenge U.S. trade laws.

Second, there must be greater transparency in the dispute settlement process. The dispute settlement panel proceedings are conducted in an almost completely secret manner. Only government delegations are allowed to attend oral arguments and there is no requirement that the panels consider written submissions from domestic interested parties. We must open up the closed-door atmosphere that is today present in the WTO.

Finally, dispute settlement panels are now made up primarily of diplomats, bureaucrats and academics, who may not be trained to serve in a judicial capacity.

Yet they are sitting on panels that are reviewing laws passed by legislatures and agreements negotiated between governments. It seems appropriate that panels should include more judiciously-trained experts to ensure due process for the parties involved.

Rather than withdrawing from the system, we have in place, let's work to improve it so that we have a rules-based trading system that benefits U.S. industry and the American public.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the resolution, which would undermine U.S. market access for billions of dollars of U.S. agricultural products.

Trade is essential to U.S. prosperity, and the WTO makes trade work for America. Is it perfect? No. But all of the criticisms that I have heard this morning by my colleagues who oppose this resolution, all of these criticisms can be corrected by the United States maintaining a strong leadership role in making the WTO better.

A recent WTO case filed by Japan challenges the antidumping duties that resulted from the hot-rolled steel import case filed at the height of the 1998 steel import crisis.

We must counter the disturbing trend of other nations challenging U.S. trade laws. The U.S. trade laws are consistent with the WTO rules and are necessary to ensure that domestic producers and manufacturers are able to compete on a level playing field. Not even the most productive U.S. industry can or should have to compete against dumped or subsidized imports.

Second, there must be greater transparency in the dispute settlement process. The dispute settlement panel proceedings are conducted in an almost completely secret manner. Only government delegations are allowed to attend oral arguments and there is no requirement that the panels consider written submissions from domestic interested parties. We must open up the closed-door atmosphere that is today present in the WTO.

Finally, dispute settlement panels are now made up primarily of diplomats, bureaucrats and academics, who may not be trained to serve in a judicial capacity.

I can go on and on with significant victories for United States agricultural products. It was reported, for example, against a Canadian dairy export subsidy scheme before it could be copied in Europe.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we need the WTO dispute resolution system to keep opening markets for U.S. agricultural products, and we need the WTO. A strong vote against joint Resolution 90 will send an important signal to our trading partners that America is ready to lead a new round of WTO negotiations.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Texas that the giant meat packers may well be represented at the WTO, but the small rancher and farmer is not. The same people who promote this type of international managed trade where we lose control and it is delivered to an international bureaucracy are the same ones who fight hard to prevent us trading with Cuba and selling our products there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the WTO is a majestic dream that predictably will become Americans' worst nightmare. The lure...
of more open trade with hundreds of countries is being used as a disguise for an awesome transfer of power and authority that will in the long run ill serve the interests of the American people.

Let us recognize that this is not about whether there should be or should not be trade. That is a nonsensical argument. America is the world's largest market, and there will always be countries clamoring for commerce with the American people.

The WTO will decide for us how we will trade and what will be the procedure that we will trade with these countries? The question is if we, through our democratic processes and bilateral agreements negotiated by elected officials, people elected by the people of the United States, will be setting the ground rules for this trade, or whether it be controlled by international boards, commissions, and committees of the WTO.

Let us admit, yes, Third World countries may probably have more open markets to American and multinational corporations if this WTO goes through and keeps going on. That trade potential, let me point out, is minuscule. We are talking with a bunch of countries like Rwanda or like tiny countries in Latin America, Paraguay, as compared to large developing countries.

We are going to trade, give up our rights here in this country to determine our own economic destiny, to open up the markets of these tiny little countries? That is ridiculous. So there is an economic down side if we do not go through with WTO, yes. It is a minimal down side. But the potential down side in terms of the loss of the ability of the American people to control their own destiny is staggering.

Predictably, the boards, commissions, and the rest of the decision-making authorities that the WTO will have in a decade or two will be dominated by the same crooks and despots who now control so many of these Third World countries that refuse to open up their markets, and bribery and corruption will come with this centralization of power. There is no doubt about that.

If we try to predict that is not going to happen, give me a break. Idealistic globalization is today the greatest threat to freedom and liberty in this country, for the people of this country. We should not be transferring power and authority to an unelected, appointed international bureaucracy. That is what the WTO is all about.

Can one foresee a country like Communist China bribing WTO commissioners in the future? How about multinational corporations? Will they try to influence decisions that dramatically impact the standard of living of the American people, without any protection or elected officials that we can bet on it. We can also bet that they are going to try to just do that, and that we will not have anything that we can do about it. Yet, we will have little recourse in this whole situation except to quit.

I oppose PNTR with Communist China now because it is a dictatorial system. Now we are being eased into a system that will mandate that every decision will be tried and be expected equally with democratic societies. The WTO plan is a blueprint for bolstering tyrannical regimes throughout the world. Trade will not turn the hearts of these despots, or it will not make honest people out of corrupt officials who end up with the goods.

Please, I ask Members to support this resolution. Do not sacrifice American liberty on the altar of globalization.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that Member after Member who opposed this resolution will get up on the floor and agree that the WTO is making decisions that destroy the environment and health and safety of the peoples of the world, thumb their noses at human rights, but they say, yes, we know all this, but we do not want to leave. We want to stay. It does not make good sense. It does not make good sense unless they simply are doing the business of multinational corporations of the world in the interests of making more profits.

I know a lot about the WTO. I have followed them intimately for the last 3 years. I have watched what they have done as they have destroyed the ability of small farmers in the eastern Caribbean to earn a living from producing and selling bananas to the European Union. Why do they do that? One man, Carl Linder from Chiquita Bananas, who gave money on both sides of the aisle, who is well-connected politically, simply teamed up with Mickey Kantor, who is our United States Trade Representative, took the case to the WTO, because it makes money.

We do not grow any bananas in the United States, but they took the case on behalf of Carl Linder, who grows bananas down in Central America and who does a terrible job of protecting the rights of the workers, spraying pesticides on them while they till the soil, many of them dying and coming up with terrible diseases.

They took this case on behalf of Carl Linder to the WTO, and guess what, we won, because Carl Linder and Chiquita are very powerful corporate interests. Do Members know what is happening over in the eastern Caribbean? The farmers no longer will have the banana crop. Do Members know what will replace it? Ganja, marijuana, drugs. It will be a transshipment point for drugs into the United States and into our communities. That is what the WTO did.

In addition to that, he created a tradecase that is now hurting small businesses because of the sanctions that we have imposed on the European Union. It does not make good sense.

Further, let us talk about the trade-related intellectual properties or the TRIPS agreement that provides another example of a WTO policy that benefits wealthy and powerful special interests.

The TRIPS agreement gives patent rights over plants and medicines that come from small countries to wealthy corporations, the soybean in east Asia, which is patented by a subdivision of Monsanto Chemical; the mustard seed that was developed by the people of India who has also been patented by Monsanto. I could go on and on and tell Members why we must get out of the WTO.

I think reasonable minds will agree that the WTO simply is substituting for the responsibilities that we should be exercising as elected representatives.

We have elected representatives in democracies around the world, and criminal justice systems in democracies that can resolve problems, can negotiate disputes. Yet, we have decided to give up our rights, and there is no transparency. They make all of these decisions in secret. They make these decisions in secret. We do not know what they are.

We are beginning to find out that the multinational corporations have inserted their people, have gotten them appointed so that they are making decisions to protect them and their ability to make money on the backs of poor people, on the backs of small nations, on the backs of Americans who do not even know who these people are and how they are making these decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask support for this resolution. It makes good sense.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. J. J. O'SWALD).

Ms. J. J. O'SWALD of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution to withdraw from the WTO. The WTO is critical to the United States' interests. It has been instrumental in opening foreign markets to our goods and in promoting U.S. values throughout the world.

The U.S. is the world's largest exporter, and it is not just multinational corporations that export, it is small businesses, and medium-sized businesses are associated with exports are associated with small- and medium-sized businesses. It is a job creator, a high-paying job creator, in the towns and cities throughout America.

But because we are the world's largest exporter, we benefit tremendously from the WTO's dispute settlement process. In fact, of the 27 cases that have been brought for dispute resolution, the U.S. has prevailed in 25 of these cases.

Let me make another point about being part of a rules-based system. We have had testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means by human
Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), for his work on arguing this issue before us today.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) often speaks of the flat-Earth society that emerges here on the floor of the House from time to time. I fear that we have some Members here today bringing that philosophy forward who do not understand that we have some Members here today speaking of the flat-Earth society that emerges here on the floor of the House from time to time. I fear that we could either force our will on other Nations around the world or that we can go our separate way in the matter of international trade or commerce or that somehow we are in danger of being somehow we are in danger of being caught in the WTO to absolutely veto that.

All of us have some Members here today speaking of the flat-Earth society that emerges here on the floor of the House from time to time. I fear that we could either force our will on other Nations around the world or that we can go our separate way in the matter of international trade or commerce or that somehow we are in danger of being caught in the WTO to absolutely veto that.

We have a strong interest in making sure that we have an international system. The United States was the institution that prompted the evolution of the WTO. We were the largest exporting Nation in this world. I agree it is true the WTO is an imperfect organization, like the United Nations, like God forbid this Congress that continues to treat the citizens of the District of Columbia like members of a colony.

Do not talk to me about somehow the WTO is imperfect. We are holding up that same mirror to us. We can talk about lack of transparency in this Congress, lack of responsiveness to the will of the people of the United States. But we are all here slugging it out trying to do our best to move it forward. That is what we should be doing here with the WTO.

Withdrawal from the League of Nations did not make Europe safer prior to World War II. Staying in the WTO, exercising our leadership is going to hasten the day when it provides the type of transparency that we want, the type of leadership. But for heaven's sake reject this resolution.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) to remove the United States from the WTO, and I hope others in this body will agree with us on that.

One of my friends and a man I respect greatly, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) to remove the United States from the WTO, and I hope others in this body will agree with us on that.

I urge opposition to this resolution. In the past, we have been the only country to pass a constitutional amendment providing for the use of a bill of rights. We have the only country to pass a constitutional amendment providing for the use of a bill of rights. We have the only country to pass a constitutional amendment providing for the use of a bill of rights.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 1/4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution before us today. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) often speaks of the flat-Earth society that emerges here on the floor of the House from time to time. I fear that we have some Members here today bringing that philosophy forward who feel that we could either force our will unilaterally on other Nations around the world or that we can just go our separate way in the matter of international trade or commerce or that somehow we are in danger of being taken over by a faceless team of sinister international bureaucrats. All of that is pure and simple hogwash.

We are in a very powerful position today. As has been documented time and time again on the floor of this House, we are in the catbird seat. We win the preponderance of the cases that are brought before the WTO. We do not have to go along with something that strikes us on its face as being unfair and inequitable against the environment.

In the final analysis, this Congress retains the power, the sovereign power, to, on the floor, turn anything that we think is wrong. But in the meantime, we have a strong interest in making sure that we have an international system.

What I would like to do is, some of these very distinguished Members who think the WTO is going to do this, and every one of them almost have come up and said we must reform it, well I am going to stay on the floor and listen to the rest of the debate. I would be very pleased if some of them would get up and explain how we are going to reform the WTO. I do not believe it can be done without a great threat and/or removing ourselves from the WTO.

We need to work within an organization; I do not disagree with that. We need world trade; I do not disagree with that. But we need to be in an organization where we, indeed, have a little more say so about what happens to the trade in America.

Well, what kind of logic is that? If we want to have clean air laws that discriminate against dirty foreign gasoline, we can have them if we want to pay penalties levied against any and all U.S. products exported abroad. There does not have to be any relationship. We can have consumer protection laws. We can have a Buy America. We can purchase any U.S. law we want. All we have to do is pay for it.

This is an absurdity on its face. My colleagues are right, constitutionally, we certainly could not give them the right to reach in and overturn our laws, but what we have done is tended to seek tribunals before the WTO with no conflict of interest rules, no interve

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, before I start, let me commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) for bringing this to the floor and for the work of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), for his work on arguing this issue before us today.

Mr. Speaker, a very gifted man once wrote that “no extraordinary power should be lodged in any one individual. That man was Thomas Paine. It was over 200 years ago, a time when Americans were first coming to terms with the question of what it meant to be free, what it meant to be a democracy.
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Well, today our Nation is faced with a very different challenge. New technologies, as we have seen and as we have heard on this floor, has sent America and the world hurdling into a global economy. We are told it is an economic reality that cannot be allowed to reign on an economy where the law of supply and demand take precedence even over the laws of a free people.

Who will settle these conflicts whose outcomes will determine our very outcome will shape this new global economy? One single body with extraordinary power, the World Trade Organization. It is an organization that operates in virtual secrecy. An organization that operates without the participation of consumers, of workers, of farmers, of people of faith, or any other representatives of the communities that its decisions affect. Yet, it is an organization whose choices can effectively nullify even the hardest-won laws governing worker safety, product safety, the environment, and worker rights.

The WTO has already forced changes in the United States laws affecting everything from formulation of gasoline to the labeling of canned tuna. There are literally hundreds of pending cases all over that could affect decisions and laws that one's State legislatures, one's county commissioners, one's city governments have written into law.

It is an extraordinary power for an organization that is extraordinarily unaccountable. That is what the demonstrations in Seattle last fall were all about, what the demonstrations in Bra-silia, where 100,000 people came, were all about. It was the privatization of the public policy process. That is what is going on.

While citizens stood out in the rain in Seattle, corporate interest enjoyed an open-door access to WTO officials. At one point, listen to this, the corporate representatives in Seattle told me they were even selling opportunities to dine with the visiting trade ministers, dine, that is, if one can come up with $250,000. If one has got a quarter of million dollars, one gets to dine with the people who are inside the room. If one contributed $150,000, one could still come to dinner, one just could not bring as many guests.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we need to rebuild this idea of an international organization. Of course we need trade. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Norwood) is absolutely right. Of course we need relations with our allies and friends and even some of those who are not our allies and friends around the world. But we need to build an international organization that is not able to interfere with the laws of our country, our States, and our cities.

The fact is that the WTO rulings could override the decisions of a town council, a city commission to be only American-made products. Is there anybody here who wants to do away with that? I have seen the votes on the board. They are overwhelming on Buy America. They are almost 400 to 5 or 400 to 6. We do not want a WTO that takes a walk on the questions of human rights.

We have human rights issues debated regularly on this floor. What we want to do is to build a World Trade Organization that is as committed to promoting human rights and human dignity as it is to promoting the interest of large corpora-tions, a WTO where consumers and workers and farmers and people who care about the environment are not spectators, but are participants. We want a WTO where working families are not trapped on the outside looking in, but where all of us have a seat at the table.

But until there is a commitment to begin that process, and it is a process, and it will not be happening overnight, and it is going to happen eventually, then until that does happen, there is a commitment to do that, I have no choice but to vote yes on the gentleman's resolution. I thank him for bringing us to this opportunity today.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a letter to me from the Emergency Committee for American Trade and also a letter to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Archer), our distinguished chairman of Ways and Means, from the U.S. Alliance for Trade Expansion. Both letters are in very strong opposition to H.J. Res. 90. The one to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Archer), our distinguished chairman of Ways and Means, and the one to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio), I do not object if the gentleman from Illinois inserts the letters, but if he reads them, I will say he has to claim time.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio). Mr. DeFazio. Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is, if he is using the time to read the letters, that is one thing. If he is making a unanimous consent and he is not using his time, I will object to reading the letter.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I am not reading the letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The unanimous consent request does come out of the time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the letter to the gentleman from Texas (Chairman Archer) contains four pages of two-column names of businesses and associations that is very strongly ob-ject to H.J. Res. 90.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentle-man from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I include the letters I referred to for the Record as follows:


Hon. Philip M. Crane, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am writing, as Chairman of the Emergency Committee for American Trade and Chairman of Cargill, Incorporated, to urge you to vote against H. J. Res. 90, withdrawing congressional approval of the agreement establishing the World Trade Organization. The financial cost of U.S. support for the WTO would undermine the tremendous growth and prosperity that the United States has enjoyed through the expansion of world trade—an expansion en-abled by the WTO and the multilateral trad-ing system.

With 96 percent of the world's population and four-fifths of the world economy located outside U.S. borders, we cannot sustain eco-nomic growth here at home unless we have the ability to expand our market outlets in world markets. As documented in ECAT's 1998 groundbreaking study, Global Investments, American Returns, America, Update, the world economic expansion and integration have enabled American companies with global operations to make important contribu-tions to the U.S. economy and standard of living that in many cases are greater than those of purely domestic firms. For the past two decades, American companies with global operations have increased average U.S. exports by half of all U.S. research and development and over half of all U.S. exports. They also have un-locked 400 to 5 percent of the major invest-ment in physical capital in the manufac-turing sector. In addition, American compa-ny's without global operations pay their workers 5 to 15 percent less than American companies with global operations.

While American companies have sought opportunities in global markets, they have faced three-fourths of all employment and investment in the United States. These American companies have provided an important source of new business opportunities for all Americans, as the have purchased from U.S. suppliers over 90 percent of their intermediate inputs for their products, totaling 3 percent of U.S. Gross Domestic Product. Two-thirds of American companies also have created signif-icant new markets for U.S. companies, as foreign affiliates account for 4 percent of U.S. exports. In addition, over 70 percent of the income from the foreign affiliates of American companies is repatriated, thereby promoting greater U.S. economic growth.

The trade liberalization shaped by the WTO and its GATT predecessor has been the major engine of the global economic growth that is so vital to our nation's prosperity. Since the founding of the multilateral trad-ing system at the end of World War II, the world economy has grown six-fold, per capita incomes worldwide have doubled, and hundreds of millions of families around the globe have risen from poverty. The historic liberaliza-tion under the Uruguay Round Agreements provided significant new market access through substantial tariff cuts on agricul-tural and industrial products, reductions in agricultural trade barriers, limits on the use of agricultural export subsidies, and the cre-ation of new disciplines to open up global markets to services providers. This liberal-ization is expected to produce a $250 billion increase in world GDP and a 10 percent in-crease in world trade by 2005. This means an additional annual $100 to 200 billion in purchasing power for consumers worldwide.

Since the Uruguay Round, the WTO has helped to pave the way for continued growth in the 21st century by producing an information technology agreement that will put $600 billion worth of trade in computers and other high-tech products, a financial services agreement covering $60 billion in financial transactions, and an agriculture agreement opening up 95 percent of the world's telecommunications markets by eliminating monopolies and establishing pro-ductive regulatory oversight. The 1998 commitment among WTO members to main-tain "duty-free cyberspace" also has laid the
foundation for world economic growth in new areas by ensuring the unhindered development of electronic commerce as a means to promote trade.

For the United States, this global economic growth has helped the U.S. economy grow from $7 trillion in 1992 to over $9 trillion in 2000. Employment levels are now at their lowest point in 30 years and, U.S. poverty rates are the lowest in two decades. The WTO has helped to ensure that this growth, even in times of economic instability as evidenced by the fact that U.S. exports of goods and services, even with the disruption of the Asian financial crisis, have grown at an annual average of 15 percent since 1992 to a record total of nearly $959 billion last year.

WTO membership has grown since 1986 from 30 members to 146 members in 2000, with 30 other countries applying for membership. As a result, the WTO is becoming a truly global system of trade rules in which WTO disciplines have become a key element not only in developed nations, but also in emerging economies in Central and Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. Achieving China’s entry into the WTO and its integration into the rules-based world trading system is vital to this process and will mean that China, the largest emerging economy in the world, develops its economy in accordance with WTO rules. China’s WTO accession along with the U.S. extension of Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) to China will help to guarantee that the U.S. farmers, manufacturers, and services providers will reap the full benefits of the world’s first U.S.-China bilateral WTO accession agreement.

The United States also has benefited from the strong and consistent settlement process put in place as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreement. The United States has used the WTO dispute settlement process to ensure adherence to U.S. trading obligations under the WTO, as the United States has prevailed in 23 of the 25 U.S. WTO complaints acted on to date. It is important to note that while the WTO dispute settlement process is binding, compliance with WTO panel recommendations is voluntary. The WTO has no authority to force a member country to change its domestic laws or policies and therefore does not pose a threat to enforcement of U.S. health, safety, or environmental standards. In cases in which a WTO member country brings itself into conformity with a panel decision, the affected WTO member countries have the right to request enforcement.

Maintaining strong U.S. support and leadership in the WTO is critical to ensuring full enforcement and implementation of existing WTO agreements, and to carry on the work of the WTO “built-in” agenda, including the negotiations on agriculture and services. It is essential that the United States sustain its efforts on liberalization of agriculture and services through the ongoing negotiations and to find ways to build a consensus among WTO members to expand liberalization negotiations to include other areas such as industrial tariffs, trade facilitation, and transparency in government procurement, and to successfully complete the sectoral accelerated tariff liberalization and information technology ITA II negotiations.

For the reasons outlined above, especially the benefits that the United States has derived from the operation of the WTO over the last five years, ECAT member companies urge you to vote against H. Res. 90.

Sincerely,

ERNEST S. MICEK, Chairman, Cargill, Incorporated and Chairman, Executive Committee for American Trade

U.S. TRADE


HON. BIL ARCHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ARCHER: On March 2, 2000, the President, pursuant to Sections 122 and 124 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA), submitted the 1999 Trade Policy Annual Report to Congress which included an expanded assessment of the operation and effects of the Uruguay Round Agreement on the World Trade Organization (WTO). Under the law, any Member of either House could introduce a joint resolution that calls on the U.S. to withdraw from the WTO. We write to urge you to oppose H. J. Res. 90, introduced by Representative Ron Paul (R-14-TX), which calls on Congress to withdraw from the World Trade Organization.

Removing ourselves from the rules-based trading system would have disastrous consequences for the American economy, jeopardizing both the longest economic expansion in U.S. history and continued U.S. global economic leadership. The consequences include:

Agriculture: The WTO Agreement on Agriculture required countries, for the first time, to reduce or cap tariffs, export subsidies and import surcharges, and established new science-based rules for measures restricting imports on the basis of human, animal, or plant health. When the U.S. withdrew, American farmers could be excluded from these benefits. Moreover, American farmers would not benefit from further negotiations already launched at the WTO to reduce trade-distorting export subsidies overseas. One-third of American farm production is sold overseas. These exports support approximately 3 million American jobs.

Intellectual Property Rights (IPR): The enforcement mechanisms now available to the United States through the WTO’s TRIPs are critical to American holders of patents, trademarks and copyrights. Total foreign sales of the core copyright industries amounted to an estimated $45.8 billion in 1993. TRIPs implementation has produced the most significant progress to date for protecting pharmaceutical patients in developing countries. We should not make the world safe for pirated American software, pharmaceuticals, and other high value-added products.

Manufacturing: With $527 billion in exports in 1998, the U.S. is by far the largest exporter of manufactured goods in the world—17 percent larger than our nearest competitor. Manufactured products account for 62 percent of all U.S. exports and 72 percent of all U.S. imports. Under the Information Technology Agreement (ITA), 52 countries represent 95 percent of trade in high-tech products eliminated tariffs in a rapidly-expanding $600 billion global market that is critical to U.S. growth. Given these statistics, it should be no surprise that a rules-based international trading system—one that protects against abusive trade practices—is more important than ever to American manufacturers.

Retailing: The U.S. retailing sector employs nearly one-fifth of the American workforce, and contributes greatly to the high U.S. standard of living by providing consumers with a wide variety of products they demand at affordable prices. Tariffs are essentially import taxes that, if reintroduced as a result of a U.S. pullout, could add 30 percent or more to the cost of consumer products. As Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan has noted on several occasions, imports have also served as a great inflation-fighter and economic growth engine in a period of economic growth, and contribute substantially to our rising standard of living.

Services: The WTO General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) established a rules-based trading system for services. The WTO rules safeguard American service exports, which were $292 billion in 1998 and resulted in a surplus of $79.4 billion. The Basic Telecommunications Agreement represents 93 percent of the total domestic and international revenue of $600 billion generated in this sector annually. The Financial Services Agreement represents 95 percent of the international trade in banking, insurance, securities and financial information services. Negotiations to further liberalize world-wide trade in services—including the delivery of services via electronic commerce—began in January 2000.

It’s not just the economy that is at stake, but our national security as well. The rules-based trading system that has developed since the end of World War II stands in stark contrast to the mushrooming trade barriers that the world saw in the 1930s. These policies sent trade flows into a long downward spiral that culminated in the virtual collapse of international commerce, depression and, finally, war. The bitter lessons of the first half of the 20th century provide a map toward not to retrace the steps of an integrated world economy—economic nationalism, isolationism and protectionism.

The WTO is by no means perfect. We, along with our fellow WTO members, have already taken a range of measures to improve the functioning of the system. At the same time, it is indisputable that the rules-based trading system has been a positive force shaping the world since the end of World War II. It has played an essential role in the transformation of the American economy since the mid-1980s, driven in no small measure by the competition faced both here and abroad. Concerning the alleviation of poverty, trade is a key element in the new strategy worth mentioning in the developing world.

U.S. membership in the World Trade Organization deserves the support of all Americans. We urge you to oppose H. J. Res. 90, which calls on the United States to withdraw from the World Trade Organization.

Sincerely,
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And the best example that has been cited today widely is the need to have a more open judicial process that more closely resembles the process that has served us so well in the United States.

So the question before the House today is really what tactic should we take in order to pursue reform. And I would suggest that what we should do is stand up and act like leaders; act like leaders, as expected by other countries and by the citizens we represent here today. What they expect us to do is to act openly, action and not just simply support some blanket general withdrawal of the WTO.

So let us begin to debate the specific types of reforms we need to undertake, and let us pursue our right in the World Trade Organization to lead an effort for those of us who, for example, will pursue more openness and the other types of reforms we have debated today. And let us use our time on the floor more wisely. Let us debate how we can expand the benefits of trade for everybody, how we can expand the winners circle, how we can begin to open up the benefits of trade for more small- and medium-sized businesses, so that they too can enjoy the benefits of trade.

And let us get back to debate on what we can do. I am an important partner with our States and our local governments to fund the types of job training and education programs that American workers need today to succeed and survive in this global economy. There is tax credits available; there are programs we know that can work, that can create partnerships between employers and employees so more of the people we represent can succeed in this global economy. That is the debate we ought to be having today. We ought to defeat this resolution and we ought to get back to work. Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Let me say to the gentleman that reforms are not permissible. The Congress cannot reform the WTO. Only they can reform themselves. But they work in secret, and they have to have a unanimous vote. Our vote is equal to the country of Sudan. So do not expect it to ever be reformed. The only way we can voice our objection is with this resolution. And there will never be another chance to talk about the WTO for 5 more years.

Let me state that the Congress is required to state a constitutional justification for any legislation. The Committee on Ways and Means amending bill states its purpose in section 8 of this bill. And let me state their constitutional justification. It says, the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxation, duties, imposts and excises. But the Constitution says the Congress. But what we are doing is allowing the WTO to dictate to us.

Even those on the Committee on Ways and Means and said that they endorse this system of fair trade administered by the WTO. Who is going to decide what is fair? The WTO does. And they tell us what to do.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).
Mr. PAUL. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 5½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has 5½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio has 9½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. (Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts was asked and given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

I agree with all those who have said it is important for the future of America and for our economy to continue to participate in the World Trade Organization. It is simply common sense that the more open our trade regime the more gain from supporting the international organization whose purpose is to open up the trade regimes of all nations and police those arrangements.

Many members today have talked about the faults of the WTO, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), is in part correct; they are many. But we have to keep in mind that these faults take place against a backdrop of international agreements and cooperation. We are not going to win every case, and sometimes the WTO simply going to be wrong. But that does not mean that we are better off without having a WTO. It provides a place to resolve trade conflict that historically can easily escalate into more serious matters.

There are a number of improvements to the WTO that we want and have been working to persuade other countries to agree to, and the Committee on Ways and Means speaks to that frequently. They involve opening up the WTO to public view and input, expanding the scope of trade agenda to fit the realities of modern technology and economic integration, consistent enforcement of core labor standards, bringing environmental considerations more forcefully into the discussion, and certainly reaching out to developing countries.

However, there is something we can do here that is equally important, and we need to do it ourselves. In these trade debates, including the debate that we recently had over China, and others as well, they are infused with a certain cultural elitism that needs to be challenged. Those who make key decisions in this Nation on trade issues are going to have their jobs, for the most part, after the decision is made. But there are thousands and thousands of people who believe that they will not, and they are scared about it.

A factory closes in New England and moves to Tennessee, a merger between two companies that leads to downsizing for cost efficiencies, and the start-up of new production lines overseas all look about the same from the factory floor. While we criticize and support the WTO throughout the morning, I would ask Members, Mr. Speaker, to think about the job we need to do to talk about trade in such a way that it is less threatening and more universally accepted.

If we cannot change the tone of the debate, if we cannot sell free trade to those who are nervous about it, then perhaps we have a lot less to say than those who are nervous about it. And I would predict that if we do not, and we simply vote against this resolution and go on our merry way, then we are going to have a much bigger problem 5 years from now.

Mr. DeFazio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Financial Times, senior WTO staffer: "The WTO is the place where governments collude in private against their domestic pressure groups. I would posit that actually the WTO is working very much the way its principal authors intended, and its principal authors were the multinational corporations who want to be unfettered from the restrictions of consumer rights, labor rights, environmental rights and property law."

The WTO does have a few standards. It prohibits slave and prison labor. It does not prohibit child labor, bonded child labor. On the environment, it does allow nations to have the precautionary principle upon which most of our consumer protections and environmental laws are based. It sets new standards that they say are scientifically based and higher than the precautionary principle.

We have to prove a substance is harmful before we can prohibit it. Thalidomide would have had to be imported into the United States, under the WTO rules, until it was proven that it was safe. I have asked the U.S. to file a complaint at the WTO against them. Our Trade Representative says, oh, no, we cannot do that. Well, maybe Pakistan. How about the WTO and ask them to put forward reform proposals. I think we are going to have to do it ourselves.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would posit that actually the WTO is really designed to protect corporate multinational interests and the profits of gasoline companies and the oil companies, which are up 400 to 500 percent. People in the Midwest are paying up to almost $3 a gallon, and we cannot do anything about that in the WTO; we cannot stick it to consumer law.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is vital for the United States to have a strong, open, fair trade organization. The WTO is simply going to be wrong. But we cannot simply say yes, we have to be more involved in the discussion that is being held here today, to examine the evidence, and conclude to vote against H.J. Res. 90. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair as to who will have the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska).

The majority manager, will be the last speaker.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, so the speakers will be in what order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Paul), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Levin), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Crane).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Dooley).

(Mr. DOOLEY of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, as our world's economy makes the transition from an industrial-based economy to one that is information based, what we are finding increasingly is that geography is going to become less important. We are going to find that national borders are no longer going to be barriers to the flow of information, the flow of commerce, and to the flow of new ideas.

What is important for us to understand, as globalization takes hold, is that we have these international bodies that can develop the rules of the road that we can have a level of certainty in terms of how international laws related to trade can be effectively and equitably implemented.

There is no country that has more at risk in this endeavor as the United States, with our country only having 4 percent of the world's population, 96 percent of the world's population outside our borders, when we look at the fact that we consume 25 percent of all the world's GDP. It is important for us to understand that we have more at risk than any country in terms of the opportunities that a consistent set of rules that help to guide international trade provide us.

I also would make a strong case that, for those of us who are very interested in seeing how we can advance issues related to human rights, how we can advance issues that can elevate labor and environmental standards, is that the WTO has the potential to be one of the most effective vehicles in order to achieve that outcome.

Because if we ever looked to see what would be the impact of this legislation passing today, it would, basically, leave us without an effective mechanism with which the United States can exert its influence on a world body.

And so, that is why I think it is important for us to certainly vote against this measure today and dedicate ourselves to continue to have the United States, indeed, leadership through the WTO to advance the issues of labor and environmental standards.

This will make good sense in terms of ensuring that U.S. workers have the economic opportunities the global marketplace provides and, also, to maximize the influence of the United States in developing countries.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Holt).

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill to call for removal from the World Trade Organization.

Quite simply, the reason for the WTO is that organized, rule-based trading is more reliable and more beneficial to all than unregulated exchanges. This is what we were talking about just a few weeks back when we are talking about permanent normal trade relations with China.

I think the argument follows that, of course, what is good for trading goods is also relevant to other things we hold important. And certainly, the WTO is far from perfect. We need to make some improvements with regard to transparency and the information that is included in the decision-making and public disclosure, and we need to improve the trade and labor working group and the way the environment is considered. But without the organization, we have nothing to work with. It should be clear that a trade free-for-all is not better than a principle-guided one.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, a recent study by the School of Public Affairs at the University of Maryland found 93 percent of Americans agree with the statement "Countries that are part of international trade agreements should be required to maintain minimum standards for working conditions." Over 80 want to buy products made by children under the age of 15. Seventy-eight percent say that child labor and environmental protections should be part of the agreement. Seventy-four percent said countries should be able to restrict the import of products if they are produced in a way that damages the environment. Seventy-four percent said there should be a moral obligation to ensure foreign workers do not have to work in harsh or unsafe working conditions.

Guess what? None of those things are protected by the WTO. None of them are allowed to be protected by the current rules of the WTO by us, by the United States, enforcing those values in trade.

We cannot restrict the movement of goods produced under any of those problems conditions by child labor, bonded child labor, in an environmentally destructive manner, on and on. The list goes on. Labor rights. Those are not part of this agreement.

The gentlemen opposite, no one talked about American consumers are benefiting so much. He might have said the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur).

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that many of the provisions that are included in the decision-making under the WTO will be a protest vote. Because in Ottawa, Ohio, right next door where I live, as president of Philips Components also has announced they will move 1,500 more area jobs to Mexico.

The firm is going to take the production lines that exist at this Ottawa plant and transfer it to Mexico over a 3-year period starting now. Work will be moved on making the 25- and 27-inch picture tubes. And the spokesman for Philips, which is based somewhere in the Netherlands, no one seems to be able to find it, we cannot even get a phone call returned, we get a recording when we call the firm in Ohio, a spokesman for Philips declined to give any specifics on the Mexican facility, even what city these goods will be moved to or what the factory is making now.

Yesterday's announcement had been dreaded in this Putnam County, Ohio community. Now, David Thompson, the Phillips' spokesman, said, the company maintained that moving production to Mexico was the best alternative for the long-term health of the business, so an counter-proposal for the company to stay had to come from Local 1654, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
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But as the newspaper reports this morning, when John Benjamin of that local contacted company representatives several times trying to find what areas they felt needed to be addressed in the contract, they received no response.

So today my vote against the U.S. involvement in WTO is a protest vote, and it is standing with the workers of our country who have no rights in this regime.

I have tried to get the head of another group of workers in Ohio whose jobs had been moved to China to come and meet with these workers to help these 1,500 people adjust to the world that they are about to face now, and the leader from the other company said he was going through a divorce because life has been so hard for them. They have lost over 2,000 jobs in China.

I stand in protest to this regime, which turns its back on the working people of our country. It is absolutely wrong. I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind our colleagues that we are the biggest export nation on the face of this Earth. Every billion dollars in increased U.S. exports translates into roughly 15,000 to 20,000 new jobs here in the United States. And those new jobs that are trade-related jobs pay on average about 17 percent more than jobs simply for domestic consumption.

In other words, trade is one of the biggest benefits economically this country has experienced. We are at a point because we have been at full employment for almost 5 years now where we are importing skilled labor, thousands of skilled workers, because of the shortage of workers we have in this country. And there has been some suggestion by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Sweeney) that there may be 6 million immigrants working in the United States that are filling those empty slots because we have no opportunities for any increased jobs. We are short of labor in this country, just like we are short of virtually everything else.

Let me read a Statement of Administration Policy here for the RECORD:

Though its origins date back more than 50 years, the WTO continues to be a critical forum for (1) advancing U.S. interests and advance U.S. interests in the global economy; (2) lower trade barriers and promote new opportunity for American workers, firms, and farmers; (3) advance the rule of law; (4) promote economic stability and peace by giving nations stronger stakes in one another’s prosperity and stability.

If the United States did not participate in the WTO, we would (1) expose ourselves to discrimination by virtually all other major trading nations; (2) weak our ability to get other trade by trade commitments; (3) threaten U.S. competitiveness and living standards; (4) create uncertainty and risk in the U.S. and world economy.

U.S. leadership in the WTO is critical at this time. There are more than 30 nations, including some economies in transition, seeking to join the WTO, as well as a number of developing countries that are working to meet their WTO obligations. Withdrawal of congressional support for the multilateral system would send precisely the wrong message to these countries.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPITUR), I totally agree with her statement and she has every right to be angry. We do not do a very good job at all in this country of helping those who lose from trade, even though I strongly believe that the majority of Americans benefit from trade and I concur with what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) just said. She has every right to be angry.

But this prescription, being proposed, withdrawing from the WTO, would not do one thing to help the workers in Ohio or any other workers; and, in fact, it would probably make their lot worse.

What the gentleman, my dear colleague from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is proposing would lead us down the road towards trade anarchy at the expense of the American worker and the American consumer. It would not solve the legitimate concerns that some of the proponents of this resolution have. It would make matters much worse for all Americans.

I hope the whole House will reject this unwise resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 90, a resolution to withdraw Congressional approval of the agreement establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO). I want to point out that the Ways and Means Committee reported this resolution adversely by a unanimous roll call vote of 35 to 0.

U.S. membership in the WTO is clearly in our national interest. The multi-lateral rules-based trading system of the WTO, which was first established in 1947 as part of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), has been vital to global economic growth, peace and stability. In its five-year existence, the WTO has helped create a more stable climate for doing business. WTO members have adopted and provided an effective means for settling trade disputes. More than any other member, the U.S. has benefited from the dispute resolution mechanism, winning 23 of the 25 actions it has brought against other WTO members.

It is important to note that while WTO dispute settlement process is binding, compliance with WTO recommendations is voluntary. The WTO has no authority to force a member country to change its domestic laws or policies and therefore poses absolutely no threat to enforcement of U.S. health, safety, or environmental standards. In cases in which a WTO member chooses not to bring itself into conformity with a panel decision, the affected WTO member countries have the right to seek compensation or to retaliate.

The trade liberalization shaped by the WTO and its GATT predecessor has been the major engine of global economic growth and is vital to our continued economic prosperity. Since the founding of the multilateral trading system at the end of World War II, the world economy has grown six-fold, per capita income worldwide has tripled and hundreds of thousands of families around the world have risen from poverty. For the U.S., this global growth has helped the economy grow from $7 trillion in 1992 to $9 trillion in last year. The WTO has helped to ensure that this growth is sustained even in times of economic instability as evidenced by the growth of U.S. exports of goods and services, even with the disruption of the Asian financial crisis, have grown by 55 percent since 1992 to a record total of nearly $95 billion last year.

During the first five years of the WTO, the U.S. economy generated 1.4 million new jobs. Almost 10 percent of all U.S. jobs—nearly 12 million—now depend on our ability to export goods abroad. Membership in the WTO also yields concrete benefits to Texas workers and families. Since the WTO was created, U.S. exports have grown by $255 billion, helping thousands of jobs for Texas workers. Texas is the second largest exporting state in the U.S., totaling more than $78 billion in exports in 1998. Texas and the U.S. would lose these benefits if it withdraws from the WTO and member countries could, and likely would, erect a host of protective barriers to U.S. goods and services. They could, in fact, block U.S. access to their markets altogether. Given that international trade now accounts for nearly one-third of U.S. gross domestic product and one-fourth of U.S. income, Texas and the U.S. simply cannot afford to lose access to these markets.

The WTO is not a perfect organization. While I will vote against this resolution, I believe we should open up the WTO to greater participation. Significant events and economic events have shown us that as trade has increased and had greater impact on people’s lives, there has been a greater desire for knowledge about the WTO and the development of international trade rules. Opening the process, by allowing public submissions to dispute settlement panels and opening panel proceedings to public view will go a long way toward making Americans more comfortable with WTO recommendations.

Trade now represents nearly one-third of our economy. Leaving U.S. exports and imports with no effective rules or framework is reckless and counterproductive. Withdrawal of U.S. support for the WTO would undermine the tremendous growth and prosperity that the U.S. has achieved through the expansion of world trade—an expansion enabled by the WTO and the multilateral trading system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the growth of international trade and institutional reform and urge a “no” vote on this resolution.

[From the Blade, Toledo, OH, June 21, 2000]
move 90 per cent of its television-tube production from this northwest Ohio town to a facility it bought in north-central Mexico, leaving 1,500 area workers without jobs. The Ann Arbor-based division of Royal Philips Electronics announced yesterday that production lines from the Ottawa plant will be transferred in phases to Mexico over a three-year period, starting in the first months of 2001. When the move was disclosed in April, the company said it planned for the transfer to start next spring.

The element to move from the Ottawa plant will join machinery for two new production lines in an existing factory. Work to be transferred to Mexico includes the production of 25-inch and 27-inch picture tubes. A spokesman for Philips declined to give any specifics on the Mexican facility, except that it is in an area where the company already has a manufacturing site.

The Ottawa plant will retain 250 to 300 workers to make 32-inch tubes.

Yesterday's announcement, although expected, has not been well received in this Putnam County town.

"It's definitely a hit. But we had tried to run this community like a business, so we've been prepared for this and we'll survive," said John Williams, municipal director of the village of Ottawa.

The company said in April and reiterated yesterday that the move to Mexico is part of its strategy to improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of its manufacturing operations, as prices in the North American market have declined.

David Thompson, a Philips spokesman, said the company maintained that moving production to Mexico was the best alternative for the long-term health of the business, so any counterproposal needed to come from Local 1654 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

"We needed to take a look at significant cost-savings in production . . . and the union never came back with a counterproposal, so we finalized our plans," said Mr. Thompson.

John Benjamin, president of Local 1654, said union officials contacted company representatives several times trying to find out what areas they felt needed to be addressed, either in the contract or otherwise, and received no response.

"We're not going to other facilities where workers have given up stuff to secure their future and it didn't work," said Mr. Benjamin, a 34-year employee of the plant.

The International Workers of the Worldexpires Section 27 and Mr. Benjamin said he has contacted the company about dates to start renegotiating a contract.

"We've got to have something in place for people until they find other work," he said. He declined to reveal what type of severance package or retraining help the union might offer an updated bonus plan to raise production levels. The union's Mr. Benjamin said workers with greater seniority will be allowed to bump into jobs that are staying in Ottawa.

Severance packages for the 1,300 hourly workers who will lose their jobs will be negotiated. Severance and benefit packages are being prepared for the 200 salaried workers who will lose their jobs, Mr. Thompson said.

Mr. Williams, Ottawa's municipal director, said village officials contacted legislators and learned that the plant's workers are eligible for displacement benefits under the North American Free Trade Agreement but that will be handled by the federal government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFazio) has 2 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Paul) has 5 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Levin) has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Crane) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The gentleman from Illinois just quoted a statement about exports and 15 to 20,000 jobs per $1 billion. Apparently that is true. But unfortunately one cannot just use one side of the equation. One has to get to the next part of the equation. The net is we ran last year a $27 billion trade deficit by which his math would mean 4,065,000 jobs were lost. We are heading toward more than $300 billion this year, and the administration itself admits with the accession of China to the World Trade Organization the deficit with China and PNTR will grow dramatically. So you cannot just use the side of the equation that goes to your argument. It goes both ways.

We are running a huge and growing trade deficit because American workers cannot and should not be competing with bonded child labor, with people who work in unsafe conditions, with people who work in factories where they dump the toxic waste out in the back. Does not that what the U.S. represents, is that not what we want to drive the rest of the world to, and it is not what we should be driving our Nation to. We should be demanding more. This organization was set up basically so it could not be changed. You are going to get Cuba and China and Myanmar and those other great bastions of democracy, workers' rights, environmental protections to go along with improvements in the WTO? I think not.

But it is working quite well for those companies as well as it is for the giant multinational corporations. It is working as designed.

Every once in a while, once every 5 years, we get a chance to gain out of the WTO.

We cannot control the WTO. None of us here in the Congress has anything to say. You have to have a unanimous vote with WTO to change policy. Our vote is equal to all the 134 other countries, and therefore we have little, or no say here in the U.S. Congress.

Why is it that I have alliances on the other side of the aisle where we may well disagree on the specifics of labor law and environmental law. We agree that the American people have elected us, we have taken an oath of office to obey the Constitution, that we have a responsibility to them and we should decide what the labor law ought to be, we should decide what the environmental law should be, we should decide what the tax law should be. That is why we have an alliance.

But let me remind my colleagues, the American people are getting frustrated. They feel this sense of rejection and this loss of control. Why bother coming to us? We do not have control of the WTO and they do not want to rubber-stamp it, and they do not think it is quite appropriate to vote "yes" on this resolution, vote "present." Send a message. They deserve to hear the message. We have no other way of speaking back. Every 5 years, we get a chance to get out of the WTO.

We cannot control the WTO. None of us here in the Congress has anything to say. You have to have a unanimous vote with WTO to change policy. Our vote is equal to all the 134 other countries, and therefore we have little, or no say here in the U.S. Congress.

Why is it that I have alliances on the other side of the aisle where we may well disagree on the specifics of labor law and environmental law. We agree that the American people have elected us, we have taken an oath of office to obey the Constitution, that we have a responsibility to them and we should decide what the labor law ought to be, we should decide what the environmental law should be, we should decide what the tax law should be. That is why we have an alliance.

But let me remind my colleagues, the American people are getting frustrated. They feel this sense of rejection and this loss of control. Why bother coming to us? We do not have control of the WTO and they do not want to rubber-stamp it, and they do not think it is quite appropriate to vote "yes" on this resolution, vote "present." Send a message. They deserve to hear the message. We have no other way of speaking back. Every 5 years, we get a chance to get out of the WTO.

We cannot control the WTO. None of us here in the Congress has anything to say. You have to have a unanimous vote with WTO to change policy. Our vote is equal to all the 134 other countries, and therefore we have little, or no say here in the U.S. Congress.

Why is it that I have alliances on the other side of the aisle where we may well disagree on the specifics of labor law and environmental law. We agree that the American people have elected us, we have taken an oath of office to obey the Constitution, that we have a responsibility to them and we should decide what the labor law ought to be, we should decide what the environmental law should be, we should decide what the tax law should be. That is why we have an alliance.

But let me remind my colleagues, the American people are getting frustrated. They feel this sense of rejection and this loss of control. Why bother coming to us? We do not have control of the WTO and they do not want to rubber-stamp it, and they do not think it is quite appropriate to vote "yes" on this resolution, vote "present." Send a message. They deserve to hear the message. We have no other way of speaking back. Every 5 years, we get a chance to get out of the WTO.

We cannot control the WTO. None of us here in the Congress has anything to say. You have to have a unanimous vote with WTO to change policy. Our vote is equal to all the 134 other countries, and therefore we have little, or no say here in the U.S. Congress.

Why is it that I have alliances on the other side of the aisle where we may well disagree on the specifics of labor law and environmental law. We agree that the American people have elected us, we have taken an oath of office to obey the Constitution, that we have a responsibility to them and we should decide what the labor law ought to be, we should decide what the environmental law should be, we should decide what the tax law should be. That is why we have an alliance.

But let me remind my colleagues, the American people are getting frustrated. They feel this sense of rejection and this loss of control. Why bother coming to us? We do not have control of the WTO and they do not want to rubber-stamp it, and they do not think it is quite appropriate to vote "yes" on this resolution, vote "present." Send a message. They deserve to hear the message. We have no other way of speaking back. Every 5 years, we get a chance to get out of the WTO.
eventual chaos from WTO mismanage-
ment. The trade agreement is unman-
ageable. They would like to do it in se-
cracy, and they like to wheel and deal;
but it is unmanageable.

Let me say there is another reason why we are in the economic and in trade. It has to do with the trade imbalances. Today we are at record highs. The current account de-
cicit hit another record yesterday. It is 4.5 percent of the GDP, and it is signif-
cant. Frankly the WTO can do nothing about that because that is a cur-
rency problem. It too causes chaos.
Yet there will be an attempt by the WTO to share the problem of imbal-
ces. I just think of how NAFTA came to the rescue of the Mexican peso im-
mEDIATELY after NAFTA was approved; a $50 billion rescue for the politicians and the bankrs who loaned money to Mexico.

Quite frankly, I have a suspicion that when the Chinese currency fails, that will only reverse the things that we will do. China will be our trading partner. They are in the family of countries, so therefore we will bail out their cur-
rency. That is what I suspect will hap-
pen. Why else would the Chinese put up with what we are doing in the world. So, the question is: about what we are going to do, inves-
tigate them and tell them how to write their laws? They have no intention of doing that. I think they are anxious to be with WTO because they may well see a need for currency support by our currency, which would be a tax on the American people.

This is a sovereignty issue. We do not have the authority in the U.S. House of Representatives to give our authority to the President. We do not have the authority and we should never permit the President to issue these executive orde-
sed the way he does, but this is going one step further. We have deliv-
ered this sovereignty power to an un-
elected bunch of bureaucrats at the WTO.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield my-
self the balance of my time.
The WTO has its roots in the decision of the country and others after the Second World War not to make the mistakes that we made after the First World War, and that was for this coun-
ty to engage, to take a leadership po-
sition, to craft international institu-
tions to respond to problems, to chal-
lege wrong entities. Trade is not win-win. There are losers as well as winners. Our challenge is to try to make sense out of that dynamic, to try to make sure that in our country we come out ahead and not fall behind in terms of the international scene.
The WTO is not a message. It is the wrong message. It is the message of withdrawal. It is a message to tear down. It is much harder to build, and it is easy to tear down. Do not tell me the WTO is not working.

I went to Geneva with others to talk to safeguard our antidumping laws in those negotiations and we succeeded. If Members think the world is unmanageable, if they want to put blenders on, vote "yes" or "present." If they want to roll up their sleeves and make this a better world economically for this country and the others, vote no. Vote no.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield my-
self the balance of my time.
Mr. Speaker, we have heard ref-
erences made to jobs; we have heard references made to our trade deficits. The economic concerns involved in trade are important, but I think it is im-
portant for us to recognize that trade plays a critically important role in our economy today, and it is because we are less than 5 percent of the world's population and the market is beyond our borders and we have boun-
tiful employment. We are at the big-
gest increases in gross domestic pro-
duction that we have experienced in years. In fact, last year over $9.2 tril-
lion was our GDP. I think it is impor-
tant to recognize, if the studies have al-
discovered that better than 90 per-
cent of job dislocation here in the
United States is totally unrelated to trade. When we then wonder about these increases in U.S. deficits, it is be-
cause of the appetites we have; and notwithstanding our incred-
ible productivity, we cannot produce enough to meet the demands of the American consumers here at home.
Let me conclude with a point, and this deals with the question of sov-
ereignty. U.S. law which approved and implemented America's membership in the WTO makes clear that the U.S. reigns supreme.

The Uruguay Round Agreements Act, URAA, states, "No provision of any of the Uruguay Round Agreements, name-
ly, the WTO agreements, nor the appli-
cation of any such provision to any person or circumstance that is incon-
sistent with any of the United States law shall have effect."

Secondly, "Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend or modify any law of the United States, including any law relating to, one, the protection of human or animal life or health; two, the protection of the environ-
ment; or, three, worker safety unless specifically provided for in this act of Congress."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is essential that all Members here recognize the importance of this vote. I know we have some honest disagreements. I hope that we can move some of our op-
ponents in this debate through a pres-
tative way, as we have the past and the present, but I think it is important to continue to play a lead-
ing role.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to op-
pose this resolution.
Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution. The WTO serves as a forum for negotiations to eliminate trade barriers, allowing us to export our goods and services freely around the world. It provides the only multilateral dispute mechanism for international trade, administers rules to discourage discrimination, and en-
sures greater security on how trade will be conducted. For example, stronger dispute res-
olution procedures within the WTO prevent na-
tions from keeping U.S. goods and services out of their markets through tariffs and non-
tariff barriers.

Engaging in global trade helps American workers and consumers replace old economic progress. Since 1994, approximately one fifth of U.S. economic growth has been linked to the dynamic export sector. If we choose to-
stead to build trade barriers and ignore the po-
tential of consumers in other nations, we will only reverse our incredible economic expan-
sion and the subsequent higher standard of living.
I have heard many allegations that, as a member of the World Trade Organization, we
undermine our ability to determine our own domestic policy and compromise our national security. But when we look closely at the WTO structure and how it operates, we realize this is not true.

First, the trade rules by which member nations agree to follow are reached by consensus by all members, allowing the U.S. to vote against any rules it finds unacceptable. Further, neither the WTO nor its dispute panels can compel the U.S. to change its laws or regulations. Under the WTO charter, members can enact trade remedies for reasons of national security, public health and safety, conservation of natural resources and to ban imports made with forced or prison labor.

Isolationist policies will only destroy jobs and stifle innovation, while at the same time discourage environmental responsibility. I encourage my colleagues to vote against this resolution and for engagement with the world trade community.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 90. This legislation withdraws congressional approval for the agreement establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO). Its adoption would mean that for the first time in 50 years, the U.S., the world's largest economy, would not be a member of the world trading system.

I will be the first to admit that the WTO is far from perfect. Despite our efforts, it remains a closed, non-transparent decision-making body in which anti-U.S. biases are strong and due process is weak. Whether it's the dispute with the European Union (EU) over the Foreign Sales Corporation (FSC), market access for bananas and hormone treated beef, Airbus subsidies, or EU restrictions on U.S. biotechnology products, the WTO has either rejected or failed to enforce U.S. rights. Nevertheless, turning our backs on the rest of the world, as H.J. Res. 90 would have us do, is a wholly unacceptable solution to the WTO's problems.

If we want to trade with the world, we must remain a part of the world trading system. And, as a member of the world trading system, we must show the rest of the world that, truly, this system can only serve the interests of all when it transcends the biases and prejudices that now infest it, and it starts rendering honest judgments based solidly on the actual language of agreements reached. Fair, impartial and open decisionmaking must become the WTO's standard, if it is to promote economic efficiency and world prosperity.

The WTO is far from meeting that standard today. Until real progress is made, we should expect that sentiments for the resolution we are considering today will become more, not less, prevalent. Let me describe some of the major problems facing the WTO.

Our major trading partners, including Japan, Korea, and the EU, have turned the WTO dispute settlement process into a de facto appeals court that reviews U.S. trade agency determinations and strikes down our trade laws. Japan and Korea have gone so far as to say they will launch WTO appeals of every U.S. trade determination that is adverse to their interests. Already, WTO decisions are gutting the effectiveness of U.S. trade remedies in ways that the Administration and Congress expressly rejected during the negotiations on the agreement establishing the WTO.

In the UK Bar case, the WTO tribunal actually usurped the role assigned to the U.S. Commerce Department by refusing to accept the agency's reasonable interpretations of WTO agreements. The WTO Antidumping Agreement contains a special standard of review which recognizes that national authorities (e.g., the U.S. Commerce Department) should have the primary role in interpreting the complicated and technical WTO rules. A 1994 WTO Ministerial Declaration provides that subsidiary cases (like UK Bar) should also be subject to this deferential standard of review. Despite this fact, the WTO tribunals disregarded the WTO Members' intent and said the standard of review was "non-binding".

The simple fact is that the WTO dispute settlement process is structurally biased against the U.S. Panels are staffed by the WTO Secretariat that has demonstrated a bias against U.S. fair trade laws. WTO documents, including the WTO Annual Report, reveal a hostility to dumping laws. In addition, the actual members of the panels are selected from a cadre of foreign diplomats, economists, and academics, many of whom have no judicial training and have very negative opinions of U.S. trade laws.

The U.S. must take steps to increase its participation in the WTO dispute settlement process. Without even changing WTO rules, the U.S. could "deputize" counsel for domestic industries so they can hear the presentations to the panels. We should also increase federal support by assigning Commerce Department personnel to our country's WTO mission in Geneva. The WTO process must also become more transparent by permitting panels to consider written submissions from interested private parties and by giving private counsels, under appropriate protective order, access to all materials in cases considered by panels.

Mr. Speaker, the WTO dispute settlement process needs thorough reform. It is to these reforms that we must now direct our efforts and not to the abandonment of the world trading system. I urge my colleagues to vote "No" on H.J. Res. 90.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution withdrawing approval of the United States in the World Trade Organization. Although I have some concerns, the United States must be actively engaged in global trade and we need to be forceful, perhaps more forceful than we have been, in advocating a rules-based, transparent trading system.

My main concern stems from the potential for manipulation of the WTO by some of our trading partners to challenge our domestic laws to address unfair trading practices. These are legitimate tools to ensure fairness to American industries and American workers.

We need a viable dispute resolution process that permits a full, open airing of grievances. In a rules-based trading system, the rules need to be transparent—everybody needs to know what the rules are. It also must address any non-tariff barriers that are erected to inhibit free and fair trade.

The United States must be vigilant to seek openness, access, and transparency in international trade. We must also be able to preserve our ability to ensure fairness when American producers and workers are placed at risk from unfair trading practices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 528, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas had appeared to have it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.
Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material)

Mr. REGULA, for 5 minutes, June 23.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today and June 22.

Mr. KASTEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADY of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GILMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material)

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KNOLLENBERG and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $3,770.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Thursday, June 22, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8265. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report that appropriation to the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) for "Salaries and Expenses" for the fiscal year 2000 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1515(b)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

8266. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the approved amendment and advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list of Vice Admiral J ohn A. Lockard; to the Committee on Armed Services.


8268. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 14-99 which constitutes a request for Final Approval for the Memorandum of Understanding with Canada and the United Kingdom for developing, negotiating, and managing future Project Arrangements of mutual benefit, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(1); to the Committee on International Relations.

8269. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 07-00 which constitutes a Request for Final Approval for the Multinational Memo- randum of Agreement on the International Test and Evaluation Program for Humanitarian Demining, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

8270. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Russia, Ukraine, Norway, United Kingdom, and Cayman Islands [Transmittal No. DTC 06-00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.


8272. A letter from the Director, Institute of Museum and Library Services, transmitting the FY 1999 Annual Program Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8273. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting the annual report entitled Outer Continental Shelf Lease Sales: Evaluation of Bidding Results and Competition’ for fiscal year 1999, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(a)(9); to the Committee on Resources.

8274. A letter from the President, American Academy and Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the American Academy of Arts and Letters during the year ending December 31, 1999, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4204; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8275. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting a copy of the Legion’s financial statements as December 31, 1999, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 1101 and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8276. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. MU-2B Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-265-AD; Amendment 39-11670; AD 2000-07-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8277. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-265-AD; Amendment 39-11670; AD 2000-07-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8278. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11-1 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-265-AD; Amendment 39-11670; AD 2000-07-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8279. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes Equipment for Electric CF6-80C2 Series Engines [Docket No. 2000-NM-94-AD; Amendment 39-11712; AD 2000-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
8287. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model 717-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-09-99; Amendment 39-11713; AD 2000-07-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8286. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company AE 3007 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-46-AD; Amendment 39-11714; AD 2000-09-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
H.R. 4711. A bill to establish an Office of Community Economic Adjustment in the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce to coordinate the Federal response in regions and communities experiencing severe and sudden economic dislocations, in restructuring their economies, and to expand the authorization of appropriations for these purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. C. A. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 4712. A bill to improve the procedures of the Federal Communications Commission, in the conduct of congressional communications; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. P. J. RYAN of Ohio (for herself, Mr. A. K. SHAW, Mr. C. A. CAMP, Ms. D. M. DUNN, Mrs. J. W. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. S. J. KENNY, and Mr. T. L. Upton): H.R. 4712. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to provide for the treatment of certain expenses of rural letter carriers, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. McCARTHY of New York, Mr. H. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. G. T. MILLER, Mr. J. C. ROBERTS, Mr. A. K. SHAW, Mr. C. A. CAMP, Ms. D. M. DUNN, Mr. m. M. MATSUI, Mr. J. T. NELSON, Mr. J. A. RODGERS, Ms. J. G. STEFANSKI, Ms. J. A. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. R. G. TEBBETTS, Mr. J. R. TEBBETTS, Mr. J. M. TUCKER, Mr. L. H. WEGNER, and Mr. C. B. WELCH: H.R. 4716. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the rate of reimbursement for motor vehicle travel under the eligible education program of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be the same as the rate for private vehicle reimbursement for Federal employees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: H. Con. Res. 358. Concurrent resolution calling upon the Government of Turkey to withdraw its armed forces from the island of Cyprus and to negotiate, along with the Government of Turkish-occupied Cyprus, for the reunification of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself and Mr. W. J. BOYD): H. Con. Res. 359. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the carrying of firearms into places of worship or educational institutions should be prohibited; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASCARELL: H. Con. Res. 360. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Roberto Clemente was a great athlete and should be honored by a national day of recognition; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. FORD. H.R. 41: Mr. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LANTOS, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 303: Mr. SOUDER. H.R. 329: Mr. STUPAK. H.R. 362: Mr. A. K. SHAW.

H.R. 583: Mr. HOLT. H.R. 689: Ms. CARSON. H.R. 763: Mr. CONCETES, Mr. PASCAREL, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 797: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Mr. ROGAN. H.R. 914: Mr. DOYLE. H.R. 923: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 934: Mr. HOLT. H.R. 1041: Mr. Cramer. H.R. 1044: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. MILLIMAN.

H.R. 1082: Mr. SAXTON. H.R. 1172: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. C. R. CLARK.

H.R. 1248: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. EVERTT.

H.R. 1354: Mr. CARSON. H.R. 1360: Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 1705: Mr. MARKER, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. BAKER. H.R. 2129: Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 2219: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 2341: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. ROYALE, and Mr. DOYLE. H.R. 2451: Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 2457: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KENNEHY of Rhode Island, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. SYNDER.

H.R. 2597: Mr. BAKER. H.R. 2620: Mr. ABERCROMBIE. H.R. 2631: Mr. KUCINICH. H.R. 2635: Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 2741: Mr. TJERNSTROM. H.R. 2814: Mr. COOK and Mr. GILCHREST. H.R. 2816: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2871: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. H.R. 2934: Mr. STRICKLAND. H.R. 3082: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 3100: Mr. NEY, Mr. MATTHEWS, and Mr. KUSHNER.

H.R. 3126: Mr. COOK. H.R. 3240: Mr. JONES of North Carolina. H.R. 3259: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 3302: Mr. RYAN of Kansas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SHADEG, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 3408: Mr. MOORE. H.R. 3454: Mr. COLLINS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 3521: Mr. BRADY of Texas. H.R. 3561: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 3575: Mr. EDWARDS. H.R. 3576: Mr. THORNEBERRY.

H.R. 3578: Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 3610: Mr. CARSON, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 3668: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 3698: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. COBLE, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3710: Mr. NEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio and, Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 3842: Mr. HOFFEL, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MCMINNIS, Mr. SHERWOOD, and Mrs. APPS.

H.R. 4038: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 4042: Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 4106: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 4136: Mr. COOK and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 4144: Mr. HILL of Indiana.

H.R. 4162: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 4167: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 4207: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COSTELLO Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCHERMAN, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 4210: Mr. COBLE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4220: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 4239: Mr. INSLEE and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 4257: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. BLEILEY.

H.R. 4262: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 4271: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. BERETUER.

H.R. 4272: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. BERETUER.

H.R. 4273: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. BERETUER.

H.R. 4277: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4299: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 4320: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. PASCARELL.

H.R. 4357: Mr. HOFFEL.

H.R. 4368: Mr. KLECKZA.

H.R. 4395: Ms. MORELLA.

H.R. 4398: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 4412: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 4439: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. LOFREN.

H.R. 4453: Mr. Houghton.

H.R. 4482: Mr. MOORE, Mr. MURAN of Kansas.

H.R. 4511: Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 4536: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. MULLEN.

H.R. 4539: Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 4548: Mr. REYNOLDS.
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H.R. 4566: Ms. Kilpatrick, Ms. Norton, Mr. Costello, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Kanjorski, and Mr. Oberstar.

H.R. 4567: Mr. Filner, Ms. Roybal-Allard, and Mr. Kucinich.

H.R. 4638: Mr. Watt of North Carolina.

H.R. 4659: Mr. Royce, Mr. Wynn, Mrs. Jones of Ohio, Mr. Geaser, Mr. English, Mrs. Clayton, Mr. Forbes, Ms. Millender-McDonald, and Mr. Owens.

H.R. 4660: Mr. Mckeon and Mr. Cunningham.

H.R. 4677: Mr. Hulsfof.

H.R. 4680: Mr. Roger.

H.R. 4781: Mr. McIntosh, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Leahy, and Mr. Whitfield.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Weller, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Oxley.

H. Con. Res. 207: Mr. Crane.

H. Con. Res. 306: Mr. Metcalf, Ms. Degette, Mr. Moran of Virginia, Mr. Wynn, Mr. Kennedy of Rhode Island, Ms. Norton, Mr. Talent, Mr. Markey, Mr. Watt of North Carolina, Mr. Baird, Mr. Weldon of Florida, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. McCollum, Mr. Reyes, Mr. Phelps, and Mr. Hutchinson.

H. Con. Res. 308: Mrs. Mink of Hawaii and Mr. Evans.

H. Con. Res. 323: Mr. Romero-Barcelo, Mr. Gallegly, Mr. Frost, Mr. Phelps, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Shays, Mr. Pascarella, and Mr. Coyne.

H. Con. Res. 325: Mr. Waxman and Ms. Lofgren.

H. Con. Res. 348: Ms. Carson, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Rangel, and Mrs. Tauscher.


H. Res. 197: Ms. Lofgren.

H. Res. 420: Mr. Green of Texas.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4461
Offered by: Mr. Allen

AMENDMENT NO. 32: Insert before the short title the following title:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the amounts made available in this Act for the Food and Drug Administration may be expended to approve any application for a new drug submitted by an entity that does not, before completion of the approval process, provide to the Secretary of Health and Human Services a written statement specifying the total cost of research and development with respect to such drug, by stage of drug development, including a separate statement specifying the portion paid with Federal funds and the portion paid with State funds.

H.R. 4461

Offered by: Mr. Sanford

AMENDMENT NO. 33: Insert before the short title the following:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to the Department of Agriculture may be used to carry out a pilot program under the child nutrition programs to study the effects of providing free breakfasts to students without regard to family income.

H.R. 4463

Offered by: Mr. Hinchey

AMENDMENT NO. 49: Page 90, after line 15, insert:

Sec. 426. Any limitation in this Act on funds made available in this Act for the Environmental Protection Agency shall not apply to:
(1) the use of dredging or other invasive sediment remediation technologies; or
(2) enforcing drinking water standards for arsenic
where such activities are authorized by law.

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Mr. Allen

AMENDMENT NO. 13: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 624. Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading “Administration of Foreign Affairs—Diplomatic and Consular Programs” in fiscal year 2000, $215,000 shall be available only for bilateral and multilateral diplomatic activities designed to promote the termination of the North Korean ballistic missile program.

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Mr. Bilbray

AMENDMENT NO. 14: Page 71, line 1, after “$2,699,825,000” insert “(decreased by $5,100,000)”.

Page 79, line 16, after “$31,470,000” insert “(increased by $5,100,000)”.

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Mr. Bilbray

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Page 73, line 19, after “$523,771,000” insert “(decreased by $5,100,000)”.

Page 79, line 16, after “$31,470,000” insert “(increased by $5,100,000)”.

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Mr. Bilbray

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Page 78, line 2, after “$486,100,000” insert “(decreased by $5,100,000)”.

Page 79, line 16, after “$31,470,000” insert “(increased by $5,100,000)”.

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Mr. Bilbray

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 71, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by $500,000)”.

Page 79, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by $500,000)”.

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Mr. Campbell

AMENDMENT NO. 18: Page 79, after line 22, insert the following:

In addition, for a feasibility study for the construction of a diversionary structure in the flood control channel of the Tijuana River as it enters the United States, to be derived by transfer from the amount provided in this title for “Diplomatic and Consular Programs”, $500,000.

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Mr. Campbell

AMENDMENT NO. 19: Page 23, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by $173,480)”.

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Mr. Campbell

AMENDMENT NO. 20: Page 107, after line 21, insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used to incarcerate an alien subject to removal from the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act (whether pending a decision on whether the alien is to be removed or subsequent to the issuance of an order of removal) if the determination to detain the alien is based in whole or in part on evidence not shared with the alien.

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Mr. Davis

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 37, strike lines 12 through 16 (section 111).

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Mr. Hinchey

AMENDMENT NO. 22: Page 27, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by $49,500,000)”.

Page 28, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by $49,500,000)”.

Page 43, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by $49,500,000)”.

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Mr. Hostetler

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new title:

TITLE VIII—LEGAL AMNESTY RESTORATION ACT OF 2000

SEC. 801. (a) Section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252b) is amended—
(1) in the section heading, by striking “1972” and inserting “1986”; and
(2) by striking subsection (a), by striking “1972” and inserting “1986”.

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Ms. Jackson-Lee

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 39, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 114. Section 286 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1356) is amended—
(1) in subsection (d), by striking “50” and inserting “50”;
(2) by striking subsection (e).

H.R. 4690

Offered by: Ms. Jackson-Lee

AMENDMENT NO. 25: Page 107, after line 21, insert the following:

TITLE VIII—CENTRAL AMERICAN AND HAITIAN ADJUSTMENT AND CENTRAL AMERICAN RELIEF ACT

SEC. 801. (a) Section 201 of the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act is amended—
(1) in the section heading, by striking “NICARAGUANS, CUBANS, SALVADORENS, GUATEMALANS, HONDURANS AND HAITIANS”;
(2) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “2000” and inserting “2003”;
(3) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “Nicaragua or Cuba” and inserting “Nicaragua, Cuba, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, or Haiti”; and
(4) in subsection (d)(1)(E), by striking “2000” and inserting “2003”.

H.R. 4690

The amendments made by this section shall be effective upon the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 802. An application for relief properly filed by a national of Guatemala or El Salvador under section 203 of the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act
which was filed on or before the date of enactment of this Act, and on which a final administrative determination has not been made, may be converted by the applicant to an application for adjustment of status under the provisions of section 202 of the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act as if the application had not been made. If the Attorney General grants the application for adjustment of status, the order shall be amended, upon recommendation of the Attorney General, to reflect that the alien is a lawful permanent resident, unless he or she is applying for such relief in deportation or removal proceedings.

(5) in subsection (c)(1), by adding at the end the following: “Nothing in this Act shall require the Attorney General to stay the removal of an alien who is ineligible for adjustment of status under this Act.”;

(6) in subsection (d)—

(A) by amending the subsection heading to read “SPOUSES, CHILDREN, AND UNMARRIED SONS AND DAUGHTERS.”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by amending the heading to read “ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.”;

(C) by striking paragraph (1)(A), and inserting the following:

“(A) the alien entered the United States on or before the date of enactment of the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2001.

(D) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting after “except that” the following: “(i) in the case of a parent, child, or grandparent of such an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, the qualifying relationship was entered into before the date of enactment of the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2001; and (ii)”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN SPOUSES AND CHILDREN FOR ISSUANCE OF IMMIGRANT VISAS.—

“(A) In accordance with regulations to be promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, upon approval of an application for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence under subsection (a), an alien who is the spouse or child of the alien being granted such status may be issued a visa for permanent residence, unless he or she is applying for such relief in deportation or removal proceedings.

“(B) The Secretary of State may retain the grounds of inadmissibility set forth in section 212(a)(9)(A) and 212(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act for humanitarian purposes, to assure family unity, or when it is otherwise in the public interest.”;

(2) in subsection (a), by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3), and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—In determining the eligibility of an alien described in subsection (b) or (d) for either adjustment of status under this section or other relief necessary to establish eligibility for such adjustment, or for permission to reapply for admission to the United States for the purpose of adjustment of status under this section, subsection (a), or other relief necessary to establish eligibility for such adjustment, the provisions of section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not apply.

“(3) RELATIONSHIP OF APPLICATION TO CERTAIN ORDERS.—An alien present in the United States who has been ordered excluded, deported, or removed, or ordered to depart voluntarily from the United States, and who is not the subject of any provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act, notwithstanding such order, may apply for adjustment of status under this section, or other relief necessary to establish eligibility for such adjustment, or for permission to reapply for admission to the United States for the purpose of adjustment of status under this section, subsection (a), or other relief necessary to establish eligibility for such adjustment, or for permission to reapply for admission to the United States for the purpose of adjustment of status under this section, subsection (a), or other relief necessary to establish eligibility for such adjustment, without regard to the requirement that the alien be physically present in the United States at the time of the filing of such an order in accordance with subsection (c) to prevent the execution of such an order pending the adjudication of the application for adjustment of status. If the Attorney General denies a stay of a final order of removal, or orders the Attorney General’s consent to reapply for admission without regard to the requirement that the order be stayed, or grants such a stay to an alien who is not the subject of such an order in accordance with subsection (c) to prevent the execution of such an order pending the adjudication of the application for adjustment of status, the Attorney General shall cancel the order.”;

(4) in subsection (b)(1), by adding at the end the following: “Nothing in this Act shall apply to an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, unless he or she is applying for such relief in deportation or removal proceedings.

(5) in subsection (c)(1), by adding at the end the following: “Nothing in this Act shall apply to an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, unless he or she is applying for such relief in deportation or removal proceedings.”

(6) in subsection (d)—
(A) by amending the subsection heading to read “Spouses, Children, and Unmarried Sons and Daughters.—”;
(B) in paragraph (1), by amending the heading to read “ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—”;
(C) by striking paragraph (1)(A), and inserting the following new subparagraph:
“(A) the alien entered the United States on or before the date of enactment of the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2001;”;
(D) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting after “exceeds” the following: “(i) in the case of such a spouse, stepchild, or unmarried stepson or stepdaughter, the qualifying marriage was entered into before the date of enactment of this Act, the scope of any proceeding reopened on this basis shall be limited to a determination of the alien’s eligibility for adjustment of status under the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act,”;
(E) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:
“(E) the alien applies for such adjustment before April 3, 2003;”;
(F) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:
“(3) ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN SPOUSES AND CHILDREN FOR ISSUANCE OF IMMIGRANT VISAS.—
“(A) in accordance with regulations to be promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, upon approval of an application for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or an alien lawfully admitted for temporary or permanent residence, the alien who is the spouse or child of the alien being granted such status may be issued a visa for admission to the United States as an immigrant following to join the principal applicant, provided that the spouse or child—
“(i) meets the requirements in subparagraphs (B) and (D); and
“(ii) is eligible for such a visa within a time period to be established by regulation.
“(B) The Secretary of State may retain fees to recover the cost of immigrant visa application processing and issuance for certain spouses and children of aliens whose applications for adjustment of status under subsection (a) have been approved, provided that such fees—
“(i) shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to any Department of State appropriation for the recovery of the cost of such processing and issuance, and
“(ii) shall be available until expended for the same purposes of such appropriation to support consular activities;
“(C) in subparagraph (B), by inserting after “permanent residence” the following: “or an immigrant classification;”;
“(D) by striking subsections (i), (j), and (k) as (j), (k), and (l) respectively, and inserting after subparagraph (h) the following new subsection:
“(i) ADMISSIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing an alien to apply for admission to, or be admitted to, be paroled into, or otherwise lawfully return to the United States or to apply for or pursue an application for adjustment of status under this section without the express authorization of the Attorney General;”;
(E) the amendment made by subsections (a)(3), (a)(4), and (a)(8) of this Act shall be effective as if included in the enactment of the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act of 1996. The amendments made by sections (a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7) shall be effective as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 806. (a) Notwithstanding any time and number limitations imposed by law on motions to reopen, a national of Haiti who, on the date of enactment of this Act, has a final administrative denial of an application for adjustment of status under the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act of 1996 is made eligible for adjustment of status under that Act by the amendments made by this title, may file one motion to reopen exclusion, deportation, or removal proceedings to have the application considered again. All such motions shall be filed within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act. The scope of any proceeding reopened on this basis shall be limited to a determination of the alien’s eligibility for adjustment of status under the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act of 1996.

(b) Notwithstanding any time and number limitations imposed by law on motions to reopen, a national of Cuba or Nicaragua who, on the date of enactment of the Act, has a final administrative denial of an application for adjustment of status under the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act, and who is made eligible for adjustment of status under that Act by the amendments made by this title, may file one motion to reopen exclusion, deportation, or removal proceedings to have the application considered again. All such motions shall be filed within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act. The scope of any proceeding reopened on this basis shall be limited to a determination of the alien’s eligibility for adjustment of status under the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act.

H.R. 4690
OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY
AMENDMENT NO. 32: Page 47, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by $5,500,000).”
Page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by $3,000,000).”

H.R. 4690
OFFERED BY: MR. SANFORD
AMENDMENT NO. 33: Page 80, strike lines 14 through 16.

H.R. 4690
OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY
AMENDMENT NO. 34: Page 51, line 20, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by $2,275,000).”
Page 51, line 21, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by $2,275,000).”
Page 51, line 22, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by $7,856,000).”

H.R. 4690
OFFERED BY: MR. SCOTT
AMENDMENT NO. 35: Page 27, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by $3,000,000).”
Page 28, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by $10,000,000).”
Page 32, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by $3,000,000).”
Page 32, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by $3,000,000).”

H.R. 4690
OFFERED BY: MR. SCOTT
AMENDMENT NO. 36: Page 27, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by $60,812,500).”
Page 28, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by $121,625,000).”
Page 30, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by $60,812,500).”

H.R. 4690
OFFERED BY: MR. OBEY
AMENDMENT NO. 37: At the end of the bill, after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new title:

TITLE VIII—LIMITATIONS

SEC. 801. Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading “FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,” not more than $880,000 shall be available for the Office of Plans and Policy of the Federal Communications Commission.

H.R. 4690
OFFERED BY: MR. STEARNS
AMENDMENT NO. 38: At the end of the bill, after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new title:

TITLE VIII—LIMITATIONS

SEC. 801. Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading “FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,” not more than $880,000 shall be available for the Office of Media Relations of the Federal Communications Commission.
H.R. 4690

Offered By: Mr. Talent

Amendment No. 39: In title V, in the item relating to “Small Business Administration—Salaries and Expenses”, before the period at the end, insert the following:

"Provided further, That, of the funds made available under this heading, $4,000,000 shall be for the National Veterans Business Development Corporation established under section 33(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657c)."

H.R. 4690

Offered By: Mr. Terry

Amendment No. 40: Page 20, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by $471,000)".

Page 20, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $8,500,000)".

Page 27, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $7,000,000)".

Page 31, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $8,500,000)".

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $7,000,000)".

Page 31, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $7,000,000)".
The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Sovereign of our Nation and Lord of our lives, we praise You for the Asian American veterans who fought with valor and heroism in World War II. Today, as the Senate family, we express our deep admiration and gratitude for Senator DANIEL INOUYE of Hawaii who will receive the Medal of Honor from the President at the White House. We thank You for his heroism in battle and his leadership here in the Senate for 38 years. Most of all, Father, we express our praise for his character traits so authentically expressed: humility, patriotism, integrity, courage, and faithfulness. You have blessed the State of Hawaii, our Nation, and this Senate with this truly great man.

Now dear God we commit this day to You and ask that all the Senators will receive Your wisdom and discernment for their decisions and mutual trust and loyalty for their working relationships with one another. This is a day You have made; we will rejoice and be glad in it. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The Honorable WAYNE ALLARD, a Senator from the State of Colorado, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Colorado is recognized.

SCHEDULE
Mr. ALLARD. Today, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until approximately 10:45 a.m., with Senators GRAHAM and VOINOVICH in control of the time. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the foreign operations appropriations bill. Under the order, Senator WELLSTONE will be recognized to offer his amendment regarding Colombia. There will be 90 minutes under Senator WELLSTONE’s control and 45 minutes under Senator MCCONNELL’s control. As a reminder, first-degree amendments to the bill must be filed by 3 p.m. today. Votes are expected throughout the day, with a vote on final passage anticipated prior to tonight’s adjournment. Senators can expect the Labor-HHS appropriations bill to be the next bill for consideration. I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE
Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the foreign operations appropriations bill is completed today. I think it is going to be real difficult to do that. We won’t know for sure until we get our amendments at 3 o’clock. Considering that the first amendment is going to take until after noon, it is going to be difficult to do all the amendments that need to be done. I know there is going to be a number of them filed. We are all anxious to get to the Labor-HHS bill. It is very important, and it is going to take several days to do that. As I have indicated, the majority will have our cooperation, but we have to be realistic as to when we will be able to finish this bill. We will not know until the amendments have been filed at 3 o’clock.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. 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
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during World War II, countless individuals distinguished themselves while serving this fine Nation. However, few displayed the valor, leadership, and selflessness as our colleague DANIEL K. INOUYE and it is with much admiration...
that I congratulate him on what this afternoon will be a deserving receipt of the Congressional Medal of Honor. The Medal of Honor is the highest medal awarded by the United States and is reserved for those who have gone above and beyond the call of duty, at the risk of their own life, to perform a deed of personal bravery or self-sacrifice.

We have recently reached a point in U.S. history which has left only a handful of Americans who can personally vouch for the events that took place during World War II and even fewer who fought in this effort to free Europe from the plague of Nazis. Though history books attempt to give younger generations insight into the valiant deeds and the countless deaths which occurred during the Second World War, no words can convey the emotional tragedies and triumphs felt by the men and women who participated in this campaign.

At the age of seventeen, DAN INOUYE embarked on a life of public service. Using his knowledge of first aid, he volunteered to treat the earliest casualties of the bombing of Pearl Harbor. This marked the beginning of Dan’s exemplary service to his country. After turning twenty-one, he enlisted in the United States Army’s 442nd Regimental Combat Team.

On the fateful day of April 21, 1945, outside a small town in Italy, Lieutenant INOUYE made a decision which would change the course of his life. As he led his platoon of the 2nd Battalion up a ridge, they were confronted with heavy machine-gun fire, striking Lieutenant INOUYE in the abdomen and barely missing his spine. Rather than risk the life of one of his men, the injured young officer went up against insurmountable odds, and crawled alone farther up the hill into the nest of machine guns. He struggled to stand up, pulled the pin from his grenade, and dragged himself with one arm.

I hope someday they are told. During the time he spent in the hospital with Senator Dole, their friendship developed. That is one of the friendships that has served the American people well.

I think it is wonderful that finally Senator INOUYE is going to be recognized, as he should be, with the Congressional Medal of Honor.

I think it is wonderful that finally Senator INOUYE is going to be recognized, as he should be, with the Congressional Medal of Honor.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I am delighted to speak on behalf of Senator DAN INOUYE. A man who has distinguished himself in the House and now in the Senate for more than 40 years. He is also a man for whom I have tremendous respect and regard as a truly national leader on a wide range of issues. Later today at a White House ceremony, DAN INOUYE will be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor by the President.

This memorable occasion is one that has been much anticipated and long
overdue. I have had the honor and opportunity to serve with Senator INOUYE in Congress over the past 14 years, and we have worked side by side on the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs over the past 8 years. On many occasions, Senator INOUYE’s leadership in standing up for serious issues and problems that have affected all Americans including our collective national defense.

These qualities and traits can be witnessed throughout Senator INOUYE’s life, career, and his service in the United States Army during World War II. I would like to recount for those unfamiliar with the experience of DAN INOUYE and the “Go for Broke” regiment a brief history of the heroics and commitment to his men and the United States during his service in the 2nd Battalion, 442nd “Go for Broke” Regimental Combat Team in the War.

In April of 1945, Army 1st Lieutenant Daniel K. INOUYE, was leading a platoon of the 2nd Battalion, when it came under fire from a bunker manned by Italian Fascists fighting for their Axis partners the Nazis. There was no cover on the hill, so INOUYE crawled up alone. He was taking cover but a hand grenade to destroy the first position, he was hit in the abdomen by a bullet which came out his back, barely missing his spine. Although wounded, INOUYE was still able to pull the pin out of the grenade and run to within five yards of the nearest of the three machine guns, and throw the grenade inside the position. He continued to lead the platoon and advance alone against a machine gun nest which had his men pinned down. He tossed two hand grenades with devastating effect before his right arm was shattered by a German rifle grenade at close range. With his left hand, he tossed his last rifle grenade. He threw a final grenade near the top of the hill. INOUYE refused to be evacuated, so INOUYE crawled up the hill. INOUYE was hit in his right leg and fell down. The leg forced him to retreat. It is for his courage in battle. We also know however, that Senator INOUYE is being honored for his courage in battle. We also know how Senator INOUYE’s service to our country extends far beyond his bravery in war. When Senator INOUYE was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1953, he was the first American of Japanese ancestry to serve in the House. Since 1962, Senator INOUYE has served with great distinction in the Senate. Every day, we witness first-hand Senator INOUYE’s commitment to the people of Hawaii and the people of the United States. He is a leader on national security and international human rights. As a senior member of the Appropriations Committee, he works tirelessly to ensure that we meet the demands of our constituents—and the long term needs of our nation. Since my earliest days on the Appropriations Committee, I’ve learned from Senator INOUYE—particularly in the area of defense policy.

Even in a war filled with heroes, Senator INOUYE’s heroism was extraordinary. It is with deep respect and affection that I offer my most sincere congratulations for being awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

SECTION 527 ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. TORRICEILLI. Mr. President, last week the Senate voted to tighten regulations on 527 organizations. These organizations created to influence political campaigns in the United States; that section of the Tax Code allows them to operate without disclosure of their contributors or without limitations on their expenditures, and, indeed, on a tax-deductible basis.

The vote last week was genuinely historic in the Senate. It was the first time since 1993 that a campaign finance reform measure passed the Senate.

I congratulate Senator LIEBERMAN on his leadership in bringing the Senate to this important moment of judgment.

These “527 organizations,” as they have come to be known, are the latest threat to the integrity of our Nation’s electoral process, with unlimited funds unaccountable from unknown sources.

If this legislation does not become law, they threaten to change the entire electoral process of the country. Every reform instituted not only since Watergate but, indeed, in this century could be undone.

There is no assurance that even those limited protections—from the progressive movement in the times of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson that barred unlimited and undisclosed corporate contributions—and reforms could remain in place if these 527 organizations are allowed to operate and, indeed, to proliferate.

The Senate’s vote last week sent a very strong message that for whatever we are unable to do on campaign finance reform we can at least agree that complete and full disclosure is required, and that we will not allow the tax code to be misused for the raising of unknown political funds.

It is, however, important that the public not accept this limited achievement as the sum total of all the Congress can do on campaign finance reform. It is only a beginning. Indeed, it is a modest beginning.

It is also true that our efforts on soft money in McCain-Feingold have been frustrated. For a variety of reasons, it is impossible to sign Senator McCain-Feingold and limitations on soft money contributions are not going to be enacted in this Congress. Some of the barriers are political. Some are legislative. Indeed, as my friend, MITCH MCCONNELL, has pointed out, some can only be removed by constitutional. There are real problems to enacting a complete soft money ban. Federal courts have spoken on the subject. There are many who believe their
individuals' rights might be limited. That debate will continue for years on the merits.

Now the Congress is left with a partial achievement on 527 organizations, a frustration on soft money prohibitions, and an uneasiness whether any thing else can be done. Indeed, a great deal more could be done that is both easier to achieve and in some respects more important.

There is primarily a single reason that campaign fundraising is rising exponentially in the Nation. It is very simple. Campaign expenditures are rising exponentially in the Nation. It is becoming more and more expensive to communicate with the American people through more and more news outlets. It is the heart of the problem.

A recent study has indicated that records are being broken across the Nation in the cost of political advertising. The study, led by the Alliance for Better Campaigns, cited the Senate primary in my own State of New Jersey as evidence of how broken the campaign finance system has now become and that the same broadcasters in the news media who are leading national efforts for campaign finance reform are a central part of the problem.

Television stations in New York and Philadelphia during the recent New Jersey Democratic primary took in a record $21 million in advertising. The chart below, which compares stations in New York and Philadelphia, the four-rated stations, the amount of time they actually devoted to hard news. We have these stations in New York and Philadelphia bringing in $21 million in revenue from political advertising. Yet in actual news coverage of the campaigns per evening—two stations in Philadelphia—one is giving 19 seconds of coverage per evening; another, 1 second; in New York, the two top stations, WNBC and WCBS, 23 seconds and 10 seconds, respectively.

Advertising rates soar. News coverage collapses. Candidates are left with no choice. There being no other means to communicate with people who live in our States, they must buy more advertising time at ever-higher and higher rates. Indeed, in the final 2 weeks of the New Jersey primary, voters in Philadelphia and New York markets were 10 times more likely while watching a news program to see a campaign advertisement than a news story—10 times more likely to see an advertisement than a legitimate news story on an issue in the campaign.

That, my colleagues, is the heart of the problem. However, it is not only a senatorial problem or not only a problem in my own region of the country. During the month before the March 7, Super Tuesday primary, the national networks aired a nightly average of only 36 seconds discussing an issue of importance to our Nation. The situation that Democrats and Republicans face in the New Jersey primary is identical to what Al Gore and George W. Bush face in the national elections—no news coverage, rising rates, higher expenditures. It is, of course, part and parcel of this problem that is driven by the individual rates for specific advertising time.

An example of this would be, in New York or New York or $50,000. In Chicago, the same advertisement could cost $20,000. Television stations in the Nation's top 75 media markets took in a record of $114 million in the first 4 months of this year in political advertising.

There is no other nation in the world where the public airwaves are licensed to a private corporation which will then set commercial rates as the cost of discussing public policy issues with the Nation's voters. This wouldn't happen in Britain, Canada, Italy or France. These airwaves belong to the American people. The issues, be they Democrat, Republican, or Independent, be they from some other group or political party, are of importance to the American people. Yet the broadcasting networks are using them as a revenue source while they incredibly claim to be campaigning for campaign finance reform.

There is no mistaking that the power to change the campaign finance system belongs in the Congress. We could lead to a solution. For a variety of political reasons, legislative reasons, and constitutional reasons, I am not going to happen. The question now is whether the television networks will spend the remainder of this electoral season complaining about this political problem of reaching a solution or be part of the answer. I believe they should lead by example.

Only a year ago, Mr. Kennard, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, raised the prospect of, by regulation, lowering the cost of television advertising. Rather than $900,000 in Chicago, the FCC could mandate, if the networks are unwilling to do it voluntarily, a lower cost. Since television accounts for 80 or 90 percent of the cost of the Senate or Presidential campaign, lowering the cost of that advertising would dramatically remove pressure on fundraising. The problem could begin to solve itself. The FCC chose not to do so under pressure from Members of Congress.

The question remains, why do the networks not do so themselves? I understand the networks looking to the Congress for an answer. They should. They are entitled to look to us, and they are entitled to expect an answer. But I also look back to them. Rather than 20 seconds a night for candidates to discuss the future of our Nation, rather than using the national airwaves to discuss every latest crime trend or weather pattern or cultural aberration, airwaves could be used to actually discuss the Nation's future—not 10 seconds a night or 20 seconds a night but 10 minutes a night or 15 minutes a night so can-
didates believe there is an alternative to communicating with the American people other than buying the public airwaves to do so.

Second, the networks, most obviously, could enhance this national debate and reduce at least some of this fundraising, remove the pressure on fundraising by dramatically reducing these costs. Political advertising is now the third largest source of revenue for the television networks. We have become an industry supporting the networks themselves, only behind retail sellers of merchandise in the Nation, spending hundreds of millions of dollars in this Presidential and congressional campaign. A reduction of those rates to allow challengers to compete with incumbents and lesser-financed candidates to compete with multimillionaires would enhance the American political system and start setting an example of how the Nation can begin to change the dominance of money in the American political system.

I hope at some point the networks, as good corporate citizens and as Americans, no less as people who claim to be for campaign finance reform, would hear this message and join this movement.

I yield the floor.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Rhode Island, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Rhode Island, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. Without objection, the Senate stands in recess until 11 a.m.

Thereupon, at 10:22 a.m., the Senate recessed until 11 a.m. Thereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

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 assistant 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:

SESSIONS amendment No. 3492, to provide an additional condition on assistance for Colombia under Plan Colombia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order that I deliver my statement while seated at my desk.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3490

(Purpose: Relating to support by the Russian government for Serbia)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask unanimous consent that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be in order at this time. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] proposes an amendment numbered 3490.

Mr. HELMS. 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 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. 3. SUPPORT BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION FOR SERBIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) General Dragolub Ojdanic, Minister of Defense of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, during the Kosovo war and has been indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia for crimes against humanity and violations of the laws and customs of war for alleged atrocities against Albanians in Kosovo;

(2) warrants have been issued by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia for General Ojdanic's arrest and extradition to the Hague;

(3) the Government of the Russian Federation, a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council which established the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, has an obligation to arrest General Ojdanic and extradite him to the Hague;

(4) on May 16, 2000, Russian Minister of Economics Andrei Shapovalyants announced that his government has provided the Serbian regime of Slobodan Milosevic $102,000,000 of a $150,000,000 loan it had reactivated and will sell the Government of Serbia $32,000,000 of oil despite the fact that the international community has imposed economic sanctions against the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Government of Serbia;

(5) on May 16, 2000, Russian Minister of Economics Andrei Shapovalyants announced that his government has provided the Serbian regime of Slobodan Milosevic $32,000,000 of oil despite the fact that the international community has imposed economic sanctions against the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Government of Serbia;

(6) the hospitality provided to General Ojdanic demonstrates that the Government of the Russian Federation supports the Russian regime and its war criminals and that it is acting in concert with the Russian regime.

(b) ACTIONS.—(1) Fifteen days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a report to Congress detailing all loans, financial assistance, and energy sales the Government of the Russian Federation or other entities acting on its behalf has provided or intends to provide to the Government of Serbia or the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or any entities under the control of the Governments of Serbia or the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(2) If that report determines that the Government of the Russian Federation or other entities acting on its behalf has provided or intends to provide the governments of Serbia or the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or any entity under their control any loans or economic assistance and oil sales, then the following shall apply:

(A) The Secretary of State shall reduce assistance obligated to the Russian Federation by an amount equal in value to the loans, financial assistance, and energy sales the Government of the Russian Federation has provided and intends to provide to the Governments of Serbia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(B) The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors of the international financial institutions to oppose, and vote against, any extension of new debt relief to Serbia or the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or any entity under their control.

(C) The United States shall suspend existing loans and assistance that serve basic human needs.

(iii) In this subparagraph, the term "international financial institution" includes the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, and the International Finance Corporation.

(i) The United States shall suspend existing programs to the Russian Federation provided by the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and any consideration of any new loans, guarantees, and other forms of assistance by the Export-Import Bank or the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to Russia.

(ii) The President of the United States should instruct negotiators to negotiate on Russia's international debt to oppose further forgiveness, restructuring, and rescheduling of that debt, including that which was considered the 'Comprehensive Paris Club' negotiations.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I offer this amendment in the hopes that it will bring about needed realism in our Government's relationship with Russia. President Clinton continues to promote the myth that the Russian Government has been "a supportive and reliable partner in the effort to bring peace and stability to the Balkans." That myth was shattered again last month by the Kremlin's brazen display of the enormous political, military, and economic support Russia continues to provide the Milosevic regime. Surely no Senator has forgotten the visit to Moscow last month by General Ojdanic, Milosevic's Minister of Defense, who just happens to be a war criminal indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Instead of arresting and sending this man to The Hague, the Kremlin provided not only meetings with the Russian Minister of Defense but a privileged seat at the Putin inauguration and a week of fine food and camaraderie.

Shortly after Milosevic's Minister of Defense visited Russia, Russian officials announced that it is sending to Russia $150 million in concessional credits and a $150 million loan. All of this flies in the face of the effort of the international community to isolate and undermine the Milosevic regime.

I confess that I find incredible the audacity of Russian President Putin. Here he is, providing the Milosevic regime with more than $150 million in economic support while seeking debt relief from the international community and loans from the International Monetary Fund. While his country seeks and receives food aid from the United States and while he is asking the United States to reschedule and forgive Russian debt owed to the United States,

The Kremlin should not be encouraged to assume that Western, and particularly the United States, economic assistance and aid are an entitlement. It is, however, sadly evident that Putin understands that Russian foreign policy with impunity and still count on the West's economic largesse. The fact is, the hospitality and support provided to Serbian war criminals occurred just one month prior to President Clinton's visit to Moscow, emphasizing how little respect Putin has for the policies of the U.S. Government.

What concerns me most about the relationship of the United States and the Milosevic regime is the threat it poses to America's men and women in uniform serving in the Balkans, along with those of our allies. The political, military, and economic support the Kremlin provides Milosevic directly undermines the safety and security of both American and allied forces deployed in the Balkans. While we are trying to force the Milosevic regime to step down and turn power over to Serbia's democratic opposition, Russia is signaling Milosevic that he can survive and even outlast the alliance and that Russia will help him, Milosevic, prevail.
There is no reason the American taxpayer should provide Russia loan forgiveness and economic assistance when the Kremlin continues to support a regime in Serbia whose forces directly threaten U.S. troops who are trying to bring peace to the Balkans.

My amendment, which I have just offered, simply underscores that the U.S. assistance is not an entitlement benefitting the Kremlin. The amendment proposes that the United States withhold assistance to Russia by an amount equal to the amount which Russia provides Serbia. The amendment also will preclude any debt forgiveness or rescheduling of OPIC and Eximbank programs along with U.S. support for loans from international financial institutions to Russia. This assistance certainly is not warranted unless and until the Kremlin demonstrates that it has at long last cut its ties to the Milosevic regime.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3499 THROUGH 3513, IN BLOC
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send up a group of managers' amendments to the desk, en bloc, and ask for their immediate consideration. They have been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator From Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes amendments numbered 3499 through 3513, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3499
On page 142, on line 5 strike: "Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, not less than $5,000,000 shall be made available for administration of demobilizing and rehabilitating activities for child soldiers in Colombia" and insert in lieu thereof: "Provided further, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of State for transfer to the Department of Labor for the administration of the demobilization and rehabilitation of child soldiers in Colombia the amount $5,000,000 shall be transferred not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and the remaining $2,500,000 shall be transferred not later than October 30, 2007."

AMENDMENT NO. 3500
(Purpose: To require the Secretary of State to submit a report concerning human rights in Colombia, and for other purposes)
On page 145, line 12, after "(b)"
and before "DEFINITIONS," insert the following:

"REVIEW.—Beginning 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for the duration of the provision of resources administered under this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees containing the following:

(1) A description of the extent to which the Colombian Armed Forces have suspended from duty Colombian Armed Forces personnel who are credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights, and the extent to which such personnel have been brought to justice in Colombia's civilian courts, including a description of the charges brought and the disposition of such cases.

(2) An assessment of efforts made by the Colombian Armed Forces, National Police, and Attorney General to disband paramilitary groups, including the names of Colombian Armed Forces personnel brought to justice for aiding or abetting paramilitary groups and the names of paramilitary leaders and members who were indicted, arrested, and prosecuted.

(3) A description of the extent to which the Colombian Armed Forces cooperate with civilian authorities in investigating and prosecuting gross violations of human rights allegedly committed by its personnel, including the number of such personnel being investigated for gross violations of human rights who are suspended from duty.

(4) A description of the extent to which attacks against human rights defenders, government prosecutors and investigators, and officials of the civilian judicial system in Colombia, are being investigated and the alleged perpetrators brought to justice.

(5) An estimate of the number of Colombian civilians displaced as a result of the "push into southern Colombia," and actions taken to address the social and economic needs of these people.

(6) A description of actions taken by the United States to promote and support a negotiated settlement of the conflict in Colombia."

AMENDMENT NO. 3501
On page 13, line 16, after "vaccines" insert in lieu thereof": "notwithstanding any other provision of law".

On page 13, line 8, delete "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "$35,000,000."

On page 11, line 13, delete "$55,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "$55,000,000."

AMENDMENT NO. 3502
On page 57, line 19, delete the following: "Panama."

AMENDMENT NO. 3503
(Purpose: To appropriate funds to assist blind children)
Before the period at the end of the paragraph under the heading "Global Health", insert the following: "Provided Further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $5,200,000 shall be made available to assist blind children".

AMENDMENT NO. 3504
On page 151, line 10, after "605" insert "HERBICIDE SAFETY.—"

On page 151, line 12, strike "Surgeon General of the United States" and insert in lieu thereof "Director of the National Center for Environmental Health at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention."

On page 151, line 11, strike "aerial spraying" and insert in lieu thereof "use".

On page 151, line 18, strike "water or leach in soil" and insert in lieu thereof "ground or surface water".

AMENDMENT NO. 3505
On page 38, line 6, strike "$330,000,000" and insert "$340,000,000."

AMENDMENT NO. 3506
On page 63, on line 9 after the words "Sec. 530." strike all through line 15 and insert the following:

"(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subsection (b), the United States may not sell or otherwise transfer to the United States any Stinger ground-to-air missiles to any country bordering the Persian Gulf in order to replace, on a one-for-one basis, Stinger missiles previously furnished to such country if the Stinger missiles to be replaced are nearing the scheduled expiration of their shelf-life."

AMENDMENT NO. 3507
At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new general provision.

PROCUREMENT AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REFORM

SEC. . (a) Of the funds made available under the heading "International Financial Institutions" in this Act or any prior Foreign Operations, Export Financing, or Related Programs Act, 10 percent of the United States portion or payment to such International Financial Institution shall be withheld by the Secretary of the Treasury, until the Secretary certifies that—

(1) the institution is implementing procedures for conducting semi-annual audits by qualified independent auditors for all new lending;

(2) the institution has taken steps to establish an independent fraud and corruption investigative organization or office;

(3) the institution has implemented a program to assess a recipient country's procurement and financial management capabilities including an analysis of the risks of corruption prior to initiating new lending; and

(4) the institution is taking steps to implement measures to improve transparency and anticorruption programs and procurement and financial management controls in recipient countries.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of Treasury shall report on March 1, 2001 to the Committees on Appropriations on progress made to fulfill the objectives identified in subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—The term "International Financial Institutions" means the International Finance Corporation, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Inter-American Investment Corporation, the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund, the Asian Development Bank, the Asian Development Fund, African Development Bank the African Development Fund, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund.

AMENDMENT NO. 3508
On page 21, line 21, after the word "organizations" insert: "Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading for Kosovo, not less than $1,300,000 shall be made available to support the National Albanian American Council's training program for Kosovar women."

AMENDMENT NO. 3509
On page 21, at the end of Section 3(c) insert the following: "Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading not less than $750,000 shall be made available for a joint project developed by the University of Pristina, Kosova and the Dartmouth Medical School, U.S.A., to bring back the primary care capabilities at the University of Pristina Medical School and in Kosova."
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, over the past two years, the Sub-committee has held hearings which have focused on corruption, fraud and financial management problems at the International Financial Institutions. The interest was stimulated in part by flagrant abuses which compromised the World Bank's program in Indonesia. The Bank's Country Director ignored internal reports detailing program kickbacks, skimming and fraud. He caused the world to believe the Suharto family and their cronies whom he believed were responsible for Indonesia's economic boom. A change of government and country directors presented an opportunity to set a new course for management and lending policies.

Because of these problems, I asked GAO to conduct a review of the Bank's management with an emphasis on anti-corruption policies and programs in Indonesia and several other borrowing countries, including Indonesia, Russia, and Brazil. While the Bank limited GAO's access to documents, and set up a special committee to supervise their work, they still did an excellent job.

In brief, the Bank has launched an ambitious effort to identify problems, but significant challenges lie ahead. We are a long way from real solutions. Let me tick off some of the conclusions which concerned me the most.

First, although the World Bank has established an Investigations Unit which answers to a new Fraud and Oversight Committee, many local problems in borrowing countries never reach the investigators. In one country where the Bank itself identified corruption as a serious problem, 50 allegations of abuse reported to their local officials had not been referred on to the Investigations Unit or Committee.

Second, the GAO determined that investigations are compromised by the fact that a Managing Director controls the unit's reports and makes final decisions on whether an investigation is pursued, including those that may involve employees who answer to the Director.

Third, new initiatives introduced in 1998 to improve financial and procurement procedures only apply to 14% of the Banks' 1,500 projects. In recent audits, 17 of 25 borrowers showed a lack of understanding or noncompliance with procurement rules. GAO's review of 12 randomly selected projects identified 5 projects where the borrowing countries implementing agencies had little or no experience managing projects. Fourth, when making project recommendations for Board approval, the staff's risk analysis fails to adequately address corruption or undermine political influence as key factors. Eight of Twelve projects reviewed did not identify corruption or political manipulation as a critical risk even though other Bank reports indicated both were serious issues in the countries included in the project sampling.

Finally, GAO determined that solving problems is made more difficult because audits are often late and of poor quality, and the Bank does not evaluate the quality of audits.

To remedy these problems, GAO recommends the Bank integrate the investigative function and establish organizational independence, include more complete corruption data in risk assessments and country strategies, develop a system for allocating anti-corruption assistance, improve borrowing countries' capability to implement and supervise fraud free projects, and improve auditing and project supervision.

These problems are not unique to the World Bank. We have all read the stories about the IMF being caught by surprise in both Russia and Ukraine regarding manipulation of loans and loan data. I am sure there are similar problems in the regional institutions as well.

To accelerate a solution to these pressing issues, Senator LEAHY and I felt it was prudent for the Secretary of the Treasury to encourage these institutions to implement GAO's recommendations. The amendment before the Senate requires the Secretary to withhold 10% of our contribution to each institution until audits are in place, independent investigation units are established, and anti-corruption is being addressed in risk assessments. We also expect the institutions to strengthen local government capacity so that lending and projects are better supervised to prevent corruption.

This amendment addresses one of the most fundamental issues which has compromised support for the multilateral banks. Bringing more transparency to lending and improving procurement and management practices will help restore confidence and support to the banks.

Mr. ROBERTS. I support 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 economic development in the PRC and Asia in general.

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

The Baucus-Roberts amendment also sends a strong pro-engagement mes-
sage to the PRC since the U.S. ex-
cluded 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. 3972.

Our government purports to be con-
cerned 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 poten-
tial to impact the world’s environment over the next 50 to 100 years. That
makes no sense.

What is the United States-Asian En-
vironmental Partnership? It is a pub-
lic-private initiative implemented by the U.S. Agency for National Devel-
opment (USAID). Its aim is to en-
courage environmentally sustainable development in Asia as that region in-
dustrializes at a phenomenal rate. By “environmentally sustainable develop-
ment,” we mean industrial and urban development that does not irreparably
damage the air, water, and soil nec-
essary for life. It’s really that simple.

US-AEP currently works with govern-
ments and industries in Hong Kong,
India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia,
Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tai-
wan, Thailand, and Vietnam. In cre-
aturing US-AEP, the U.S. government
recognized the long-term environ-
mental hazards of Asia’s rapid indus-
trialization 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 facili-
tating the transfer of environmentally sound and energy-efficient tech-
nologies to the Asia/Pacific region.
Again, the objective is to address the
pollution and health challenges of rapid industrialization while stimu-
lating demand for U.S. technologies. In cooperation with the U.S. Department
of Commerce, US-AEP has placed En-
vironmental Technology Representatives in 11 Asian countries to identify trade oppor-
tunities 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 colleagues
support for this common sense amend-
ment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3512

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, this amendment would allow the
United States to provide non military
education and anti corruption assist-
ance to countries, and their govern-
ments, that are not on the terrorism
list, and that are denied U.S. assist-
ance or are under U.S. sanctions. Let
me just reiterate that this amendment
is not applicable to countries on the
terrorism list or which are major pro-
ducers or traffickers of drugs.

This provision is specifically in-
tended to enable the U.S. Government
to conduct a broad range of rule of law
programs, as well as other programs
(e.g. setting up elementary schools,
combat anti-corruption training or
educating, economic reform measures; tax reform, tariff regulation, developing rational and transparent budgeting procedures, privatization, or drafting a commercial code, etc.), so long as there
is some component of the program that
includes educating or providing infor-
mation to persons.

Mr. President, the United States has
been working for a long time to try to
find ways to help the most vulnerable and fragile in the developing world. Allowing the United States to continue to pro-
vide assistance in education and anti
corruption training is something which
ultimately is in our own interests.

In many parts of the world, we are up
against an enemy like the Wahhabis,
the Saudis, the Iranians and the likes of
Bin Laden and others, who are pour-
ing money into the poorest regions of
the world to set up schools which are
dedicated to teaching children anti-
Western attitudes, as well as how to
carry weapons.

In many countries, because of the
dire poverty, such schools are the only
game in town. And the single common
element which allows these schools to
flourish is poverty and ignorance.
There is no other option for many peo-
ple. The poverty and the lack of edu-
cation leads to radicalism, and vio-
ence, often directed first against
women, and a host of problems which
are tied when assistance is denied to a
situation where programs in edu-
cation or anti corruption training is
involved. We shouldn’t be mandating sanctions in an area, like education, which
are of long term assistance to the
United States.

Mr. President, I will explain about such
things as corruption or lack of environ-
mental awareness, or lack of democ-
racy, or child labor, or trafficking in
women and children. Education could
help make a dent in such things, from
setting up schools which allow exchange of higher school lev-
els, to such things as providing infor-
mation to people in such areas as eco-
nomic reform, equitable distribution of
wealth, growing their economies, im-
pact situations of tax reform and tariff
regulation, development of rational and transparent budgeting procedures,
development of rule of law and dem-
cratic institutions, and privatizing or
drafting a commercial code.

And yet we occasionally find our-
selves in the position of having to deny
assistance in the very area which
would help fix these problems.

That is why I am introducing this
amendment today. Denying U.S. assist-
ance to a country is a right we should
have, but we should be exercising our
ability to influence countries at such a basic level as education and we
certainly should do what we can to
combat anti-corruption.

The most effective way to overcome
the anti democratic threats and the
lure of terrorism is to go to the root of
the problem and to encourage the
development of civil society.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is here.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under
the previous order, the Senator from
Minnesota is recognized to offer an
amendment relative to Colombia.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I
got a last-minute call from the Budget
Committee, and we may have to work
this amendment out. I will wait about
5 minutes before I offer the amend-
ment. I am waiting for some last-
minute wording.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The
clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk pro-
ceded to call the roll.
Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Is there an amendment pending? Are we open for general debate on the foreign operations appropriations bill?

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina sent up an amendment by unanimous consent, and the regular order is to recognize the Senator from Minnesota to offer an amendment.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to use leader time at this point to speak with regard to the Wellstone amendment, which I understand he will be offering momentarily.

I rise to speak against the Wellstone amendment that I understand will be offered. What this amendment would do would be to knock out the funds that are included in the foreign operations appropriations bill for Colombian aid. Is that correct about the intent of the amendment by the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, no, it is not. This amendment leaves several hundred million dollars out of the $900 million that would go to the southern Colombia military campaign. I will talk about the military and the right-wing violence groups that are included in the foreign operations appropriations bill for Colombian aid. Is that correct about the intent of the amendment by the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LOTT. You would move a significant portion of the funds in excess of $900 million into another category to be used for exactly what? Will the Senator describe that to me?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased to. We are working on this final wording because we are trying to figure whether to make this an emergency designation or whether we can do this in a different way.

What this amendment says is that we absolutely are committed to institutional building in Colombia; we are committed to helping out in every way, shape, or form, including interdiction and police action.

There are very serious concerns that have been raised by a whole range of religious groups. I have a list of hundreds of nongovernment organizations that are included in the foreign operations appropriations bill for Colombia. This is very important for us.

There are very serious concerns that have been raised by a whole range of religious groups. I have a list of hundreds of nongovernment organizations that are included in the foreign operations appropriations bill for Colombia. This is very important for us.

For years, to our own detriment, in our own country, in the United States, we have been doing business with people who are killing our children. The drugs that come out of Colombia are coming right into the United States—coca and heroin. They are poisoning our children.

This is not very well. I am very concerned about it. I think we ignore it at our own peril. Should we do more in our country to combat this demand problem, education, and treatment? Sure. We ought to find ways to do that. But we shouldn't do it by taking away from the efforts that are underway in Colombia.

This is why I call this a close national security interest for our own country. There are those who are worried if we do this, we are slipping toward being involved. Where better to be involved than to try to take action and provide support for people who are trying to move toward greater democracy and greater economic development and to control and stop the drug trafficking and the drug pushers in that part of the world? I think we should do this. I think we should have been doing more years ago. I worked in the Senate with Senators COVERDELL, DEWINE, and others in communication with our own drug czar in America that we were not doing enough in Colombia.

Finally, the administration has said, well, we need to do something more; we need to be involved. I commend them for that. We need to get it done. That is why we pulled this foreign operations appropriations bill up as early as possible. We think we should get this foreign operations bill done and we should get the Colombian aid package included. This is very important for us.

President Pastrana of Colombia has asked for our help—not to solve the problem for him. We are not advocating U.S. troops go in or that we have direct involvement in their efforts there but to help him without American troops. Give them the equipment they need; give them the equipment they need to fight these massive narcotic drug cartels in Colombia and that part of the world.

President Clinton's plan is multifaceted: Economic, political, social, and military means to gain the upper hand in dealing with the narcoterrorists who control vast amounts of Colombian territory. That is an area where I have some concern.

I think too much territory has been conceded to these narcoterrorists.

Make no mistake, the FARC and the ELN guerrillas are ruthless. They don't know anything or care anything about human rights. They only want power to control a part of the world, a part of the world that is rich in natural resources. They control by narcoterrorists. Think about that. That is a real possibility unless we act to get assistance there as soon as possible.

Will this aid package alone solve the problem? No. I emphasize again we should have been doing more last year and the year before and over a period of years. But it will make a significant contribution by giving to
the Colombian Government the wherewithal to challenge these narcoterrorists. We know one thing for certain: Without this package, these narcoterrorists will be emboldened and they will have no incentive to come to the peace table. The freely elected pro-U.S. government of President Pastrana will be dealt a very serious blow. We cannot leave them unassisted when they have asked for our help.

This is a question of standing up for our children or standing up and fighting these narcoterrorists in our part of the world, in our neighborhood, in our region. Colombia has a chance. They are tired of the bloodshed. They are tired of kidnappings. They are tired of human rights abuses on all sides. I don't for a minute mean to push aside the complaints about some of the human rights violations on the other side, but that shouldn't be a reason not to act.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, support the foreign operations bill as it is, with the Colombian aid. As a matter of fact, I think it is possible the aid may actually be increased somewhat in conference. We should not let this be blocked apart. We should step up to our responsibility and fulfill our commitment to Colombia, to President Pastrana for his efforts, but particularly for the children of our country.

Do support amendments that will take away funds in this package and move them over into other areas. It is the minimum that we should do.

I thank Senator WELSTONE for allowing me to go forward at this time. I yield the floor.

Mr. WELSTONE. Mr. President, I say to the majority leader, I appreciate his comments and I did not want to interrupt him while he was speaking.

I will, as thoughtful a way as possible, state one of his comments. I don't think there is any question that we need to deal with narcoterrorists. I don't really believe that is the issue. I will take time to develop this.

My colleague from New York wanted to speak.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to follow the Senator from North Carolina.

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

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, more than 80 percent of the cocaine, and most of the heroin flooding America's streets comes from Colombia. That is just one of many reasons why helping honest Colombians is an urgent and absolute necessity.

Today, Colombia's democratically elected government is besieged by bloodthirsty, communist guerrillas who have gone into business with narcoterrorists, and, Mr. President, without U.S. help, Colombia may very well lose its fight with these narcoterrorists—and that is why the United States must move swiftly to help President Andres Pastrana save the second oldest democracy in the Americas. I support doing whatever it takes to save Colombia—not only because of the enormous cost of drugs to our country but because the United States of America should stand with a decent, democratic government in our own hemisphere that is threatened by Marxist terrorists.

I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, and the able Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, for including in the foreign operations bill the emergency anti-drug assistance for Colombia and surrounding countries.

This bill deserves our support even though I expect that the House-Senate conference will choose to make some adjustments.

For example, we must resist unrealistic conditions that will block the delivery of badly needed support. Also, I am persuaded that we must supply the Colombian army with AH-64D helicopters so they have the mobility to respond to the hit-and-run tactics of the guerrillas who are part of the drug trade.

The stakes are enormously high. Colombia is one of the most important U.S. trading partners in the Americas, with $45 billion in direct U.S. investment in sectors—not counting the key petroleum sector. Also, the guerrillas have expressly targeted American businesses and citizens in Colombia for bombings, kidnappings, and murders.

Further, the threat to regional stability is acute: Venezuela, Peru, and Ecuador all have massed troops on their borders with Colombia, Panama, which has no army, is helpless to secure its frontier from smugglers of drugs and weapons.

President Pastrana doesn't ask us to do his fighting for him. In fact, no man alive has taken this for peace. If anything, he might be criticized for making too many concessions to bring the guerrillas to the peace table.

The guerrillas have responded by launching murderous attacks on civilian targets. While President Pastrana is going the extra mile for peace, the guerrillas have launched a recruitment drive—bent on tearing Colombia apart.

These guerrillas are criminals and terrorists operating on drug trafficking, kidnapping, and extortion. They are playing an ever-increasing role in the drug trade, which earns them a blank check from the narcoterrorists who realize that chaos is good for their dirty enterprise.

These 20,000 guerrillas move about the country virtually unchallenged while most of Colombia's army is pinned down protecting bridges, oil pipelines, and power stations from terror attacks. That leaves only 40,000 soldiers, with a mere 30 helicopters, to take on the guerrillas in a rugged, mountainous country almost twice the size of Texas.

What can the United States do to help?

We can approve emergency anti-drug aid to Colombia and to her neighbors, thereby giving them a fighting chance to stem the tide of lawlessness and cocaine that threatens the entire Andean region.

U.S. support will bolster the Colombian army's counter-drug battalions, providing continued U.S. military training, better intelligence and communications, and increased mobility in the form of transport helicopters. We will also provide support to eradicate illegal crops and create alternative employment for displaced farmers.

Current U.S. law requires that any military units receiving U.S. aid must be "scrubbed" for human rights violations. That is as it should be. But we should not hold U.S. support hostage to unrealistic preconditions.

If America fails to act, Colombia will continue to hurdle toward chaos—or if the Colombians lose their struggle or are forced to appease the narco-guerrillas—the United States and the rest of the hemisphere will pay a very dear price.

The longer we delay, the higher that price will be.

I urge Senators to support emergency anti-drug support for Colombia—and to do so without delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota. Without objection, the Senator's time will be charged under the previous order against his time on the amendment.

Mr. WELSTONE. Mr. President, I will outline for colleagues what this amendment is about. I will send the amendment to the desk in a short while.

This amendment would essentially transfer $225 million—as I said to the majority leader, this is by no means an amendment that says we don't supply assistance to Colombia—from the Colombian military for purposes of the push into southern Colombia to the domestic drug treatment programs.

Specifically, this amendment would transfer funds to the substance abuse prevention and treatment block grant program to provide—I will marshal evidence to colleagues—desperately needed funds for State and local community-based programs and for drug treatment programs within a variety of different facilities, such as correctional facilities and other facilities in the country.

By the way, part of the argument that I present today is that we deal with this drug problem for sure, but there is a considerable amount of evidence that we don't want to do all of a sudden militarize this whole package, especially with the record of the military in Colombia.

And I want to deal with the demand side in our country. By the way, I am sure the vast majority of people in the United States of America agree.
This amendment leaves substantial assistance for the Colombian Government and civil society, including all sorts of alternative development programs such as judicial reform and human rights programs.

I want colleagues to know what they are voting on. It simply removes and transfers to more effective domestic use the resources in this particular bill destined for the Colombian Army's push into southern Colombia.

Since 1989, virtually all U.S. assistance to Colombia has officially been intended to fight illicit drug production and use. The majority leader now has the third largest internally displaced population in the world.

American advisers—let me talk about that—are doing all of a sudden in this package a remarkable job of changing the ratio of our support and giving much more to the military linked to these death squads. I don't think that is what our country is about.

Moreover, I don't believe the militarization of this package will work. I will get to that in a moment.

The majority leader says he is concerned about human rights. He said it in a word or two. But I would like to spend a little bit more time on this.


"Paramilitary groups working in some areas with the tolerance and open support of the armed forces continue to massacre civilians, commit selected killings and special terror.

Democratic Senators and Republican Senators, now we are going to give this military, given this record, a massive infusion of money for a campaign in southern Colombia with American advisers with the military.

Let me quote again from the "Human Rights Watch World Report 2000." That is this year.

"Paramilitary groups working in some areas with the tolerance and open support of the armed forces continue to massacre civilians, commit selected killings and special terror.

I argue that we should take this seriously.


Jesus Ramiro Zapata, human rights defender, was arrested in Segovia, department of Antioquia. Several days earlier he reported that members of paramilitary groups had inquired into his whereabouts, and that about eight assassins in the latter part of April. On the 3rd of April, 500 paramilitaries reportedly entered the municipalities of Segovia and Remedios, setting up camp in Otu. The large number of Colombian National Army 4th Brigade troops stationed in the area did nothing to confront the illegal paramilitary group.

That is a report from Amnesty International. I could go on.

The armed forces, the military that we are now going to provide money to with American advisers watching and standing by idly as paramilitary groups violate human rights, abduct innocent people and murder them, and we are going to be providing all of this support for this military.

This is a letter from a number of different religious organizations in the United States of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of these documents be printed in the RECORD.

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

LEGAL ACTION CENTER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE COUNSELORS (NAADAC), NATIONAL COUNCIL ON ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG DEPENDENCE (NCADD), PARTNERSHIP FOR RECOVERY, STATE ASSOCIATIONS OF ADDICTION SERVICES (SAAS), JUNE 21, 2000.

SUPPORT THE WELLSTONE AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

DEAR SENATORS: We are writing in support of Senator Wellstone's Amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill to transfer $225 million from the section of the bill funding military operations in Southern Colombia to drug and alcohol treatment and prevention programs funded by the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment (SAPT) block grant.

We feel this amendment leaves intact critical assistance for democracy stabilization and drug interdiction efforts in Colombia, while also supporting the vastly underfunded drug and alcohol treatment and prevention programs here in the United States.

Public funding for treatment primarily serves low income and indigent people who want to reclaim their lives. When looking at drug and alcohol addiction, we find that in addition to being a disease itself, it is a critical risk factor for health problems such as HIV and other infectious diseases as well as social problems such as crime and domestic violence.

Traditionally, treatment and prevention systems have faced increased pressure from entitlement reforms, specifically welfare and SSI program reforms that decrease system capacity while increasing the need for public treatment and prevention services. Successful criminal justice programs involving (and often mandating) treatment, including drug court programs, have proliferated and are steadily increasing the demand for treatment.

We feel that a balanced approach to the drug control effort is necessary, yet prevention and treatment programs have not received adequate funding to keep up with demand. The Wellstone amendment adds necessary prevention and treatment funds to domestic programs that will save lives and taxpayer dollars.

On behalf of the 18 million Americans who chronically use drugs or alcohol and the 83 million children whose parent(s) abuse drugs or alcohol, we ask that you support drug and alcohol prevention and treatment programs by supporting the Wellstone amendment.

We thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Tom McDaniel, Director of National Policy, Legal Action Center.
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COLOMBIA

Colombia is a constitutional, multiparty democracy, in which the Liberal and Conservative parties have long dominated politics. Citizens elected President Andres Pastrana of the Conservative Party and a bicameral legislature controlled by the Liberal Party in general elections in June 1998, despite attempts at intimidation and fraud by paramilitary groups, guerrillas, and narco-traffickers. The judicial system is largely independent of government influence, although the suborning or intimidation of judges, witnesses, and prosecutors by those indicated is common.

The Government continued to face a serious challenge to its control over the national territory, as longstanding and widespread armed conflict and rampant violence—both political and criminal—perpetuated the principal participants were government forces, paramilitary groups, guerrillas, and narcotics traffickers. In some areas government forces were engaged in combat with guerrillas or narcotics traffickers, while in other paramilitary groups fought guerrillas, and in still others guerrillas attacked demobilized members of rival guerrilla factions. Paramilitary groups and guerrillas have increased drug trade in some areas and trafficked in narcotics and weapons.

The Government's human rights record remains marred by serious human rights violations committed with or on the order of government security forces, paramilitary groups, guerrillas, and narcotics traffickers, and_Page_12

By an agenda for formal negotiations and on procedures for the creation of an international verification commission to monitor both sides' compliance with the terms of the despeje, President Pastrana and the FARC's leader, Marulanda, failed to appear for the scheduled formal inauguration of peace talks in April. The Government's concession to the FARC that, at least initially, there be no international verification commission. The Government also held a series of informal discussions with the ELN during the year, but insisted on the ELN's release of the victims of specific mass kidnappings as a condition for undertaking formal negotiations and for demilitarizing a zone in which the ELN could hold its national convention. At year's end, the ELN had not committed itself to the Government's request and still held captive several dozen of the specified kidnap victims.

The citizen-led Ministry of Defense is responsible for internal security and overseas both the armed forces and the National Police, although civilian management of the armed forces is limited. The security forces include armed state law enforcement, investigatory, and military authorities, including the National Police, army, air force, navy, and the Administrative Department of Security (DAS), and the Prosecutor General's Technical Corps of Investigators (CTI). The army, air force, navy, and the DAS are directly under the command of the President, but is directed by a law enforcement professional. The police are charged formally with maintaining internal order and enforcing laws. Security enforcement responsibilities often were shared with the army, especially in rural areas. The security forces regularly failed to confront paramilitary groups, and members of the security forces sometimes illegally collaborated with paramilitary forces. The armed forces and the police committed numerous, serious violations of human rights throughout the year.

Despese years of drug- and politically related violence, the economy is diverse and developing. However, the country has suffered a recession, and there was negative growth of 5 percent in 1999 for the first time in the country's modern history. The Government's underdeveloped economic policies have led to high inflation, which has eroded living standards for all sectors of society, and to a large case backlog, and undermined by intimidation and the prevailing climate of impunity. This situation remains at the core of the country's human rights problems. The Superior Judicial Council (CSJ) reported in August that 63 percent of crimes go unrepted, and that 40 percent of all reported crimes are "void" and not processed, and that 40 percent of crimes are not processed due to a lack of victims, and that 40 percent of all reported crimes are not processed due to the impunity. The Government's human rights record remains marred by serious human rights violations committed with or on the order of government security forces, paramilitary groups, guerrillas, and narcotics traffickers. Narcotics traffickers continued to control large tracts of land and other assets and exploited the economy, and political life. The official unemployment rate peaked at 20 percent, a record high, although it had declined to 18.1 percent that year. Unemployment rates were higher in rural areas, which were engaged in the cocaine and marijuana trade, and in thedepartments of Cauca, Putumayo, and Caqueta, which have the highest rates of drug production and trafficking. Guerillas and paramilitary groups supplanted absent state institutions in many sparsely populated areas of the national territory. In July 1998, then-President-elect Pastrana met with the FARC's leader, Manuel Marulanda Velez, and agreed to a demilitarization zone ("despeje") in which the two sides could pursue direct peace talks. In November 1998, the despeje was initiated in five southern municipalities, with a population of approximately 300,000 persons. Security forces completed their withdrawal from the area the following month. In January Marulanda Velez failed to appear for the scheduled formal inauguration of peace talks in the despeje. President Pastrana and Marulanda met again in May and agreed on
cases that potentially placed their lives in danger. The authorities sometimes infringed on citizens’ privacy rights. Journalists practiced self-censorship. There were some restrictions on freedom of movement. There were unconfirmed reports of security forces harassing or threatening human rights groups. Violence and extensive societal discrimination against women, abuse of children, and child prostitution are serious problems. Sexual discrimination against the indigenous and minorities continued. Child labor is a widespread problem. Trafficking in women and girls for the purpose of forced prostitution is a problem. So-called “social cleansing” killings of street children, prostitutes, homosexuals, and others deemed socially undesirable by paramilitary groups, guerrillas, vigilante groups continued to be a serious problem.

Paramilitary groups and guerrillas were responsible for the vast majority of political and extrajudicial killings during the year. Throughout the country, paramilitary groups killed, tortured, and threatened civilians suspected of sympathizing with guerrillas in an orchestrated campaign to terrorize them into fleeing their homes, thereby depriving guerrillas of civilian support. Paramilitary groups responded to the increasing number of massacres and other politically motivated killings. They also fought guerrillas for control of some lucrative coca estates and other land grants. Their presence in narcotics production and trafficking. The AUC paramilitary umbrella organization, whose membership totaled approximately 5,000 to 7,000 armed combatants, exercised increasing influence during the year, extending its presence through violence and intimidation into areas previously under guerrilla control. Although some paramilitary groups reflect rural residents’ desire to organize solely for self-defense, others are vigilante organizations, and still others are actually the paid private armies of narcotics traffickers or large landowners. Popular support for these organizations grew during the year, as guerrilla violence increased in the face of a slowly evolving peace process. The army’s record in dealing with paramilitary groups remained mixed.

In some locations the army on rare occasions attacked paramilitary groups directly. In many other cases, army units appear to be collaborating with paramilitary groups. The FARC and the ELN regularly attacked civilians, including committed missionaries and summary executions, and killed medical and religious personnel. Guerrillas were responsible for the majority of cases of forcible displacement and extrajudicial killings, with the Colombian military forces and brutal paramilitary groups responsible for massacres, assassinations of community leaders and human rights defenders, and over 70% of Colombia’s human rights violations. A report released by Human Rights Watch this month links half of Colombia’s 18 brigade-level army units to paramilitary activity. Colombia’s internal conflict has produced 1.6 million internally displaced persons, more than in Kosovo or East Timor, and an increasing number of refugees fleeing to Panama and Venezuela. It is our fear the proposed aid package will replace the U.S. deepening into Colombia’s civil war, intensify the conflict, and make the U.S. complicit in violations of human rights. Even more disturbing, the proposed aid package includes plans for intensive aerial fumigation that will replace 10,000 to 40,000 hectares of coca in the area under coca cultivation has increased from 40,000 to 100,000 hectares despite huge increases in U.S. assistance for weapons, training, and military objectives. That proposed aid package will only expand a failed war on drugs by increasing military force, while failing to address the complex political, economic, and structural roots of the problem of Colombia’s internal conflict.

On October 24, 1999, more than 10 million Colombians marched for peace. Talks between the Colombian government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the largest guerrilla force, have resumed. Progress is being made toward opening negotiations with the National Liberation Army (ELN), the second largest guerrilla group. We ask you to honestly assess the progress towards peace. We urge you to support increased U.S. military involvement in Colombia.

U.S. AID TO COLOMBIA
March 8, 2000

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are writing as religious leaders. The United States is faced with the need to oppose the two-year $1.3 billion military aid package for the “Push into Southern Colombia” proposed by President Clinton on June 21, 2000. Targeting the area of Colombia, the proposed military aid package will escalate the violence and undercut efforts for a negotiated peace settlement to Colombia’s civil war, and support the militarization of the Colombian peace process. We urge you to support much-needed assistance for peace, human rights, justice reform, alternative development, and humanitarian assistance to Colombia’s internally displaced.

Colombia is currently the third largest recipient of U.S. military assistance. Yet reports from the United States and the U.S. Department of State, independent human rights organizations, and Colombian judicial authorities point to continuing ties between the Colombian military and paramilitary organizations. They are the paid private armies of narco traffickers or large landowners. Population displaced and human rights violations continue as a result of the policies of these vigilante organizations, and still others fight guerrillas for control of some lucrative coca estates and other land grants.

Colombia’s human rights record continues to deteriorate. A report released by Human Rights Watch this month links half of Colombia’s 18 brigade-level army units to paramilitary activity. Colombia’s military has produced 1.6 million internally displaced persons, more than in Kosovo or East Timor, and an increasing number of refugees fleeing to Panama and Venezuela. It is our fear the proposed aid package will replace the U.S. deepening into Colombia’s civil war, intensify the conflict, and make the U.S. complicit in violations of human rights. Even more disturbing, the proposed aid package includes plans for intensive aerial fumigation that will replace 10,000 hectares of coca in the area under coca cultivation has increased from 40,000 to 100,000 hectares despite huge increases in U.S. assistance for weapons, training, and military objectives. That proposed aid package will only expand a failed war on drugs by increasing military force, while failing to address the complex political, economic, and structural roots of the problem of Colombia’s internal conflict.

On October 24, 1999, more than 10 million Colombians marched for peace. Talks between the Colombian government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the largest guerrilla force, have resumed. Progress is being made toward opening negotiations with the National Liberation Army (ELN), the second largest guerrilla group. We ask you to honestly assess the progress towards peace. We urge you to support increased U.S. military involvement in Colombia.

COLOMBIA ANSWERS PLAN COLOMBIA: A PLAN FOR PEACE OR A PLAN FOR WAR?

(A Declaration From Social and Human Rights Nongovernmental Organizations, and the Peace Movement in Colombia, Bogota, May 31, 2000)

We would like express our support for those offers of international assistance that contribute to resolving the armed conflict through a process of political negotiation, and that strengthen and unite Colombian society and the economy. We support proposals that include viable and integral solutions to the problem of drug trafficking, the design of a new development model agreed to by the people, and the strengthening of a new kind of democratic institutions.

However, Plan Colombia, presented by the Government of President Pastrana, has been developed with the same logic of political exclusion that has been one of the structural causes of the conflict Colombians have experienced since the time of our formation as a Republic.

In this same vein, because we feel it is a mistake, we are obligated to reject the fact that Plan Colombia includes, as one of its strategies, a military component that not only fails to resolve the narcotraficking problem, but also endangers the efforts to build peace, increases illicit crop production, violates the Amazonic ecosystem, aggravates the humanitarian and human rights crisis, multiplies the problem of forced displacement, and worsens the social crisis with fiscal adjustment policies. In its social component, Plan Colombia is largely to some of the tangential causes and effects of the conflict.

What we are proposing is the need for a comprehensive agreement between different actors in Colombian society and the international community, one where civil society is the principal interlocutor, where solutions to the varied conflicts are found, and where stable and sustainable peace is constructed.

We are ready and willing to design strategies, to define forms of implementation, and to monitor a plan that reflects these intentions.

Taking into consideration the arguments put forth above, we the undersigned are given no choice but to oppose the assistance for Colombia that you are considering at this time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will quote one section:

In this same vein, because we feel it is a mistake—

They are talking about this package—

we are obliged to reject the fact that Plan Colombia includes as one of its strategies, a military component that not only fails to resolve the narcotraficking problem—

I say to the majority leader and others, “that fails to resolve this problem,” but that is what we want to do, is resolve the problem—
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but also endangers the efforts to build peace, increases illicit crop production, violates the Amazonic ecosystem, aggravates the humanitarian and human rights crisis, multiplies the problem of forced displacement, and worsens the social crisis with fiscal adjustment policies.

It is from a variety of about 70 non-government organizations, including religiously as well as the country of Colombia. They are saying don’t do this. Provide the assistance; we need it. Let’s get it to the civic-building organizations, get it to the police, get it to some of the interdiction efforts, or other economic development efforts. But don’t put the money into the military for this campaign, given the military’s record of torture, murder, and widespread violation of human rights.

I, continuing to pursue our current Colombia counternarcotics policy, cloaked under the veil of counternarcotics efforts— that is not what this is about. This is not about an antinarcotics effort. That is not what the vote is about. The vote is about whether or not you are going to put money into this military anti-insurgenancy effort. It risks drawing us into a terrible quagmire. History has repeatedly shown, especially in Latin America—just think of Nicaragua or El Salvador— that the practical effect of this strategy now under consideration is to militarize, to escalate the conflict, not to end it. That is, I think, the flaw in this package.

The call by the administration for a massive increase in counternarcotics assistance for Colombia this year puts the United States at a crossroads. Do we back a major escalation in military aid to Colombia that may worsen a country? Should some of that aid not target the United States at a crossroads. Do we back a major escalation in military aid to Colombia that may worsen a country of Colombia. They are saying don’t do this. Provide the assistance; we need it. Let’s get it to the civic-building organizations, get it to the police, get it to some of the interdiction efforts, or other economic development efforts. But don’t put the money into the military for this campaign, given the military’s record of torture, murder, and widespread violation of human rights.

It is from a variety of about 70 non-government organizations, including religiously as well as the country of Colombia. They are saying don’t do this. Provide the assistance; we need it. Let’s get it to the civic-building organizations, get it to the police, get it to some of the interdiction efforts, or other economic development efforts. But don’t put the money into the military for this campaign, given the military’s record of torture, murder, and widespread violation of human rights.

I, continuing to pursue our current Colombia counternarcotics policy, cloaked under the veil of counternarcotics efforts— that is not what this is about. This is not about an antinarcotics effort. That is not what the vote is about. The vote is about whether or not you are going to put money into this military anti-insurgenancy effort. It risks drawing us into a terrible quagmire. History has repeatedly shown, especially in Latin America—just think of Nicaragua or El Salvador— that the practical effect of this strategy now under consideration is to militarize, to escalate the conflict, not to end it. That is, I think, the flaw in this package.

The call by the administration for a massive increase in counternarcotics assistance for Colombia this year puts the United States at a crossroads. Do we back a major escalation in military aid to Colombia that may worsen a country? Should some of that aid not target the United States at a crossroads. Do we back a major escalation in military aid to Colombia that may worsen a country of Colombia. They are saying don’t do this. Provide the assistance; we need it. Let’s get it to the civic-building organizations, get it to the police, get it to some of the interdiction efforts, or other economic development efforts. But don’t put the money into the military for this campaign, given the military’s record of torture, murder, and widespread violation of human rights.
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The call by the administration for a massive increase in counternarcotics assistance for Colombia this year puts the United States at a crossroads. Do we back a major escalation in military aid to Colombia that may worsen a country? Should some of that aid not target the United States at a crossroads. Do we back a major escalation in military aid to Colombia that may worsen a country of Colombia. They are saying don’t do this. Provide the assistance; we need it. Let’s get it to the civic-building organizations, get it to the police, get it to some of the interdiction efforts, or other economic development efforts. But don’t put the money into the military for this campaign, given the military’s record of torture, murder, and widespread violation of human rights.

I, continuing to pursue our current Colombia counternarcotics policy, cloaked under the veil of counternarcotics efforts— that is not what this is about. This is not about an antinarcotics effort. That is not what the vote is about. The vote is about whether or not you are going to put money into this military anti-insurgenancy effort. It risks drawing us into a terrible quagmire. History has repeatedly shown, especially in Latin America—just think of Nicaragua or El Salvador— that the practical effect of this strategy now under consideration is to militarize, to escalate the conflict, not to end it. That is, I think, the flaw in this package.

The call by the administration for a massive increase in counternarcotics assistance for Colombia this year puts the United States at a crossroads. Do we back a major escalation in military aid to Colombia that may worsen a country? Should some of that aid not target the United States at a crossroads. Do we back a major escalation in military aid to Colombia that may worsen a country of Colombia. They are saying don’t do this. Provide the assistance; we need it. Let’s get it to the civic-building organizations, get it to the police, get it to some of the interdiction efforts, or other economic development efforts. But don’t put the money into the military for this campaign, given the military’s record of torture, murder, and widespread violation of human rights.
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I, continuing to pursue our current Colombia counternarcotics policy, cloaked under the veil of counternarcotics efforts— that is not what this is about. This is not about an antinarcotics effort. That is not what the vote is about. The vote is about whether or not you are going to put money into this military anti-insurgenancy effort. It risks drawing us into a terrible quagmire. History has repeatedly shown, especially in Latin America—just think of Nicaragua or El Salvador— that the practical effect of this strategy now under consideration is to militarize, to escalate the conflict, not to end it. That is, I think, the flaw in this package.

The call by the administration for a massive increase in counternarcotics assistance for Colombia this year puts the United States at a crossroads. Do we back a major escalation in military aid to Colombia that may worsen a country? Should some of that aid not target the United States at a crossroads. Do we back a major escalation in military aid to Colombia that may worsen a country of Colombia. They are saying don’t do this. Provide the assistance; we need it. Let’s get it to the civic-building organizations, get it to the police, get it to some of the interdiction efforts, or other economic development efforts. But don’t put the money into the military for this campaign, given the military’s record of torture, murder, and widespread violation of human rights.

I, continuing to pursue our current Colombia counternarcotics policy, cloaked under the veil of counternarcotics efforts— that is not what this is about. This is not about an antinarcotics effort. That is not what the vote is about. The vote is about whether or not you are going to put money into this military anti-insurgenancy effort. It risks drawing us into a terrible quagmire. History has repeatedly shown, especially in Latin America—just think of Nicaragua or El Salvador— that the practical effect of this strategy now under consideration is to militarize, to escalate the conflict, not to end it. That is, I think, the flaw in this package.
met this campesino leader on one of his visits to Bogota to attend meetings of ANUC (a national peasants organization with strong support during this period). According to the terrifying young woman we are dealing with, Chucño, as Jesus was affectionately called, died a slow and agonizing death on October 31, 1981. He was hung from a tree as psycho-pathological, had his hands, ears, eyes, and testicles and finally shot 21 times.

Other colleagues have come to the floor to speak, and I want to make sure they speak.

If this were an isolated example and if I did not have in hand the evidence from respected human rights organizations and the State Department reports of blatant violation of human rights now of these paramilitary organizations committing so many of these atrocities, most of the violence, with the military acquiescing and sometimes linked to it and supporting it, with no evidence the military is taking any steps to purge its ranks of human rights violations, I think it is hard to disagree with this dramatic change in our package, from military to police, for a campaign in southern Colombia with American advisers, putting us in the middle of the civil war aligned with this military.

I want to have aid for Colombia. I want President Pastrana to have our support, but this effort will not be successful. Moreover, I think, we are, on very treacherous ground, moving into this area. I will summarize so that other colleagues may speak.

We could put this money into the demand side. I am simply saying we take $225 million, leaving $700 million, or some of the war, and we put it into the substance abuse prevention and treatment block grant program which basically is a block grant to our States. Whether or not we are talking about the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, or not, we are talking about the data that is collected in our States, we are talking about a situation where 50 percent of adults or more and 80 percent of adolescents or more who need treatment are receiving no treatment because we do not have the funds for the treatment programs.

Our police chiefs tell us drug abuse is the most serious problem in their community. They also identify a shortage of treatment programs as a real limitation and their ability to deal with it.

We know from study after study—and I will talk more about this when I have more time—that money put into treatment programs pays for itself over and over. I have dramatic statistics and data I will present, but the long and the short of it is, if we have this package and if there are questions to be raised about the militarization of this aid, putting the money into the military for the southern campaign, a military strategy to human rights violations, with so many organizations in Colombia saying do not do this, it will lead to more violence; do not do this, America, you could be sucked into this conflict; at the same time, we could provide a significant package into building democratic institutions for economic aid, $700 million, and we could take a tiny portion of it and deal with the demand side for drugs in our own country, which is also critically important and linked to the community level that would help us provide some treatment for people, that is a win-win situation.

I hope this amendment will receive strong support from my colleagues.

(Purpose: To provide additional funding for the substance abuse and mental health services)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk reads as follows: The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], for himself and Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 3518.

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

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

The amendment as follows: On page 143, line 9, insert before the period the following: "Provided further, that subject to the 2 preceding provisos, of the funds appropriated for military purposes under the heading for Southern Colombia, $225,000,000 shall be made available to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration for carrying out program under part II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Services Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-21 et seq.); Provided further, that amounts made available under the preceding proviso 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;

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 26 minutes and has 64 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

I sent this amendment on behalf of myself and Senator BOXER. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment that has been offered by my friend and colleague from Minnesota. I commend him for his commitment to drug use reduction. He and I serve on the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. We have worked on a number of bills having to do with this very topic, including the Safe Schools and Safe Communities Act of 1994.

Ultimately, however, this amendment is, I am afraid, attempting to re-allocate resources from one part of our antidrug strategy to another. The amendment raises important questions about the effectiveness of our entire strategy and opens, I believe, an important and necessary discussion about our drug control policy in this country. The sad fact is that since almost the beginning of the last anti-drug strategy has not worked. More children are abusing drugs, and with an abundant supply, drug traffickers are seeking to increase their sales by targeting children ages 10, 11, 12, and 13. This is certainly an assault on the futures of our children, an assault to our families, and an assault on the future of our country. This is nothing less than a threat to our national values and, yes, a threat to our national security.

All of this, though, begs the question: What are we doing wrong? Clearly, there is not one simple answer. However, in 1998, a bipartisan group of Senators—myself; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. COVERED; the Senator from Florida, Mr. GRAHAM; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY; and the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN—worked together to deal with this problem. We came to the conclusion that our overall drug strategy simply was not working. It was time to talk about this because I am afraid what my colleague is doing is not helpful as we attempt to balance our antidrug strategy.

We have been working together since 1998 to restore that balance. The emergency assistance antidrug package for Colombia contained in this bill is part of that effort to restore this balance, but even with this, we still have a long way to go.

The fact is, to be effective, our national drug strategy must have a strong commitment in three different areas: No. 1 is demand reduction which consists of prevention, treatment, and education. The Federal Government in this area shares responsibility with the Federal Government and the local communities.

The second component is domestic enforcement. Again, in this area, it is a shared responsibility among the Federal Government, the local communities, and the States. Again, the Federal Government has a shared responsibility to use law enforcement resources, along with the States and local governments, to detect and dismantle drug trafficking operations within our borders.

We witnessed a successful return on that investment last week on what was called Operation Tar Pit, when the U.S. Justice Department announced it had worked with State and local law enforcement agencies in 12 cities, including 2 in the State of Ohio, to dismantle
a major Mexican heroin trafficking organization. They did a great job, in a coordinated effort.

The third component in any successful antidrug strategy is international eradication and interdiction. This is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government. States can't help. Local communities can't help. We are the only ones who can do this. I am afraid my colleague's amendment strikes directly at our attempt to do this.

Like our national defense and immigration policies, only the Federal Government has the authority, only the Federal Government has the responsibility to keep drugs from ever crossing our borders. If we do not do it, no one else will. No one else can. The buck stops in this Chamber.

These three components are all interdependent. We need to have them all. A strong law enforcement component helps for them to work individually and to work collectively.

For example, a strong effort to destroy or seize drugs at the source or seize them at our borders reduces the amount of drugs in the country and drives up the street price. As we all know, higher prices do in fact reduce consumption. This, in turn, helps our domestic law enforcement and demand-reduction efforts.

As any football fan knows, a winning team is one that plays well at all three phases of the sport: offense, defense, and the special teams. The same is true with our antidrug strategy. All three components have to be supported if our strategy is to be a winning one.

While I think the current administration has shown a clear commitment to demand-reduction and domestic law enforcement programs, the same, sadly, was not true for our international eradication and interdiction components. This was not always the case.

I think these charts I have will show how our commitment has changed. In 1987, a $4.79 billion Federal drug control budget was divided as follows: 29 percent for demand-reduction programs, 38 percent for domestic law enforcement, and 33 percent—one-third—for international eradication and interdiction efforts. This is the way it should be. This is a balanced program. This is what we had in 1987.

Now we fast forward to 1995, and you will see that this balance goes out of whack. We no longer had that balance. We no longer had that balance today.

The balanced approach worked. It achieved real success. Limiting drug availability through interdiction drove up the street price of drugs, reduced drug use, and as a result reduced overall drug use.

From 1988 to 1991, total drug use declined by 13 percent, cocaine use dropped by 35 percent, and overall drug use by American adolescents dropped by 25 percent—results. We began to see results.

This balanced approach, however, ended in 1993. By 1995, the $13.3 billion national drug control budget was divided as follows: 35 percent for demand reduction, 53 percent for domestic law enforcement, but only 12 percent for international interdiction efforts. International interdiction efforts have gone down to 12 percent from 33 percent.

Though the overall antidrug budget increased almost threefold from 1987 to 1995, the percentage allocated for international eradication and interdiction efforts decreased dramatically. This disruption only recently has started to change.

We have put together, on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives, a bipartisan group—a bipartisan group of Senators—who have said: We cannot have this imbalance. We must begin to restore the balance we had a few years ago in 1987. We have to do it.

Let me go forward, if I may, to this current budget year, the budget year 2000. In the budget year 2000, 34 percent has been allocated for demand reduction, 51 percent for domestic law enforcement, and 14.4 percent for international interdiction efforts.

We are slowly getting back in the right direction. Even in this year's budget we have a long way to go, with only 14.4 percent for international interdiction efforts. We have more work to do, more work, such as the assistance package for the Colombians that we are debating on the floor. But, we are starting to see some modest progress.

But what really matters is what these numbers get you, what they buy us as a country, what they buy in terms of resources. The hard truth is that our drug interdiction presence—the ships, the air, and the manpower dedicated to keeping drugs from reaching our country—has eroded dramatically over the course of the last decade. We are just now starting to restore those valuable resources.

In fact, with the modest improvements we have made in our international drug fighting capability, we have seen progress. In 1999, for example, the U.S. Coast Guard seized 57 tons of cocaine with a street value of $4 billion. By the way, that is more than the total operational costs of the Coast Guard. These operations demonstrate we can make a big difference, a very big difference, if we provide the right levels of material and the right levels of manpower dedicated to it. It worked before. It can work again.

The emergency assistance package we are talking about today, along with investments included in the Senate-passed military construction appropriations bill, is designed to build on that success. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, while it is very well intentioned, simply, effectively robs Peter to pay Paul just as Paul is getting back on his feet again. I just look at the example I mentioned earlier.

Through my visits to the Caribbean, Colombia, and Peru in the last several years, I have seen firsthand the dramatic decline in our eradication and interdiction capability. The results of this decline have been a decline in cocaine seizures, a decline in the price of cocaine, and an increase in drug use in the United States

We have to turn this around. This is why we need emergency assistance to Colombia. We need to dedicate more resources for international efforts to help reverse this trend. We have to restore that balance.

I want to make it very clear, as I have time and time again, that I strongly support our continued commitment to demand reduction and to law enforcement programs in the United States. No one is a stronger supporter of these. It has to be a balanced program where we have money for treatment, where we have money for education, where we have money for international interdiction and law enforcement.

My concern is not that this amendment is not well intentioned, not that we should not be putting more resources in this area. My concern is that this goes to the other side of the component, and that is international drug interdiction.

Let me make it clear. We do need this balanced program. I believe that reducing demand is the only real way to permanently end illegal drug use. However, this is not going to happen overnight. That is why we need a comprehensive counterdrug strategy that addresses all components of this problem.

Let me say again, if the United States does not make an effort to stop drugs before they reach our borders, no one else will. It is the Federal Government's responsibility. I remind my colleagues that our antidrug efforts here at home are done in cooperation with a vast number of public and private interests. Only the Federal Government has the ability and the responsibility to help deal with the problem at the sources, which is the responsibility of the Federal Government, in order to stop drugs in the transit routes. This is our responsibility; the buck stops with us.

It is not only an issue of responsibility. It is also an issue of leadership. The United States has to demonstrate leadership on an international level, especially in our own hemisphere, if we expect to get the full cooperation of source countries where the drugs originate. That is why I am concerned about the emergency assistance to Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, as well as countries in the transit zones, including Mexico and Haiti.

In conclusion, ultimately what we are striving for is a balanced, effective antidrug strategy. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota; we can and should do more to reduce demand but not at the expense of our sole responsibility to stop drugs abroad. That would not result in the balanced approach we have put together. That is why we need to aim for, balance and effectiveness. It worked before; I believe it can work again.
Mr. WELLSSTONE. Mr. President, since there are a lot of Senators here on the other side, I will take 2 minutes to respond to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MCCONNELL. As long as it is on the time of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSSTONE. I would be pleased for it to be on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSSTONE. I say to the Senator from Ohio, that I was trying to do is to try to remove the pressure of the demand, that we can make a big difference in the way we treat addiction, that we can make a huge difference. We can make a huge difference. Senator MOYNIHAN has spoken with such eloquence about the whole history of our efforts to constantly try to militarize and go for interdiction and not deal with the demand side. It is a completely one-sided proposition. I look forward to working with my colleague from Ohio on this question. I know he will be there.

I will wait to respond to other Senators. I know Senator DURBIN is going to speak and Senator BIDEN. As I listen to my colleagues, what I am hearing—and I think we should be explicit about this—is that this is not just a question of a kind of war on narcotics. Otherwise, we would be doing more on the demand side. This is a question of basically saying that we can't just focus on the police. We can't just provide help to the government for police action and building democratic institutions and economic development and every other kind of assistance possible. We have to provide the money for the military to basically conduct their anti-insurgency campaign in the southern part of Colombia with American advisers and support. I believe that means we are taking sides. If we are taking sides and we are now in the middle of this war, so be it. That is what I am hearing on the floor. I wanted to comment on that.

I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding.

Sunday afternoon, 3 days ago, I was in southern Colombia in a Blackhawk helicopter. We spent an hour going in southern Colombia in a Blackhawk helicopter. We spent an hour going in the United States, I hope they will mine in the human rights community are not going to collaborate with the militaristic that has a record of human rights abuses. Senator WELLSTONE of Minnesota.

I might add that I salute Senator MCCONNELL and Senator LEAHY for this fine bill they have brought to us. They went further than the administration. Please read the section on Plan Colombia, and you will see page after page of efforts by Democrats and Republicans to address the internal human rights concerns raised by Senator WELLSTONE of Minnesota.

Time and again, they come forward and say we are going to do more and make certain, as best we can, that before money comes from our Treasury down to Colombia to eradicate narcotics, the people receiving the money are not going to collaborate with the narcotraffickers who are guilty of things that have been proven in the past.

I salute the committee. For friends of mine in the human rights community in the United States, I hope they will read what has been done here by Senators LEAHY and MCCONNELL. It is very positive.

Imagine, for 40 years Colombia has been involved in what has been called a civil war or an internal conflict. What does that mean? Forty years ago, groups on the left were inspired either by Moscow, or Beijing, or whatever, came to the front and said, we are going to push for reform in this country so that the poor people of Colombia...
have a better chance. That sort of revolu-
tion was taking place all over Cen-
tral and South America.

But things changed over 40 years. What started off as a leftist-inspired, popular uprising to improve life for the poor people in Colombia quickly be-
came subsumed and taken over by the narcotics trade. The World Bank esti-
mates that there is a billion dollars in money coming into Colombia to sus-
tain the narcotics trade. That money is going to the right-wing paramilitaries, the terrorist groups, and the guerrillas. They all use the same tactics. They don't go into villages and beg for soldiers; they stick a gun to their heads and say, “You are now part of our paramilitary group. They en-
slave them. If they don't cooperate, they kill them. And they are involved in kidnapping.

The President of that country has been kidnapped. His father-in-law was kidnapped and murdered. When we met Satur-
date at the Defense Min-
ister said his brother was kidnapped. Everybody there told stories about kid-
napped people. If you think this is a typical civil war where the left is mov-
ing for poor people and the government is against it, then you don't fit the descrip-
tion. When we sat down with the human rights groups, they said the guerrillas on the left and the paramilitaries on the right are just as guilty of human rights abuses in this country as any other group. No ques-
tion about it.

There are very few good guys in this story. But from the U.S. point of view, I think the President is right, and I think this bill is right to say we cannot stand idly by and let these drugs flood into the United States with all of the negative consequences.

I totally support Senator WELLSTONE's premise that if we just stop the supply of drugs coming into the United States, that is not enough, we have to deal with the demand side of it. America is a great consumer of narcotics. That is why those plants are being grown thousands of miles away. When Senators WELLSTONE and DeWine come to the floor and say put more money into drug prevention and rehab in the United States, they are right. But it is not an either/or situation; we need both.

This bill addresses reducing and eliminating the supply of narcotics coming into the United States. Senator WELLSTONE believes the military in Co-
olumbia has a record of human rights abuses, and he is right. The State De-
partment stands behind that. This bill addresses that and says, we will bird-
dog you every step of the way, demand reforms in the Colombian society, and we will demand that you not be en-
gaged in human rights abuses to be part of this partnership to reduce nar-
cotics in Colombia.

I might add, to suggest we will give money to the police and not to the army really doesn't tell the whole story. They are together in Colombia.

The national police and the army are together. When I sat down with the Minister of Defense, I sat across the table from General Gilibert, who is head of the police, and General Tapias, head of the army. They work together. We want to use helicopters to secure areas where the coca leaf is grown and down planes to spray with Roundup. Cosa plants and kill them, so that coca is not turned into paste and white powder and sold on the streets of Washington, DC, and Chicago, IL, addicting people and bringing suffering and imprison after committing crimes. That is a good thing to do. I support the administration in their efforts to achieve that.

It is true that Senator WELLSTONE says we may be taking sides. I hope we are taking sides against narcotics and saying to the leftist guerrillas and right-wing paramilitaries: We have no use for either one of you.

As said to me by the President of Co-
lombia, they are both our enemies. We have to stand behind both of them.” We should view it that way. As I met with the Army and Marine Corps per-
sonnel from the United States advising these troops in Tres Esquinas, a remote location in the Putumayo Province, it is clear that these men in the Colombi-
ian Army were prepared to put their lives on the line to stop the narcotrafficking that ultimately will corrupt and kill so many Americans. I think we have to stand behind them. We have to say we will use money to get back and say we will do nothing now is un-
acceptable.

This bill makes it clear that we have not forgotten the poorest people in Co-
lombia. I commend again the sub-
committee for saying that additional assistance is given to the Agency for International Development, so that once that coca planter in Colombia has his crop sprayed, we can give him an alternative, find some other agri-
cultural activity to be involved in. That is the humanitarian and sensible way to approach this. This bill does that; it tries to make sure some alter-
native, legal agriculture is available to the people there.

Is it worth a billion dollars to Amer-
ica to send this money to Colombia? I will use my State as an illustration. In 1987, we had 500 people in Illinois pris-
ons for the possession of a thimbleful of cocaine. Today, we have 9,000 pris-
ons for the possession of a thimbleful of cocaine. It costs us about $30,000 per prisoner a year. The tax-
payers of Illinois are spending $270 mil-
ion a year and the story can be re-
peted in every other State. That is $270 million a year in Illinois because of what is growing in Putumayo Prov-
ince in Colombia.

I think we have to have a coordi-
nated effort of interdiction and stop it at its source, to do everything in our power not to let these drugs come into the country. Then deal with the demand side of it and see that drug rehab is available—a sensible and a balanced approach.
question about it. The question is whether or not we have now decided we are going to be there with aid and our people supporting the military in this counterinsurgency effort. Are we going to take sides in this military conflict? I have heard from the President he says yes. I always respect his directness. But I think that is really what the debate is about. I think probably all of us need to understand, since some who have come to the floor have said they are aware of what this government has been doing in the war against drugs, this is not a debate about only a war on drugs, obviously from what colleagues have said. We have been down this road before. Now we are going to say we have decided that we have to support the southern Colombia military, and we are going to put the money into this military effort. If we are going to have Americans there supporting it, we are taking sides. OK. As long as that is clear.

Third, my colleague from Illinois said that the police and the military are in this together, and that they work together. I do not know. Again, I didn’t have a chance to visit Colombia. But I do know, at least from sort of the one time I was in Latin America and in my own study, that I always saw in these countries a great difference between the police and the military. You see the super-highly qualified people, who do their job. The military are the “Rambos.” There is a difference in the groups. They are an entirely different group of people and entirely different people.

In due respect, the evidence we have right now by one human rights organization after another after another, much less the State Department report, is that about 70 percent of the violence has been committed by the paramilitary groups, not to the military groups to which the military quite often is linked. We haven’t been able to vet that. All of a sudden, we are going to be able to vet it, monitor it. We are going to be able to control it. I think that is a very desirable thing.

I think by militarizing this aid package we make a big mistake. I think we could support this amendment which permits extensive assistance to Colombia while safeguarding U.S. interests and avoid entanglement in a decades-old civil conflict and partnership with an army that is implicated in human rights abuses. Moreover, I think we could take some of the resources and put them in the hands of local NGOs who could do the most good, which would be providing drug treatment programs at home.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, is the Senator from Kentucky able to yield time to me?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 28 minutes, and he has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCCONNELL. How much time does the Senator from Delaware need?

Mr. BIDEN. I understand the Senator’s dilemma.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware 12 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. I thank the Senator. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, knowing he was about to give me time, which is his nature. I appreciate that.

Mr. President, my mom had an expression. Occasionally, when I was a kid, I think she had a good idea and was well intentioned. She would say, “I’key, the road to Hell is paved with good intentions.” I have no doubt about the intentions of my friend from Minnesota. I know he knows that as the author of the drug law legislation for the past 14 years, I have issued every year a drug report or an alternate drug report laying out a drug strategy for the United States, usually as a counterbalance on the Republican administration or one of agreement with the administration.

This debate reminds me a little bit of the position in which Democrats have always been put. The Democrats get put in a position where we are told there is no drug war. It can be distributed among the hearing impaired, the sight impaired, and those children needing emergency medical care. So we have to choose. We have the blind fighting the disabled fighting the hearing impaired. Instead of saying we can choose between building a highway and taking care of all the needs of those in desperate need, or we cannot build a submarine, or an air base, whatever, we are debating about whether or not we can walk and chew gum at the same time.

There is no disagreement. I have, as well as my colleagues, pushed—pushed in the early days when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee—for major increases in treatment. I have issued a total of seven major reports on treatment, its value, its efficacy, and why we should be doing more. I take a backseat to no one in arguing that we do not give enough treatment here in this drug war.

I point out the President’s budget, unrelated to the Colombian aid package, has $6 billion in it for drug treatment and drug prevention. That total includes $300 million in funding increases in this area. We don’t have to take away the military that, in fact, would have a significant impact on the reduction of product here. That is the bad news.

The good news is that, as we have debated the Andean drug policy for the past 12 years, we used to have to deal with the idea that Colombia was the transiting country as well as a country that turned raw product into the materials sold, and the laboratory work and product used to be produced in Bolivia and Peru.

The good news is, because of eradication programs, because of U.N. leadership, I might add in this area, essentially there has been an elimination of that in the 12 years.

The bad news is that it has all moved into Colombia. They now are a full-service operation. The product is there, the narcotraffickers are there, the laboratory laboratories are there, and the transiting is there. That is the bad news.

The good news is it is all in one spot for us to be able to hit it. It is all in one spot for us to have a very efficacious use of this money.

I spent days in Colombia. I spent 2 days, 24 hours a day, with the President of Colombia. I ended up actually going with him on his Easter vacation by accident to his summer residence. This is a real guy, a human being.

What did we do? We gave the Colombian National Police aid, $750 million in aid. What did we say? Purge this police department, purge the national police, and they did. And guess what. If I stood on this floor 5 years ago and said the Colombian President was going to crack the Medellin and Cali Cartel, no one would have said that is possible. No one.

Guess what. They cracked the Medellin Cartel. They cracked the Medellin Cartel. They put them in jail. They are extraditing the police. Why? Because we trained their police; they purged 4,000 of them.

Where are we on military? I met here with every major human rights group from Colombia, including the bishops who came up. When we push them to the wall and say to them: By the way, you want us out?

No, no, no, no, no, no, no. Don’t do that. You have to stay in. You have to be involved. We don’t like the balance the way you have it here.

I say: Fine. No problem.

Tell me, bishop, you want us in or you want us out?

Stay. Stay.

Now, civil war. There is no civil war. We are so caught up in the old logic of...
how we deal with things. There is no civil war. Less than 5 percent of the people of Colombia support the guerrillas. Every other guerrilla movement, every other civil war, you go into the village to recruit people. They go in, as my friend Illinois said, to shoot people. There is no popular sentiment at all. This is not a civil war.

With regard to the paramilitaries, I called President Pastrana a few weeks ago. I asked, a lot of the criticism of the plan is you have to be sure that you are only dealing with the FARC and the ELN and only focusing on the guerrillas. What about the paramilitaries? I said, I want a letter guaranteeing that you will, in fact, move on the paramilitary simultaneously. You must change.

He changed it. Here is the letter. I ask unanimous consent the letter be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.  

Senator JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. President:

I thank you again for your visit to Colombia and your support of my country. I greatly enjoyed our discussions and valued your insights.

I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate, as I did personally during your visit here, the commitment of my government to attack drug trafficking and cultivation in all parts of the population and not only in the south, no matter what individual or organization may be promoting them.

This policy has been in effect since the beginning of my administration, generating very important results. In 1999, 51,415 hectares of coca and poppy were sprayed, 31 tons of coca and 691 kilos of heroin were seized, and 166 labs and 44 airfields were destroyed. Just this past weekend, in an extraordinarily successful operation in Norte de Santander on the north border of Colombia, we were able to destroy 44 laboratories and capture 20 persons, in an area linked to illegal auto-defense organizations, but where guerrilla groups and organized drug traffickers also operate.

Plan Colombia is an integral plan for peace designed, among other goals, to eradicate drug production and address the social problems created by the violence associated with drug trafficking in all the producing regions with an emphasis on the areas where there is the greatest cultivation and a marked increase in cultivation in the recent past—areas close to the Ecuadorean border in the south and to the Venezuelan border in the north. The success and the success of eradication will depend on the resources available to us, but you are correct in stating the principle that we want to demonstrate that no trafficking organization is immune.

Indeed, as you may know the initial effort of the plan marks combined police, military, civilian operations in the Department of Putumayo in the south where not only FARC but also auto-defense organizations are present. In that regard, the coordinated effort and the eradication alternative development, support for the internally displaced, human rights protection, democratic governance, judicial reform and promotion of the rule of law to diminish drug trafficking and violence in this fragile Amazon region. We enjoyed your visit and hope to have you again as our guest. Your interest and that of your government in my nation's future strengthens our commitment and gives us crucial international support.

Sincerely,

ANDRES PASTRANA ARANGO,
President of Colombia.

Mr. BIDEN. When I said, do we take sides? The answer is, yes, we take sides. We are in the field. What are we doing? We are training three battalions. Why are we training them? For the same reason we train the police. We want to open up the eyes of the Colombian military, who in recent years have been accused of fewer human rights abuses. They have been accused of turning their heads. They hear the paramilitary coming, they lift the gate, the paramilitary comes through, the paramilitary eliminates people, and they go back out.

Then they ask, what happened?

That is what they are doing.

Plan Colombia does not only involve U.S. participation, but also a $75 billion plan. The Colombians are coming up with $4 billion; the Europeans, about $1 billion and the international financial institutions about $1 billion. If we take our piece, it all falls apart. We are not the only game in town. But we are not the catalyst. What will happen? The whole world is going to be looking to the Colombian military, from Japan to Bonn, because they are all in the deal. They are all in the deal. If you want to clean up anybody, anything, any institution, what constitutes a former Supreme Court justice: The best disinfectant is the clear light of day.

There will be a worldwide spotlight shining upon this military. I have never personally testified on the floor that I have faith in an individual leader, but I have faith in President Pastrana. He is the real deal. What is at stake is whether or not Colombia becomes a narcostate or not. This is not a civil war. This is the real stuff. It is not like a whirlwind in this hemisphere on matters that go far beyond drugs. It will include terrorism, it will include whole cadres of issues we have not thought about.

I thank the chairman for his time. I truly appreciate the motivation of my friend from Minnesota. At the appropriate time, unless the chairman of the committee does not want me to, I move to table. I am not trying to cut off discussion.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the Senator from Delaware for an important contribution and assure him at the appropriate time it would be appropriate for him to make a motion to table. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 17 minutes remaining.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for this amendment and for this time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, listening to the Senator from Delaware, one would think the Wellstone amendment is taking away all the funding from Colombia. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Senator from Minnesota is leaving in place the funding for Colombia; that makes good sense. Here is what is important: the Senator's amendment: Funding for interdiction; funding for the Colombian police; funds for alternative development and internally displaced people; funds for human rights; funds for regional assistance; funds to rehabilitate soldiers under the age of 18 who have been involved in armed conflict.

The only thing the Senator from Minnesota is doing in his amendment is making sure this country doesn't get involved in a conflict that will hurt our people eventually. The Senator from Minnesota is saying we are going to help President Pastrana, we will help this country, we will help this region, but we are not going to get involved with the military.

I thank the Senator from the bottom of my heart for this amendment. I don't care if the Senator gets 2 votes or 22 votes; he is doing the right thing.

I clearly understand the threat that illegal drugs pose to the security of my State of California, and I clearly understand that Colombia is a major supplier of the cocaine and heroin that reach our shores. But let me tell my friends in the Senate, we need a balanced approach to the problem of drug abuse. You could have a big supply, but if no one wanted to buy it, it would not hurt anyone. The fact is, the people in this country want to buy it. And there is not 1 cent in this bill, not 1 cent for rehabilitation, not 1 cent to help us with education, treatment on demand. This is a lost opportunity. What my friend from Minnesota is saying is, if we in this Chamber are sincere
about fighting drugs, and a war on drugs, then we do not put $1 billion into a foreign country and ignore what is happening here at home.

Let me tell you what happens in California and all over this country when someone is arrested for a drug crime. Mr. President, 50 percent to 75 percent of those perpetrators of this violence are high on drugs. I cannot tell you how many times when I have been in meetings, maybe it is because my State is a large State—that I have someone come up to me, a parent, saying: I have a son or a daughter who wants to get off drugs; there is no room in a treatment center; we don’t have money we need to keep sending a lot of money: what are we going to do?

I look at that person and all I can say is: Send me a letter and let me see if we can help you find some treatment program that might have a slot.

Does it make sense to spend $1 billion, as this bill does, and ignore the emergency here at home? We are so quick to find the money to send somewhere about our life who are ready, perhaps, to take that step to get off drugs? Telling them they have to wait 6 months to get into a program is consigning them to more months of addiction. What happens if we can stop this whole thing before it starts, with education, with prevention? I do not quite understand the enthusiasm for a bill that does not spend a penny here at home.

My friend from Delaware is as eloquent as anyone on this floor. He says, “Yes, we are spending more.” Yes, we are spending more in our regular appropriation, but if we are facing such a horrible emergency that we have to go in, with $2 billion, I have to say to my friend, why can’t we see this emergency here at home, when people cannot get treatment on demand? You don’t have a sale if you don’t have a willing consumer. If it is because the addicts are here, in this country.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I am happy to.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Why doesn’t the Senator have an amendment to take $1 billion out of the highway trust fund or $1 billion out of the education budget or $1 billion out of NIH or $1 billion out of the Department of Energy?

Mrs. BOXER. I will be glad to answer it. Because this is $1 billion to deal with the drug problem specifically. That is the point of it. The Senator made that point. The Senator from Illinois made that point. This is money that we are spending because we are stumped at the drug trafficking that is going on—and we should be. All the Senator from Minnesota is saying in his amendment, which I am proud to support, is we will leave 75 percent of that money intact to do the things we want to do to help the good President of Colombia. But all we are saying is before we get our advisers caught in a situation—(you know, you may be right. Maybe nothing will ever go wrong with it. But all we are saying is, how about fighting a drug war here at home for a change instead of always spending the money outside of this country?

Mr. BIDEN. Will my distinguished colleague yield for another question, just 30 seconds?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I am happy to yield.

Mr. BIDEN. The Senator is aware the President’s budget calls for spending $6 billion in drug treatment and prevention, including $31 million for substance abuse block grants; that is $54 million on targeted capacity expansion programs, $37 million for research and treatment, $5 million. This list goes on. The Senator knows of that?

Mrs. BOXER. If I may take back my time, and I will not be able to further yield because I have such a restriction, I stated that, I gave my friend absolute assurance I understand that. We are not doing enough when 50 percent—

Mr. BIDEN. I agree.

Mrs. BOXER. Of the addicts in my State are not getting treatment. Only 50 percent can get treatment. The other 50 percent, unless they are rich, cannot get the treatment on demand.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I will.

Mr. WELLSTONE. For my colleague from California, just so she knows, the particular program we are talking about, which is the block grant, the SAMHSA block grant program to our States and communities for treatment programs, is $1.6 billion.

My colleague’s figure lumps everything and anything together.

Mr. BIDEN. On treatment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am talking about direct treatment out in the community. When 50 percent of the addicts in this country get no treatment whatsoever, and 60 percent of the adults get no treatment whatsoever, it is hard to come out on the floor and say we have made this tremendous commitment, there is no reason to talk about some additional resources.

Mrs. BOXER. Again, I represent the largest State in the Union. My friend represents a smaller State. I would just say, maybe it is my State, but when I see these figures coming back—and my friend is a leader in the whole issue of crime prevention and being tough on crime and all the rest, and he knows it is true that if you look at the arrests for violent crime in our country—I could say particularly in California, 50 to 75 percent of the perpetrators are high on drugs. So all my friend from Minnesota is saying in his amendment is everything the Senator said about President Pastrana, everything he said about the need to help his country—I don’t argue with that. That is why I say proud of this amendment. Everything is left in except getting us involved in this counternarcotics insur- gency, which may well put us in a situation where we find ourselves between two bad actors: the FARC on the one hand, with a horrible story of violence and human rights violations, and the paramilitary on the right-hand side here, with the same horrible record.

Unfortunately, it ties to the military in Colombia.

So here we are, giving us a chance to do all the good things in this appropriations bill that we are happy are in there, but to take out the one for $225 million, that could lead us into trouble.

Here is the Boston Globe. They talk about targeting addiction. They say:

The Clinton proposal for U.S. intervention in Colombia’s Civil War—

And that is what is being supported on this floor. They say it really isn’t going to work. They finish saying:

History suggests that increased funding for treatment of addicts and programs for prevention—treatment on demand for drugs—can accomplish more to ameliorate the individual and social pathology associated with the endless war on drugs.

This is the Boston Globe. We have a number of editorials that are very strong on this point.

This is the St. Petersburg Times. We have these from all over the country:

Have we forgotten the lessons of our involvement in Central America in the 1980s . . .?

They talk about the fact:

In an attempt to contain communism, our government provided support to right-wing governments and paramilitary groups that produced positive results and often undermined democracy in the region.

That is from the New York Times. It talks about the fact that President Pastrana is well intentioned, but all of the programs he faces, we are going to be bailed with them.

Then, from the Detroit News:

Colombia: The Next Quagmire? The Clinton Administration’s proposed aid package intends to break the choke hold of the guerrillas by training and arming Colombia’s military. The hope is that returning control to a legitimate government will help curb the illegal narcotics trade. But this is a hope that ignores the other half of Colombia’s gritty ground reality. The military is a corrupt institution with close links to the outlawed paramilitary groups that control the drug trade in urban areas.

It goes on. This is not Senator BOXER speaking or Senator WELLSTONE. These are editorial boards from all over the country.

We have others from California that I wanted to have printed in the RECORD. I seek unanimous consent they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:
Five American soldiers were killed in a plane crash the other day in a mountainous region of Colombia. They were on a reconnaissance flight as part of an escalating U.S. effort to combat the Colombian government’s war against heavily armed narcotics traffickers.

The deaths call attention to a U.S. aid program that has grown rapidly, partly because Washington has more confidence in Colombia’s new president, Andres Pastrana, than in his corrupt predecessor, and partly because of a perception that the threat to the country faced by Colombian traffickers is increasing.

That perception is strongly held by Gen. Barry McCaffrey, President Clinton’s anti-narcotics chief, who says cocaine production in Colombia has doubled in three years, that 80 percent of the cocaine and heroin entering the United States comes from Colombia and that traffickers have amassed so much wealth that they can buy all the weapons and recruit all the fighters they need, especially in a time of economic hardship for most Colombians, to fend off poorly trained and undermanned forces.

McCaffrey has called for $1 billion in emergency U.S. aid to combat the drug trade in Latin America, most of it for Colombia, which is getting $289 million this year—triple last year. (Colombia ranks third, behind Israel and Egypt, as a U.S. aid recipient.) The money would pay for technical and intelligence assistance, and training by U.S. forces of a newly created anti-narcotics army battalion whose mission is to attack guerrilla units, clearing the way for police (who get most U.S. aid) to move in and enforce laws.

But there are serious obstacles. For one thing, U.S. aid has been meager in the past not only due to corruption but because of rampant human rights violations by soldiers and right-wing paramilitary groups. Thus the new battalion has been carefully recruited and will receive human rights training.

A larger problem is that U.S. aid is meant to target Colombia’s narcotics traffickers, not a 35-year-old leftist insurgency. Yet the two have become virtually indistinguishable as guerrillas extort tribute from coca growers and traffickers, and U.S. forces in Colombia and in some U.S. states—of keeping troops out of the region as an inducement to the rebels to negotiate a peace settlement. But the rebels, while enjoying some reports that all sides—including guerrillas—continue to operate, some of the blame will inevitably accrue to the U.S. program, fairly or not.

Add to that Colombia’s endemic corruption, deadly political violence and bad government policies, and the ease with which drug crops can be shifted from areas eradicated and the task seems overwhelming.

Undaunted, U.S. officials want funding to be expedited. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott objects, not to aid for Colombia but to folding it into a $127 billion supplemental appropriation that includes other military aid, domestic flood relief and various pork-barrel projects. He’s right; the Colombian program is too critical to be obscured by typical election-year log-rolling.

Opponents fear, reasonably, that the United States could become ensnared in a foreign civil war that is not a vital U.S. interest and that is probably unwinnable without far more intervention than most Americans would support. Backers say that Colombia’s plight is a vital U.S. interest because of the illicit narcotics trade and the drug money funding terrorism.

But every study, and common sense, tell us that the solution lies mostly at home—in prevention, treatment and rehabilitation programs and in interdiction enforcement by administrative law. If rampart eradication builds on existing aid—Colombia is already the largest recipient of U.S. military aid outside the Middle East—and involves us more deeply in a 4-decades-old civil war, as well as perpetuates programs that have failed to control drug production.

As a veteran, I know the importance of a clear military objective, of having the resources needed for success, and a clear exit strategy. In Colombia, we’re sending a half a million troops to a 4-decades-old civil war, and the rebels, who control a handful of helicopters and a few hundred troops. Yet we were unable to control a smaller Vietnam with hundreds of helicopters and thousands of troops.

The Clinton administration has proposed, and congressional Republicans seem prepared to back, a $1.7 billion anti-drug aid package to Colombia. This formible expenditure builds on existing aid—Colombia is already the largest recipient of U.S. military aid outside the Middle East—and involves us more deeply in a 4-decades-old civil war, as well as perpetuates programs that have failed to control drug production.

The Colombian military intervention seems poorly planned, unrealistic and doomed to fail. After a few years of military support, we will have the choice of cutting off an expensive military quagmire or abandoning a vital interest. The money has strengthened the rebel armies, which are important if we want to get international cartels and urban gangs out of the drug market. We already spend hundreds of millions of dollars annually to eradicate crops in South America, especially in Colombia. According to a 1999 report by the General Accounting Office, “Despite two years of extensive herbicide spraying, U.S. estimates show there has not been any net reduction in coca cultivation—net coca cultivation actually increased 50%.”

Rather than escalate a failed policy, we should recognize that the present strategy cannot succeed and look for new approaches. According to the Rand Corp., eradication is the least-effective way to reduce drug use. Rand’s research found that 50% of the money spent on drug treatment in the U.S. would have the same effect as $783 million in eradication expenditures. Naturally, the less cocaine the traffickers sell, the less destruction in Colombia will have to grow. That would be the best eradication policy.

Further, we need to face the difficult and politically controversial question of whether prohibition enforced by the drug war provides better control of the drug market than regulation enforced by administrative law. If we want to get international cartels and urban gangs out of the drug market we must determine how to control the market through civil law rather than criminal law. The administration’s “war on drugs” strategy has failed miserably, and drug money has strengthened the rebel armies.

The Columbia military aid package is nothing more than an introduction to a quagmire and an escalation of failed drug policy. The administration and Congress should step back and formulate goals they think are best to achieve them without promoting bloodshed and lawlessness.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Does my colleague need more time?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

Mr. WELLSTONE. The Presiding Officer. The Senator has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask the Senator from Minnesota for an additional 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I yield the floor for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

The Clinton administration has proposed, and congressional Republicans seem prepared to support, a $1.7 billion anti-drug aid package to Colombia. This substantial expenditure builds on existing aid—Colombia is already the largest recipient of U.S. military aid outside the Middle East—and involves us more deeply in a 4-decades-old civil war, as well as perpetuates programs that have failed to control drug production.

As a veteran, I know the importance of a clear military objective, of having the resources needed for success, and a clear exit strategy. In Colombia, we’re sending a half a million troops to a 4-decades-old civil war, and the rebels, who control a handful of helicopters and a few hundred troops. Yet we were unable to control a smaller Vietnam with hundreds of helicopters and thousands of troops.

The Colombia military intervention seems poorly planned, unrealistic and doomed to fail. After a few years of military support, we will have the choice of cutting off an expensive military quagmire or abandoning a vital interest. The money has strengthened the rebel armies, which are important if we want to get international cartels and urban gangs out of the drug market. We already spend hundreds of millions of dollars annually to eradicate crops in South America, especially in Colombia. According to a 1999 report by the General Accounting Office, “Despite two years of extensive herbicide spraying, U.S. estimates show there has not been any net reduction in coca cultivation—net coca cultivation actually increased 50%.”

Rather than escalate a failed policy, we should recognize that the present strategy cannot succeed and look for new approaches. According to the Rand Corp., eradication is the least-effective way to reduce drug use. Rand’s research found that 50% of the money spent on drug treatment in the U.S. would have the same effect as $783 million in eradication expenditures. Naturally, the less cocaine the traffickers sell, the less destruction in Colombia will have to grow. That would be the best eradication policy.

Further, we need to face the difficult and politically controversial question of whether prohibition enforced by the drug war provides better control of the drug market than regulation enforced by administrative law. If we want to get international cartels and urban gangs out of the drug market we must determine how to control the market through civil law rather than criminal law. The administration’s “war on drugs” strategy has failed miserably, and drug money has strengthened the rebel armies.

The Columbia military aid package is nothing more than an introduction to a quagmire and an escalation of failed drug policy. The administration and Congress should step back and formulate goals they think are best to achieve them without promoting bloodshed and lawlessness.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Does my colleague need more time?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

Mr. WELLSTONE. The Presiding Officer. The Senator has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask the Senator from Minnesota for an additional 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I yield the floor for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.
I will continue reading from some of these editorials. These are newspapers that have very different editorial policies, usually, from one another.

The Sacramento Bee:

A larger problem is that U.S. aid is meant to target Colombia’s narcotics traffickers, not a 35-year-old leftist insurgency. Yet the two have become virtually indistinguishable as guerrillas extort tribute from coca growers and traffic in drugs as well.

The Pentagon insists that U.S. combat troops will not be used in Colombia.

The newspaper says that is good.

The L.A. Times says:

The administration’s most frequent rationale for pumping millions of dollars in aid and tons of military equipment into Colombia is the need to fight “narco-guerrillas.” In fact, there are reports that all sides—including the side the U.S. supports, the Colombian military—have been tied to the drug trade. It seems to me that we are supporting one group of drug traffickers while opposing another group.

Let’s look at this one. What are we doing? We have the left wing on one side killing people, human rights viola-
tions, and violent. We have the right wing on the other side, with which the Colombian military oftentimes sides, and they are doing the same thing from the right. In comes the United States of America—and I think we have some advisers there already; I am aware of that, but this is clearly an exacerbation of our involvement through the donation of these helicopters and advisers—and they are going to become targets in the middle between the left and right wings.

Even though we say they are there to fight drug trafficking, which is laudable, they may well go into the jungles and encounter some of the left-wing guerrillas and find themselves in a pretty horrible situation, which is something about which we need to be clear and why I am so proud to be a co-sponsor of this amendment and why, quite frankly, I am a little surprised there is not more concern in the Senate.

There is a Fresno Bee editorial that is excellent. It says in part:

[This amendment] allows that U.S. advisers be sent to train Colombian forces in the use of U.S. helicopters and other equipment... And if right-wing death squads that have been closely linked to elements of the Colombian military continue to operate, some of them will inevitably accrue to the U.S. program...

That is another fear. What could be more important to us as Members of the Senate than making sure people do not get hurt in our country, in the world, that we work for peace and all the right things? If somehow our dollars wind up helping paramilitary groups and they commit human rights abuses and killings—and we know the worst of these abuses; they are horrible, somehow it is definitely going to come back to us. It is going to come back to us, and I do not want that on my hands. I do not want that on the hands of the people from my State.

We have the rebel groups already saying U.S. advisers will be targeted. This is what the Sacramento Bee says. I associate myself with their conclusion:

While it may be premature to sound an alarm, it’s not too early to begin a debate about U.S. interests in a conflict that has at least the potential to suck Americans into another quagmire. Congress and the administra-
tion owe it to the country to clarify what’s at stake, what is contemplated and what is not, and the sooner the better.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I know the Senator from Minnesota is giving us today an opportunity to do all the good things we should do in Colombia. I will go through them again. There are important things he has left in this bill.

He is only taking out 25 percent of this money and transferring it to this country to help us in a war on drugs in our Nation.

He is leaving in interdiction, $132 million to pay for new aircraft, upgrades for existing aircraft, secure communications, sea- and river-based interdiction.

He is leaving in $93 million for Colombian police to pay for spray aircraft, helicopter upgrade, communications, ammunition.

He is leaving in funds for alternative development for internally displaced people, $109 million—funds to help displaced people.

He is leaving in human-rights-boosting government capabilities. This funding would provide for the protection of human rights workers, judicial reform, training of judges, prison security—all the things President Pastrana needs to strengthen the institutions in Colombia.

He is leaving in regional assistance for Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru. This funding would be used for alternative development programs in these nearby countries.

He is leaving in $5 million to help rehabilitate child soldiers, children who got involved in this conflict.

For people to talk against this amendment as if it is eviscerating aid to Colombia, eviscerating aid to President Pastrana, they have not read the Wellstone amendment. The only thing he is taking out is this involvement on the ground with this counterinsurgency against the narcotics.

As I look around my State and I read the studies from my State—for example, in Ventura County, CA, a beautiful part of our State where there is a lot of agriculture and open space and it looks like paradise, 40 percent of the County’s homeless population is related to drug abuse or alcohol abuse. A San Francisco study found in 1998 that drug abuse was the leading killer of the homeless. There are over 500,000 drug-related emergency room episodes every year.

In 1995, nationwide, drug abuse cost $2 billion in health care—$12 billion in health care costs—and the good Senator is suggesting $225 million so we can cut down on those expenses. It is an investment to cut down on these costs.

The loss of productivity in 1992 has been calculated at $69.4 billion. That is a 1-year loss of productivity.

In summing up, I consider myself someone who is good at solving problems, and the way one solves problems is not putting blinders on and going in one direction, but looking at the whole picture. With the Wellstone amendment, taking $225 million and putting it in this country so we can stop people from becoming addicts and, if they are addicts, help them get off drugs, this is going to be a really good and balanced bill, one that I will be proud to support.

I thank Mr. Wellstone for his courage in offering this. I am proud to stand with you.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield it back to the Senator from Minnesota.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I know the Senator from Georgia is here. I just want to talk to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I yield myself up to 10 minutes of our time, and, of course, reserve the remainder of the time when I conclude my remarks for our side.

We have heard a lot of interesting remarks. I rise against the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Delaware.

I would like to try to not repeat everything that has been said but try to underscore several fundamental basic points with regard to these issues.

The first is that over the last 8 years, funding for drug treatment and drug prevention has increased by $1.6 billion. I repeat, it has increased over the last 8 years. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would increase it even further.

On the interdiction side of the ledger, during the same 8 years, there has been a decrease in the funding for interdiction. So interdiction is dropping and the treatment and prevention is growing.

What happens when the Federal Government moves away from its responsibilities to protect our borders and to
engage international narcotics entities? I can tell you what happens. The United States is flooded with more drugs—because there is nothing to stop that—the price of those drugs plummets, and more of our children become addicted to narcotics. Almost the reverse of what this amendment seeks to achieve happens.

As of Friday, June 9, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention gave us these alarming figures. In 1993—so this is the same timeframe I have been talking about per cent, about 25 percent, said they used marijuana. Who are they? They are 9-year-olds to 12-year-olds—children 9 years old. By 1999, the figure was 27 percent.

This is the period we are all talking about here, where our interdiction dropped and where we increased treatment and prevention. What has happened? We have had more and more youngsters—kids, children—using drugs.

In 1991, 31 percent of students reported they tried marijuana at least once. By 1999, when we cut off the interdiction, it had grown to 47 percent.

In 1991, 17 percent of students said they used cocaine. By 1999, 8 years later—no interdiction—4 percent said they used cocaine. It doubled.

What we have essentially seen is that, while we have increased the prevention, while we have increased the treatment and lowered interdiction, more and more kids have taken up using drugs.

I have to tell you, the greatest prevention program in the world and the greatest treatment program in the world is to keep the student—the child—from using them in the first place.

Point No. 2, our borders and our work with international partners, whether it is Colombia or Bolivia, or Peru, or Panama—we name it—is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government. No other entity can practice the interdiction. Georgia cannot do it. California cannot do it. Minnesota cannot do it. Only the U.S. Federal Government can exercise the muscle to protect our borders and to work with our alliances.

Prevention and treatment require Federal support, which has been growing rapidly, with State support and community support. It is a multifaceted effort and should be there. But only the Federal Government can do what this underlying bill suggests has to be done.

Point No. 3, the battle in Colombia is not an ideological battle. It started out that way, but it isn’t anymore. This is a battle against a narcotics insurgency. They have 3 percent support in the entire country. In that country, 33,000 people have been killed fighting this. And 800,000 Colombians are displaced, as in Kosovo, and we are going to turn a blind eye? Colombia sits in the center of the Andean region and has already pushed its trouble into Panama, into Ecuador, and into Peru. The entire region is being affected by this struggle to maintain a democratic government in Colombia. War is a very ugly thing. It is particularly ugly when it is driven by narcotics and narcotics money, by people who want to profit from their fellow citizens.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry. Would the time be equally divided for both sides?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this agreement on foreign operations bill provides $934 million in emergency supplemental funding toward the administration’s request for plan Colombia.

I again want to express my appreciation to Senator McCONNELL, and others of the Appropriations Committee, for supporting provisions in the bill that will help protect human rights and strengthen the rule of law in Colombia.

I have repeatedly expressed concerns about the administration’s proposal, particularly the dramatic increase in military assistance. I am troubled about what we may be getting into. The administration has yet to give me sufficient details about what it expects to achieve, in what period of time, what the long-term costs are, or what the risks are.

What the administration has said is that in addition to reducing the amount of drugs supplied abroad, Plan Colombia is intended to prevent increases in drug addiction, violence, and crime here at home.

Those are goals that I strongly support, and I commend Senator WELLSTONE for his amendment. It would provide $225 million for substance abuse prevention and treatment programs in the United States.

According to the Office of National Drug Control Policy, 150,000 drug deaths kill an estimated 52,000 Americans each year. It costs our society nearly $110 billion annually. It has strained the capacity of our criminal justice system and our medical facilities, and brought violence and tragedy to families, schools, and communities throughout this country.

As of 1996, there were more than 13.6 million illicit drug users in the United States. Some 50 percent of adults in immediate need of drug treatment are not receiving it, and many treatment programs have closed their doors.

Eighty percent of adolescents who need treatment—those who will, if not provided treatment, sustain the demand for drugs in the future—cannot get it.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this agreement on foreign operations bill provides $934 million in emergency supplemental funding toward the administration’s request for plan Colombia. I would provide $225 million for substance abuse prevention and treatment programs in the United States.

According to the Office of National Drug Control Policy, 150,000 drug deaths kill an estimated 52,000 Americans each year. It costs our society nearly $110 billion annually. It has strained the capacity of our criminal justice system and our medical facilities, and brought violence and tragedy to families, schools, and communities throughout this country.

As of 1996, there were more than 13.6 million illicit drug users in the United States. Some 50 percent of adults in immediate need of drug treatment are not receiving it, and many treatment programs have closed their doors.

Eighty percent of adolescents who need treatment—those who will, if not provided treatment, sustain the demand for drugs in the future—cannot get it.

We should help Colombia. I support President Pastrana’s efforts to combat the violence, corruption, and poverty which plagues his country. But I am not convinced that the administration’s request for Plan Colombia will effectively address those problems, nor is it likely to reduce the flow of drugs into our country or ameliorate the drug problem here at home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time will run off of his time, unless there is a quorum. It yields time. However, if the Senator wishes to yield time, the time will be equally divided if neither side yields. When the time for both sides is up, it will be equally divided for the Senate’s use.

I retain the balance of my time for the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?
Ultimately, reducing the demand for drugs—which is what these programs do—is the only long-term solution to reducing the flow of illegal drugs from Colombia and elsewhere.

Mr. President, I commend SenatorWellstone for his leadership on this issue and urge other Senators to support his amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I rise today to address the situation in Colombia and the question of the U.S. role there.

The situation in Colombia has been correctly described as grave. To the extent that “grave” can be considered an understatement, however, that is the case with respect to the ongoing conflict in that strife-torn country. The issue ostensibly before us involves the war on drugs. What is being contemplated, however, should under no conditions be considered a simple extension of that struggle. What is being considered is nothing less than an escalated U.S. role in what has increasingly become an all-out civil war. The relationship between the narcotics trafficking that we seek to curtail and the insurgency that we oppose but dare not engage is a fine line that has blurred. To contemplate engaging one side but not the other is to labor under an illusion of alarming dimensions.

Mr. President, the conditions on the ground in Colombia are not in doubt. A large, elevated, and well-armed and funded guerrilla army, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, and the smaller but equally lethal National Liberation Front, have emerged over the last two years as a serious threat not just to Colombia, but to the entire Andean region. The FARC, in particular, has evolved into a large-scale threat to regional stability. Look carefully at the operations the FARC has carried out over the past two years. What you will see is impressive and alarming. Coordinated battalion-size operations against Colombian military and police units, including coordinated multi-objective operations spread out across Colombia have become the norm. The March 1998 battle at El Bilbar, for example, demonstrated the FARC’s ability to conduct battalion-size operations employing refined tactics like maneuver warfare against Colombia’s best trained units. In a separate operation, a 1,200-strong guerrilla force carried out a coordinated and simultaneous ambush attacks on an anti-narcotics police installation and the army base at Miraflores, overwhelming both.

This should give us pause. The Colombian government’s position is precarious. Already the fighting has touched Colombia’s neighbors. Panama, which lacks a military as a result of the post-invasion structure the United States imposed on that country, is now threatened by cross-border incursions by guerrillas, who have massed in large numbers on its border with Colombia. Colombia’s other neighbors in Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela are all feeling the heat from the war in Colombia, the latter in the form of refugees escaping the fighting.

I point all of this out, Mr. President, because no one here should be under any doubt that the path down which we are heading is potentially fraught with peril. I personally believe that Plan Colombia is the answer to that country’s problems; we support it because we are at a loss for viable alternatives. But a guerrilla army as capable as the FARC will not be defeated by well-trained and equipped battalions. Much more is needed, including fundamental reform and restructuring of the Colombian armed forces to reverse the ratio of combat units to rear-area units—-a key reason an army of 140,000 is stretched so thin against guerrilla armies numbering around 20,000.

And the army and police must be thoroughly inculcated with the need to respect human rights. This is not just a moral imperative, but a practical one as well. Human rights abuses by government forces increases sympathy for guerrilla armies that otherwise lack serious popular support. It is never easy, as we learned in Vietnam, to win in a war that can melt into civilian surroundings and build an infrastructure of support, through force and intimidation if necessary, that government forces are hard-pressed to defeat without inflicting civilian casualties. But Colombia’s army and police must not underestimate the importance of maintaining constant vigilance in respecting the rights of the people they purport to defend.

The United States role in Plan Colombia is limited, limited to training the aforementioned special battalions and equipping them with modern helicopters. Toward this end, we are sending special forces teams into the field in the midst of that civil war. The primary role of U.S. Army Special Forces is training, not combat. But Colombia’s army and police must not underestimate the importance of maintaining constant vigilance in respecting the rights of the people they purport to defend.

And with respect to the issue of helicopters, Mr. President, I find it deplorable that the question of which helicopter should be provided to Colombia should be decided on the basis of any competition for the United States’ market. Blackhawk helicopters were selected for the capabilities they provide, capabilities that are not inconsequential in terms of the Counter-Narcotics Battalions’ ability to deploy to the field with the speed and in the number required to confront opposing forces. Their substitution by the Appropriations Committee with Super Hueys goes beyond the usual fiscally irresponsible approach to legislating that per- petuates Congress. It is, in my view, morally wrong. I continue to talk of life and death decisions here: the ability of soldiers to fight a war. That decisions on their equipment should be decided on the basis of parochial considerations is reprehensible.

Let me return, though, to the fundamental issue of a counter narcotics strategy that is imbued with an inherent flaw: the misguided notion that the principal threat to the United States is not drugs separated from the guerrilla and paramilitary activity that is the threat to Colombia’s existence. If, as has been suggested, the FARC is reconsidering its involvement in the drug trade, it is because it is unlikely that surgical counterdrug operations can be conducted without expanding into counterinsurgency. That the guerrillas control the very territory where the coca fields are located, however, should continue to cause us concern. To quote one unnamed U.S. official in the Christian Science Monitor, “If the guerrillas [so] choose, they don’t have to continue to protect the narcotics, [but] if they do...this [aid] will be used against them.”

This, Mr. President, is precisely the problem. Plan Colombia is perhaps a last desperate hope to save a nation. But it carries with it the seeds of greater U.S. involvement in a civil war of enormous proportions. Those of us who have been witness to our country’s involvement in another region, another time, should not fail to bear witness to the choices we make today. Funding for this plan will go forward, but the Administration and the government in Bogota should be sure that whatever role we will be watching the situation there very carefully. To do less would be to acquiesce in the possible materialization of that most feared foreign policy scenario, another Vietnam.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I reluctantly oppose the Wellstone amendment to transfer $225 million from the military purposes of Plan Colombia to domestic substance abuse programs. The passage of this amendment would not only undermine the Administration’s plan to attempt to prevent the democratic government of Colombia from being destroyed by narco-traffickers. While I strongly support the goal of allocating additional funding to substance abuse prevention and treatment programs, this cannot be achieved at the expense of the effectiveness of Plan Colombia.

In solving the difficult problem of drug abuse and its many negative effects, I believe that balanced is the best approach. This approach must include funding for not only drug abuse prevention and treatment programs, but also for international eradication/interdiction and local law enforcement. Plan Colombia, which stresses eradication and interdiction, is a balanced approach. It is a useful part of our nation’s overall strategy to end drug abuse.

Colombia’s government, a partner supplying approximately 40 percent of the cocaine and heroin consumed in the United States. The Plan Colombia aid package, which has been designed by the Administration and the Colombian government, is
a comprehensive attempt to stem this flow of narcotics. The package includes important funding for counter-narcotics support, economic development, and human rights programs.

A particularly important goal of this initial aid package is the promotion and protection of human rights in the Andean Region. In this respect, the Senate Foreign Operations Appropriations bill makes important contributions. The bill provides approximately $138 million for programs to protect human rights, strengthen the judicial system in Colombia, and support peace initiatives. In addition, all assistance to Colombian armed forces is contingent on a screening of security forces to ensure that they have not been implicated in human rights violations.

Drug abuse has taken a terrible toll on our country. It has led to increased levels of crime, a clogged judicial system, and most of all, it takes the lives of our nation’s citizens and their families. It is for this reason that I am committed to effective drug abuse and treatment. I have worked hard to win Senate passage of legislation which would make it legal for physicians, under strict conditions, to prescribe new anti-addiction medications aimed at suppressing heroin addiction. I have also strongly supported government funding for state and local community-based programs for drug treatment. In Fiscal Year 1999, the federal government spent approximately $5.6 billion on domestic programs directed at the reduction of drug demand.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

While I share his conviction that we as a country must do more to reduce the dangers of drugs in our society, I do not believe we should undermine our assistance for Plan Colombia to pay for increased domestic drug treatment and prevention programs.

Mr. President, I recently visited Colombia and am aware of what our aid can 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 reported 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.

Mr. President, 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, such as what kinds of copters should be provided, we must use the opportunity to cooperate with a fellow democracy to fight the scourge of drugs which harms both our people.

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 related trade.

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.

Mr. President, we absolutely need to improve protection for human rights in Colombia. One people face very real risks of murder, kidnaping, 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.

Mr. President, 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 military.

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.

To return to the amendment now before us, Mr. President, I believe we need to keep working to build and expand a demand reduction package. We must transfer $225 million from aid to drug crop cultivation and processing, into southern Colombia into domestic drug treatment programs. It is that simple. It is not about providing assistance to Colombia. It is not about not focusing on interdiction.

A number of different questions have been raised. To respond to some of what has been said, I will respond to the comments of my friend from Delaware.

It is important to note that right now, more than half of the people who need treatment, don’t get any at all. Why aren’t we dealing with the demand side?

We have a bill out here, almost a billion dollars, and the majority leader comes to the floor and says this is all about the war on drugs. I am saying, how about a little bit that focuses on the demand side in our country. Let us have some funding for drug treatment programs for people in the United States. Yes, we have some money in the budget, but it is vastly underfunded.

The 2000 budget for SAMHSA altogether is $1.6 billion. This is the block grant money that goes to drug treatment. The States, which are down in the trenches using a different methodology, report that close to 19 million people in our country are going without any treatment. The ONDCP estimates, moreover, that 80 percent of the adolescents in our country who are struggling with this problem are getting no treatment at all. For women who are struggling with substance abuse problems, 60 percent of them get no treatment at all. In some regions of the country, the waiting list for treatment is 6 months long or longer. The overall cost to our country for illicit drug use is about $110 billion a year, according to the ONDCP. Right now we are spending $1.6 billion on a block grant program that gets money down to the communities for treatment.

I do not want to get away from the point that drug use, drinking
and smoking among young teens, is higher in rural America than our Nation’s urban centers. According to this report, eighth graders, 13-year-old children in rural America, are 50 percent more likely to use cocaine than those in urban America. I remember when I heard Joe Califano say this; I was stunned—and 104 percent more likely to use amphetamines, including methamphetamine. Drug treatment is needed to treat addiction and to end the demand for drugs. This is not just an urban problem.

We are talking about taking $225 million out of this almost-billion-dollar package for Colombia. We are saying, cannot any of this be put into treatment, if this is going to be called the war on drugs legislation, as the majority leader identified it. I think we have had a different debate on the floor. What I am saying as a Senator from Minnesota is, can’t we take some portion of that and deal with the demand side? Can we move money for the war on drugs in our own country? If 80 percent of the adolescents aren’t receiving any treatment and need some help, can’t we get some help to them?

This amendment is supported by the Legal, Inmate, National Association of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors, National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, Partnership for Recovery, and State Association of Addiction Services.

Again, I say to my colleagues, this amendment, when all is said and done, is basically saying to Senators that we can provide assistance to Colombia, and we should.

We should provide extensive assistance, including interdiction, but at the same time we ought to avoid entanglement in a decades-old civil conflict and we ought to avoid partnership with an army implicated in severe human rights abuses. Moreover, I am saying we cannot place a small portion of the resources and put it where it will do the most good, and that is in providing funding for drug treatment programs at home.

I just want to echo the words of my colleague from California. It is quite incredible to me that we can find the money for the war on drugs—close to a billion dollars—for Colombia, but we can’t take $225 million and put it into community-based treatment programs in the war on drugs in our own country.

Moreover, we have in this legislation—and I think in particular this may interest the Chair—a shift via a 7 to 1 ratio from money for police to military. This is particularly worrisome because, right now, one human rights organization after another—and we have our own State Department report on violations of human rights abuses by paramilitary groups. It points out that we have a conflict where children are up 70 percent of the casualties in that horrible war, and paramilitary groups linked to the army commit over 75 percent of the abuses.

I say to my colleagues, again, President Pastrana has made the political decision that he wants to conduct a military campaign in the southern part of the state. All of a sudden, this debate has shifted because Senators have come out and have supported Sen.-Sen. WOOLSTONE, we are taking sides and we should take sides. If President Pastrana says he needs money from us to support his military in this counterrorism effort in the southern part of Colombia, with U.S. sur-

I know this is a debate about a war on drugs, in which case I would say, yes, yes, yes. I would say, we have in this package support for the Colombian Guerillas and we should give it. If we are going to have a war on drugs, do it in our country and deal with the demand side and put more into community treatment programs. I think we win that argument. I am sure the vast majority of people would say, if you are going to spend money on the war on drugs, put some money into our own country. We have a package out here that basically says, for the first time, we are going to be directly aligned in the military campaign in Colombia, in the southern part of Colombia.

I have some very real doubts that militarizing this conflict is going to somehow be a successful war against drugs. Moreover, I have some very real doubts, which are expressed by human rights organizations and religious organizations and a whole lot of people in our country and in Colombia, that we should be taking sides and we should be supporting a military which, as recently as this year, has been unwilling to change its practice and stands accused by all of the reputable human rights organizations of human rights violations.

Do we want to align ourselves with this military, with these paramilitary groups that have committed such terrorism against civilians and are responsible for most of the violence in that country? I have not a shred of sympathy or support for the guerrillas, the leftwing, the right-wing, any of them.

The question is, If it is a war against drugs, don’t we want to put some money into drug treatment programs here? Other than that, do we want to take sides in this military conflict? That is what my colleagues have been talking about today, and they say we have to. They say that if we do, we will be aligned with the military legislation that will safeguard against human rights violations by the military, that we will be able to invest this money in the military operation in southern Colombia and make sure everything will be above board. Frankly, I think that is problematic at best.

I am not sure people in Colombia or in the United States have the faintest idea what we are about to do. We haven’t been able to stop any of these human rights abuses over the years. But now, all of a sudden, we are going to be right in the middle of this and take sides, and we are going to be aligned with this military campaign in southern Colombia, and we say we are going to vet it and make sure there aren’t any human rights violations.

Nevertheless, that all the human rights organizations are saying that the military campaign in southern Colombia will not work and the religious community says it is a profound mistake; that all sorts of government organizations in Colombia with a tremendous amount of credibility say, don’t do this; don’t align yourselves with this military campaign in southern Colombia. We are being told, no problem; we can vet this now.

I also want to say to my colleagues I don’t think we have taken these human rights abuses, either directly by the military or the military assigned with these paramilitary groups, very seriously. Again, that is a declaration from social and human rights non-governmental organizations in Colombia; there must be 45, 50 organizations, or more. We just disregard them. They are saying, yes, interdiction, give us the package. But they are saying don’t align yourselves with this military, with such horrendous, horrific record of violence, murder, violation of human rights—allignment with the worst of the atrocities that have been committed Colombia—just as we don’t want to side with the left-wing guerrillas.

Why are we now taking sides? Again, some of my colleagues come out here and say this amendment is basically taking away assistance to Co-
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I have to be concerned about the path we are taking. I am not going to bore my colleagues with the statistics. Let me ask the Chair how much time I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has approximately 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELLSSTONE. Mr. President, this amendment is a sensible approach which permits extensive assistance to Colombia while safeguarding U.S. interests and avoiding entanglement in a decades-old civil conflict and partnership with an army implicated in serious human rights abuses. Moreover, it moves resources to where they will do the most good; that is, providing funding for drug treatment programs at home.

In my State of Minnesota, according to the Department of Human Services, there are 21,277 people who have requested treatment for substance abuse and have trouble paying to receive it. An additional 4,000 received some treatment but then were denied further treatment because resources weren’t available. Most cited lack of funds to pay for the treatment, or they were put on a long waiting list when they needed it the most. Other treatment services were not appropriate for their needs—women with children, people with transportation problems, people who were trying to get jobs and needed treatment. This amendment makes sense for some balance.

When we started this debate several hours ago, the majority leader came out on the floor and in a very heartfelt way said this is about the war on drugs; this is about what is going on in Colombia and the ways in which that country is exporting their drugs to this country; they are killing our children.

If it is about the war on drugs, then let’s make it balanced. Let’s support efforts to have a war on drugs in Colombia but let’s also support the war on drugs in our own country. Some of this money ought to be put in treatment programs.

It is absolutely naive to believe we are going to be able to deal with the substance abuse problem in our country without dealing with the demand side. It is shameful that we have so little for the prevention and the treatment programs. This amendment takes just a little over $200 million and puts it in community-based treatment programs.

I doubt whether there is a Senator, Democrat or Republican, who either does not know a friend or even a family member who struggles with alcoholism or drug abuse. We ought to be doing a much better job of getting the treatment to people. This war on drugs is focused on interdiction. It is focused on a military solution in Colombia. I argue that it is one-sided. I would argue it is naive.

Second, I have today read from about five different human rights organizations’ studies, human rights organizations that I believe command tremendous respect, I hope, from all of us. I read excerpts from the State Department report of this past year. I read a letter signed by 70 nongovernment organizations, human rights organizations, and people who were down in the trenches in Colombia. They all said it was tragically false for our Government to now move away from supporting police, supporting interdiction, supporting a lot of efforts in Colombia, and shift a considerable amount of money to a direct military campaign in Colombia. I think that the military is aligned with paramilitary groups and organizations that have committed most of the violence in the country, a military with a deplorable human rights record. It would be a tragic mistake for the United States to now move away from supporting the military with Americans on the ground with them in southern Colombia. What are we getting into?

I conclude I do not agree with some of my colleagues who have said that if we don’t do this, it is the end for Colombia, and watch out for all of South America and Central America. I have heard that kind of argument before. It is eerie to me. It has an eerie sound to me.

I do not agree that we should take sides in this military conflict. Instead, I think we should be providing all of the support we can to President Pastrana’s efforts to move away from drugs and build democratic institutions, and to have economic development. I do not believe we should turn a blind eye away from the blatant human rights violations of the military. I think it is extremely one-sided to go about “fight a war on drugs” which won’t work, which will militarize our foreign assistance to Colombia, which will have our country directly involved in this military conflict, away from at least providing a small amount for community-based treatment programs.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President. Senator MCCONNELL is controlling time, but he is not here. Could I ask how much time is under Senator MCCONNELL’s control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has 5 minutes remaining, and Senator WELLSSTONE has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I request 3 minutes of the remaining time of the opponents of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

I strongly support the approval of this assistance for Colombia. For the past 8 months I have chaired, together with General Brent Scowcroft, a Council on Foreign Relations Task Force on Colombia. This bipartisan Task Force released an Interim Report in March of this year which recommended that Congress approve the administration’s aid request for Colombia, with two modifications. The first, additional supplemental aid provided to Bolivia, Peru, and other countries in the region, has been incorporated into the bill by the Appropriations Committee. The second modification, that additional trade benefits should be part of the package, I will address with the introduction of separate legislation later this week.

Let me explain why I, and the Task Force, feel so strongly that this assistance package for Colombia needs to be approved.

There is a crisis in Colombia that demands our immediate attention. While Colombia has experienced violence and guerrilla insurgencies for many years, in the production and transport of illegal important ways. First, Colombia is experiencing record violence which is killing over 25,000 Colombians each year. More than half of all kidnappings in the world occur in Colombia. The FARC and ELN have 14,000 personnel and the paramilitary groups are escalating their violence in ways that have not been seen before.

Second, our success in reducing coca cultivation in Peru and Bolivia has shifted the production and cultivation of coca to Colombia, with an explosion of coca cultivation in southern Colombia in the past five years. Over 90 percent of the cocaine on our streets comes from Colombia. More importantly, the guerrilla forces operating in Colombia have become directly involved in narco-trafficking. Where they once provided protection for drug traffickers, they now are directly involved in the production and transport of illegal drugs. This provides them with an almost limitless source of revenue. For the first time we have a guerrilla organization that does not rely on external sources of funding.

Third, the Colombian economy is experiencing its worst recession since the 1930s. An unemployment rate of over 20 percent is exacerbating social and political tensions. The violence is determining investment making economic recovery more difficult.

Fourth, Colombians are leaving Colombia at record rates. Last year over 100,000 Colombians moved to my State of Florida alone. Hundreds of thousands more have moved to other parts of the United States to escape the violence and instability.

It is this combination of factors that led President Pastrana, working closely with our administration, to propose Peace in Colombia. To make it clear, Colombia is only about drug, but in reality it is a broad plan that addresses five key areas: the peace process; the Colombian economy; the counter-drug strategy; joint-U.S. and Colombian; human rights; and democratization and social development. It is this broad based plan to rebuild the Colombian state that needs our support.
Some have said that Plan Colombia is only about providing military equipment to Colombia. Indeed, Plan Colombia is much more comprehensive and far-reaching. But, the United States contribution to Plan Colombia is heavily weighted toward military equipment. This is a good reason for the United States to want to see Plan Colombia succeed. Plan Colombia is a $7.5 billion plan, of which the Colombians themselves will provide over $4 billion. They are looking to the United States to provide about $1.6 billion and to international communities to provide the remainder.

It is appropriate that the portion of the funding being provided by the United States focus on the counterdrug part of Plan Colombia since this is of particular interest to us and since we are the only country that can supply that type of support. It is also the part of Plan Colombia that is most compelling for U.S. involvement, since it involves keeping drugs off of our streets.

Some have argued that there are risks associated with providing this type of support to Colombia. That is true, but there are also risks associated with doing nothing, and I believe that the risks associated with doing nothing are greater than the risks involved with helping the Colombian Government and the Colombian people.

We have important national interests at stake in Colombia that would be critically harmed were the current situation in Colombia to continue. First, Colombia is the oldest democracy in South America and has been an important partner in bringing democracy and democratic values to all of our hemispheric neighbors, with the exception of Cuba. We must act to preserve democracy.

Second, the entire Andean region is threatened by instability and Colombia is the center of that instability. Failure to stem the crisis in Colombia could spread instability in Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru, Panama, and Venezuela. A stronger Colombia means a stronger region and a stronger Western Hemisphere.

Third, a complete breakdown in Colombia would make it even more difficult to control the drug trafficking. And the illegal networks that are set up by drug traffickers also involve other illegal activities that threaten our security, such as money laundering and financial crimes, arms trafficking, human smuggling, cargo theft, and terrorism.

Fourth, Colombia is an important trading partner for the United States. It is South America's fourth largest economy and the fifth largest export market in Latin America for the United States. Colombia has the potential to be an economic engine for the Andean region and an even bigger market for U.S. goods. The violence and instability in Colombia are preventing economic growth, including the exploitation of large, newly discovered oil fields that would help to reduce gaso-line prices in the United States.

Fifth, the exodus of Colombians, nearly 1 million in the past 5 years, further exacerbates our own immigration problems. A further downturn in the Colombian situation could lead to an immigration crisis that would directly impact the United States.

Finally, for those concerned about human rights, and I consider myself in that category, the deteriorating human rights situation in Colombia can only be reversed through the implementation of Plan Colombia, with the government gaining effective control over its national territory. President Pastrana has demonstrated his will to improve the human rights situation in Colombia, and has taken concrete steps, including dismissing senior military officers, to demonstrate his determination.

With all of this at stake it is hard to understand why we have not been able to move faster to approve this assistance package. And there are direct costs associated with this delay. Last December I visited the first of the Colombian counternarcotics battalions that are to be trained and equipped by the U.S. as part of Plan Colombia. The U.S. Special Forces soldiers who were training them reported that their moral was excellent and they were as capable at their tasks as any soldiers they have ever trained.

Unfortunately, this battalion has been doing very little other than calisthenics since my visit, largely because of our failure to move this assistance package. They are limited to where they can reach by foot, since they have no mobility capability. They have no fuel for the helicopters they were given on an interim basis by the State Department. The valuable training they have received is vesting away, and their skills are fading from lack of practice.

In addition, the second Colombian counternarcotics battalion has been vetted but are unable to begin training. Eradication of coca and opium poppy has been halted. Crop substitution and alternative development programs are also on hold, as are the human rights programs that are included in the legislation. Meanwhile, the guerrillas and the drug traffickers continue to strengthen and expand their operations. The peace process has floundered and the violence has escalated. Each day we wait the situation worsens, the regional instability increases, the drugs flow out of Colombia, and the money and effort required to turn the situation around increases.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to act now and support this vital package of assistance for Colombia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCONNELL. I reserve the remainder of my time.
I agree that we should increase education, prevention, and treatment efforts, as well as local law enforcement efforts. But, will that effort pay off, if we do so at the expense of attacking the supply problem? It is pretty clear that after seven years of doing nothing, the administration is trying to play catch up in this crisis.

If we look at trends and commitments, during the Reagan just-say-no years, drug production and use plummeted. This trend sharply reversed in 1992 which was exactly when Clinton was asked, "If you had to do it over again, would you do it any differently?" He answered, "Sure, if I could have." Since 1992, and this unfortunate remark, drug use has soared and production has tripled.

We need to attack both fronts in this war—here, at home, and abroad. I think we have recommended a good balance for the battle abroad. Let me remind everyone it is a very different package than the request made by the Clinton administration—I have much more confidence in the bill before the Senate than I did in the request.

The most important difference is our emphasis on a regional strategy. Just as we saw production spike in Colombia when pressure was applied to traffickers in Peru and Bolivia, I believe we would see the problem shift back to Peru, Bolivia, and to Ecuador if we don't increase our regional support. Without compromising vital support for Colombia, we provided $205 million in support to Peru, Bolivia, and other nations in the region. This more than doubles the administration's request of $76 million.

A second key difference between the bill and the request is the support we offer for human rights programs. As the tempo of operations against the traffickers pick up, I am concerned that abuses will also increase. Colombia's human rights situation is weak and court officials are regularly threatened. Making investigations and prosecutions extremely difficult. Moreover, the military has undermined attempts by civilian courts to prosecute officers accused of human rights abuses even though Colombian law requires the transfer of these cases to civilian courts.

To address these concerns we have required certification that the military is complying with their own laws and are cooperating in the pursuit of these cases in civilian court. We also substantially increase aid to government and non-government organizations involved in the protection of human rights. We paid for these increases by changing the helicopter package.

Again, let me say, striking the right balance is the key to our success. This bill strikes the right balance between domestic and international law enforcement—the right balance between Colombia and the other countries in the region—and the right balance between our support for Colombian law enforcement and Colombian human rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I have a copy of Senator LEAHY's statement. I am going to read a little from Senator LEAHY's statement. This is just a portion of his statement:

I have repeatedly expressed concerns about the administration's proposal, particularly the dramatic increase in military assistance. I am troubled about what we may be getting into. The administration has yet to give me sufficient details about what it expects to achieve, in what period of time, what the long-term costs are, or what the risks are. That is, of course, part of the position that a number of us have taken today. I thank Senator LEAHY, who has a tremendous amount of expertise in this area, for his statement. He goes on to say:

I commend Senator WELLSTONE for his amendment. It would provide $225 million for substance abuse prevention and treatment programs in the United States. According to the Office of National Drug Control Policy, drug abuse kills 52,000 Americans each year. It costs our society nearly $110 billion annually. It has strained the capacity of our criminal justice system and our medical facilities, and brought violence and tragedy to families, schools, and communities throughout this country.

I could not have said it better. Mr. President, 80 percent of adolescents who abuse drugs today—those who will, if not provided treatment, sustain the demands for drugs in the future—today in our country cannot get it. Some 50 percent of adults in our country who are in need of a drug treatment program are not receiving it. Many treatment programs have lines out the door.

And the conclusion of Senator LEAHY's statement:

We should help Colombia. I support President Pastrana's efforts to combat the violence, corruption, and drug producing capabilities of this country. But I am not convinced the administration's effort for "Plan Colombia" will effectively address those problems, nor do I like the idea of drugs into our country or ameliorate the drug problem here at home.

We do know, however, that substance abuse treatment and prevention programs work. A frequently cited Rand study showed that, dollar for dollar, providing treatment for cocaine users is 10 times more effective than drug interdiction efforts, and 23 times more effective than eradicating coca at its source. Scientific advances promise to make treatment and prevention programs even better. Ultimately, what these programs do—is the only long-term solution to reducing the flow of illegal drugs from Colombia and elsewhere.

Mr. President, I commend Senator WELLSTONE—

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, this is a two front war—we need to advance on both fronts. Clearly, we can't continue the administration's pattern of ignoring this crisis.

I urge other Senators to support this amendment.

I urge other Senators to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, is all time needed back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. GRAHAM. 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. 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, we are going to have two votes shortly. The Senator from Alabama would like to modify his amendment and take just a few moments to describe it. Then the previous plan was to have two votes, back to back. I believe the Senator from Delaware will make a motion to table the Wellstone amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Is that a unanimous consent request?

Mr. McConnell. I ask unanimous consent the Senator from Alabama be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alabama.

AMENDMENT NO. 3492, AS MODIFIED

Mr. Sessions. Mr. President, I send a modification to the desk. I would like to share a few thoughts about this situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be modified.

The amendment (No. 3492), as modified, is as follows:

On page 155, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 607. DECLARATION OF SUPPORT. (a) Certification Required.—Assistance may be made available for Colombia in fiscal years 2000 and 2001 only if the Secretary of State certifies to the appropriate congressional committees, before the initial obligation of such assistance in each such fiscal year, that the United States Government publicly supports the military and political efforts of the Government of Colombia, consistent with human rights, necessary to effectively resolve the conflicts with the guerrillas and paramilitaries that threaten the territorial integrity, economic prosperity, and rule of law in Colombia.

(b) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Appropriate committees of Congress.—The term "appropriate committees of Congress" means the following:

(A) The Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(B) The Committees on Appropriations and International Relations of the House of Representatives.

(2) Assistance.—The term "assistance" means assistance appropriated under this...
heading for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and provided under the following provisions of law:

(A) Section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Pub-

lic Law 101-510; relating to counter-drug as-

sistance).

(B) Section 1003 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Pub-

cil Law 105-85; relating to counter-drug as-

sistance to Colombia and Peru).

(C) Section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (Public Law 90-629; relating to credit sales).

(D) Section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-195; relating to arm-

export control).

(E) Section 506 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-195; relating to em-

ergency drawdown authority).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-

ator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, the people of Colombia are good people. They have been living a democracy for a long time. There are 40 million people in Colombia. They are our fifth largest trading partner in Latin America. They are struggling with violence that has been going on for 40 years. There are at least two major Marxist-orien-
ted guerrilla groups who control nearly 50 percent of the territory of Co-

lombia. They have attempted repeatedly, through President Pastrana, to negotiate with these guerrillas and have had very little success. In fact, the guerrillas have taken advantage of the good auspices of the people of Co-

lombia and President Pastrana, and even strengthened their hold on the territory and strengthened their anti-
democratic activities.

There are paramilitary groups in the country also who are operating outside the law and are involved in drug traffi-
cicking.

The guerrilla organizations sustain themselves through the most active kidnapping in the world. Colombia has the highest number of kidnappings in the world. Its kidnap rate is probably the highest in the world. The guerrilla groups sell protection for drug traffi-
cickers, and that is how they make their money to maintain their exist-
ence.

I believe, as a former Federal prose-

cutor who has been involved in study-

ing the drug issue and has prosecuted many cases in the district of Mobile, AL, involving quite a number of Co-

lombian drug dealers and cartel mem-

bers, to have limited ability containing the drug problem in America through this money. But what we can do with this money and what is critical that we do with this money is strength the country of Colombia.

We need to say to them: We support you; we believe in your democracy. The 97-plus percent, as Senator Biden said, of the people in that country support their government, not these guerrilla organizations. They want peace, they want unification, they want economic growth, and they want a rule of law. That cannot be done and we cannot expect Colombia to stop drug trafficking in their nation if 40 percent of the territory is outside their control—50 percent perhaps. I am distressed that this administra-

tion in public statements, in testimony before committee hearings, has refused to say: We support Colombia in their efforts to wipe out the guerrillas. They suggest their only motive is to provide money to help knock down drug pro-
duction in Colombia. That is dis-
tressing to me. Ambassador Pickering testified and I cross-examined him. He said: Our emphasis is on drugs. That is not what we are doing. We want to help Colombia. We want Colombia to create a peaceful government to take control of its country. They want to encourage strong lead-

ership, the kind of leadership that Abraham Lincoln provided when he unified this country. That is what needs to be done in Colombia to bring this matter to a conclusion once and for all.

If we do not do so, we are pouring new wine in old wine bottles. We are pouring money down a dangerous rat hole.

This amendment says: We support you, Colombia. We believe in you, Co-

lombia. We explicitly endorse and sup-

port your efforts through peace nego-

tiations or warfare, if necessary, to unify your country, to bring peace so you can then eliminate the drug traffi-
cicking that is occurring there.

Drug trafficking is a major problem in Colombia. It is our No. 1 supplier of cocaine. The cocaine production in Co-

lombia has more than doubled in 5 years. Heroin is going up. Seventy per-
cent of the heroin in the United States comes from Colombia. The main reason is the Government of Colombia does not control its territory. There are whole areas of territory outside the control of the government. We should support this country, and this amend-

ment says so explicitly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-

ator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware be recognized to offer a tabling motion on the Wellstone amendment and that the vote on or in relation to the Sessions amendment occur immediately after the Wellstone vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a quorum? If so, the vote shall be taken.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any other Senators in the Chamber des-
ing to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 11, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEA S—89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feingold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feingold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feingold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. MCCONNELL. I asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Dela-

ware be recognized to offer a tabling motion on the Wellstone amendment and that a vote be taken in relation to the Sessions amendment occur immediately after the Wellstone vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a quorum? If so, the vote shall be taken.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any other Senators in the Chamber des-
ing to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 11, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAY S—11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boxer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feingold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sessions amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object. What is the Senator asking for?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I will not ask unanimous consent that the Sessions amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object. What is the Senator asking for?
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 (Mr. CRAPO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, is there a pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Helms amendment, No. 3498, is pending.

Mr. McCONNELL. I call up amendment No. 3519 by Senator STEVENS, amendment No. 3528 by Senator INHOFE, and amendment No. 3532 by Senator LEAHY. These three amendments have been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments, en bloc.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] proposes amendments Nos. 3519, 3528, and 3532, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3519

On page 38, on line 12 after the word “Appropriations” insert the following: “Provided further, That foreign military financing program funds estimated to be obligated for Egypt during fiscal year 2001 shall be transferred to an interest bearing account for Egypt in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York within 30 days of enactment of this Act or by October 31, 2000, whichever is later: Provided further, That withdrawal from the account shall be made only on authenticated instructions from the Defense Finance and Accounting Service: Provided further, That in the event the interest bearing account is closed, the balance of the account shall be transferred promptly to the current appropriations account under this heading: Provided further, That none of the interest accrued by the account except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations:”

AMENDMENT NO. 3528

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding United States citizens held hostage in Colombia)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON UNITED STATES CITIZENS HELD HOSTAGE IN COLOMBIA.

(a) The Senate finds that—

(1) illegal paramilitary groups in Colombia pose a serious obstacle to U.S. and Colombian counter-narcotics efforts;

(2) abduction of innocent civilians is often used by such groups to gain influence and recognition;

(3) three U.S. citizens, David Mankins, Mark Rich, and Rick Tenenoff, who were engaged in humanitarian and religious work were abducted by one such group and have been held hostage in Colombia since January 31, 1993;

(4) these 3 men have the distinction of being the longest-held American hostages;

(5) their kidnappers are believed to be members of the FARC narco-guerrilla organization in Colombia;

(6) the families of these American citizens have not had any word about their safety or welfare for 7 years; and

(7) such acts against humanitarian workers are acts of cowardice and are against basic human dignity and are perpetrated by criminals and thus not deserving any form of recognition.

(b) The Senate—

(1) in the strongest possible terms condemns the kidnaping of these men;

(2) appeals to all freedom loving nations to condemn these actions;

(3) urges members of the European Community to assist in the safe return of these men by including in any dialogue with FARC the objective of the release of all American hostages;

(4) appeals to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to condemn the kidnaping and to pressure the FARC into resolving this situation; and

(5) calls upon the President to raise the kidnaping of these Americans to all relevant foreign governments and to express his desire to see this tragic situation resolved.

AMENDMENT NO. 3532

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

SEC. __. INDOCHINESE PAROLEES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any national of Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos who was paroled into the United States before October 1, 1997 shall be eligible to make an application for adjustment of status pursuant to section 243(b) of Public Law 102-167.
Hezbollah’s terrorist war against Israel. At this delicate juncture with rising concern about cross border violence against Israel, Mr. Mubarak’s comments were and are extremely damaging to peace and stability, to say nothing of safety of Israeli civilians. I am not sure what message it sends to increase military aid after such unfortunate remarks. After all, the aid is provided in recognition of Egypt’s service to the peace process established at Camp David—the President’s comments conform to those very principles and prospects.

In the State Department briefing justifying the request, U.S. officials urged our support because of Mubarak’s need to address the requirements of “his key constituents, the military.” Frankly, I think Mr. Mubarak needs to worry less about satisfying the military and spend more time and effort shoring up democratic institutions and civic society.

One year he demonstrated a heavy handed political style by extending for three more years the State of Emergency which grants him far reaching powers. He has granted and maintained this sweeping authority for nineteen years. Press censorship and restrictions on political parties and activities are among many authoritarian measures which are routinely enforced in Egypt—not characteristics of the most open democracy.

In the face of my concerns about the trends in Egypt that signal the need to consider this request fully and carefully in consultation with the chairman and others who I know are interested and expect we will have a recommendation by the time we get to conference.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, S. 2522 contains $934.1 million for Plan Colombia, a counter narcotics initiative. A portion of that is earmarked for the investigations of human rights abuses. Certainly, I support the drug eradication of FARC, but I believe the funds should be utilized in a way that will protect human rights.

In the剥离 of any concerns about the trends in Egypt that signal the need to consider this request fully and carefully in consultation with the chairman and others who I know are interested and expect we will have a recommendation by the time we get to conference.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, S. 2522 contains $934.1 million for Plan Colombia, a counter narcotics initiative. A portion of that is earmarked for the investigations of human rights abuses. Certainly, I support the drug eradication of FARC, but I believe the funds should be utilized in a way that will protect human rights.

In the剥离 of any concerns about the trends in Egypt that signal the need to consider this request fully and carefully in consultation with the chairman and others who I know are interested and expect we will have a recommendation by the time we get to conference.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, S. 2522 contains $934.1 million for Plan Colombia, a counter narcotics initiative. A portion of that is earmarked for the investigations of human rights abuses. Certainly, I support the drug eradication of FARC, but I believe the funds should be utilized in a way that will protect human rights.

In the剥离 of any concerns about the trends in Egypt that signal the need to consider this request fully and carefully in consultation with the chairman and others who I know are interested and expect we will have a recommendation by the time we get to conference.
drug trafficking between Colombia and the United States. I will read the language found on page 151 of the bill, section 6106:

LIMITATIONS ON SUPPORT FOR PLAN COLOMBIA AND ON THE ASSIGNMENT OF UNITED STATES PERSONNEL IN COLOMBIA

(a) LIMITATION ON SUPPORT FOR PLAN COLOMBIA—Except for appropriations made by this Act and appropriations made by the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2001, for such purpose, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by any Act (including unobligated balances of prior appropriations) shall be available for support of Plan Colombia unless and until—

(1) the President submits a report to Congress requesting the availability of such funds; and

(2) Congress enacts a joint resolution approving the request of the President under paragraph (1).

In other words, let's spend $1 billion, and after it is spent, let's ask the President for a justification of why we were spending it and a plan for what we are going to do in the future.

That is absolutely, totally, completely backwards. This is a major undertaking, a huge change in our relationship with Colombia, in what we some would denominate our fight against drugs, with some kind of hope that it will have a positive impact. My guess is I will very shortly be asked to enter into a time agreement so we can vote on this amendment no later than 6 or 6:30 p.m. today. Time constraints will lead me to accept that time agreement. But is it not equally bizarre and irresponsible that we should put the United States into another military adventure on the basis of so short and superficial a debate about both means and ends in connection with this appropriation?

The Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, just proposed an amendment that got very few votes, that superficially at least was aimed at the same purpose. I say superficially because Senator WELLSTONE did not propose to save any of the money. He simply proposed to spend about 25 percent of it with priorities that differed from those of the committee and those of the President of the United States. The war and all the equipment were still there under his amendment. We just had a quarter of a billion dollars spent on various social program purposes.

His amendment, in other words, did not get at the availability of the money that is before us. That question is, Are we prepared casually, at this point, to take the first step in what has often in the past been an inevitable series of steps toward engaging in another shooting war?

I grant you there is a limitation of no more than 250 American military personnel to accompany the equipment we will be selling to Colombia under the provisions of this bill. But isn't that precisely always the way we begin an adventure of this nature, with those declarations that our participation is limited; we are just helping some other country solve its own problems and challenges in some military fashion? I think so.

But this is a shift from supporting a police force in a friendly country to supporting an army engaged in a civil war, a civil war that it has not been winning. And we are doing so because the other side is very well financed—indirectly, at least, in large part by Americans who purchase cocaine—but without the slightest real control over the use of the equipment that the Colombian Army will be receiving pursuant to this bill.

How long will it be until we read the first news story about some of this equipment showing up in the hands of the rebels, by capture or, for that matter, by purchase? I don't know, but that is what has constantly happened in the past in almost each of the other adventures of this nature in which the United States has found itself.

But my fundamental point with respect to this amendment is that we are voting money first and asking for the justification later. We should get the justification first and make the determination as to whether to spend this amount of money or how much we ought to spend after we know exactly what the plan is and how the plan promises to lead to any kind of successful conclusion.

But the bill says, right here on pages 151 and 152, we will spend the $994 million. It is not the President who tells us how he is going to spend future money, and we will get a joint resolution.

At a later stage in a similar adventure, we went through an almost identical debate just a couple of weeks ago on Kosovo. We voted the money and lacked, by a small margin, the courage even to say that it had to be justified and authorized by Congress a year from now. I hope we may have learned something from that experience. Should we not seriously debate this matter first—what does it mean in an Appropriations Committee and essentially a rider on an appropriations bill but seriously and extensively? Is this the single best way in which to spend the almost three-quarters of a billion dollars that is the subject of this amendment, even on drug interdiction, much less on any other potential program in the United States? Will it help Colombia? Does it really address drug problems in the United States? Is there an exit strategy?

We know there was not any in Bosnia. We know there is not any in Kosovo. And we are sure are not told what it is here. One consequence of passing this appropriations bill in its present form, however, is certain. It will not be a one-time appropriation. It will not be the only request we are asked to respond to, to deal with the Colombian military, almost $1 billion in this appropriation—a downpayment. But it isn't a downpayment that is on a home, an autonomous. It is a downpayment on which we don't know the schedule of future payments; we don't know the total amount of future payments; we don't know how we will measure success if, indeed, any success exists. It is simply the beginning of an open-ended commitment, with the pious statement that the President must come back a year from now and justify future appropriations and get a joint resolution of Congress.

I don't think those lines are worth the paper they are printed on because next year's foreign operations appropriations bill can just appropriate another $1 billion, and its passage will be the joint resolution, with any more justification than we have today.

In one respect, at least, I must interject with this comment: I have been overly critical. In comparison with the way in which this problem has been treated in the House of Representatives, this appropriation is a model of responsibility. It includes considerably fewer dollars and considerably more in the way of conditions—future conditions through they may be. That means, unfortunately, the conference committee will end up spending more money than we are spending now and probably with fewer and less responsibility requirements imposed on the administration in the way in which the money is spent.

But my points in this amendment are simple. We are asked to engage in another civil war with a major commitment to equipment and training for the Colombian Army. Very rarely does this kind of commitment get made without escalating into something more, in money or in personnel or the like. Very rarely are insurgencies such as the one in Colombia successfully met when those insurgencies have as large a source of monetary support as this one seems to have.

In any event, I suppose one can even say that this is a good, thoughtful, and responsible idea, but we do not know that. We have not had any kind of national debate on the subject. We have not had anything more than the most superficial justification for it by an administration whose foreign policy guesses so far during the last few years do not lend a great degree of confidence to most of us with respect to the responsibility of this adventure.

In the relatively short period of time we have available, I ask my colleagues to ask themselves the simple question: Do you know enough about this idea to risk $1 billion on it in an open-ended commitment to an entirely new adventure in a campaign which has rather spectacularly lacked in success for the last 10 or 20 years? Wouldn't you like a little bit more advanced justification? Wouldn't you like a little bit more time to thoughtfully consider whether we want to involve ourselves in this particular civil war with some assurance that you can think of the $700 million would be spent more wisely, even in connection with our struggle against illegal drug usage in the United States.
States or for some other program entirely or for the reduction in the national debt to which we all give so much lip service, except when it comes up against a new spending program.

What I offer is an amendment that will be spending four times as much money in Colombia than we are spending during the course of the current year--four times as much money, $50 million to $200 million--but one that will require the President to come up to us with the very requirements--and I am not on pages 151 and 152 of this bill but with a difference. He will have to come up and justify it before we give him the money rather than after it is over.

Next year, this request will be a very simple one: Oh, gosh, we have already spent $1 billion. We can't stop now; it is just beginning to show results; the helicopters have only been down there for 2 months; we are only asking another $1.5 billion, or whatever the request will not engage it; we won't show purpose; we won't show purpose. The time to show constancy and purpose is right now.

This spending program, even with the restrictions and limitations included in this amendment, is not a way to spend money. It is almost impossible to conceive that it will be successful, and we should deal with it today, here and now, by very simply saying: No; no, Mr. President, we will not give you the money until those reservations are represented so far.

"We should heed in our votes as well as in our words the very words of the committee and show "grave reservations regarding the administration's ability to effectively manage the use of these resources." If we have grave reservations, we should not be spending the money until those reservations are met and we have a far greater degree of confidence than any of us can show today that this spending will be effective.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a hard time remembering the last time I disagreed with my friend from Washington on an issue, but on this one, regretfully, I do. We had a vote a few moments ago to reduce the Colombian drug war money by $225 million. That was defeated 89±11. Now my colleague from Washington would take it all the way down to a mere $100 million for this effort. He would be the first one to agree that, in effect, eliminates this effort. I think that is a mistake.

I will make the motion to table the amendment which I would like to schedule for 4 p.m., if that is agreeable with Senator GORTON.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am sorry, I did not hear.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I was saying to my friend from Washington, I am planning on making a motion to table at 4 p.m. and that would give us a time certain for the vote. We can lay the amendment of the Senator from Washington aside and go on to Senator Dodd who has an amendment as well.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, has the unanimous consent request been provoked?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Not yet.

Mr. DODD. I am going to make a suggestion before my colleague makes it. There are at least two other people who I know want to speak on the amendment and go to offer. I am worried about the timing. If we schedule a vote at 4 p.m. and I presume a vote on my amendment to follow immediately thereafter—

Mr. MCCONNELL. I was not going to propound this.

Mr. GORTON. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. This Senator has made his case. He will need 5 minutes at the most to repeat it. As the Senator from Kentucky knows, however, a somewhat more drastic version of this amendment received 11 votes on the Appropriations Committee. There may very well be other Members who do wish to speak on it.

While I am perfectly happy at this point to grant unanimous consent to go on to another amendment, I would like to take two Cloakrooms to be able to circulate the thought that this amendment is before the body, and if other Members want to come, that they be given an opportunity to speak. I hope he defers his motion to table until that opportunity has been presented.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I will be happy to defer. As a fellow chairman of a subcommittee on Appropriations, the Senator is sympathetic, I am sure, of my goal to finish the bill. I was trying to move this along. Obviously, I will defer to my friend from Washington if he is not prepared to have that vote.

Mr. GORTON. If other people wish to speak, I want them to have that opportunity. I am perfectly happy to vote before we leave tonight.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Washington, is there further debate on the amendment? Does the Senator from Connecticut wish to speak to the Gorton amendment?

Mr. DODD. Briefly, I will not take a lot of time. I know the chairman wants to move this bill along.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I will be proposing another amendment briefly. I did not speak during the consideration of the Wellstone amendment but, in effect, the amendment offered by our friend and colleague from Washington is tantamount to the same conclusion as the Wellstone amendment. This amount will be reduced, as I understand the amendment, to some $200 million, in effect gutting the program. An amendment that says we not spend the money would have the same effect, in my view.

This is a complicated and difficult issue. I say to my friend from Washington, for whom I have the highest regard and respect, and I listen to him carefully when he speaks on any issue, I am deeply concerned. This is not a perfect package by any stretch of the imagination. If I were crafting this alone, it would be somewhat different than the package as it is before us. I understand with 535 Members of Congress and a Defense Department and a State Department and dealing with regional governments as well as the hemisphere who are as concerned about this issue as we are, we cannot bring together a package that reflects necessarily the views of every single person. We have to put together a package that seems to make the most sense from a variety of perspectives.

I did not speak on the Wellstone amendment, but my feelings are very strong when it comes to this issue of Colombia.

Colombia is the oldest continuous democracy in Latin America. It is not engaged in hyperbole when I suggest to my colleagues that this nation of Colombia is very much, in my view, on the brink of being disintegrated by narcotraffickers and guerrilla forces operating in that country. These narcotraffickers are accumulating a fortune, a vast fortune, significant parts of which are being used to finance the guerrilla operations. The major source of funding for the narcotraffickers, regrettably, comes from right here in the United States. We lose about 50,000 people a year in the United States to drug-related deaths. We are the largest market for illegal Colombian drugs.

Just in the last 2 years, Colombia's coca production has grown by 40 percent. In 1999, the United States estimated the street value of cocaine processed from Colombia's coca fields and sold on the streets of this country was in excess of $6 billion. I do not believe this issue is necessarily going to be resolved because we have a military aid package going to Colombia. It is going to be resolved from a variety of different ways. I, frankly, have been terribly disappointed; we are now almost in July—this is a request for help from our neighbor, from President Pastrana, from a democratic government, where 1 million people are now displaced because of the conflict in Colombia. And 100,000 people leave that country every 6 months because of the war there, many of them coming to our shores and many of them going to other nations.

Colombia is greatly distressed. Politicians, journalists, judges, and innocent civilians are being gunned down. We think we put ourselves at great risk
when we run for political office if someone slams a screen door in our face. In Colombia, if you run for high office, you run the risk of being killed. That is not an exaggeration.

Literally dozens and dozens of people who wanted the terror to end, who wanted to talk to the narcoterrorists and to some of these paramilitary forces, and others, have lost their lives. President Pastrana, the President of the country, was actually taken hostage and kept in the trunk of a car not that many years ago as a result of the conflict.

My point is this. This package may not be perfect, but our delay in responding to a neighbor's call for help is getting too long. Every day we wait, every day we delay, means more lives lost, means greater strength for these narcoterrorists, who respect no one, not sovereignty, not governments, certainly not democratically elected governments, and will use whatever means available to them in order to secure their own gain. Narcoterrorists through their illegal trade in death, in a trade in death which costs the lives of people in this country.

Obviously, we have to do a lot here at home. We can't blame the Colombians because we have our own legal drug habits in this country that exceed anywhere else in the world. But part of the answer is going after the source. So when we step up to offer the Colombian democracy a chance to fight back, we are not only doing it for them; we are doing it for ourselves.

So with all due respect to my friend from Washington, and others, this may not be a perfect plan, but every day we delay in stepping up to help our neighbor, we cause more hardship, more death and destruction in our own country, and greater is the proximity of Colombia losing its democratic government, losing its sovereignty.

So I hope that this amendment will be recorded, and the previous amendment, and that we will get about the business of passing this legislation, and giving these people a chance to fight back, and also giving ourselves an opportunity to reduce the hardship in our own streets as a result of the narcoterrorist problem.

I do not claim to be any deep expert on the issue of antinarcotics efforts, but I respect those who are. From General McCaffrey to our colleagues in this chamber, in the other House, who work on this issue every single day, almost without exception, they say this is a must-pass program; that if we back away from our responsibility, if we back away from an ally and a friend and a neighbor in trouble, then our credibility, when it comes to fighting back on this issue, will be severely damaged, if not lost entirely, in this part of the world.

President Pastrana deserves the admiration, support, and cooperation of the American people and this Congress. From the first days he was elected to office, he has sought to resolve the conflict in his country with a major guerrilla group in his nation that has operated for 40-some years, by sitting down with them to try to resolve their differences. He even turned over a sizable portion of Colombia, his own nation—a small percentage of the population resides in this area of Colombia.

I have been a friend of Colombia. It is not clearly shown on the map, but a substantial portion of Colombia is in an area called the llanos, a Spanish word for lowlands, wetlands. When you come out of the Andes in Colombia, in the area of the llanos, the flat areas, there is a large section of this piece of territory which President Pastrana and his government conceded—in effect, an autonomous region—as part of the effort to try to resolve this 40-year-old conflict with the major guerrilla group called the FARC. As I said, a small percentage of the Colombian population actually lives there. But that was part of his concession to try to resolve this dispute. I just recently, in the Colombian press, saw the concession of some additional property.

I show you a better map of Colombia. It is a little clearer. On the map you can see the darker area. Here is the Andean ridge that runs from Venezuela down through Colombia. There are major population centers in the northern sections of Colombia around Bogota.

This area over here is the least populated area of Colombia. It is in this shaded area where this concession was made. There have also been concessions made in the north.

President Pastrana has desperately tried to bring this conflict with this age-old guerrilla operation to a conclusion. But the problem is, the major cocaine and major coca productions occur in areas very similar—in fact, this is the darkened area, the DMZ area, in an area called Caqueta and Putumayo. The Putumayo region is along the border of Ecuador and the Caqueta region is very similar to it. This is the largest region from which these killer drugs come that end up on our streets.

It is estimated, by the way, these narcoterrorists have profits in excess of $1 million a day—some would suggest three times that number—daily profits made in the streets of the United States to fund their operations and to support guerrilla activities. They cannot handle this alone. If it is left entirely up to Colombia to solve this problem, it gets worse every hour.

I know it is a lot of money, $1 billion. It is not cheap. But every day we delay, every day we refuse to step up, this problem becomes worse, and the narcoterrorists get stronger. They are already now in Ecuador. They moved into this region, where they moved the product up through Ecuador to the chemistry laboratories and then back down through Ecuador and either back into Colombia or out to the United States. It is a serious issue.

They end up on our streets. They kill people, and now they ask us for a little help. We have here a democratic neighbor, the oldest democracy in Latin America, one of our best allies in the world, a group of people who have supported us and have been through hell over the last 20 years as judges and presidential candidates, prosecutors, state legislators. Anyone who had the guts to stand up to narcoterrorists has gotten gunned down or their families kidnapped and put through a reign of terror by these people, and now they ask us for a little help. All of those drugs come here. They end up on our streets. They kill people. We want to help, we will help to put an end to it. I think it is very little to ask, considering the magnitude of the problem, how precarious it is for us here at home and for this good neighbor and friend to our south.

Regardless of party, political persuasion, or ideology, this is a time when we need to say to democratic countries in this hemisphere, we stand with you, particularly when the fight involves us very directly. I hope this amendment will be resoundingly defeated and a strong message sent that this Congress, despite its demands for attention and time and resources, is not going to turn its back on the people of Colombia. Rather we will be saying that we are willing to provide the resources necessary so these people have a chance to fight back against a crowd who wants to take their sovereignty and simultaneously add to the cocaine on our own streets.

For those reasons, I urge rejection of this amendment. When the tabling motion is offered, I hope my colleagues will support it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to bring my colleagues attention to the importance of what we are trying to do with emergency aid to Colombia. Why is this aid important? And we now an emergency?

Illegal drugs pose a direct, immediate threat to the health and safety of the citizens of the United States. Today, a majority of the cocaine and heroin consumed in the United States, is produced, processed, and smuggled from Colombia.

The Senate, today, has the opportunity to act. We have the opportunity to provide a needed boost to the Government of Colombia, to help halt illegal drug production in their country. They have a plan, and they have asked the U.S. for support. We should provide it.
That said, I don't want to mislead anyone into thinking this is either the perfect or final assistance package that will come before the Senate for Colombia. However, it is a good start. It will strengthen the Colombian military while emphasizing the importance of human rights. It will provide additional resources for the Colombian National Police, and strengthen U.S. Colombian, and other nations in regional interdiction capabilities in and around Colombia. Personally, I would like to see more on intelligence collection, and more emphasis on coordination of activities between the Military and National Police, and more assistance to Colombia to strengthen the rule of law. However, these are all things that can be addressed in future appropriations. We also need to address economic and trade issues to help the legal economies in the region. This package provides important assistance needed now to a government with the will and ability to act.

The drug problem is not going to be solved overnight. To confront this threat, we must work locally, as well as internationally. We must provide assistance so those who have been seduced by drug use can get help, but we also—and I would say this has to be our first focus—we also must keep people from becoming addicts in the first place. This means education and prevention. It means using the law to punish those who break it, providing the resources so those who become addicted, and it also means focused programs to stop drugs at the source. That means that it is in both the moral and strategic interest of the United States to support the Government of Colombia in its efforts to rid the country of drug production. We should not squander this opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I think it might be appropriate to lay the Gorton amendment aside temporarily and go forward. Is the Senator from Connecticut ready to offer his amendment?

Mr. DODD. I am.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Gorton amendment be temporarily laid aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3524

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I call up amendment 3524.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], for himself and Mr. Lieberman, proposes an amendment numbered 3524.

Mr. DODD. 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 342, on lines 3-5, strike the words "procurement, refurbishing, and support for UH-1H Huey II helicopters;" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "procurement and support for helicopters determined by the U.S. Department of Defense, in consultation with the Colombian military, to be the most effective aircraft to support missions by elite Colombian counter narcotics battalions in eradicating the expanding cultivation and processing of illicit drugs in remote areas of Colombia."

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and my colleague from Connecticut, Senator Lieberman, and others who may wish to join us. I will read the substance of the amendment; then I will go into the language. The substance of the amendment is as follows: We would strike the words "procurement, refurbishing, and support for UH-1H Huey II helicopters;" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "procurement and support for helicopters determined by the U.S. Department of Defense, in consultation with the Colombian military, to be the most effective aircraft to support missions by elite Colombian counter narcotics battalions in eradicating the expanding cultivation and processing of illicit drugs in remote areas of Colombia."

I begin these remarks by stating what was perhaps obvious to my colleagues but may not be obvious to all who are following this debate. My colleague and I from Connecticut represent a division of United Technologies known Sikorsky Aircraft which produces Blackhawk helicopters. I am not proposing an amendment that mandates that Blackhawk helicopter be the helicopter of choice. I am sure that may disappoint some of my constituents that I am not fighting on behalf of a particular helicopter. Rather, my amendment provides for the helicopter to be selected on its relative merits.

As I said a moment ago, when it comes to narcotics issues, I don't claim great expertise. I don't claim to be a military expert when it comes to making decision. I don't claim that Blackhawk may be the best to use in a given situation. Rather than offer an amendment, which my colleague from Connecticut and I might have done, to say we replace the language here, which does call for a specific helicopter, call the one that is produced in our home state, our amendment says, let the people who have to make the assessment about what would work best in Colombia decide. Let the Senators from Connecticut want or the Senators from Texas or some other place. My amendment would allow our military experts to say what makes the most sense, in consultation with the people who will be receiving this military equipment.

Even if Senators disagree with this package in its entirety, I hope they will support this amendment so that at least Colombia will be receiving the kinds of equipment that will be necessary to get the job done.

The questions raised by our colleague from the State of Washington about whether or not this policy can work are not illegitimate. None of us have a crystal ball to determine whether or not this particular program is going to produce the desired results of those of us who support it. One way we can almost guarantee it won't is to insist that the Colombian Government accept only the hardware which we want to give them, not which may be the best in order to deal with the problem but that which we think they ought to have because of some parochial interest.

I don't want to be in a position of demanding that the Colombian Government take a helicopter made in my State. Nor should anyone else be demanding they take one from theirs. Let us let the experts decide on what works best. That is the reason I am offering this amendment with a number of my other colleagues.

The administration's primary rationale in proposing the $1.2 billion supplemental package is that what is called Plan Colombia was to assist the Colombian Government in stemming the massive growth in coca cultivation in southern Colombia. Again, it is the area I described in the shaded green around the Cauca and Putumayo region. It is not limited to those areas. There are other areas as well where the products are grown. Those are the principal ones.

In the last 2 years, Colombia's coca production has grown by 40 percent. In 1999, the estimated street value in the United States was in excess of $6 billion coming out of this region, just in one year. We are talking about a billion-dollar program to deal with a supply in coca alone, in 1 year, 2 years, in excess of $6 billion.

The Colombian Government has proposed to address the explosion in coca production by going by to the source, the coca-producing regions of Putumayo and Cauca in southern Colombia. However, these coca growing areas are also strongholds of the FARC guerrilla organizations—frankly, there is a relationship between the drug cultivators and the guerrillas in these two areas. There are also right-wing paramilitary organizations which operate in these areas, but the paramilitary groups are more extensive in the northern part of the country.

To address these threat levels and logistical difficulties in mounting substantial counter narcotics programs, President Pastrana has made a central feature of his plan the so-called push into southern Colombia, where the bulk of the problem resides. The key components of the push into southern Colombia are to equip and train two additional Colombian counter narcotics battalions, the training and deployment of the first battalion having already occurred in December of last year, and to provide tactical mobility, air lift, and training capability to these newly trained battalions so that the Colombian national police will have sufficient area security to carry out
eradication and other drug law enforcement operations in southern Colombia.

The Clinton administration specifically requested almost $600 million to support that component of Plan Colombia, a request essentially met in the House of Representatives, which supported the bill. The success or failure of push into southern Colombia depends in no small measure not only on the effectiveness of these battalions but also on the effectiveness and the capacity and capability of the forces that will provide them. It is going to be critically important that we not jam down the throats of this government equipment that is not going to meet the test, not going to help get the job done. That is why I offer this amendment today.

President Pastrana and U.S. defense experts spent a number of months discussing how best to ensure the maximum effectiveness of these operations. Contrary to the assertion of my colleagues, again, a lot of time has been spent discussing this issue. There has not been a lack of discussion about what is going on in Colombia. There has been a lot of discussion, a lot of hearings.

Our opponents and other experts have determined that the ability to transport substantial numbers of elite Army troops together with members of the national police quickly and safely to remote areas of Colombia would be absolutely crucial to the overall success of the larger strategy. After reviewing a number of different options, including the possibility of non-U.S. aircraft, the Colombian Army selected the Blackhawk helicopter as their equipment of choice in dealing with this issue. According to Gen. Charles Wilhelm, Commander in Chief of the Southern Command, our top military person in the region, the ultimate decision to select the Blackhawk over other options was based on its superior capability in the following areas: range, payload, survivability, versatility, service ceiling, and other technical considerations.

Let me share a chart with you that makes the point more clearly than anything I could have just said, in very specific terms. I have here a chart that shows a comparison between the Huey II, presently demanded in this bill, and the Blackhawk. Let me go down each one of the critical areas identified by our best military people in the Southern Command.

What is the maximum cruise speed of the Huey II? It is 100 knots. The Blackhawk is 155 knots. The maximum number of passengers at sea level is 11 persons for the Huey and 24 for the Blackhawk. The maximum passengers at 9,000 feet is 8 persons the Huey and 18 persons for the Blackhawk.

On this other chart, when you are based, for example, in the north, you have to get to southern Colombia, you have to fly over the Andes. This is not at ground level or sea level. For those people who may be familiar with the geography of this area, to suggest somehow you are going to have an effective quick-response team, taking 8 people in a Huey helicopter over the Andes, as opposed to a Blackhawk, which can carry 18 at 9,000 feet, is to put the cart before the horse.

The maximum flight time is 1.5 hours for the Huey; its 2.5 for the Blackhawk. The range of a Huey is 196 nautical miles. It is 300 nautical miles for the Blackhawk. The ceiling—how high they can go—is 10,000 feet for a Huey and 20,000 feet in a Blackhawk. The weight the Huey can carry is 10,500 pounds; the Blackhawk can carry 22,000 pounds. Fuel consumption for a Huey is 600 pounds an hour. For the Blackhawk, it is 700 pounds an hour. The sling load is 5,000 pounds for the Huey and 9,000 pounds—almost double—for the Blackhawk. The payload at 4,000 feet again is more than double for the Blackhawk as opposed to a Huey.

Mr. President, every category that our top military people have said is important, the Blackhawk outperforms the Huey. I am not offering an amendment that demands that we write in Blackhawk instead of Huey. I just want to get our military people decide which is best. If you are going to vote for this program, then you ought to let the military people decide what is going to give it the greatest chance of success, and not have a bunch of Congressmen and Senators tell them, it is going to have the greatest chance of success. We should give significant weight to what our military people think will work in this area.

If you want to condemn the Plan Colombia program to failure at the outset, then provide them with inferior equipment so that they can't get the job done. I suggest that is what is happening with the present language in this bill. In virtually every operational category, the Blackhawk outperforms the Huey. It has a greater flight time, ceiling, weight-carrying capacity—the Blackhawk outperforms the Huey. That is not at all surprising, since the Huey is a Vietnam war vintage aircraft, which first went into production in 1959—40 years ago. The production of Hueys ended in 1976, a quarter of a century ago. The Blackhawk is newer; in fact, it is still being manufactured. Moreover, the Blackhawk was engineered specifically to address the deficiencies of the Huey during the Vietnam conflict.

The so-called Huey II is a retrofitted Huey. The upgrade package that the Committee mark would fund was only developed 4 years ago and sold to the Colombian armed forces to improve the performance of Hueys currently in operation in that country. None of the U.S. services have chosen to upgrade Huey inventories using the kits the Appropriations Committee proposes to fund. In fact, the U.S. Armed Forces are in the process of phasing out current inventories of the 800 Huey aircraft and replacing them entirely with the newer model aircraft, including Blackhawks. Hueys are no longer used in combat missions by any of the U.S. Armed Forces.

The Appropriations Committee has indirectly acknowledged the differences in capability of the two aircraft by recommending a substitute of Hueys for Blackhawks—60 Huey II's, instead of 30 Blackhawks. That also means that the significant cost advantages that the proponents of the Huey II have pointed to as a justification for the substitute is significantly reduced. It is even further reduced because U.S. military experts who are familiar with the conditions in Colombia in which the aircraft will be operating have stated it will actually take two-plus Hueys to accomplish what one Blackhawk could do. If that is the case, then the cost advantage argument goes out the window.

There is currently a limited capacity in the United States, or Colombia for that matter, to do that in a time frame that is much faster than the 2 years that the pork barrel has proposed for the 30 Blackhawks. However, setting that point aside for the moment, there is another more fundamental flaw, with all due respect, in the Committee's argument. It assumes the Colombian army has trained pilots available to fly in the 60 Hueys once they arrive. Mr. President, that simply is not the case.

The expectation is that it will take between 6 to 9 months to train a pilot to do the necessary job for that aircraft. In Colombia, however, the Colombian army has a limited number of pilots trained to carry out the missions. Frankly, the serious questions as to whether or not that many individuals can be identified on short notice in Colombia to undergo such training in order to actually produce the necessary pilots to operate that many Hueys safely and with the capacity and efficiency that is necessary.

Again, I don't claim to be an expert on this, conversant in all the nuances of various helicopter technologies. For that reason, in light of the fact that the Appropriations Committee proposes to fund Blackhawks instead of Hueys, I simply do not demand that the Huey be the choice. I have made a case for it here, but I have tried to point out the fallacies in the demands in the committee's argument. It assumes the Colombian army has trained pilots available to fly in the 60 Hueys once they arrive. Mr. President, that simply is not the case.
then you ought to be for this because at least this increases the chance of success of this program. So my amendment simply says let the pros make the choices—not Senators or Congressmen for a specific State, but those who are knowledgeable about this issue, the defense experts in our own country, and those in Colombia who know this terrain.

Last, I will put up a chart that shows the relative ranges of the two helicopters. If you look at the colored circles, the red line is the range of a Blackhawk. The black line is the range of a Huey. The black line is the range of a Blackhawk. Look at the difference in terms of range capacity of these two pieces of equipment.

With that, I hope that my colleagues will support this amendment when a vote is called for on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. At the outset, neither of these helicopters were made in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. My good friend from Connecticut has done, as usual, a very effective job of representing his position. Were I the Senator from Connecticut, I am confident I would be making a very strong speech. Even though the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut doesn’t specify the particular kind of helicopter, as a practical matter, if you leave that decision entirely to the Pentagon, I think the Senator would agree that we are likely to prefer the Blackhawk.

Let me just point out to my colleagues why the committee made the decision that it did. First, this is primarily a cost decision. While we didn’t want to compromise on safety or capability, we had to consider the fact that over the next several years of use, this subcommittee will have to provide financial support to maintain and operate whatever aircraft is selected to move troops. Mr. President, this is not a one-time procurement decision. We will be dealing with this in future years. According to the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, the Blackhaws will cost about $12 million each and then at least $1,200 an hour to operate. Counternarcotics aircraft are expected to average 25 hours of flying time a month year-round. To cover these costs, the administration has requested $388 million to procure, maintain, and operate the 30 Blackhaws.

In comparison, the Hueys will cost $1.8 million to refurbish, and then roughly $500 an hour for fuel, spare parts, and other operational costs.

Frankly, the strongest argument the administration made for Blackhaws over Hueys was that the former had twice the troop-carrying capability, as Senator Dodd pointed out. While the Huey manufacturer challenged this argument, I decided it was better safe than sorry. To address this, and we doubled the number of aircraft we were funding to 60. Even doubling the number of helicopters, the cost of the Huey program stays under $120 million.

Supporters of the Huey have also argued that they can be made available sooner than the delivery schedule of the end of the year for the Blackhawk. Given the pilot shortages and the time it will take to train both Blackhawk or Huey pilots, I don’t see the supply gap as being a particular advantage.

I think we have assured the Colombians that they can successfully achieve their mission by taking the approach we recommended in the bill.

I think Senator Dodd pointed out the Colombians that they can successfully achieve their mission at a lower cost, not only now but, very importantly, to the budget here in the United States, and lower it in the future for the United States.

With the savings we achieved by taking the approach we recommended in the bill, we have been able to increase the regional support for the Colombian police, increase support for human rights programs, and sustain requested levels in the counterinsurgency training, and related support for counternarcotics battalions.

Senator Dodd’s chart points out the range advantage we chose to fund 60 Hueys rather than 30 Blackhaws. His chart shows that the Huey costs to operate the Huey is $617 per hour compared to the Blackhawk cost of $1,675 per hour.

The foreign operations account has to pay for these operational costs this year, next year, and every year after that. Those are years in which we will probably not have $1 billion in emergency funds for Colombia. That means we will have to cut into other accounts to keep these helicopters flying in future years. Which accounts do we cut? Refugees, UNICEF, funds for Armenia, and Russia, demining, or health? What accounts will pay the price to fly Blackhaws in the future years when Hueys would do?

These are U.S. units, which do not have Blackhaws, which will have to wait while the production line produces Colombia’s inventory. Given the short- and long-term costs, and given the impact on the availability for U.S. troops, the committee decided to provide twice the number of refurbished Hueys which will meet all the troop transport requirements in Colombia.

Those are the arguments for the approach the committee has chosen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am impressed with Senator Dodd’s logic and wisdom in drafting legislation which does not direct the purchase but, rather, makes the purchase subject to the decisions of the DOD, which will ultimately be responsible for the training and military support for the Colombian Army.

I am today principally because I am fortunate enough to be in Colombia and in the field with a narcotics battalion, to get the opinions of those Colombian soldiers who actually have to fight these missions, and to get the observations of the American special forces troops who are training the Colombians. I think their observations will be very useful and informative to my colleagues. I believe I have an obligation to speak to those observations.

The question is, are we providing systems, support, and training to the best advantage of our country or are we providing systems, support, and training to the best advantage of the Colombian Army? In order to do that, I think both of the options have their advantages.

The use of Plan Colombia from a military standpoint is to create a counternarcotics battalion which will push into the South from the provinces of Putumayo and Caqueta. This is part of the Amazon jungle. It is all jungle. The last road ends at Tres Esquinas. All military supplies for the core operation of that base must be done by air. The core operation of the one proposed is that they operate from Tres Esquinas, which is about 150 nautical miles from the operating base. That is their zone of operation.

The mission of the counternarcotics troops is to airlift out of Tres Esquinas, to move into landing zones that are close to either final laboratories or other significant assets of the narcoterrorists, and to deliver, at a minimum, two platoons. Those two platoons have about 70 personnel. The ultimate lift will be a full company of about 360 personnel.

It has been pointed out before that the range of the Huey II, Super Huey, is about 75 nautical miles carrying 30 troops, and the Huey II can range only half the target area, half of the 115 nautical miles, without expensive refueling operations.

So the first tactical decision a commander would have to make is in fact deploy the troops. It would be to operate in the full range of the area of operations. You would have to go ahead and establish, at least temporarily, four refueling points so the Hueys could come in and refuel. This is in some respects a tactical hindrance to the operation.

First of all, you have to defend these positions in the field—in a jungle area that is literally infested with guerrillas.

Second, the element of surprise would be at least somewhat vitiated if in fact they were able to see you come in, refuel, and then lift off, and go again to a target area.

In contrast to the range of the Huey II and the necessary-for-refueling bases to cover the whole area, the Blackhawk has a range of about 730 nautical miles and can carry 18 troops. This disparity between range and capacity of troop lift also goes to the heart of the issue. In order to conduct these tactical operations, you will need more of the Super Hueys than you would Blackhawk helicopters. That doesn’t completely
equate the force, but it in a significant way narrows operational forces.

The military personnel on the ground, the Colombian National Army, and the special forces advisers suggest that to put two platoons into an LZ someplace in this area of operations would require seven Hueys as compared to four Blackhaws. Again, tactically, four Blackhawk aircraft flying at higher speeds and moving in without the necessity to refuel gives them more operational capabilities, and it gives them the ability to amass their forces, strike quickly, and pull back quickly.

There is something else that has to be mentioned. They are flying against military forces that potentially have fairly sophisticated defense systems, which again puts a premium on speed and surprise—being able to get in and out—and also the survivability of the helicopters. That is again an issue that requires capital military judgments about the forces available. The most capable to operate and survive in this type of environment.

There is another aspect to this. The lift capacity of the Blackhawk, according to the people to whom I spoke, gives an edge when they operate closely in the highlands of the Andes where you need lift simply because of the altitude. It also gives the Blackhawks some respect.

Also, this was suggested to me while I was in the field. If you are going to do fast-rope rappelling operations, you have to come in, hover over the objective, and get your troops out. Many places in this area of operation will not be landing zones. You will have to require rappelling operations to get your troops on the ground and get them out again.

Another aspect that was alluded to by Senator Dodd is the aspect of the ability of the Colombian forces to absorb a number of helicopters. Right now, the State Department has managed to procure for the use of the Colombians, at least temporarily, 18 Huey helicopters from Canada. These are “1-November” models. Already, that has increased the aviation capacity potentially of the Colombians by substantial amounts. They are out finding pilots; they are finding logistical support.

If we give them 30 Blackhaws, that will stress their logistical ability to train pilots, to provide mechanics, to provide the kind of logistic base they need. If we double that by providing twice as many Hueys, we will put additional pressure on the logistical base of the Colombian military forces to do the job. That is something we have to consider with respect to this issue.

What Senator Dodd has suggested is very thoughtful and appropriate, to make this military decision subject to military judgment and not our particular judgment. I was compelled to speak today because I had the chance, gratuitously, to be at Tres Esquinas and Larandia on Sunday to talk to the Colombian soldiers who will fly the missions and jump into this difficult area. I talked to our special forces troops and our military forces who are advising. They provided information, and it is important my colleagues understand this in formation. I urge this committee to consider this amendment, not to direct that the aircraft be one variety or the other but to ensure that the Department of Defense make a very careful review based upon some of the issues I have mentioned, including range, lift capability, the nature of the operations, the nature of the Colombian military forces, and their capacity to integrate these platforms quickly into their operations. I hope this debate accomplishes those missions. I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to support the committee’s position on this issue.

Do you think the Senator will yield? Mr. STEVENS. Yes, but I would like to attend the ceremony, as well. Perhaps the leadership could provide a window for those who want to attend the ceremony.

Mr. STEVENS. It is above my pay grade. I will speak for 2 minutes and express my position. If the vote occurs while I am gone, people will see an old bull scratch the ground very hard.

As a practical matter, this position that we have taken is the best one for Colombia. We looked at this very seriously. This account is under attack in the highlands of the Andes. What they need is lift capacity to integrate these platforms quickly into their operations. We provided the Hueys. They can have two or more times the number of Hueys for the cost of what the administration wants to do with Blackhaws.

The Blackhaws are fighting machines. They will be the tip of a sword going into Colombia, if we are not careful. What they need are the Hueys. They need to transport these people. They need to be able to fight against the drug people. They do not need to get these so they can fight against the insurgents.

I urge the Senate to realize what we are doing. We are doing our utmost to increase the tremendous pressure upon the drug operations in Colombia. We want to do that in a way that Colombia can sustain the cost we are putting upon them. I hope Congress will act upon what we have provided.

Others have spoken about the costs. The Huey is a good machine. We are upgrading the Huey and providing our own troops for them. There is no reason for anyone to be ashamed of flying a Huey in combat. But it is not the type of situation that calls for Blackhaws to be a part of our operation against the drug lords. What we need in Colombia is to provide assistance they need and to give them the ability, if they want to continue this, to operate these machines.

I cannot see why we should start this precedent. I assume Senator McCONNELL made the same comments. We have similar situations all over the world. We are going to be faced in the next decade with trying to suppress the spread of drugs coming from all over the globe. This is no time to take the frontline item that we have for war-fighting machines and provide it as assistance to people trying to suppress drug producers.

I wish I had more time to deal with this because I believe very strongly that if we go to the Blackhaws—with the cost of operation per hour, the high maintenance cost, the high cost of continued operation—we will start a trendline that this budget cannot sustain into the future. We have to think about this not only in terms of what we will do now but what it will do in terms of outyear costs to continue this assistance. It is not a 1-year operation. We will not be able to stop this drug operation in Colombia in 1 year.

We have done our best. In fact, we have not done it yet. If this account gets overloaded, I seriously question the surviving the people that have been warned about that in terms of the level of support. I believe Senator McCONNELL and his committee have brought to us a bill that meets the needs, gives them the assistance, and gives them the support to carry out their operations against the drug lords without getting the U.S. in the position of building up a military force in Colombia to deal with the other problems they face internally.

I hope the Senate agrees with our position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENS). It is above my pay grade to intervene in the debate, but I believe Senator McCONNELL’s concerns are well-founded.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I will join my good friend from Alaska shortly, but this amendment I have offered says to let the people we are going to get into the situation decide. Some people think we ought not be involved with the respect that McCONNELL dis-agree. If we are going to get involved with narcotraffickers who are as well heeled and financed as any military group in the world, if we are going to do the job right and properly, we ought to let the military people decide what they need. My amendment says to let the military people decide what works best.

Let me read what 24 of our aviation experts sent to Colombia specifically for the purpose of trying to determine what equipment would work best had to say on the impact of substituting 60 Hueys for 30 Blackhaws, as originally proposed.

What is a superior troop-carrying capacity and range of the Blackhawk versus the Huey, coupled with the combat nature of the operations, the requirement to operate at high altitude areas and the increased survivability of both aircrew and troops, clearly indicate that the Blackhawk is the helicopter that should be fielded to Colombia in support of the counterdrug effort.
Additionally, the number of acquired pilots, crew chiefs, gunners, and mechanics to operate and maintain the Hueys is twice that of the Blackhawks. Infrastructure requirements, maintenance, building, parking, and refueling areas, as well as other associated facilities, are necessary to support the operation of the aircraft. The cost of these requirements, are essentially double to support the 60 Hueys as opposed to the 30 Blackhawks.

If this issue were to be decided strictly on dollars and cents—put aside the issue of whether or not one piece of equipment is better than the next—there are 18 Hueys that are there, plus the 60 they talk about sending, those numbers exceed what it would cost in order to have the equipment that the military says they need to do the job. These are the numbers from the military.

I am not suggesting you blindly follow the military in every case. But my amendment says at least let them make a recommendation as to what they think I need. It does not say that you have to take the Blackhawk. It says the proper, intelligent decision. We heard from my colleague from Connecticut Academy, who served with distinction in the U.S. military for a career. He was just in Colombia, along with others, going down to assess what makes the best sense. He comes back with the same conclusion: We ought to let the military people decide.

I have been to Colombia many times. I know that terrain, where the flatlands are, where most of this problem exists. If I can get that chart here which shows the map of Colombia? Let me make the point again. When you get down to the area where most of the narcotraffickers operate, that is jungle. That is down along that Ecuadorian border, the Putumayo River. There are no roads here at all. The roads end up here in the highlands. The idea that you are going to have the capacity to handle 90 helicopters—they do not have the personnel in Colombia to do that. If you want to condemn this program to failure, then demand this language be in this amendment. The idea we are offering at least offers this program a much higher chance of success down the road by allowing 60 Blackhaws, which every military expert who has looked at this says is what you ought to have to do with the terrain in the Andes because of its lift capacity, personnel capacity to be able to move into this area, and the speed to move in and out.

Again, it seems to me, if you look at the charts, on all the comparisons here, using 1976 equipment—the last year the Huey was made—as opposed to a modern piece of equipment is wrong. Unless you think this is not an issue worth fighting over, if you think you want to have these narcotraffickers control this country and take over this place at the expense of the Andes because of the drugs that are killing 50,000 people a year, we ought not support it at all. But if you are going to do it and you think it is worthy of doing, then do it right. Do it with the kind of equipment that will guarantee at least a higher possibility of success, or we will end up doing it ourselves down the road, which I don't welcome at all.

We can't renew aircraft, not fly these helicopters or can be trained to do so. Let them do the job. If we send in inferior equipment that can't get the job done, the problem gets worse, the situation gets worse, and then we will be regretting the day we made a political decision rather than a military decision about what works best.

I urge colleagues, regardless of their position on whether or not this is a program they want to support, to support this amendment which says this decision ought to be left to the people who make the calculated determinations of what works best. That is all this amendment does. It does not demand a Blackhawk. It just says make the calculated determination of what works best. That is the reason for the recommendation. I want to make that this amendment be in this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment when it comes to a vote. I think my colleague from Connecticut wants to be heard on this issue. I don't know how the chairman of the committee wants to handle this. I would likely to be excused for about an hour to attend a very important medal ceremony for one of our colleagues.

Mr. MCCONNELL. We are not ready to schedule a vote yet, I am told.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, there are United States units that don't have Blackhaws yet, that will have to wait while Blackhaws are produced to send to Colombia, which could get by on Hueys. My good friend from Connecticut has made a good case for a home State product, the Blackhawk helicopter. The Blackhawk is not made in Kentucky. The Huey is not made in Kentucky. What I am concerned about, as chairman of this subcommittee, is two things: No. 1, the fact that even U.S. units don't have Blackhawks yet, and will have to wait, as I just said, while these are sent to Colombia. And, No. 2 is the cost of operation.

We are not going to have $1 billion to spend on Colombia every year. This is a unique year in which we are debating whether to spend $1 billion on the drug war in Colombia—an unusual year. But the cost of operating these Blackhaws, if we go in that direction, is going to come back every year and that is $3,000 an hour more than operating the Huey, $3,000 an hour more than operating the Huey.

As the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee just pointed out, and also the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, the Huey will get the job done at a lower cost to the United States. The foreign operations account is going to have to pay for these operational costs, as I just pointed out, not just this year but the year after that and the year after that and the year after that. That means we will have to cut into other accounts to keep these helicopters flying.

That is the reason the subcommittee decided to go with the Huey because we think the Huey will get the job done at a lower price, next year, and in years down the road, which is not to say I am sure the Colombians would not like to have Blackhaws; I am sure they would. All of our U.S. units that need them would like to have them, too, and they don't have them yet. So that is the reason for the recommendation that is in this amendment.

I hope when we subsequently vote on the Dodd amendment it will be defeated. Mr. President, with that, 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 dispensed with.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes occur in relation to the pending Dodd amendment, the amendment beginning at 6:10 p.m., with the first vote in relation to the Gorton amendment, to be followed by a vote in relation to the Dodd amendment, with the time between now and 6:10 p.m. to be equally divided for debate on both amendments, and no second-degree amendments be in order prior to the votes just described, with 2 minutes between the two votes for explanation.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, does he have a feeling whether there will be votes after those votes?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am told the majority leader wants to continue and try to wrap the bill up tonight.

Mr. LEAHY. I am for that. There may be some difficulty with some of the amendments coming down. I urge Senators who have amendments even if we have to put a couple aside, that they come down and start debating their amendments.

I think I can speak for both the distinguished chairman and myself on the pending amendment. There will be no difficulty in having it set aside for the moment if somebody wants to start debate on another amendment, especially if it is going to require a rolcall vote. I can see a situation where it can easily be sequenced following these other two amendments.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Vermont, as we speak, staff on
both sides are going over the amendments that were filed prior to the deadline of 3 p.m. Hopefully, we will be able to process those of any agreement during this period between now and 6:10 p.m. I agree with the Senator from Vermont. We want to make progress. If anybody wants to come down and offer an amendment that might be contentious and debate it, we will certainly be glad to see them.

Mr. LEAHY. The point is, we will jointly move to set something aside so they can debate an amendment, if they wish. I urge that. It will save us from having debate quite late this evening. In the meantime, we will try to clear some amendments. Even in that regard, if there are Senators who have amendments they wish cleared, we can try to do that.

I see the distinguished Senator from Virginia on the floor, one of my Senators when I am away from home. I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I very much want to make a statement in support of the subcommittee's efforts on the funding for the Colombia operation. Our committee had a hearing on the subject. We looked into it very carefully. At the appropriate time, I want to be recognized by the Chair. I need a few more minutes to collect my documents. I look forward to the managers' questions. I would not be disruptive to what they are engaged in were I to seek the floor in the near future.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Virginia, there is no time like the present or the near present. Seeing no one else on the floor at the moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I very much want to make a statement in support of the subcommittee's efforts on the funding for the Colombia operation. Our committee had a hearing on the subject. We looked into it very carefully. At the appropriate time, I want to be recognized by the Chair. I need a few more minutes to collect my documents. I look forward to the managers' questions. I would not be disruptive to what they are engaged in were I to seek the floor in the near future.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Virginia, there is no time like the present or the near present. Seeing no one else on the floor at the moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I very much want to make a statement in support of the subcommittee's efforts on the funding for the Colombia operation. Our committee had a hearing on the subject. We looked into it very carefully. At the appropriate time, I want to be recognized by the Chair. I need a few more minutes to collect my documents. I look forward to the managers' questions. I would not be disruptive to what they are engaged in were I to seek the floor in the near future.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Virginia, there is no time like the present or the near present. Seeing no one else on the floor at the moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I very much want to make a statement in support of the subcommittee's efforts on the funding for the Colombia operation. Our committee had a hearing on the subject. We looked into it very carefully. At the appropriate time, I want to be recognized by the Chair. I need a few more minutes to collect my documents. I look forward to the managers' questions. I would not be disruptive to what they are engaged in were I to seek the floor in the near future.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Virginia, there is no time like the present or the near present. Seeing no one else on the floor at the moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I very much want to make a statement in support of the subcommittee's efforts on the funding for the Colombia operation. Our committee had a hearing on the subject. We looked into it very carefully. At the appropriate time, I want to be recognized by the Chair. I need a few more minutes to collect my documents. I look forward to the managers' questions. I would not be disruptive to what they are engaged in were I to seek the floor in the near future.
The President. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senate

(Amendment 3584, Mr. Abraham)

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I propose an amendment numbered 3584, as modified.

(a) The United States must review and modify as appropriate its political, economic, and military relations with Peru and with other democracies in this hemisphere and elsewhere toward a restoration of democracy in Peru.

(b) After 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of Congress a report evaluating United States anti-narcotics assistance to Peru, interdiction efforts, as provided for in this bill, and to address the impact of drug trafficking on the stability of the region.

(c) If the President certifies to the appropriate committees of Congress that the Government of Peru has not made substantial progress, no funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the Government of Peru, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors for as long as he determines that the independence and constitutional role of the judiciary and national congress, and freedom of expression and independent journalism.

(d) The President may waive subsection (c) if he certifies to the appropriate committees of Congress that doing so is important to the national interests of the United States and will promote the respect for human rights, the rule of law and the independence of Congress.

(e) The President may waive subsection (c) if he certifies to the appropriate committees of Congress that doing so is important to the national interests of the United States and will promote the respect for human rights, the rule of law and the independence of Congress.

(f) The President may waive subsection (c) if he certifies to the appropriate committees of Congress that doing so is important to the national interests of the United States and will promote the respect for human rights, the rule of law and the independence of Congress.

(g) For purposes of this section, "humanitarian assistance" includes assistance provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, or assistance provided by the Trade and Development Agency.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I propose an amendment numbered 3584, as modified.

(a) The United States must review and modify as appropriate its political, economic, and military relations with Peru and with other democracies in this hemisphere and elsewhere toward a restoration of democracy in Peru.

(b) After 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of Congress a report evaluating United States anti-narcotics assistance to Peru, interdiction efforts, as provided for in this bill, and to address the impact of drug trafficking on the stability of the region.

(c) If the President certifies to the appropriate committees of Congress that the Government of Peru has not made substantial progress, no funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the Government of Peru, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors for as long as he determines that the independence and constitutional role of the judiciary and national congress, and freedom of expression and independent journalism.

(d) The President may waive subsection (c) if he certifies to the appropriate committees of Congress that doing so is important to the national interests of the United States and will promote the respect for human rights, the rule of law and the independence of Congress.

(e) The President may waive subsection (c) if he certifies to the appropriate committees of Congress that doing so is important to the national interests of the United States and will promote the respect for human rights, the rule of law and the independence of Congress.

(f) The President may waive subsection (c) if he certifies to the appropriate committees of Congress that doing so is important to the national interests of the United States and will promote the respect for human rights, the rule of law and the independence of Congress.

(g) For purposes of this section, "humanitarian assistance" includes assistance provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, or assistance provided by the Trade and Development Agency.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senate from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] for Mr. Abraham, proposes an amendment numbered 3584, as modified.

The amendment, as further modified, is as follows:

On page 14, line 4, strike "$15,000,000" and insert "$8,000,000," of which $3,000,000 shall be for assistance to the United States Global Support Fund assistance for an amount not to exceed $1,000,000.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I propose an amendment numbered 3584, as modified.

The amendment, as further modified, is as follows:

On page 14, line 4, strike "$15,000,000" and insert "$8,000,000," of which $3,000,000 shall be for assistance to the United States Global Support Fund assistance for an amount not to exceed $1,000,000.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, these amendments that have been modified have been approved by both sides. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 3521 and 3584), as modified, were agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 3521 and 3584), as modified, were agreed to.

I believe this could be a very important piece of legislation that would benefit Colombia and, indeed, democratic forces throughout the world. Have I been privileged to meet with the Foreign Minister, the Ambassador—the very courageous Ambassador from Colombia to the United States—and many others.
from that nation. And, indeed, I have met with private citizens here in America who have had their origin and background in Colombia. So I have talked to a wide range of individuals.

This legislation is the right thing. I commend the President for introducing this bill into the Senate, and particularly those in the current Government of Colombia, as well as the citizens who have worked to foster this legislation.

Mr. President, to reiterate, I rise to speak of United States counter-narcotics activities in the Andean Ridge and neighboring countries as provided for in this bill, and the impact of drug trafficking on the stability of the region. The importance of this region to the United States cannot be overstated.

This region provides the United States with almost 20 percent of its supply of foreign oil—a number that is likely to increase with the recent discovery of Colombia's eastern plains of reservoirs that are estimated at two billion barrels. The ongoing controversy over the price of gasoline that the American motorist is paying only serves to reinforce the importance of this commodity in our everyday life and economy.

In sharp and tragic contrast is the threat from this same region posed by illegal drugs to American citizens on the streets of our cities and in the playgrounds of our schools. An estimated 80 percent of the cocaine and 90 percent of the heroin smuggled out of Colombia is destined for the United States. Sadly these drugs have caused, directly and indirectly the death of 50,000 Americans each year and the loss of billions of dollars from America's economy.

I am also very concerned about the impact that narco-trafficking in Colombia is having on the democratically elected governments in the region. Many of these countries have only recently transitioned from military dictatorships to democracies—and as recent events have demonstrated—these democracies are fragile. The "spill over" effect from the narco-trafficking in Colombia could prove enormously destabilizing to the surrounding nations.

Additionally, this region is home to the Panama Canal, a waterway of significant importance to America. With the United States no longer maintaining a permanent military presence in Panama, it is crucial that we be vigilant against any threat as a consequence of drug trafficking our friends in the Panamanian Government and the Canal itself.

The President's recent request for a $1.6 billion supplemental aid package to assist Colombia and its neighbors in their counter-narcotics efforts, and the funding which will be appropriated through this bill, is in my view, consistent with the important role the United States assumes in this package represents an increased U.S. role in the region's difficulties. The rampant violent criminal activities of the various terrorist organizations and paramilitary groups involved in narco-trafficking, including kidnaping and murder, continue to undermine the stability of the democratically elected governments of the region. This is particularly true in Colombia.

The proposed aid package, much of which will be appropriated to Colombia in order to fund portions of the $7.5 billion Plan Colombia, represents one of the most aggressive foreign policy actions of the United States in Latin America in recent history. However, the funding in this package is only a small part of our overall commitment to this problem. We already spend hundreds of millions of dollars and deploy hundreds of military personnel to the region every year. In addition to the proposed increase in funding, our support for Plan Colombia will require us to deploy many more military personnel in order to train Colombian law enforcement and military personnel. This is a matter of grave concern for the Senate Armed Services Committee, which has as its primary focus the safety and well-being of the men and women who proudly serve in the Armed Forces.

The decision by the Congress to support Plan Colombia and an increased American involvement in the region was not to be an easy one to make. Some have compared the situation in Colombia to Vietnam, and warn against such a U.S. military involvement in a regional matter. Others believe that such involvement is in our vital interest and warn of the consequences if we refuse to engage.

On April 4th of this year, the Senate Armed Services Committee held a hearing on this issue in order to explore the problem and determine what, if any, assistance was appropriate. Our witnesses at that hearing included Brian Sheridan, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict; Rand Beers, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs; General Charles Wilhelm, Commander-in-Chief, United States Southern Command; and Mr. Peter Romero, Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs.

Mr. President, at that hearing I asked our witnesses five questions I believe to be essential in making a decision regarding what role the United States should play in this effort:

1) Is it in our vital national security interest to become involved?
2) Will the American people support this involvement?
3) Can we make a difference if we become involved?
4) Will American involvement create a reaction amongst the people of the region that is counter to our interest?
5) Are those we propose to help committed to achieving the same goals we support?

These are not easy questions but the testimony of the witnesses left me to conclude that it is in our interest, that we can make a difference, and that we will have the support of the people of the United States and the people of the region if we take appropriate and effective action to help the democratically elected governments of this region regain control of their sovereign territories.

Mr. President, this bill represents that appropriate action and I believe that our Armed Forces will ensure that it is effective.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. 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. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in the quorum call be divided equally to both sides.

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

Mr. WARNER. 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. DeWINE. 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. DeWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my time come off of the time of the Senator from Kentucky.

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

Mr. DeWINE. Mr. President, we will be voting in just a few moments in regard to the Gorton Amendment. I rise to talk about the bill but also to oppose, with due respect, the Gorton amendment.

What is at the heart of this debate on the emergency aid package to Colombia, the very essence of why we need to help restore stability in Colombia and help combat the violent insurgents, is the urgent need to keep drugs off our streets in the United States and out of the hands of our children. That is what this debate is all about; that is what this vote on the amendment is all about.

As my colleagues know, this emergency package would provide $934 million to support Colombian efforts to eliminate drugs at the source, improve human rights programs, improve rule of law programs, and increase economic development. The fact is, there is an emergency in our neighbor to the south, in the country of Colombia. This country, this democracy, is embroiled in destabilizing and brutal civil war, a civil war that has gone on for decades with a death toll reaching at least 35,000.
Today, we have heard a lot of speeches about human rights abuses in Colombia and what has taken place in the past. In that context, I remind my colleagues of the fact the current aid package that the Senator from Kentucky has put together is based on legislation Senators Coverdell, Grassley, Graham, and I introduced last fall, which was developed with the protection of human rights in mind. It is an integral part of this bill. Our colleagues have a right to be concerned with and the transaction of abuses. One way to deal with this is through the safeguards that are written all through this bill.

My office met with numerous human rights organizations. We worked closely with Senator Leahy’s office, and many others, to ensure that safeguards were put in place to prevent U.S. assistance from being used by those in Colombia who do not respect human rights.

Many of those original provisions have been incorporated into the package before us, such as funds to monitor the use of U.S. assistance by the Colombian armed forces and Colombian national police; funds to support efforts to create and support members of both the armed forces and the paramilitary organizations involved in human rights abuses. It also contains funds to address the social and economic needs of the displaced populations in Colombia.

Our provisions were not only developed to prevent human rights abuses in Colombia but, more importantly, they were developed to prevent those abuses. The fact is that this Congress places such a strong emphasis on the protection of human rights that the legislation before us today would provide more funding for human rights—$25 million to be exact—than was in the President’s requested budget. This is more than the President requested.

This Congress is committed to the protection of human rights and will continue to monitor the assistance we provide to ensure that every penny is used for its intended purpose, which is the respect for and protection of human rights.

Many of us on the floor today, and those watching in their offices, have spent a lot of time and energy to expel communism and bring democracy to this hemisphere and to bring a rule of law and human rights protection to this hemisphere. The 1980s were a true success story for the ideals we believe in and for our attempt to spread those ideals and beliefs in democracy throughout this great hemisphere. The people of this hemisphere paid a very high price, but I think that price was worth paying to achieve the spread of democracy throughout the hemisphere. We brought democracy and we brought opportunity into our neighbors.

Today, the drug trade—not communism—is now the dominant threat to peace and freedom in the Americas. It threatens the sovereignty of the Colombian democracy and the continued prosperity and security of our entire hemisphere. Tragically, our own drug habit—America’s drug habit—is what is fueling this threat in our hemisphere. Colombia is one of the countries whose use of drugs is causing the instability and violence in Colombia and in the Andean region.

The sad fact is that the cultivation of coca in Colombia has doubled, from over 126,000 acres in 1995 to 300,000 in 1999. Poppy cultivation also has grown to such an extent that it is now the source of the majority of heroin consumed in the United States. Not surprisingly, drug availability has increased in the United States; drug use among adolescents has also increased. To make matters worse, the Colombian insurgents see the drug traffickers as a financial partner who will sustain their fighting capabilities beyond our shores. The FARC and ELN—these guerrillas—grow stronger and stronger day by day. So the sale of drugs in the United States today not only promotes the drug business, but it also fuels the antidemocratic insurgency.

Some may ask, why does Colombia matter? Why are we taking good tax dollars to help our neighbors to the south? I think the answer is simple. It matters because Colombia is shipping their drugs into the United States. It matters because the drug trade is a source of rampant lawlessness and violence within Colombia itself—violence and lawlessness, which has destabilized that country and threatens the entire Andean region.

Fortunately, in the last few years, Congress has had the foresight to recognize the escalating threats, and we have been working to restore our drug fighting capability beyond our shores. Many of us who have worked very tirelessly on the Colombian assistance package this year also worked together just a few short years ago to pass the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, which was reduced to 13 to 14 percent, which is a dramatic reduction in the percentage of money we are spending on international drug eradication. That is why many of us in this body—on a bipartisan basis, in both the House and here in the Senate—worked to pass the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. Speaker Hastert, before he was Speaker, played a major role in working on the House version of this bill, as did many, many others.

We passed that bill. It became law. It has made a difference. We have begun to at least reverse the direction of our policy. We have to go back to that balanced approach, where we spend money on international eradication, domestic law enforcement, treatment, and education. It has to be a balanced approach.

We passed the bill. It became law, and we started to reverse that policy. The initiative for that came, quite candidly, from this side of the aisle, with support from the other side of the aisle. We saw what the administration was doing and we said that the policy has to change. We said we needed to put more money into interdiction, and that is exactly what we did. We said, candidly, we needed a balanced policy
and we began to move in that direction. Now, today, we need to build on that effort.

We need to build on that effort, which today is focused primarily on the current crisis that we see in Colombia. Senators Feinstein, Feingold, and others worked with me to put together a package specifically dealing with the situation in Colombia.

I ask my colleagues to look at the big picture. Step back from the debate about this amendment and look at where we are going as a country. Think about what is in the best interest not of Colombia, but of the United States. This assistance package before us, which my colleagues from Kentucky and Vermont have put together, was put together because Colombia is our neighbor, and what affects our neighbor to the south affects us. We have a very real interest in helping to stabilize Colombia and keeping it all of us. By helping to stabilize Colombia, we are helping to stabilize an area that is a friend of ours.

Colombia faces a crisis that is different only in degree from any crisis that any country has ever faced before in the history of the world. Many countries have faced guerrilla movements in the past few decades, but no country has ever faced guerrillas with as much money as the Colombian guerrillas have. We don't know of any country that has ever faced a guerrilla movement supported by so much illegal drug money. A synergistic relationship is involved between the drug dealers and the guerrillas. These two forces profits from each other; each one takes care of the other. While this is a crisis that Colombia faces, it is a crisis driven by those who consume drugs in our country, and we must admit that it is a crisis that directly impacts you; it directly impacts us, our children, and our grandchildren.

I ask my colleagues to really consider the great human tragedy that Colombia faces. I ask my colleagues to remember how we got here, and to remember what role this side of the aisle, with help from the other side, played in trying to deal with the Colombian problem, and what role we played in trying to increase the money we were spending and the resources we were providing to stop drugs from ever coming into our country.

The emergency aid package before us today is in the best interest of the Colombian-Andean region. There is no doubt about that. But, more importantly, and more significantly for this body and for the vote we are about to cast, it is in the best interest of the United States.

It is clearly something we have to do. It may be tempting on the Gorton amendment to say: Look, why don't we just take that money? We don't need to send it to Colombia. We don't need to send it down there. What do we care about what goes on in Colombia? Let's keep it here, spend it here, and apply it to the national debt.

I understand how people may come to the floor and say that, I understand how people may come to the floor and think that and maybe even vote that way. But I think in the long run it would be a tragic mistake. If we are looking for an analogy, let me be quite candid. The analogy isn't any long-term involvement in the United States. The analogy shouldn't be to Bosnia; it shouldn't be to Vietnam; it shouldn't even be Kosovo. The analogy is what happened in the Central American countries in the 1980s.

Quite candidly, many people on this side of the aisle and on the other side were directly involved in trying to make sure democracy triumphed in Central America. We were successful because people took chances. People cast tough votes. People said we care. Today, when you travel through Central America, you find democracies. I have had the opportunity within the last several years to do that, and to travel to most every Central American country. No, things are not perfect. But each of those countries is moving towards more democracy. Each of those countries is moving towards more market-driven economies. Each of those countries has a chance to develop a middle class.

That is the analogy. The United States cared. We were involved. The people there got the job done.

Colombia faces a very difficult challenge. Will this be the only time Members of the Senate are asked to vote on this and to send money to deal with this? Of course not. We all know that. This is a commitment, and it is probably going to be somewhat of a long commitment. But I think it is clearly in our national interest.

We vote today not to assist Colombia. We vote today really to assist ourselves because what happens in Colombia directly impacts the United States. It is not about whether it is illegal immigration, or whether it is drugs coming into this country. What happens in that region of the world has a direct impact on people in Cleveland, on people in Cincinnati, or any other State, or any city in the United States. We vote in our self-interest today for this package. We vote in our national self-interest. I believe, to vote down the Gorton amendment.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Voinovich). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. 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. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to express my serious concerns about the foreign operations bill that is before us. I am concerned, and I believe that many of my colleagues will be concerned, about what is in this bill. And I am even more concerned about what is not in it.

What is here in this bill, is an extremely expensive package of support to the Colombian military, designated, of course, as emergency economic assistance. I recognize that Colombia is a country in crisis. I believe that it is in the national interest of the United States to help Colombia emerge from that crisis, and into an era in which basic human rights and the rule of law are firmly entrenched in the fabric of Colombian society.

I recognize that we all share an interest in fighting the terrible impact that illegal drugs have on our society and in our own communities. So I have made a very serious effort to evaluate this initiative over a number of months. I have heard the perspectives from the business community, of human rights activists, and of the administration. I have also heard from Colombian civic groups and labor unions and from the Colombian government itself. In the end, I remain very skeptical about the wisdom of this undertaking.

My primary concerns about the proposed package of assistance to Colombia are two-fold. First, I am concerned about the degree to which this package involves the United States in a counter-insurgency campaign in Colombia. The aim of our assistance to the Colombian military would be to combat narcotics traffickers. I have no doubt about that, but it probably should be to wage war against the rebels who control the south. Our country's history teaches us something about how easy it is to get stuck in such situations, about how seductive arguments to increase our involvement might become after we invest massive resources in this phase of the counter-insurgency campaign. It troubles me that, because of the drug-related elements of the Colombian issue, we in this country, perhaps, walking into this scheme with our eyes wide open to these dangers.

But my primary concern, Mr. President, is the impact that Plan Colombia would have on the human rights of Colombians. The Colombian military, which this package of assistance would directly support, has been involved in serious human rights abuses and has a record of collaborating with the murderous paramilitary forces that terrorize Colombian citizens. The package in the foreign operations appropriations bill seems, in the words of the Economist magazine, to "merely bolt three shiny new antidrugs battalions on to an abusive and unreformed military force." That action would escalate a war in which civilians bear the brunt of the violence. I know that Senator Leahy has worked hard to establish human rights conditions for the use of this assistance. But I am not at all certain that it is appropriate for the United States to send Colombian military to this degree at this time.

I note that the Senator from Vermont has a point when he questions...
the emergency designation for this spending package. Colombia has been in crisis for some time. But of course, the emergency designation frees this body from fiscal discipline—discipline, Mr. President, that we badly need.

In a genuine emergency, for the devastating flooding in southern Africa, this bill provides only one-eighth, one eighth, of the administration's request. It was not so long ago, that the entire country was moved by video reports of the people of southeastern Africa, clinging to life in trees and rooftops as flood waters rushed past them. These floods were 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. While more needs to be done, the country has made progress with regard to basic human rights. Mr. President, the people of Mozambique have been fighting for a better future. This kind of disaster comes at a terrible time, and it will require the assistance of the international community to help the people of Mozambique hold to the opportunities that lay before them before the waters rose.

And an appropriate level of funding for the communities ravaged by flooding in Africa is just the beginning. Even a cursory glance will indicate that there is a great deal that is not in this appropriations bill.

The news is not entirely bad. I applaud the increased funding levels to combat the global HIV/AIDS crisis, which I believe is one of the most important international issues that this country faces in this new millennium, although I would still like to see that level increase.

And I am pleased to see provisions linking the resumption of certain military and security assistance programs for Indonesia to key conditions—conditions which bolster the position of reformers in the new government by requiring real accountability for human rights abuses and real cooperation with the international community on matters relating to East Timorese refugees. On this note, I would point out to my colleagues the fact that UNHCR personnel have been suspended from activities in three refugee camps in West Timor because the security situation in these camps, where military-backed militias continue their campaign of intimidation and destabilization, has made it impossible to for humanitarian workers to continue to do their jobs. Provisions like those included in this bill are still critically important as are the more comprehensive provisions of a bill that I have introduced, S. 2621, the East Timor Repatriation and Security Act of 2000.

Despite the laudable elements, this bill funds only $75 million of the administration's $262 million debt relief request—and that's excluding the $210 million supplemental request, which also goes unfunded. This bill barely addresses the crushing debt burden that stands as an obstacle to growth and development throughout much of the developing world.

This bill allocates only $85 million for peacekeeping operations. That is a sizable cut. It is likely to threaten one of the most logical and far-sighted initiatives that we have in this area, Mr. President, the African Crisis Response Initiative, which trains African militaries to help them to become more effective in working to secure stability and share the global burden of peacekeeping.

This bill cuts two of the most important accounts for international development aid, the ESF account and the World Bank IDA account, below fiscal year 2000 levels.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has found that the U.S., when compared to twenty other donor nations worldwide devotes the smallest portion of its overall resources to development aid—the smallest portion by far. The typical donor country in the study contributed more than three times the share of national resources that the U.S. contributes. In fact, the U.S. falls—and fails miserably—to contribute the U.N. target level of even point-seven-percent—not seven percent, but seven-tenths of one percent—in aid to the developing world. The Center found that, using a number of different sources, the level of U.S. development aid in fiscal year 2001 would be equal to its lowest level since the end of World War II, measured as a share of the economy. That conclusion refers to the Administration's request, a request that this bill fails $1.7 billion below the President's request. I believe that we must exercise more foresight and that we must re-think our priorities to make more room for the world around us and for the global context in which our great nation will operate in this new century.

I believe strongly in fiscal discipline. I believe in governing within our means. I know that means tough choices. But I also know some of the appropriations bills we have just passed and no doubt will see more of the same as we consider spending in the future. I believe that the fundamental thrust of the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington, which would cut all but $200 million of the recommended appropriations for the United States share of the financing plan in Colombia, would essentially eviscerate not only the U.S. participation but would probably eliminate the prospects of other nations, that see themselves looking to the United States for leadership in terms of dealing with the crisis in Colombia, and would probably have a very distasteful effect on Colombia's intention to provide more than half of the $7.5 billion cost of the comprehensive plan in Colombia.

Essentially, what we would be saying, by adopting this amendment, is that we are prepared to see Colombia continue in the almost death spiral of downward direction in which it has been in for the past many months.

I would like to first point out what are some of the national interests of the United States that would be sacrificed if we were to allow that to occur. Of course, the most fundamental sacrifice would be the loss of an effective democratic partner in the efforts to build stability within the Western Hemisphere. Colombia offered the longest continuous democracy on the continent of South America. It is a country that other countries, which are relatively new democracies, look to for leadership and example.

That's a serious consequence. It would be, by our lack of responding to the call for help at this critical time, we were to be the principal agent of converting this nation of over half a
century of democracy into a failed state.

There are also consequences to the region, particularly the Andean region. That is a region that is already in trouble, as I know the President Officer is well aware.

There is a new and untested government in Venezuela. We have, in Ecuador, the first successful military coup in Latin America in almost two decades. We are in the midst of some contentious election aftermath which in many quarters has been called incredible in the sense of not being a credible election.

Even Bolivia, which has been a source of stability, had to impose essentially a period of martial law. And on the north side, we have Panama, which has recently been given full control of the Panama Canal, and where there are great concerns about the stability of that country, and particularly its vulnerability to drug traffickers.

So here Colombia sits, in the middle of this very vulnerable, fractious part of our hemisphere. If it goes down, it will have enormous spillover effects, and the consequences will be dire for U.S. interests.

What we most think about when we hear the word "Colombia" is drugs. Colombia has become an even greater source of drugs during, in part, to the success of our efforts in Peru and Bolivia in reducing coca production, but also, unfortunately, due, in large part, to the fact that we now have a marriage between the narcotraffickers, the guerrillas, and the paramilitaries in whose arms are all working together in various places in Colombia, particularly in the southernmost regions, to have contributed to a doubling, maybe soon a tripling, of drug production in that nation over the last decade.

Colombia is also an important economic partner of the United States. It has one of the larger economies in Latin America, and it has been a significant trading partner for the United States.

Colombia has had a long period not only of democracy but also of sustained economic growth. It was not until 3 or 4 years ago that the record of every year being better than the last was broken in terms of the economy of Colombia. It was able to avoid a series of economic crises in South America and be a solid bastion of economic stability. That pattern is now broken, with 5 percent unemployment, a 5 percent drop in gross domestic product, and an outflow of investment.

Finally, we have a national interest in terms of the people of Colombia believing that their future and their hope is in their own hands, that they do not have to flee and become another diaspora in the United States.

There has been substantial out-migration, oftentimes of the people with the very skills that are going to be necessary to restore the democracy and economy in Colombia.

When I was in Bogota, in December of last year, I was told that if you wanted to apply for a visa to leave Colombia, even as a tourist or for one of the standard visas, it took 10 months to get an appointment to meet with the U.S. consulate official to apply to get a visa. That is how backlogged they are because of the number of people who are continuing to leave the country. One can imagine if these conditions of violence and economic turmoil continue how many people will be leaving illegally from Colombia with the United States as their primary destination.

We have a lot at stake. This is not a trivial issue with which we are dealing. I hope just as we, by a very strong vote, rejected previous propositions that would have diluted our capacity to be a good neighbor on this critical issue, that we will do so again in defeating the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Once we have acted, we will still have some work to do, in particular work to help in reducing the flow of the drugs from the friends of Colombia to be a strong support group to continue this effort, remembering that 30 percent of Plan Colombia is going to be paid by other than the United States or Colombia—the Colombians have yet to identify who will pick up that 30 percent of the cost—and that we must put greater emphasis on the economic recovery of Colombia, which I hope will include items such as bringing parity to the cost internally and externally that we are recently adopted increase in trade preferences for the Caribbean Basin and extending the Andean trade preference to the year 2008 in order to give investors greater confidence.

There is important work to do today, important work to do tomorrow. The goal is to be a good neighbor and contribute to the salvation of a very good friend of the United States, Colombia, at a time of dire need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the first vote begin at 6:15, with the time equally divided and for more than the full length of the time provided for the vote, with the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair and my friend and colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Connecticut. I am proud to be a co-sponsor of that amendment. I respectfully oppose the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from the State of Washington.

As has been amply testified to here on the floor today, Colombia is in a crisis, there is increasing drug trade emanating from that country, an aggressive guerrilla movement spreading within it, right-wing paramilitary operations, and human rights abuses on all sides. All of this represents a fundamental threat to democratic government, the rule of law and economic prosperity in Colombia, and undermines stability in the region. It also, closer to home, results in the sad reality that too much of it ends up in our country.

The democratically elected leader of Colombia, President Pastrana, has urgently asked for our assistance and has shown strong leadership in developing a long-term comprehensive strategy for dealing with the multifaceted crisis his country faces.

The United States is not pushing its way into this situation, nor are we attempting to impose an outside solution. The Colombian Government quite simply cannot carry out these constructive plans it has without substantial international assistance. Our Government has quite responsibly pledged that the United States will make a major contribution to this critical effort, and I am convinced that is in our national interest to do so. The Administration's budget request for what has become known as Plan Colombia seeks to help that country and other nations in the region tackle the issues of the drug trade, guerrilla and paramilitary violence, human rights, and economic reform.

This assistance package would allow for the purchase of 30 Blackhawk helicopters to do the essential job of transporting counter narcotics battalions into southern Colombia. These Blackhaws are fast, they have tremendous capacity, and they are well suited for long-range operations. Unfortunately, the Senate version of the foreign operations appropriations bill eliminates the funding that the Blackhawks and replaces them with twice as many of the slower, less capable Huey II helicopters. While the Huey II is an improvement over the 1960s vintage Huey helicopter, it does not have the same performance capabilities, including range, speed, lift, or survivability, at any altitude as does the Blackhawk.

The Colombian Army itself chose the Blackhawk to meet its long-term requirements for all of its armed forces, and believes it is the best solution for providing helicopter support to the newly formed counter narcotics battalions. The Blackhawk would allow the Colombians to put more troops on the ground, more quickly and from greater distances, allowing for a higher initial entry of the battalions and for more rapid reinforcement, all necessary to achieve success against opponents on the ground. For some missions in the mountains at high altitudes, the Huey II will not work as well as the drug flow into these United States. There has been literally an explosion of cocaine and heroin production in Colombia, and too much of it ends up in our country.

In sum, the Colombians have concluded that the Blackhawks best suit their need for counter drug missions,
which is at the heart of our American interest in this aid package. Both General McCaffrey and General Wilhelm have strongly concurred.

In addition, in May, a team of 24 U.S. Army aviation experts was sent to Colombia to conduct an assessment of the operation's effectiveness and the support requirements of the Blackhawks versus the Huey IIs in Colombia. In a preliminary report on its findings, the team said:

The superior troop carrying capacity and range of the Huey II, or Blackhawk, versus the Huey II, coupled with the combat nature of operation, limited size of landing and pick up zones within the area of operations, the requirement to operate in high altitude areas and the increased survivability to both aircrew and troops, clearly indicated that the Blackhawk is the helicopter that should be fielded to Colombia in support of a counter drug effort.

That was from a U.S. Army report.

Senator Dodd and I have offered an amendment that says the U.S. Department of Defense, in consultation with the Colombian military, will determine what kind of helicopters will be most effective to support the purposes for which we are spending this money, which are counternarcotics in Colombia. The Senate ought not to micro-manage the decision on which helicopters will be used. It is a decision that ought to be left to those who are the experts.

We cannot pretend this overall emergency aid package is a perfect solution to all the problems confronting Colombia or any of the other countries in the region. Neither is this assistance a panacea to the problems of drug abuse and addiction in the United States. It is a strong and credible step forward.

For these reasons, I support the underlying package, oppose the Gorton cosponsor the Dodd amendment.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the capacity of this body for self-delusion seems to this Senator to be unlimited. Time after time, we permit this administration to enroll us in some new armed conflict without seriously examining the consequences of that involvement, the cost of the involvement, the length of the involvement, or even the possibility that we will attain the goals of that involvement.

Mark my words, we are on the verge of doing exactly the same thing here that we have done so frequently in the last 7 or 8 years. This bill includes almost $1 billion for an entirely new, and almost totally military, involvement in a civil war in Latin America, without the slightest promise that our intervention will be a success, and it does it in a totally backward fashion.

The very committee report that recommends spending this almost $1 billion says the committee "has grave reservations regarding the administration's ability to effectively manage the use of these resources to achieve the expected results."

Well, if we have grave reservations, why are we doing it before those reservations have been met?

The bill is a paradox. It says to the administration, spend $934 million, and then come to us and tell us what you have done and go on. But if Kosovo and Bosnia are any indication, when the administration comes back next year, the answer will be: Well, we are already in it; we can't quit now.

That is what we have been told for 6 or 7 years in Bosnia and 2 or 3 in Kosovo, with no end in sight. And there will be no end in sight here either, Mr. President. This bill says let's get in a war now and justify it later. My amendment says let's hear the justification first; let's seriously consider what we are getting into and then maybe vote the money.

This amendment takes $700 million of the $934 million and says, for now, let's pay down the debt with it. Let's expand our present help to Colombia and its police forces, rather substantially, but let's not get into a new armed conflict until we have far greater justification than we have at this point.

It just seems impossible to me to believe that in the absence of the debate of the whole country, with all of the lessons we must have learned not just in this administration, but in previous administrations, about how easy it is to get in and how hard it is to get out, we will blithely make this downs payment—and this is a downs payment only. Next year, maybe we will need a lot more money to maintain the position the Huey IIs in Colombia. In a preliminary report on its findings, the team said:

The amendments are as follows:

SECTION 1. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING ZIMBABWE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) people around the world supported the Republic of Zimbabwe's quest for independence, majority rule, and the protection of human rights and the rule of law;

(2) Zimbabwe, at the time of independence in 1980, showed bright prospects for democracy, economic development, and racial reconciliation;

(3) the people of Zimbabwe are now suffering the destabilizing effects of a serious, government-sanctioned breakdown in the rule of law, which is critical to economic development as well as domestic tranquility;

(4) a free and fair national referendum was held in Zimbabwe in February 2000 in which voters rejected proposed constitutional amendments to increase the president's authorities to expropriate land without payment;

(5) the President of Zimbabwe has defied two high court decisions declaring land seizures to be illegal;

(6) previous land reform efforts have been ineffective largely due to corrupt practices and inefficiencies within the Government of Zimbabwe;

(7) recent violence in Zimbabwe has resulted in several murders and brutal attacks on innocent individuals, including the murder of farm workers and owners;

(8) violence has been directed toward individuals of all races;

(9) the ruling party and its supporters have specifically directed violence at democratic reform activists seeking to prepare for upcoming parliamentary elections;

(10) the offices of a leading independent newspaper in Zimbabwe have been bombed;

(11) the Government of Zimbabwe has not yet publicly condemned the recent violence;

(12) President Mugabe's statement that thousands of law-abiding citizens are enemies of the state has further incited violence;

(13) 147 out of 350 members of the Parliament in Zimbabwe (96 percent) belong to the ruling party, while the political party which has 2 members is the third largest, and the opposition party has 6 members; and

(14) the unemployment rate in Zimbabwe now exceeds 60 percent and political turmoil is on the brink of destroying Zimbabwe's economy;

(15) the economy is being further damaged by the Government of Zimbabwe's ongoing
involvement in the war in the Democratic Republic of the Congo;
(16) the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization has issued a warning that Zimbabwe is facing a food emergency because of shortages caused by violence against farmers and farm workers; and
(17) events in Zimbabwe could threaten stability and economic development in the entire region.

(18) The Government of Zimbabwe has rejected international election observation delegations both for United States-based nongovernmental organizations, including the International Republican Institute and National Democratic Institute, and is also denying accreditation for other nongovernmental organizations and election observers of certain specified nationalities.
(19) The Senate of the United States:
(1) extends its support to the vast majority of citizens of the Republic of Zimbabwe who are committed to peace, economic prosperity, and an open, transparent parliamentary election process;
(2) strongly urges the Government of Zimbabwe to enforce the rule of law and fulfill its responsibility to protect the political and civil rights of all citizens;
(3) supports those international efforts to assist with land reform which are consistent with a commitment to non-violence and the respect for international law and which take place after the holding of free and fair parliamentary elections;
(4) condemns government-directed violence against farm workers, farmers, and opposition party members;
(5) encourages the local media, civil society, and all political parties to work together toward a campaign environment conducive to free, transparent and fair elections within the legally prescribed period;
(6) recommends international support for voter registration and international election monitoring, and violence monitoring activities;
(7) urges the United States to continue to monitor violence and condemn brutality against law abiding citizens;
(8) congratulates all the democratic reform activists in Zimbabwe for their resolve to bring about political change peacefully, even in the face of violence and intimidation; and
(9) desires a lasting, warm, and mutually beneficial relationship between the United States and a democratic, peaceful Zimbabwe.

AMENDMENT NO. 3491

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the significance of the availability of certain funds under this Act for an acceleration of the accession of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)).

On page 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:
SEC. 501. It is the sense of the Senate that nothing in this Act regarding the assistance provided to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania under the heading "FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM" shall be interpreted as expressing the sense of the Senate regarding an acceleration of the accession of Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

AMENDMENT NO. 3398AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To authorize non-lethal, material assistance to protect civilians in Sudan from attacks, slave raids, and aerial bombardment.)

On page 20, line 2, after the word "Development," insert the following: "Provided further, That up to $20,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide assistance to the National Democratic Alliance of Sudan to strengthen its ability to protect civilians from attacks, slave raids, and aerial bombardment by the Sudanese government forces and its militia allies: Provided further, That in the previous proviso, the term 'assistance' includes non-lethal, non-food aid such as blankets, medicine, fuel, mobile clinics, water drilling equipment, telecommunications equipment to notify civilians of aerial bombardment, non-military vehicles, tents, and shoes."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, these amendments have been cleared for both sides of the aisle. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendments?

Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 3495, 3491, and 3539, as modified) were agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator FEINSTEIN be added as a cosponsor to amendment No. 3476 and that Senator BENNETT be added as a cosponsor to amendment No. 3519.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the Gorton amendment No. 3517.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Gorton amendment and the Dodd amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (No. 3517) was rejected.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order. Senators will please clear the well.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish the Senators would respect the Chair. The chair has asked for order.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Kentucky.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would say we are down to just a handful of amendments we are trying to work out now and should be able to give some more information as soon as the next vote is completed.

Mr. LEAHY. Several Senators have been very helpful, saying they are going to withdraw amendments or look to another piece of legislation. I appreciate that. It is possible to finish this bill this evening if we continue to have the cooperation we have had on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 3524

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes equally divided on the Dodd amendment.

The Senator from Connecticut. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their conversations to the Cloakroom, please. If Senators will give their attention to the Senator from Connecticut, we can begin.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in one minute: The amendment I am proposing along with my colleague from Connecticut and others merely says the decision on which type of equipment will be used in the Colombian effort ought to be determined by the U.S. military in concert with the Colombian military. The present language requires specifically a Huey helicopter. I do not think that decision...
ought to be made by Members of Congress, necessarily.

The military categorically, in a 24-member review of what was needed to make the program in Colombia successful, requests that it be the Blackhawk helicopter.

In a letter from the Colombian Ministry of Defense they specifically request it. They would have to change their entire infrastructure to handle a Huey helicopter. The cost is excessive—more than the Blackhawk. The amendment doesn’t say buy Blackhawks, it says let the military make the decision. Congress ought not be mandating the kind of equipment that is going to help best to make this work. Our amendment allows for the experts to make the decision, not Members of Congress.

I urge adoption of the amendment and ask unanimous consent the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was agreed to be printed in the Record, as follows:


Hon. TED STEVENS, Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. C.W. YOUNG, Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: We wish to thank the U.S. Congress for its support of Plan Colombia and the U.S. Administration’s aid package to assist the people of Colombia in our fight against the explosive cultivation of coca. With your support, this aid will reverse the trend of increased drug production, violence and instability that we are too familiar with.

While we are grateful for your consideration of the aid package, we are concerned with the Senate’s proposal to replace the 30 UH-60L, Blackhawks with 60 “Huey II” helicopters. The decision to provide the Colombian Military with UH-60L helicopters was determined jointly by Colombian and US Military experts to be the best aircraft for the mission.

The Blackhawk is our clear choice given the austere environment in which our security forces must operate. First, it has redundant systems and protections that not only make it much more difficult to shoot down, but more importantly, affords our soldiers and crew increased survivability in a crash. Second, the Blackhawk is 50% faster than the Huey II allowing a quicker response time for our security forces to reach remote, inaccessible drug producing areas. Third, it has much larger range. Therefore, the near forward arming and refueling stations is significantly reduced. Fourth, the Blackhawk flies and operates better at higher altitudes, an important consideration given that the Andes mountain range runs the entire length of Colombia. Lastly, it carries three times the number of soldiers at high altitudes and twice as much at sea level, inserting more troops and security forces on the ground sooner. Optimal maneuverability at high altitudes and troop carrying capacity is crucial for counter narcotics operations, especially taking in consideration the areas where poppy cultivation takes place.

While the Huey II helicopter may be less expensive to operate, there are considerable indirect expenses not being factored in by the Huey II advocates. For example, 60 Huey IIs require twice the number of trained pilots as 30 Blackhawks. In addition to more trained pilots, they require more trained mechanics, maintenance facilities, spare parts, additional force protection, and hangar space at airfields. Any initial savings in acquiring the Huey II’s would be offset by these associated logistics and support costs.

Blackhawk is the backbone of our military’s helicopter combat fleet. Therefore our infrastructure is being standardized around it and it will aid in overall logistic facilities to operate and maintain up to 30 additional UH-60L Blackhawks.

Some members of the U.S. Congress have proposed a combination of Blackhawks and Huey’s. Given our force structure planning stated above, introducing new Huey II’s into our fleet would require separate pilot training, spare parts and supplementary maintenance facilities, not to mention the delays or changes in the projection of the force. This question includes urgent and extra efforts, since the fleet must be jointly operated increasing tactical, technical and administrative costs. The Ministry does believe that the UH-60L is the only competitively important for a successful transition to the more advanced UH-60 Blackhawk. We also believe there will be a continuing need to retain some of the UH-1N fleet until the integration of the UH-60 fleet into the Colombian counter-narcotics program.

If the Congress of the United States considers that additionally to the 30 Blackhawks initially requested, based on our needs and operational logistics capabilities, the government of Colombia should receive a number of Huey II helicopters, we suggest that the U.S. Government give consideration on supporting our extensive pilot training requirements by starting a program to acquire 20 Bell 206 training helicopters. These aircraft would enable our armed forces to establish a joint pilot training school that would meet our existing and future pilot training requirements.

We appreciate the efforts and kind support you have given the aid pack in this process. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MAYOR GENERAL LUIS ERNESTO GILBERT VARGAS, Director of National Police.

GENERAL FABIO VELASCO CHAVEZ, Commander in Chief of the Air Force.

ADMIRAL SERGIO GARCIA TORRES, Commander in Chief of the Navy.

GENERAL JORGE ENRIQUE MORA RAMIREZ, Commander in Chief of the Army.

GENERAL FERNANDO TAPIAS STAHLIN, Commander in Chief of the Military Forces.

LUIS FERNANDO RAMIREZ ACUNA, Minister of National Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the issue is this. We do not have enough Blackhawks for our own troops, much less the Colombian troops. The Blackhawks are much more expensive, about $1,000 an hour more expensive to operate. The Huey II will get the job done. We ought to do that in the most efficient way, looking not only at this year’s appropriation but down the road. We will have to pick up operation and maintenance cost on the Blackhawk in subsequent years. The Huey II will do the job.

The Senator from Connecticut has done his usual articulate job of arguing for a home State interest. The Blackhawk is made in Connecticut. I would probably be making the same speech if I were from Connecticut. But the least expensive alternative is the Huey II. That is why the committee recommended what it did.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, is there any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The motion on the table.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOuye) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 140 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Akaka  Baucus  Bayh  Biden  Breaux  Bryan  Byrd  Chambliss  Conrad  Daschle  Dodd  Dorgan  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feinstein  Kyl  Lincoln  Levin  Lieberman  Torricelli  Weilstone

NAYS—51

Abraham  Allard  Amidst  Bennett  Bingaman  Bunning  Brownback  Burns  Burros  Campbell  Chafee, L.  Cochran  Collins  Coverdell  Craig  Crapo  DeWine

Domenici  Inouye

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.
The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I know Senators are anxious to get a feel for what the proceedings will be for the remainder of the evening and in the morning, and the wargaming for the work they have been doing and the wargaming that we have been receiving from them on both sides in terms of disposing of amendments one way or another.

I believe it is likely close to getting an agreement that would get the remaining amendments done tonight. Then, in the morning, we could turn to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill and have stacked votes at 2 o'clock, both on any amendments and final passage of the foreign operations appropriations bill and any amendments that might be ready to be voted on and put in that staked sequence at 2 o'clock tomorrow.

We do not quite have that agreement yet. But for all Senators who are still working on it, I hope they will work with us to get it completed momentarily. If that cannot be done, I will be calling up the Kyl amendment No. 3558, and getting a second so we can have a roll call vote on that, and other amendments, tonight.

I think we can get this bill done without having to have that recorded vote. But if we can't get an agreement as to how we are going to complete our work, there will be having more votes tonight.

So for the Senators who are waiting to get final information, just give us a few more minutes. I think we are about to the point where we can enter this agreement, and then we would have a feel for the remainder of the night.

Mr. LEAHY. If the Senator from Mississippi will yield, I believe there is still a question on the amendment by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that we are trying to work out. I wonder if that could be withheld for the remainder of the night?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have some amendments that have been cleared on both sides. I call up amendment No. 3553 by myself; amendment No. 3537, Senator BYRD; amendment No. 3515, Senator SHELBY. Then the following amendments, Mr. President, I call up and send modifications to those amendments to the desk: Senator REID, No. 3546; Senator REID, No. 3547; Senator REID, No. 3549, Senator CHAFEE, amendment No. 3545; Senator HELMS, amendment No. 3172; Senator LANDRIEU, amendment No. 3522.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I believe there is still a question on the amendment by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that we are trying to work out. I wonder if that could be withheld for the remainder of the night?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I will withhold the Chafee amendment No. 3545. These are the modifications which I send to the desk.

Mr. LEAHY. I will continue to work with my friend from Rhode Island to see if we can work out whatever the problem is.

AMENDMENT NO. 3527

(Purpose: To transfer $24 million from elsewhere in the bill to Peace Corps to bring FY 2001 funding up to FY 2000 levels)

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a Democratic amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] for Mr. DODD, proposes an amendment numbered 3527.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 28, line 4 strike all after the first comma thru the word “Provided,” on line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following: “$24,000,000, including the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for administrative purposes for use outside the United States; Provided, That $24,000,000 of such sums be made available from funds already appropriated by the Act, that are not otherwise earmarked for specific purposes; Provided further:

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered would restore the FY 2001 appropriations for Peace Corps programs to FY 2000 levels.

The agency's ability to provide future emergency assistance through its newly established Crisis Corps of returned volunteers to respond to the devastation of unanticipated disasters such as those experienced in Central America following the 1998 devastation of Hurricane Mitch will be severely impaired.

Finally it will undermine the Agency's ability to use those volunteer computer systems in order to meet government financial management requirements, not terribly exciting but very important to the overall functioning of the Peace Corps as an organization.

The funding level in the bill is totally inconsistent with what the Congress did in 1999. Last year the Congress went on record in support of increased funding for the Peace Corps for today, approximately 7000 Americans are Peace Corps volunteers. They are recent college graduates, mid-career professionals, and retired seniors. They live and work in the far corners of the globe—in Africa, Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and the Pacific. As well as in that letter, American volunteers are diligently working to improve the lives of citizens in 77 countries throughout the world.

Mr. President, the President has requested $275 million in appropriations for FY 2001. While I would like to see this Senate approve an amendment to increase funding in this bill to meet the administration's request, I am simply asking that the Senate restore funding to the FY 2000 levels.

My request of my colleagues is a modest one—their support for an amendment to raise funding in this bill for the Peace Corps by $24 million—from $220 million to $244 million—to bring the FY 2001 appropriations for this agency up to this fiscal year's appropriations. This amendment does not add any new money to the bill, but rather allows the Clinton administration to use unearmarked funds already appropriated in this bill.

Absent adoption of this amendment, the Appropriations Committee mark will reduce funding for the upcoming fiscal year by 10 percent over the current fiscal year's funding for the Peace Corps.

What are the consequences of such reductions in funding?

Peace Corps posts will have to be shut down in as many as eleven countries; the number of new volunteers accepted by the agency will have to be cut by 16 percent, some 1,250 fewer individuals will have the honor of serving their country.

Plans for new initiatives to enable Peace Corps volunteers to bring the benefits of information technology to underserved communities throughout the world and to bolster HIV/AIDS prevention priorities in Africa and elsewhere will fall by the wayside;

New country programs will remain unfunded;

Today, approximately 7000 Americans are Peace Corps volunteers. They are recent college graduates, mid-career professionals, and retired seniors. They live and work in the far corners of the globe—in Africa, Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and the Pacific. As well as in that letter, American volunteers are diligently working to improve the lives of citizens in 77 countries throughout the world.

Mr. President, the President has requested $275 million in appropriations for FY 2001. While I would like to see this Senate approve an amendment to increase funding in this bill to meet the administration's request, I am simply asking that the Senate restore funding to the FY 2000 levels.

My request of my colleagues is a modest one—their support for an amendment to raise funding in this bill for the Peace Corps by $24 million—from $220 million to $244 million—to bring the FY 2001 appropriations for this agency up to this fiscal year's appropriations. This amendment does not add any new money to the bill, but rather allows the Clinton administration to use unearmarked funds already appropriated in this bill.

Absent adoption of this amendment, the Appropriations Committee mark will reduce funding for the upcoming fiscal year by 10 percent over the current fiscal year's funding for the Peace Corps.

What are the consequences of such reductions in funding?

Peace Corps posts will have to be shut down in as many as eleven countries; the number of new volunteers accepted by the agency will have to be cut by 16 percent, some 1,250 fewer individuals will have the honor of serving their country;

Plans for new initiatives to enable Peace Corps volunteers to bring the benefits of information technology to underserved communities throughout the world and to bolster HIV/AIDS prevention priorities in Africa and elsewhere will fall by the wayside;

New country programs will remain unfunded;

The agency's ability to provide future emergency assistance through its newly established Crisis Corps of returned volunteers to respond to the devastation of unanticipated disasters such as those experienced in Central America following the 1998 devastation of Hurricane Mitch will be severely impaired.

Finally it will undermine the Agency's ability to use those volunteer computer systems in order to meet government financial management requirements, not terribly exciting but very important to the overall functioning of the Peace Corps as an organization.

The funding level in the bill is totally inconsistent with what the Congress did in 1999. Last year the Congress went on record in support of increased funding for the Peace Corps for
FY 2001 to $298 million—beyond the Administration's request—in order to support an increase in Peace Corps volunteers. I am not asking the Senate to vote on an increase of that magnitude today. I am simply asking support for a steady state budget.

Mr. President, thirty-four years ago, I was a Peace Corps volunteer in the Dominican Republic. My two years as a volunteer had a profound impact on my life. I will treasure my Peace Corps experience forever—as will nearly every returned Peace Corps volunteer one meets.

Next year the Peace Corps will celebrate its 40th anniversary. It is important that we insure that the agency is sufficiently funded to live up to the expectations that its success has engendered throughout the world.

For these reasons I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the restoration of funding for the Peace Corps.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The amendment (No. 3527) was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, we have the block of amendments that have been cleared on both sides at the desk, some of them as modified.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 3553; 3577; 3515; 3549, as modified; 3547, as modified; 3172, as modified; and 3522, as modified), on bloc, were agreed to as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3553

Page 33, line 18, insert: "Provided further, That funds made available as a U.S. contribution to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Trust Fund shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committee on Appropriations".

AMENDMENT NO. 3537

(Purpose: To make technical amendments to language limiting support for Plan Colombia.

Beginning on page 151, line 21, strike "(a)" and all that follows through line 7 on page 152 and insert the following:

(a) LIMITATION ON SUPPORT FOR PLAN COLOMBIA.

(1) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by any Act shall be available for support of Plan Colombia unless and until—

(A) the President submits a report to Congress requesting the availability of such funds; and

(B) Congress enacts a joint resolution approving the request of the President under subparagraph (A).

(2) FORMER YUGOSLAVIA.—The limitation in paragraph (1) does not apply to—

(a) appropriations made by this Act, the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2001, or the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001, for the purpose of support of Plan Colombia; or

(b) the unobligated balances from any other programs used for their originally appropriated purpose to combat drug production and trafficking, foster peace, increase the rule of law, improve human rights, expand economic development, and institute justice reform in the countries covered by Plan Colombia.

On page 152, line 19, insert "in connection with support of Plan Colombia" after "Colombia".

On page 152, line 19, strike "(c)" and insert "(b)".

On page 152, strike lines 20 and 21.

On page 153, line 1, insert "United States" after "of".

On page 153, line 4, strike "100" and insert "300".

On page 153, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(d) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect the authority of the President to carry out any emergency evacuation of United States citizens or any search or rescue operation for United States military personnel or other United States citizens.

(e) REPORT ON SUPPORT FOR PLAN COLOMBIA.—Not later than June 1, 2001, and not later than June 1 and December 1 of each of the succeeding four fiscal years, the President shall submit a report to Congress setting forth any costs (including incremental costs incurred by the Department of Defense incurred by any department, agency, or other entity of the Executive branch of Government during the two previous fiscal quarters in support of Plan Colombia. Each such report shall provide an itemization of expenditures by each such department, agency, or entity.

On page 153, line 19, strike "(d) MONTHLY REPORTS", and insert "(f) BIMONTHLY REPORTS,".

On page 153, line 21, strike "30" and insert "90".

On page 154, line 1, insert "United States" after "and".

On page 154, line 3, strike "(e)" and insert "(g)".

On page 154, line 5, strike "subsection (a)(2)" and insert "subsection (a)(1)(B)".

On page 154, line 9, strike "subsection (a)(1)" and insert "subsection (a)(1)(A)".

On page 154, line 12, strike "(f)" and insert "(h)".

AMENDMENT NO. 3535

(Purpose: To make the limitation on assignment of United States personnel in connection with the practice of female genital mutilation. The Secretary of State shall conduct a study to determine the prevalence of the practice of female genital mutilation and to development recommendations for eliminating the practice.

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

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION OF FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION.

The Secretary of State shall conduct a study to determine the prevalence of the practice of female genital mutilation. The study shall include the existence and enforcement of laws prohibiting the practice. The Secretary shall submit the findings of the study and recommendations on how the United States can best work to eliminate the practice of female genital mutilation, to the appropriate congressional committees by June 1, 2001.

AMENDMENT NO. 3372, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To require that funding for the United States Agency for International Development be used to develop and integrate, where appropriate, educational programs aimed at eliminating the practice of female genital mutilation.

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

SEC. 4. SUPPORT BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION FOR SERBIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) General Dragolub Ojdanic, Minister of Defense of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and an indicted war criminal, visited Moscow from May 7 through May 12, 2000 as a guest of the Government of the Russian Federation, attended the inauguration of President Vladimir Putin, and held talks with Russian Defense Minister Igor Sergeyev and Army Chief of Staff Anatoly Kvaushin;

(2) General Ojdanic was military Chief of Staff of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia during the Kosovo war, indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) for crimes against humanity and violations of the laws and customs of war for alleged atrocities against Albanians in Kosovo;

(3) international warrants have been issued by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia for General Ojdanic's arrest and extradition to the Hague;

(4) the Government of the Russian Federation, a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council which established the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, has an obligation to arrest General Ojdanic and extradite him to the Hague;

(5) on May 16, 2000, Russian Minister of Economics Andrei Shapovalyants announced
that his government has provided the Serbian regime of Slobodan Milosevic $102,000,000 of a $150,000,000 loan it had reactivated and will sell the Government of Serbia $23,000,000 of it. Despite the fact that the international community has imposed economic sanctions against the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Government of Serbia;

(6) the Government of the Russian Federation is providing the Milosevic regime such assistance while it is seeking debt relief from the international community and loans from the International Monetary Fund, and while it is receiving corn and grain as food aid from those institutions;

(7) the hospitality provided to General Ojdanic demonstrates that the Government of the Russian Federation rejects the indictment of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia against him and other officials, including Slobodan Milosevic, for alleged atrocities committed during the Kosovo war; and

(8) the relationship between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Governments of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Serbia is associated with the closure of the Danube River.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 731 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, and 15 U.S.C. 4855(c), the President shall instruct the United States executive directors of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to vote against any increase in the capital of those institutions and any increase in funding for those institutions by those institutions of any financial assistance obligated to the Russian Federation.

(b) ACTIONS.

(A) Fifteen days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report detailing all loans, financial assistance, and any consideration of any new loans, guarantees, and other forms of assistance by the Export-Import Bank or the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to Russia.

(B)(i) The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors of the International Financial Corporation to vote against any increase in the capital of those institutions and any increase in funding for those institutions by those institutions of any financial assistance obligated to the Russian Federation.

(ii) In this subparagraph, the term ‘international financial institution’ includes the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, and any other institution of the World Bank Group, the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(C) The United States shall suspend existing permissible Russian Federation provided by the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and any consideration of any new loans, guarantees, and other forms of assistance by the Export-Import Bank or the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to Russia.

(D) The President shall submit to Congress a report detailing all loans, financial assistance, and any consideration of any new loans, guarantees, and other forms of assistance by the Export-Import Bank or the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to Russia.

(3) It is the sense of the Senate that—The President of the United States should instruct his representatives to negotiations with Russia’s international debt to oppose further restructuring, forgiveness, and rescheduling of that debt, including that being considered under the “Comprehensive” Paris Club negotiations.

AMENDMENT NO. 3522 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide for the rehabilitation of the transportation infrastructure of Bulgaria and Romania)

At the appropriate place, insert:

Of the funds appropriated under the heading “Support for East European Democracy” rehabilitation and remediation of damage done to the Romanian and Bulgarian economies as a result of the Kosovo conflict should be given priority especially to those projects that encourage bilateral and multilateral cooperation between Romania and Bulgaria, and that seek to offset the difficulties associated with the closure of the Danube River.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we previously agreed to amendment No. 3536. I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. MCDONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Senator HELMS be added as a cosponsor to the Verdell amendment on Peru.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator LAUTENBERG be added as a cosponsor to Senator EDWARDS’ and Senator TORRICELLI’s amendment No. 3589.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3584 AS FURTHER MODIFIED

(Purpose: To make available up to $1,000,000 to fund the Secretary of Defense to work with the appropriate authorities of the Cuban government to provide for greater cooperation, coordination, and other mutual assistance in the interception of illicit drugs being transported over Cuban airspace and waters)

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have an amendment which has been cleared on both sides. I send the amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPECTER proposes an amendment numbered 3588.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.
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Mr. LOT'T. I move to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 359

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 359.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] proposes an amendment numbered 359.

Mr. NICKLES. 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 142, line 11 after the word "pur-
poses" insert the following: "Provided fur-
ther, That of the funds made available under
this heading, not less than $100,000,000 shall
be provided after the President deter-
mines and certifies to Con-
gress that:

(a) Cuba has appropriate procedures in
place to protect against innocent loss of
life in the air and on the ground in connection
with interdiction of illegal drugs; and
(b) evidence demonstrates that the involve-
m ent of the government of Cuba in drug traf-
icking.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the es-
sence of this amendment is that up to
$1 million shall be made available to the
Secretary of Defense on behalf of the
U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Customs
Service, and other bodies to work with the
appropriate authorities of the Cuban Government to provide for greater cooperation, coordination, and mutual assistance in the interdiction of illicit drugs being transported over Cuban airspace and waters, provided that such assistance may be provided after the President determines and certifies to Congress that:

(a) Cuba has appropriate procedures in
place to protect against innocent loss of
life in the air and on the ground in connection
with interdiction of illegal drugs; and
(b) evidence demonstrates that the involve-
m ent of the government of Cuba in drug traf-
icking.

The Government of Cuba has been
prepared for some time to provide fur-
ther assistance to the United States through the use of their airspace and coastal waters on drug interdiction.

In June of 1999, I had occasion to
visit Cuba and I had a long meeting with their President, Fidel Castro. We
covered a wide variety of subjects. One of them was the issue of drug interdiction.

I believe this is a measure which our officials in all branches of the Federal Government favor to try to cut down on the flow of drugs. There is, obvi-
ously, a sharp disagreement as to what our policy should be toward Cuba with respect to the embargo. But whatever anybody may think about those sub-
jects, it is my view that there is no
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The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] proposes an amendment numbered 359.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.
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4 minutes prior to each vote for explanation. I further ask consent that at 1:20 p.m. on Thursday, the Senate resume consideration of the pending bill, and Senator Feingold be recognized to offer his floor amendment on Mozambique, and that amendment be voted on in the voting sequence under the same terms as outlined above.

I further ask consent that following the introduction of the Feingold amendment, it be laid aside and Senator Boxer be recognized to call up her two filed amendments, Nos. 3541 and 3542, and there be 40 minutes total for debate on both amendments, with the votes occurring in the voting sequence as outlined above.

I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the amendments, the bill be advanced to third reading and the Senate proceed to vote on that motion. I further ask consent that following that vote, the bill then be placed back on the calendar awaiting the House companion bill.

I further ask consent that at 9:30 a.m., the Senate begin consideration of the House Labor-HHS and Education appropriations bill, and any votes ordered to be placed to that bill, following the concurrence of the two leaders, occur at the end of the voting sequence scheduled at 2 p.m. on Thursday, with the same 4 minutes allocated for explanation prior to those votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the majority leader, with regard to the amendment I intend to offer, I hope the agreement contemplates the possibility that we can work out something on the amendment so a vote would not be required.

Mr. LOTT. Certainly. That is always the case. If the Senate gets it worked out, I am sure this body and the managers, the obvious would have that opportunity. The managers, I am sure, would be glad to work with him this evening to work out some satisfactory way. I don't know the substance of the amendment, other than it is on Mozambique. Certainly, that would be contemplated.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the Senator will yield, the conversation Senator Leahy and I had with the manager of the bill is that this body and the managers have had a chance obviously would have that opportunity. The managers agree, the majority leader and the minority leader, and the minority whip, for doing that for me. It shows the comity of the Senate, as well. I thank all of the leaders for that.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator Schumer. I thank all of my colleagues and the managers for the work they are doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for helping us wrap up this matter in due time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for helping us wrap up this matter in due time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when we were riding up here together, I told the Senator we couldn't finish tonight.

Mr. LOTT. The Senator was right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 3589

(Purpose: To provide emergency funding to the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene.)

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk that has been cleared on both sides by Senator Edwards on behalf of himself, Senator Torricelli, and Senator Robb.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.
The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senate from Kentucky (Mr. McConnell), for Mr. Edwards, Mr. Torricelli, and Mr. Robb, proposes an amendment numbered 3589.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

EMERGENCY FUNDING TO ASSIST COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY HURRICANE FLOYD, HURRICANE DENNIS, OR HURRICANE IRENE

SEC. 5125. (a) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for fiscal year 2000, for an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs", $125,000,000, to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene.

(2) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The

$125,000,000—

(1) shall be available only to the extent that the President submits an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.); and

(2) is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for fiscal year 2000, for an additional amount for the rural community assistance program under title E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009 et seq.), $125,000,000, to remain available until expended, to provide grants under the community facilities grant program under section 502(a)(19) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1929(a)(19)) with respect to areas subject to a declaration of a major disaster by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) as a result of Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene.

EMERGENCY FUNDING TO ASSIST COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY HURRICANE FLOYD, HURRICANE DENNIS, OR HURRICANE IRENE

SEC. 5125. (b) COMMUNITY FACILITIES GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for fiscal year 2000, for an additional amount for the rural community advancement program under subtitle E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009 et seq.), $125,000,000, to remain available until expended, to provide grants under the community facilities grant program under section 502(a)(19) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1929(a)(19)) with respect to areas subject to a declaration of a major disaster by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) as a result of Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene.
have passed since Hurricane Floyd struck North Carolina, the people of eastern Carolina are still struggling to rebuild. Thousands still live in FEMA trailers. Hundreds of businesses still haven’t reopened. Several cities are still operating under sewage and water moratoria.

This amendment will mean the difference between businesses reopening and businesses closing, people working and people not working, cities thriving and cities withering.

I believe this amendment will make a real difference, and will put us on the road to recovery. Let me submit a list of possible $100 million in EDA projects that has been prepared by the State. This list is by no means exhaustive, but it illustrates the extent of the need and how much good this money can be used for.

### EXAMPLES OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS THAT REQUESTED EDA FUNDS COULD FUND (50% MAXIMUM PARTICIPATION UNLESS WAIVED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District and county</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Total project cost</th>
<th>Project description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7â€”Brunswick</td>
<td>Brunswick County</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>Construct 1.65 mgd WWTP that will immediately serve a new industry creating 300 jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5â€”Brunswick</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Upgrade existing 12.0 mgd East Burlington facilities to meet effluent limits (400 jobs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7â€”Duplin</td>
<td>Duplin/Duplin/Bellevue</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>Water improvements to serve three existing industries retaining/saving 350 jobs and the construction of a multi-tenant building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1â€”Edgar County</td>
<td>Edgecombe W/S Districts Nos. 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>$4,242,000</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements to serve a new industry that will create 800 jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4â€”Chatham</td>
<td>Goldston-Gulf Sanitary District</td>
<td>$227,389</td>
<td>Water improvements (50 jobs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1â€”Lenoir</td>
<td>Lenoir County</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>Regional water transmission main and municipal sewer improvements to serve an expanding industry (400 jobs) and industrial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5â€”Nash</td>
<td>Rocky Mount</td>
<td>$3,512,700</td>
<td>Upgrade and expand the city’s 4.08 mgd plant to 6.0 mgd. The expansion requires upgrades to more stringent effluent limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4â€”Chatham</td>
<td>Siler City</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>Infrastructural improvements for the construction of a multi-tenant building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5â€”Rockingham</td>
<td>Town of Reidsville</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
<td>Collection system rehabilitation to eliminate inflow/infiltration adversely impacting WWTP’s treatment capacity. (125).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4â€”Chatham</td>
<td>Siler City</td>
<td>$3,577,512</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements to serve a new industry that will create 500 jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1â€”Warren</td>
<td>Warren County</td>
<td>$2,943,999</td>
<td>Sanitary sewer replacement to eliminate inflow and infiltration that is reducing the WWTP’s treatment capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3â€”Wayne</td>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>Sewer improvements that will serve industries creating 700 jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2â€”Wilson</td>
<td>Wilson County</td>
<td>$1,731,065</td>
<td>Replacement of a major sewer interceptor to correct inflow/infiltration resulting in WWTP operation under a moratorium and VOC (400 jobs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>47,444,665</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POTENTIAL EDA PROJECTS—FY 2000 SUPPLEMENTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District and county</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Total project cost</th>
<th>Project description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1â€”Edgar County</td>
<td>Tarboro</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements in Kingsboro corridor to retain commerce and support industrial growth in non-flood-prone areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1â€”Edgar County</td>
<td>Pinetops</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements to serve industries creating 500 jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1â€”Tarboro</td>
<td>Tarboro</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements to serve industries creating 500 jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1â€”Tarboro</td>
<td>Tarboro Area Development Corporation/NC Department of Commerce, Division of Community Assistance</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>As part of NC’s “Main Street” project, rehabilitate downtown building. This project will increase utilization of downtown properties, including mix-use development, increase tax base in Tarboro area, including property taxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2â€”Nash</td>
<td>Rocky Mount</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements to service industries creating 500 jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3â€”Lenoir</td>
<td>Coastal Community College</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements to service industries creating 500 jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3â€”Lenoir</td>
<td>La Grange</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements to service industries creating 500 jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3â€”Onslow</td>
<td>Onslow County</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements to service industries creating 500 jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7â€”Duplin</td>
<td>Duplin/Duplin/Bellevue</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>Water improvements to service industries retaining/saving 350 jobs and the construction of a multi-tenant building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7â€”Pender</td>
<td>Pender County</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements to service industries retaining/saving 350 jobs and the construction of a multi-tenant building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1â€”Beaufort</td>
<td>Belaunor CDC</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements to service industries retaining/saving 350 jobs and the construction of a multi-tenant building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1â€”Beaufort</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements to service industries retaining/saving 350 jobs and the construction of a multi-tenant building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1â€”Farnville</td>
<td>Farnville</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Water and sewer improvements to service industries retaining/saving 350 jobs and the construction of a multi-tenant building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple</strong></td>
<td>NC Department of Commerce, Division of Community Assistance</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>The “Main Street” program is an ongoing, successful effort to revitalize commercial districts in North Carolina communities. Targeting vacant or abandoned buildings for rehabilitation, the program infuses new life into commercial districts by redeveloping redeveloping existing buildings for commercial or residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple</strong></td>
<td>NC Department of Commerce, Division of Community Assistance</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>The “Main Street” program is an ongoing, successful effort to revitalize commercial districts in North Carolina communities. Targeting vacant or abandoned buildings for rehabilitation, the program infuses new life into commercial districts by redeveloping redeveloping existing buildings for commercial or residential uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $49,050,000

1 Unless waived, EDA projects require a 50% cost-share.
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In past disasters, EDA funding, combined with Community Development Block Grants, has been a critical tool in helping towns and cities recover: Midwest Floods in 1993—$20 million for EDA plus $20 million for CDBG; Northern Nevada in 1994—$15 million for EDA plus more than $25 million for CDBG; Tropical Storm Alberto in 1994—$50 million for EDA plus $100 million for CDBG; Red River Valley Floods in 1997—$52 million in EDA plus $50 million for CDBG; and in the Agriculture Appropriations, there is no EDA or CDBG funding allocated for Hurricane Floyd affected states. None.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3590) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

SENATOR INOUYE OF HAWAII

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there has been discussion of the great honor that DAN INOUYE earned in the Hawaii earned. He actually earned it on the battlefield in Europe, particularly in the time it was due—and many know why—his bravery was so well demonstrated at a time in this country when our sense of inclusion of people of all races was not as good as it is today. But I think the feeling of veterans and the feeling of historians have vindicated his achievements throughout all of his time.

I think of one thing. I was overseas for the majority of D-Day, and when DAN INOUYE walked onto the stage when his name was announced, veterans from all over this country cheered and applauded. He was accompanied by another distinguished Member of this body who also cheered, from the Rotunda, Dole. It was an emotional moment for all Senators who were there to see two such loved Members of this body received that way.

Today, I yield the floor.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3545

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, due to some confusion in the processing of cleared amendments, a mistake was made. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate action on amendment No. 3545.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators COVropdown, KENNEDY, and I be added as cosponsors to the Dodd amendment regarding the Peace Corps.

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

ASSISTANCE TO LEBANON

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Kentucky will yield, I would like to clarify some issues regarding additional assistance to Lebanon.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would be happy to yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. As the Senator knows, I have a special interest in the provision of the bill that provides $15 million for development activities in Lebanon, including support for the American educational institutions there. I am pleased that this year that level of funding is maintained in the bill as it was reported from committee, and I wish to thank the Senator from Kentucky for his leadership and the interest that he too has taken in Lebanon.

As you know, earmarking $15 million in economic assistance is an important beginning to a comprehensive aid package to Lebanon. However, the recent events in the South of Lebanon call for a more detailed and larger aid package to Lebanon.

A larger aid package can help the country rebuild itself due to the devastation of the past 30 years. Specifically, Lebanon needs the financial assistance to: rebuild its schools; repair and rebuild its sewage systems; repair its destroyed power generation plants; upgrade its water purification facilities; and construct general infrastructure projects.

In my opinion, a package similar to the recent Jordanian package of $250 million would provide the type of support effectively launch the rebuilding effort.

Unfortunately, it appears that the Administration is not currently prepared to present a comprehensive aid package. Several inquiries of the Administration have produced no budgetary figures. This is disappointing in that your legislation is clearly the appropriate vehicles in which to include this funding. Notwithstanding their reluctance, I would like to offer my amendment to increase Lebanon’s funding to $250 million.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Thank you, Senator ABRAHAM.

I, like you, am dismayed to learn that the Administration has not offered any budgetary amounts for an aid package to Lebanon. You are absolutely right that the current events in Lebanon demand that we reexamine our foreign aid package to that country.

As such, I pledge to work with you every step of the way to see that a more comprehensive aid package to Lebanon is considered here in the Senate. I appreciate your suggested amount, and would like to work with you once all the elements for a successful aid package are assembled. This requires input by the Administration, and a plan as to what programs would be funded and which ones would receive priority funding. It is my hope that the Administration will consult with us as soon as possible regarding figures for an assistance package. However, until the Administration presents a comprehensive package, I will have to lay your amendment aside.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Senator’s comments are appreciated. As always, I work with you and appreciate your suggestions and support for that clarification. I also wish to commend him and his committee for their strong interest in a financial assistance package for Lebanon.

CLIMATE CHANGE LANGUAGE

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, Sec. 576 of S. 2522 contains language regarding implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. I would like to ask the distinguished Chairman and Ranking Member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee two questions to clarify their understanding of this provision.

The United States is currently engaged in climate change negotiations to ensure meaningful participation of developing countries and to ensure that greenhouse gas emissions reductions are achieved in the most cost-effective manner. Is my understanding correct that this provision is not intended to restrict the Administration from engaging in these international negotiations related to both the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), which was ratified by the Senate in 1992, and the Kyoto Protocol to that Convention?

As you also know, the Senate has clearly expressed its views regarding the Kyoto Protocol in S. Res. 98, adopted unanimously by the Senate on July 26, 1997. That resolution made it clear that the Administration to support an approach to climate change that protects the economic interests of the United States and seeks commitments from
developing countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Administration is aggressively engaging developing countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through international projects and activities emphasizing market-based mechanisms and environmental technology. It is simply understanding that this provision is not intended to restrict international programs or activities to encourage commitments by developing countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his questions. Your understanding is correct. Sec. 576 is not intended to restrict U.S. negotiations or activities such as you have described. Rather, it is intended to prevent the Administration from implementing the Kyoto Protocol prior to its ratification.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator's understanding is correct. Sec. 576 is not intended to prohibit the United States from engaging in international climate change negotiations or activities that would encourage participation by developing countries.

THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, last year, the Senate adopted an amendment to the FY 2000 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act that deleted language restricting the availability of funds for the Inter-American Foundation. While I agree with the amendment, which was included in the managers' amendment to the bill and accepted without objection, because the basis for restricting the Foundation's funding was inaccurate and misleading, Chairman STEVENS and Chairman MCCONNELL, when apprised of the facts of the situation, agreed to remove the language from the bill, and I appreciate their willingness to do so.

This year, the report contains language that is equally inaccurate and misleading, and that implies that a principal reason for terminating funding for the Foundation is an ongoing concern about the activities of a staff member of the Foundation. Based on the agreement of Chairman STEVENS and Chairman MccONNELL to remove similar language from the bill last year, as well as the subsequent resolution of this matter, I was surprised to again see a reference to this matter in the Committee report.

First, let me say that I am not passing judgment on whatever other reasons the Committee may have for terminating the funding for the Inter-American Foundation. However, I object to the Committee's continued reference to an individual staff member of the Foundation as a reason for shutting down the Foundation. Let me take a moment to clearly state the facts of the matter.

Last year, the General Accounting Office conducted an investigation of allegations of contract and hiring regulatory abuses at the Foundation that were reported anonymously to their fraud hotline. The GAO completed their investigation and forwarded a report to the Committee on May 20, 1999, and requested permission to brief the Board of Directors of the Foundation on their findings, as well as certain additional allegations received during the course of the investigation. On June 30, 1999, when Chairman STEVENS and Chairman MccONNELL agreed to remove language from the bill last year that withheld funding for the Foundation until GAO completed a further review of the Foundation, the GAO was free to and did brief the Foundation. At that time, the Chairman advised me that, by referring the matter to the Foundation's Board, the Appropriations Committee would view this investigation as complete and no further action would be taken by the Committee regarding the subject of the GAO investigation.

GAO briefed the Foundation Board on July 23, 1999. The minutes of that Board meeting indicate that GAO investigators stated that the GAO had issued a final report on their review of the Foundation's contracting and personnel actions and that no further review would be undertaken. In addition, GAO investigators stated to the Board that the anonymous allegations received against a Foundation staff member were administrative in nature and would not be further investigated by GAO. Board members expressed concern and indignity at the allegations against the staff member, concluded that no further investigation would be necessary. On August 5, 1999, the Board adopted a formal resolution to that effect.

Mr. President, continued references to unfounded, disproven anonymous allegations against this staff member contribute nothing to the public's understanding of any legitimate reasons the Committee may have for terminating the funding for the Inter-American Foundation. I would like to ask Chairman STEVENS if he agrees that long-resolved issues regarding a new former staff member at the Foundation are not related to the Committee's action.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I share the views of my colleague, Senator MCCAIN, that the Committee's report language could be misread to imply that the actions of a former staff member are a principal reason to shut down the Foundation, and I do not believe that is or should be cited as a reason for doing so.

Mr. MCCAIN. Thank you, Senator STEVENS. Mr. President, I would also like to ask Chairman STEVENS if he would agree to include in the conference statement of managers on the FY 2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill a clear statement disavowing this report language regarding a new former employee of the Foundation.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would be happy to accept the Senator's suggestion that we include clarifying report language in the conference agreement.

Mr. MCCAiN. Thank you, Senator STEVENS.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong support for the long-in-coming supplemental appropriations request for Colombia included as part of this Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. I believe that there are few requests more important to the security and well-being of this nation in the coming years than this one.

I believe that it is critical that we move quickly to pass the Foreign Operations Appropriations measure and this emergency supplemental request for Colombia.

Some have argued that the Colombia proposal is simply too expensive. But I believe that this proposal represents the proper balance regarding what should—in fact must—be one of this nation's highest priorities: to stop the flow of illegal narcotics into the United States.

As we debate this proposal today, Colombia faces an unprecedented crisis.

Almost 40 percent of the country—an area itself the size of the entire Southeastern United States—lies under the control of the Armed Revolutionary Forces of Colombia, FARC. The FARC is an alliance of some 20,000 drug traffickers and terrorists who threaten the stability not only of Colombia, but of the entire Andean region. And, as we all know, there are right-wing paramilitary groups in Colombia who also have ties to the drug trade.

Over 80 percent of the world's supply of cocaine is grown, produced or transported through Colombia, and large swaths of Colombia, now lawless or under FARC or paramilitary control, have become prime coca and opium producing zones.

These FARC rebels earn as much as two or even three million dollars per year from drug cultivators and traffickers who rely on their protection or—perhaps even more likely—who fear their retribution.

The FARC is currently holding hostage as many as 1,500 to 2,500 people, including at least 280 military prisoners and 250 police officers.

And, as the ability of the government of Colombia to govern large areas of their own country continues to disintegrate, the FARC narco-terrorists and paramilitaries continue to expand their base of operations and attack surrounding areas.

All this, and Colombia is facing its worst economic recession in more than 70 years: Real GDP fell by over 3 percent last year. Clearly, something needs to be done. And clearly, Colombia will need help.

The situation in Colombia is not simply a problem in a far away land. The events taking place in Colombia have direct and severe repercussions for the United States and the rest of the world.

Colombia is the source country for 80 percent of the cocaine consumed in the United States each year, and up to 70 percent of the heroin.
And the situation is getting worse, not better. Coca cultivation in Colombia has doubled in the past decade alone, and shows no sign of slowing.

In addition to undermining the democratic institutions in Colombia, the violence has become endemic. Each year, over 50,000 people are forced to flee Colombia; 65,000 have sought refuge in the United States.

According to the administration, illegal drugs account for over 50,000 deaths each year in the United States, and cost $100 billion a year in health care costs, accidents, and lost productivity. So the problem of narcotics production in Colombia is not just a problem in Colombia: To the flow of drugs from Colombia has very real, and very damaging effects, on our country.

Earlier this year, I joined many of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee as we met with Colombia's President, Andres Pastrana. President Pastrana outlined a clear and comprehensive plan to address the drug trade, and to start solving the deeper problems within his country.

It is an ambitious plan, but one which I believe can be implemented, and can promote the peace process, strengthen democracy, and help revitalize Colombia's economy.

The Plan Colombia encompasses far more than the request we have before us. A combination of internal and external sources will be providing Colombia with over $7.5 billion over three years that President Pastrana has deemed necessary.

The United States need provide but a piece of the overall plan. Working with President Pastrana, President Clinton has asked Congress to fund $1.6 billion of that total. The two-year package will assist Colombia in combating the drug trade; help the country promote peace and prosperity; and deepen its democracy. This is a large package, but it is in our interest to provide it.

With this new effort, supported by the United States, the Colombian military and police simply lack the resources and ability to defeat the FARC and narco-trafficking forces.

Plan Colombia is focused on efforts to boost Colombia's interdiction and eradication capabilities, particularly in the south, including:

- Funds for special counter-narcotics battalions to push into coca-growing regions of Colombia.
- Funds to purchase helicopters, desperately needed to provide the Colombian National Police access to the remote and undeveloped regions of the country where the narco-traffickers thrive.
- Funds to upgrade Colombia's interdiction capabilities, with aircraft and airfield upgrades, radar, and improved intelligence gathering.
- Funds for equipment to be used in increased eradication efforts.
- Funds to provide economic alternatives to coca growers; and,
- Funds for new programs to promote human rights, help the judicial system and to crack down on money laundering.

As many of my colleague are aware, there is some concern about the human rights questions raised by this assistance package. This supplemental request, as well as the questions of the assistance to an army and a police force which, in the past, has had a less than Steller record on human rights issues.

But it is my belief that the Leahy amendment, augmented by specific language that has been added to this legislation in committee, goes a long way towards meeting these concerns.

To begin with, any U.S. assistance to Colombian military and police forces will be provided only in strict accordance with section 563 of the FY 2000 Foreign Operations Act—the Leahy amendment.

In addition, this legislation contains new and specific provisions intended to guarantee the protection of human rights. The bill accords with the belief that those accused of human rights violations are to be tried in a civilian court, for example, not in the military courts which have, in the past, been far too lenient in how they treat these cases. There are also requirements that any Colombian military officer accused by the United States as part of this antinarcotics effort be screened for human rights abuses.

In addition, the committee has also included language at my request relating to the registration of small arms and light weapons in the regions which, believe, has greatly contributed to the culture of violence and lawlessness in Colombia.

I believe that any effective strategy to stabilize the region and reduce the influence of the criminals, drug traffickers, narco-terrorists, and paramilitaries must include the implementation of stringent controls on existing stockpiles and the destruction of surplus and surplus and seized stocks of small arms and light weapons.

The small arms and light weapons language calls for the creation of a serial number registry by the Department of State and by Colombia to track all small arms and light weapons provided to Colombia under this supplemental request, as well as the creation of a small arms and light weapons destruction initiative for the region. If any of the small arms and light weapons provided to Colombia by the United States as part of this assistance package are used in violation of human rights, this registry will allow us to track, to the unit, who was using these weapons and bring the responsible party to justice.

On the question of human rights then, I believe that although we must remain watchful, the package crafted by the Appropriations Committee does a good job in meeting the concerns that have been raised.

Let me take a minute here, however, to express my concern about one specific part of the committee recommendations that I hope is addressed in conference: The lack of Blackhawk helicopters.

The President asked for $388 million to fund 30 additional Blackhawk helicopters.

These helicopters fly faster, farther, higher, and would造福 more people than the Huey II helicopters provided for by the committee.

In fact, I believe that the Blackhawk is critical to the terrain and mission in Colombia for several reasons:

- The Blackhawk can carry three times as many men as the Huey II; at high altitudes the advantage of the Blackhawk is even more pronounced; and the Blackhawk's maximum speed is 50 percent faster than the Huey II.

I believe that the drug war is a serious one, and that we should be devoting the best possible resources to this ongoing struggle.

I am not a helicopter expert, but the experts in the administration and elsewhere, including us, I believe that the Blackhawk is the right equipment for the job. I do not think we should be second-guessing that decision with so much at stake.

Let me also talk for a moment today about one other aspect of this assistance package for Colombia that has come under some discussions: The issue of demand reduction versus supply reduction.

Let me say that I strongly believe that even as we provide the resources necessary to implement Plan Colombia that we must also attack the demand side of the drug problem in this country with a multi-pronged, concerted effort.

I support funding for domestic prevention and demand reduction programs, and I believe we must continue to provide domestic law enforcement with the tools they need to combat the drug trade within our borders.

But much of the demand-side, domestic effort can be accomplished by state and local governments.

What state and local governments cannot do is to keep drugs from entering this country in the first place. That task can only be accomplished by the federal government, which has control over our borders and over foreign policy.

In fact, of the $18 billion in the Federal Government's counterdrug funding, 32 percent goes to domestic demand reduction; 10 percent to international law enforcement; 10 percent to interdiction along our borders; and only 32 percent to international counternarcotics efforts.

Less than 4 percent for the one area that is clearly and unambiguously the one area in this fight that is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government.

Even with passage of this package of assistance to Colombia this figure will still be under 10 percent.

So I say to my colleagues who believe more effort needs to be directed to domestic programs to address demand that they are right. More effort in this
area is needed. Our states should do more. Our cities should do more. But clearly more effort supporting our friends and allies in international efforts to curtail production, refinement, and transportation are needed too. And that is the one area where only the federal government has the power.

Only with assistance from the United States will the Government of Colombia be able to eradicate and intercept the tons of illegal narcotics that leave that country each year bound for our shores.

The ongoing narco-crisis in Colombia and the overall crisis of drugs in America represent an important threat to our nation's security and stability. The war against drugs is real, and should be treated with the same seriousness of purpose and resources as any other war.

The funding provided for the Colombia supplemental request in the Foreign Operations bill, although expensive, falls within our national interest. We face a crisis in this nation, and that crisis demands action.

I urge my colleagues to support the Colombia package in the Foreign Operations bill, and I yield the floor.

Mr. President, the foreign operations of the United States are all undertaken to promote the national interests of our country. They are all useful and important programs, and they deserve our support.

The priorities that they serve, however, are of varying importance. As George Orwell wrote in his novel "Animal Farm," "some are more equal than others." All our foreign operations programs are useful, but some are downright vital to our national security.

One element in this bill that is truly vital to our national security is severely underfunded. I will introduce shortly an amendment to address that severe problem.

The funding line to which I refer is known as "NADR." That does not refer to Ralph Nader. It does refer to "Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining, and Related Programs." The 10 programs in this category are all on the front line of protecting our people from terrorism and from weapons of mass destruction.

Unfortunately, the funding in this bill for 7 of those 10 programs is 37 percent less requested by the President. (And that ignores another $30 million that was cut because the Foreign Operations Subcommittee concluded that a new counter-terrorism training center must be funded in the Commerce, Justice, State appropriation.) I submit that the national security requires that we provide substantially more of those requested funds.

Let me describe the programs that are treated so badly in this bill:

In the non-proliferation field, the Department of State's Export Control Assistance program helps foreign countries to combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Recently customs agents in Uzbekistan stopped a shipment of radioactive contraband from Kazakhstan that was on its way to Iran, with an official final destination of Pakistan. Some press stories suggested that the shipment was really intended for a terrorist who might be planning to bomb the American Embassy in the Afghan capital of Kabul, or might sell the material to some less scrupulous buyer.

That is the kind of worry that keeps us up at night. Indeed, at the suggestion of Chairman Helms, we added $5 million in our security assistance bill to support a new project in Malta.

Another non-proliferation program, the International Science and Technology Centers, provides safe employment opportunities for former Soviet experts in weapons of mass destruction who might otherwise be tempted to sell their skills to rogue states. This program not only helps those scientists. It also gives hope to, and helps to prevent those who might otherwise be tempted to sell their skills to rogue states.

The activities of this program are guided by a Governing Board headed by the Honorable Ron Lehman, a wonderful public servant who was Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security and director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the Bush Administration.

Ron Lehman and I often disagree on policy matters, but we are in complete agreement on the need to help Russia to restructure its bloated, Soviet-era weapons complexes without leaving its weapons exports prey to offers from countries like Iran, Iraq or Libya. His program is doing some wonderful things, moreover. Since 1994, the Science Centers have supported over 840 projects, employing over 30,000 weapons experts at more than 400 former Soviet institutes.

Some of these projects led to the formation of viable commercial companies; others resulted in contracts with western companies to distribute new Russian products like medical devices or high temperature batteries. Around a fifth of Science Center funding now goes to Western companies and to government agencies that employ former Soviet experts through this program.

Other projects have put weapons experts to work on public health, environmental remediation, and non-proliferation projects that provide real benefits to the former Soviet Union and its neighbors.

For example, the Russian Academy of Sciences, MINATOM, and the presidential Kurchatov Institute recently completed a six-year project to map all the nuclear contamination sites in the former Soviet Union. Science Center funding was the lifeblood of that project.

The Science Centers also funded fourteen Y2K readiness projects that ensured the safety of nuclear power facilities and chemical and biological storage areas.

The International Science and Technology Centers are multinational. The U.S. Government provided only 31 percent of last year's Science Center funding, compared to 36 percent provided by the European Union, Japan, Norway and South Korea also participate in the program. But without our leadership, the program will falter.

The bill before us would give that program only a third of what was appropriated for this fiscal year. I know that the budget numbers for foreign operations are unrealistically tight. They always are. But if we cut the Science and Technology Centers program that much, we will endanger our national security.
It only takes a few experts in nuclear, chemical or biological weapons to provide dangerous materials or technology to a “rogue state.” We should do everything in our power to make sure that economic desperation in Russia does not result in such a catastrophe.

The committee report on this bill states that it

was devoted to learning that, after at least 5 years of interaction between the State Department and Russian scientists, relations remain guarded.

I, for one, am not disturbed by that. Russia still has a nuclear weapons program, just as we do. There are bound to be security concerns that keep us at arm’s length.

Unlike us, Russia may also have illegal chemical and/or biological weapons programs. There are military biological institutes to which we do not have access.

As a result, there is always a risk that non-proliferation assistance will be diverted to illegal military research, or that the funds we provide will keep afloat people or institutes involved in an illegal chemical or biological weapons program. That risk pales, however, compared to the risk of weapons proliferation if we leave those weapons scientists unable to put food on their table. So we must be “guarded,” and we must do more.

The Science and Technology Centers program takes great care to minimize the risk of diversion. The General Accounting Office, after studying the Science Center’s programs to employ Russia’s former biological weapons experts, reported recently that the Center:

... has directly deposited grant payments into project participants’ individual bank accounts, which prevents the institutes from diverting funds for unauthorized purposes. Program managers from the Science Center review programmatic and financial documents on a quarterly basis, and the Science Center requires a final audit of every project before it releases an overhead payment to an institute.

In addition, the U.S. Defense Contract Audit Agency has conducted internal control audits for 10 Science Center biotechnology projects through 1999.

Those precautions work. A few months ago, Science Center officials were warned by Russian scientists of a possible diversion of funds. That information was received and acted upon in a timely manner, and steps were taken to make sure that no diversion occurred.

The Science Centers program also takes steps to guard against proliferation. After all, that’s the point of this assistance. We can be proud of the job that this program is doing to reduce the risk of proliferation of Russian materials and expertise.

When the GAO looked at Science Center biotechnology projects, they found that nearly half the recipients of project assistance were “former senior weapons scientists.” On the average, the scientists devoted more than half of the year to Science Center projects. Institute directors told the GAO that these projects “were crucial to their institute budgets.”

The GAO also reports:

Prior to the funding of any U.S. collaborative research project, institute officials must pledge that their institute will not perform offensive weapons research or engage in proliferation activities. According to a January 1999 State Department report, engaging in such inappropriate behavior would have an immediate and negative impact on any proposed project.

Institute officials with whom we met consistently told us that they are no longer involved in offensive biological weapons activities and that they clearly understand the conditions of U.S. collaborative research assistance.

The GAO report continues:

Officials at three institutes we visited reported that, in the past, representatives of countries of proliferation concern had approached them seeking to initiate questionable dual-use research. Officials at the three institutes told us they had refused these offers because of a pledge made to U.S. executive branch officials as a condition of receiving U.S. assistance.

The pledge includes avoiding cooperation both with countries of proliferation concern or with terrorists. At every step, we are guarding against the diversion of funds. That in itself is a huge accomplishment.

A few days ago, a Senate committee passed the defense authorization bill, which contains the language that creates the science centers. The bill includes over $200 million for these programs. It also includes $25 million for a new program to keep Russian scientists employed.

When we talk about keeping these Russian scientists usefully employed, we’re guarding against the spread of nuclear weapons and dreaded plagues. We’re not talking about budget caps, but rather about life or death for millions of people.

Understand the need for efficient programs. But this program works. That GAO report did not need to make even one recommendation.

And when millions of lives are potentially at stake, we should do more than do less.

A third non-proliferation program is our contributions to KEDO, the Korean Energy Development Organization, pursuant to the Nuclear Framework Agreement with North Korea. Thanks to this agreement, North Korea has ceased reprocessing spent nuclear reactor fuel.

Indeed, recently the last of the spent nuclear fuel was safely canned, under IAEA supervision. That vastly lowers and North Korea’s ability to produce nuclear weapons.

The Nuclear Framework Agreement has also led North Korea to let U.S. experts visit an underground site that we feared might be a nuclear plant. Our two visits revealed that it was not a nuclear facility.

But there is a price for all these benefits, and part of that price is U.S. contributions of heavy fuel oil. Now, traditionally we have spent $35 million a year on that. But other countries have not helped out as much as we expected—although South Korea and Japan are spending much more than we are, to build new reactors in North Korea that will not be readily used for bomb-making. In addition, as we all know, fuel oil costs a lot more than it used to.

Appropriators have refused to allocate more than $35 million, however. Instead, last year, they kept this line at $35 million and added a separate, unallocated line of $20 million in the NADR account, which actually went to meet our KEDO obligations.

The bill before us again allocates only $35 million, but this time there is no additional line with $20 million.

This money keeps the Nuclear Framework Agreement on track. That agreement keeps North Korea from using a handy source of fissile material to make nuclear weapons. It also provides a bit of stability on the Korean peninsula, which has led to a suspension of North Korea’s long-range missile tests, to U.S.-North Korean negotiations on an end to those programs and to North Korea’s missile exports, and to the first summit ever between the leaders of North and South Korea.

Do we really want to put the Framework Agreement at risk, by failing to...
...mission will help us to get the publicly usable information that is so vital to putting a stop to any cheating.

The report on this bill states that in the past, the President has requested more than was needed for this program over the years. The executive branch asks for our share of the coming year's tentative budget, but we also work within the Preparatory Commission to scrub that budget, and it usually comes in a bit lower.

But does the bill really mean we can safely cut 30 percent? Not on your life! The final U.S. obligation might be $20 million, as opposed to the requested $21.5 million. But $15 million is simply out of the question. That would presume a $25 million cut in the Preparatory Commission budget proposed by their Secretariat, which would mean an intolerable delay in fielding the monitoring system.

There may be some confusion because this program has been able to absorb budget cuts in the past. In those previous years, the State Department was able to apply previous-year funds to make up for the cuts. Virtually all the Fiscal Year 2000 funds, however, have already been obligated. Thus, a cut in Fiscal Year 2001 funds will be much more harmful than were previous cuts.

The report also states that the Preparatory Commission should reimburse the United States for services we have performed in setting up monitoring systems. That, too, is true and we will be reimbursed. We will not be reimbursed, however, until the sites that we install have been certified as operational. That guards against shoddy work by other countries, and I don't think we can allow it.

Certification has been achieved for one U.S.-installed site, and we will get $500,000 in reimbursements in Fiscal Year 2001. That is already taken into account in the President's budget request, so we will be reimbursed. The budget for the Fiscal Year 2001 will be reimbursed in later years. Cutting the 2001 budget will jeopardize not only the work program for the monitoring system, but also any reimbursements for past or current work that depend upon achieving certification next year.

The bottom line is simple: either we pay for our share of nuclear test monitoring costs, or we delay significantly the work on a monitoring system that the United States has already spent $25 million for and which will be reimbursed in later years. Cutting the 2001 budget would jeopardize not only the program for the monitoring system, but also any reimbursements for past or current work. Such a budget could mean that we can sanction a violator, then we must pay our bills.

Non-proliferation programs were not the only ones to be cut in this portion of the bill before us. The Department of State's Anti-Terrorism Assistance program and its Terrorist Interdiction program are vital to the security of United States diplomatic and military personnel overseas.

The first two defense against attacks like those on our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, or on the Khobar Towers complex in Saudi Arabia, is not ours. Rather, it is the security services of the host countries. All over the world, those countries need our assistance in border control and airport security. They need our training in spotting terrorist groups hiding behind legitimate charities, and in handling terrorist incidents. The Anti-Terrorism Assistance program does all of this.

Right now, the Anti-Terrorism Assistance program trains up to 2,000 people per year. There is tremendous demand for our training that we could help 3,000 a year, if only we had the funds and the facilities. An increase in training funds would make a real contribution to our security.

The State Department also runs a Terrorist Interdiction Program—known as TIP—that provides other countries the training and equipment needed for them to apprehend terrorists entering their countries. The TIP also runs an Interpol program that enables countries to compare a person's travel documents to their own data-bases. It also works through INTERPOL to link those countries and promote information sharing. Finally, it trains immigration and customs officials how to interview and screen techniques.

The State Department recently began a program to provide these important capabilities to Pakistan. We all know about Pakistan, the gateway to Afghanistan for Osama bin Laden and his buddies. Can anybody think of a better place to beef up border security, so that terrorists can be apprehended as they go to and from those Afghan training camps?

The first phase of the TIP program in Pakistan will be paid out of Fiscal Year 2000 funds. But the bill for the second phase will come due in Fiscal Year 2001. So will the first phase of a program in Kenya, which we know all too well, has been used as a terrorist gateway to Africa, and site surveys in four more countries.

The proposed budget cut in the bill before us would force us to choose between Pakistan and Kenya. It is simply contrary to our national interest to force such a Hobson's choice.

These two anti-terrorism programs are utterly vital to our security. They make foreign security services more competent in protecting our own personnel and property. They also serve to prevent an attack that can be crucial in a crisis. We should be increasing these programs, and the President's proposed budget would do just that.

The bill before us would cut 22 percent of the funds requested. It would impose a 7-percent cut from this year's funding for these two anti-terrorism programs. This is simply unacceptable.

Finally, the Department of State's Small Arms program has underwritten successful arms buy-backs in Africa, notably in Mali. This is a low-budget program is urgently needed in areas that are emerging from civil war and still awash in automatic weapons. A...
little bit of support can go a long way to drain the supply of arms that other- 
wise end up going to drug-runners, ban-
dit gangs, or renewed civil strife.

The President proposed $2 million for 
this program. The bill before us would 
slice away half of that. This is, indeed, 
a low-budget program, but $2 million is 
really the floor for a workable pro-
to take away half of that is to 
throw this effort into the basement.

The bill before us, Mr. President, 
leaves the Senate in a nearly untenable 
position. It is under the budget request 
by fully $1.7 billion. This is no way to 
fulfill our obligations to world organi-
izations or to maintain either inter-
national influence of our own national 
security. We must accept that there is 
no such thing as world leadership on 
the cheap.

I deeply wish that I could restore the 
funds that this bill cuts from the 
NADR account. The truth is, however, 
that we must wait for conferees to 
break the ridiculous cap on this whole 

With that in mind, the amendment 
that I am introducing simply states 
the sense of the Senate that the con-
feres should find the funds needed to 
make NADR whole.

We know the problem through this drill 
before. In due course, more funds for for-
eign operations will be found. The cru-

cial question is how the conferees will 
allocate those funds. This amendment 
calls on the conferees to give priority 
to these important national security 
efforts.

I am pleased to report that this 
amendment is co-sponsored by Sena-

tors LUGAR, HAGEL, BINGAMAN, 
CONRAD, DOMENICI and LEVIN. I urge all 
of my colleagues to support it.

This amendment is not certain to 
succeed in conference—but it surely is 
the least we can do. The safety of our 
diplomats and military personnel over-
seas, the safety of all of us from the 
proliferation of weapons of mass 
destruction, demand no less.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the 
Senate is now considering S. 2522, the 
foreign operations and export financing 

The Senate bill provides $13.4 billion in 
budget authority and $4.5 billion in 
new outlays to operate the programs of the 
Department of State, export and 
military assistance, bilateral and mul-
tilateral economic assistance, and re-
lated agencies for fiscal year 2001.

When outlays from prior year budget 
authority and other completed actions 
are taken into account, the bill totals 
$13.4 billion in budget authority and 

The subcommittee is below its sec-
tion 302(b) allocation for budget au-
thority and at its section 302(b) allo-
cation for outlays.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent that a table displaying the budget 
committee scoring of this bill be print-
ed in the RECORD.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate-reported bill:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate 302(b) allocation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 level:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate-Reported Bill Compared To:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate 302(b) allocation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions. Prepared by SBC Majority Staff, May 19, 2000.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I urge adoption of this bill.

METHAMPHETAMINE LAB 
CLEANUP/CHILD SOLDIERS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wanted 
to briefly discuss two important privi-
sions regarding child soldiers and 
methamphetamine lab cleanup that are 
included in this supplemental spending 
package in the Foreign Operations bill 
before us.

A couple of years ago, Iowa and many 
states in the Midwest, West and South-
west have been working hard to reduce 
the sale and abuse of methamphetamine. 

But meth has brought another problem 
that we must address: highly toxic labs 
that are included in this supplemental 
spending package in the Foreign Operations bill 
before us.

Over the years, Iowa and many states 
in the Midwest, West and Southwest 
that we must address: highly toxic labs 
that are included in this supplemental 
spending package in the Foreign Operations bill 
before us.

Last month, the DEA was running 
that it can cost thousands of 
dollars to clean up a single lab. Fortu-
nately, in recent years, the Drug En-
facement Agency has provided critical 
funds to help clean up these dangerous 

However, last year, the DEA funding 
cut in half, despite evidence that 
more and more meth labs have been 
found and confiscated. Because of these 
cuts, in March, the DEA completely 
racked out of funding to provide meth 
lab cleanup assistance to state and local 

last month, the Administration 
shifted $5 million in funds from other 
Department of Justice Accounts to pay 
for emergency meth lab cleanup. This 
action will help reimburse these states 
for the costs they have incurred since 
the DEA ran out of money. My state 
of Iowa has already paid some $300,000 
out of its own pocket for clean up since 
March.

However, we’ve got another five 
months to go before the new fiscal 
year—and the number of meth labs 
being found and confiscated is still on 
the rise.

The bill before us contains $10 mil-

Mr. President, the Appropriations 
Committee also adopted an amendment 
before us to provide additional provision 
the Colombia package to address one of the most alarming aspects of the drug conflict in Colombia—the use of child soldiers.

Human Rights Watch estimates that 
as many as 19,000 youths—some 
as young as eight—are being used by the 
Colombian armed forces, paramilitary 
groups and guerrilla forces. Up to 50 
percent of some paramilitary units and 
up to 80 percent of some guerrilla units 
are used as combatants, guides, and in-
formants. They are forced to collect 
intelligence, deploy land mines, and 
serve as advance shock forces in 
ambushes. Guerrillas often refer to 
them as “little bees,” because they 
stoop before their targets realize they 
are under attack.

These children are forced to carry 
arms and are enticed by false promises of 
security to their families. They are 
often tortured, drugged, sexually 
abused, and permanently traumatized 
by the horror and brutality of war. 
Children who are targeted into soldiers 
lose their childhood; they lose their 
innocence and their youth. They 
become instruments of de-
struction and atrocity. And the longer 
they remain under arms, the harder it 
is for them to heal and return to any 
sim semblance of a normal life.

The use of the funds included in the 
supplemental for Colombia are in-
tended to support judicial reform, 
human rights protection and peace ne-
gotiations. Indeed, protecting human 
rights is central to the overall success of Plan Colombia. The 
use of child soldiers is a serious human 
rights abuse prohibited by numerous 
international treaties and conventions, 
including ILO Convention 182 on the 
Elimination of the Worst Forms of 
Child Labor—and by the Colombian 
government itself. The International 
Criminal Court makes the recruitment 
or use of children under age 15 in mili-
tary activities a war crime. I can think 
of no better use for these funds than to 
assist the demobilization and rehabili-
tation of child soldiers.

The current generation of children 
in Colombia is the fourth generation 
to grow up surrounded by conflict. The $5 
million in the House’s portion of the 
Colombia package will help some of 
Colombia’s children regain their funda-
mental right to life and peace. The 
money will be used by NGOs working 
to provide humanitarian assistance to 
affected children and their families. 

These NGOs will support programs 
providing counseling, education and re-
integration services to former child
solders; safe houses for escaped child soldiers; and public awareness and recruitment-prevention campaigns. Although $5 million represents less than one-third of 1 percent of the total supplemental funds for Colombia, this money may be the most well-spent of all.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I’ve worked to enact foreign aid bills that reflect our national interests and our values. While I supported the foreign operations appropriations bill, I do have some serious concerns that I hope will be addressed during conference.

I am pleased that the foreign operations bill provides assistance to Israel, Cyprus and Armenia. I believe that its important that we stand by these friends as they make the difficult steps toward peace. I am also pleased that we support bilateral population assistance and support for micro-enterprise programs, programs so vital in helping the world’s poorest people to help themselves.

I am disappointed that the bill does not provide sufficient assistance in other crucial areas, such as adequate flood assistance to Mozambique and the Administration’s full funding request for debt relief.

In addition, although I am pleased with the human rights requirements included in the Colombia aid package attached to the legislation, I have grave reservations about the large military aid package to Colombia.

Colombia has been suffering through a civil war for over thirty years. Over 35,000 Colombians have been killed in the last decade. In recent years, this civil war has been exacerbated by the illegal production and trade of drugs coming out of Colombia—primarily cocaine and heroin. Most of these drugs wind up in the United States and contribute to America’s growing drug problem. It is clear that the United States has to help Colombia deal with this volatile situation.

It is also clear that we have to do more to stop the growing demand and dependence on drugs in our own country. In my own hometown of Baltimore—out of a population of 600,000–600,000 people are addicted to heroin or cocaine. These individuals not only wreck their own lives but they also have a negative impact on the city—drug-related crimes are now at $2 to $3 billion a year. Drugs destroy individuals, families and communities. That’s why I’ve always fought for anti-drug education, increased drug treatment programs and strong law enforcement.

I am not convinced that the military aid provided to Colombia included in this bill is the best way to fight drugs in the United States.

First of all, I’m concerned that we’re getting dragged into the civil war in Colombia. I am also concerned that there is no clear exit strategy. The aid package is open-ended. The Administration has admitted that this “two-year” package is really expected to run longer—more like five or six years. An open-ended commitment could turn into a quagmire.

I believe the best way to help Colombia is by supporting its peace process through our assistance. The package before us is not at all balanced. Over 75% of this package is in military arms, equipment and training. Only a small fraction of the aid helps to fund economic alternatives to drug production, to fight the large number of Colombians who will be displaced by this assistance or to address the deeper social problems that have led to Colombia’s increasing reliance on drug production and cultivation in the first place.

These funds would be better spent combating the drug problem in the United States. More funding and support is badly needed for drug treatment and prevention programs in our own country. That is why I supported Senator Grassley and I introduced an assistance package, the Alianza Act, though fell short in the Senate.

I am pleased that the foreign operations bill provides assistance to Colombia and drug supply in the United States. By keeping this goal in mind, we can evaluate and devise the best method for combating the war against drugs in the United States which, after all, is the ultimate aim of this bill.

As the strongest nation on earth, and the world’s strongest democracy, our foreign aid must be used to promote peace, stability and human rights. As a member of the Foreign Operations Conference Committee, I will work to ensure that the final legislation supports these goals and represents our national interests and our values.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I think that a brief chronology of events regarding U.S. efforts to provide assistance to Colombia would be instructive. For years, the Administration has neglected the growing narcotics crisis in the Andean Region. Funding for international interdiction declined rapidly under the Clinton Administration. For example, international counter-narcotic funding dropped 56% from 1992 to 1996. Also Department of Defense air assets for counter-narcotics were slashed 68% from 1992-1999. As a result, drug production abroad and drug usage at home increased dramatically. The statistics are devastating. From 1992 to 1999, for example, cocaine use among 10th graders increased 133%.

Republicans have long argued for a renewed and balanced U.S. counter-drug strategy; the 1980s showed that eradicating and interdicting illegal drugs outside our borders is a necessary part of a successful drug strategy that also includes strong investments in demand reduction and domestic law enforcement.

The Colombia crisis emerged as an international crisis last spring, 1999. I had the opportunity to travel to Colombia in August of 1999 to see the drug-fueled crisis first-hand. Upon my return, Senator Grassley and I introduced an assistance package, the Alianza Act, in October of 1999. The Alianza Act authorized $1.6 billion over 3 years to support anti-drug efforts, the rule of law, human rights, and the peace process in Colombia and neighboring countries. This was, in my view, a balanced and comprehensive approach to the crisis in Colombia.

Unfortunately, the Administration was nowhere to be seen. Except for several Administration envoys who arrived to Bogota empty-handed, the White House did little. Finally, after months of delay, in January 2000 the White House announced a response to Plan Colombia, though failed to provide details until early February. The Administration plan largely mirrored the Alianza Act, though fell short in two critical areas; it failed to take a truly regional approach by providing support to other countries in the Andean region and it also failed to adequately provide for our front-line law enforcement agencies such as the Customs Service and the Coast Guard.
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In March, the House passed a $13 billion Supplemental Package, which included $1.7 billion for Colombia. The Colombia portion is a good bill that rectifies many of the shortcomings in the Administration's proposal. Then in May, the Senate Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee marked up its bill, which included almost $1 billion for Colombia (the Micron Appropriations Subcommittee also marked up more than $300 million for Colombia as well).

I strongly urge passage of this assistance. There is no doubt that the crisis in Colombia is an emergency that directly affects our national security and threatens to destabilize the entire Andean region. While we may not all agree on every detail of this package, immediate passage of counter-narcotics assistance is crucial to reduce the flow of drugs onto our streets and to bring stability to the Andean region. The true emergency in Colombia involves the United States' national security and its relationship with the country of Colombia to fight the drug crisis.

There is no doubt that the crisis in Colombia is an emergency that directly affects our national security and threatens to destabilize the entire Andean region. While we may not all agree on every detail of this package, immediate passage of counter-narcotics assistance is crucial to reduce the flow of drugs onto our streets and to bring stability to the Andean region. The true emergency in Colombia involves the United States' national security and its relationship with the country of Colombia to fight the drug crisis.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. REED. I am happy to yield.

Now, where have I left my amendment on the list? I would like to call this amendment up tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that I may be authorized to call up one of my amendments on the list tomorrow.

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

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise in support of the underlying legislation that would provide support for the country of Colombia to fight the drug problem which not only involves Colombia but involves the United States very definitely and directly.

I urge Senators MCCONNELL and colleagues who drafted this legislative vehicle to assist Colombia.

Part of my discussion tonight is based upon a trip last weekend that I took with Senator Durbin to Colombia. We had the opportunity to travel to Cartagena to meet with President Pastrana and his key national security advisers. We also traveled to Bogota to meet with the Defense Minister and the chairman of their joint chiefs of staff.

But, most importantly, we traveled out to where the military forces are being deployed to counteract this drug problem, to the town of Laranda. It is not really a town; it is a base camp. It is a forward post for the Colombians to conduct these counterdrug operations.

One of the first impressions you get when you travel to Colombia and leaf through the materials provided by the Embassy is that this country has a long history of violence—of violence. As, the Colombians say, La Violencia.

In fact, according to the Embassy, there is one kidnapping every 5 hours in Colombia. And 75 percent of the world's reported kidnappings occur in Colombia. The Embassy points out that Bogota is the murder capital of the world. In a city of 7 million people, there are 16 murders a day and 6,000 murders a year.

This is a country that has been wracked by political and criminal violence for many decades. The political violence began with some presence back in 1940s when elements of what later became the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party literally battled for control of the country. This lasted until 1957, when both parties agreed to form a national front.

There was a period from 1958 until 1974 in which both parties literally transferred power each 4 years from one president to another, and there was a semblance of stability in the country. But certainly by the 1960s, there was renewed agitation by guerrilla forces, principally Marxist and nationalist in nature, that was spectrums. The two principals were Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia, or FARC; and Ejercito de Liberacion Nacional, or ELN.

These forces, spurred on by the success of Castro in Cuba, made significant inroads in terms of establishing independent zones along with agitators who also fought for agrarian rights in the countryside.

In the 1960s, the Colombian military conducted a serious counterinsurgency operation. They were able to eliminate these zones. But in that time, they won themselves the infamous designation of being significant abusers of human rights. That reputation—both the perception and, unfortunately, reality—continues in the Colombian military today.

But by the end of the 1960s and the 1970s, they had effectively pushed the insurgency away from the populated centers of Colombia, which are the coastline and the Andean plains—into the jungles of the Amazon, in an area which is desolate, unpopulated, and, frankly, beyond the effective control of authorities in Bogota and elsewhere in Colombia.

But in the 1970s, the drug trade began to assert itself into the life of Colombians, first with the cultivation of marijuana. It took the Colombian police authority a while to recognize the threat to them as well as to others who had been corrupted by this industry.

Recognizing the problem, they began to organize themselves to conduct counterdrug operations in the police force—not the military.

Then, as we all know, marijuana was rapidly displaced in the world drug market by cocaine. The cocaine trade became a curse for Colombia.

Within Colombia infrastructure, the leadership of several major organizations—mainly the Medellin cartel and others—set up their headquarters in Colombia and began to run worldwide operations. Most of the production was done outside in the surrounding Andean country. This map is a recent example of cultivation areas—the cultivation areas in Peru, Bolivia, which have been very successful with eradication, and here is Colombia. Cultivation was typically outside Colombia. Within Colombia, clandestine laboratories to convert the coca leaf into cocaine base and later cocaine. From the 1970s and through the 1980s, there was a fabulously powerful and wealthy criminal combination that was destabilizing Colombia.

The United States did not stand aside when this situation developed. The United States supported the Colombian police and insisted that the Colombian police reform them to throw out those who had been corrupted by the narcotraffickers. With cooperation, and with the leadership of the Colombian police and with the bravery and the sacrifice of scores of Colombian police, they defeated the Medellin cartel was disrupted.

What has happened recently has been the cultivation of coca. As a result, the FARC—and other guerilla forces—has been enlisted in the support and protection of the coca fields. They are deriving great resources in doing that. They are deriving resources to support their political activities.

Coca production has now been linked with armed militarized guerrilla warfare. The police are no longer capable with their equipment and their technology to deal with this. This has become a military problem. As a result, we are in a military problem that requires military support of the United States, just as it required police support in the 1980s and the early 1990s.

Part of the reason the cultivation has come to Colombia is the fact that we have been successful. As indicated by the police, it was in the late 1970s that production surged dramatically. It has surged where in other places the production has been cut back. Both in Bolivia and in Peru, we have made significant progress again working with local authorities. We have realized that the utilization of their counter-narcotics organizations and we have been able to suppress the cultivation of coca. What has been suppressed in Peru and Bolivia has now been transferred to the southern provinces of Colombia. Again, this combination of coca production and guerrillas has produced a military crisis as well as a drug crisis.
I have heard colleagues come to the floor and talk about the situation, saying: This is Colombia's problem, not our problem.

Mr. President, the streets of America are also the battlegrounds for this problem. The problem of the eradication of the production of cocaine is felt—as too many Americans are subject to the ravages of cocaine addiction.

This chart demonstrates what we are talking about. As I mentioned before, Peru has shown a 21 percent reduction in cultivation; Bolivia, a 53 percent reduction in cultivation; Colombia, production has increased and will increase unabated unless we do something.

The bottom line is, from all these sources, but increasingly from Colombia, 512 metric tons a year of cocaine is directed to the United States. About 380 metric tons arrive, get through our border checkpoints, get around our intense efforts to stop it, and hit the streets of America.

In a real sense, Colombia's problem is our problem and our problem is Colombia's problem. It is the huge demand of the United States which is causing some of this instability in Colombia. So we must be a rather strong national security interest in assisting Colombian forces to do the job we insist they do, which is to stop cocaine production and distribution emanating from Colombia. It is important to note we have a situation where, without security in the regions where the production is significant, the Colombian forces help us by curtailing supply, so it does not arrive on the streets of America.

The proposal that is included in the legislation before the Senate, Plan Colombia, has been carefully worked out. It's focus is counternarcotics—not the political insurgencies that have washed back and forth across Colombia for decades. It represents the recognition by our Government and the Government of Colombia, first, that there is a significant problem in Colombia that directly affects the tranquility of peace and the security of the United States. Second, I believe it also recognizes the competence of the Colombian authorities to fight the good fight.

Again, as I indicated, it was Colombian police officials working with the United States and other international narcotics control officers that went a long way to destroy the Cali cartel and the Medellin cartel. Now this is a new phase in Colombia that directly affects the tranquility and the security of our country.

Mr. President, as I mentioned, Plan Colombia is a reaction to the recognition of a crisis. It is also proposed as a result of the confidence that has been demonstrated in the Government of Colombia, their sincere dedication to try to eradicate their own problem with drug and also to represent, I think, and based upon my trip, a sense of a reasonable prospect for success because of their commitment and also because of the nature of the problem we face.

Plan Colombia has many different aspects. First, it focuses on not only military operations. It focuses on the peace process, which is ongoing in Colombia. President Pastrana, when he was elected, was elected on a plank that called for sincere and serious negotiations with the guerrilla forces. He has instigated such negotiations. In fact, what has happened in Colombia is that he had dedicated an army, a demilitarized zone, approved by the United States, in the hinterlands of Colombia, which is a DMZ area, controlled by FARC, the principle guerrilla group. This peace process is important.

This plan is also an attempt to provide alternate development efforts for the peasants and the cultivators in a region where coca was being cultivated. This plan calls not only for military operations but also calls for heightened sensitivity to peace, a commitment to the reintroduction of economic development. The United States share is just a fraction of what the Colombian Government has committed to this effort for economic development and for ways to have alternatives to the coca cultivation.

Also, and quite rightly, the plan calls for reform of the justice system and protection of human rights, because, frankly, one of the most feeble institutions within Colombia, and this applies to many of their problems, is the justice system and the penal system that is not responsive to efficient, fair, and appropriate justice. Here, too, Plan Colombia, will call for a reform and renewal of those institutions, which are so important.

Then part of it, of course, is a military component. Without security in these areas, in these areas we have talked about—without security in these areas, there will be no way in which we can conduct our economic development and provide the kind of economic development and alternative development that is necessary for long-term stability.

Here is another map that focuses clearly on Colombia alone. Here are the regions where the production is significant, Putumayo and Caqueta, these provinces. Here in the pink is the zone controlled by FARC. You can see it really is in between major production areas.

In order to get into these areas, in order to provide the kind of economic development that is necessary, there has to be, first, security, and, because of the nature of the area, combatants in the area, that calls for military assistance.

This is a big part but not the only part of Plan Colombia. Within the context of the bill, which are basically two significant components militarily: first, the training of counternarcotics troops, and, second, the provision of helicopters for their mobility, because without helicopters you really cannot be effective in this region.

The training has already been finished for the 1st Battalion and they are in Tres Esquinas. The 2nd Battalion is up here in Laranda. They are awaiting our approval. The American forces and troops can conduct the training. Without helicopters, however, none of these trained troops can effectively get to where the cultivation is taking place, where the clandestine laboratories are located. That is why we must go in order to upset and defeat the drug lords in this part of Colombia. So it is very critical. We move today with dispatch with this legislation, and move forward to allow the military plan to go forward as well as to provide the basis for later alternative development.

Many legitimate concerns have been raised with respect to the program that is being presented within this legislation. First of significance, one we should all be very concerned about, is the respect for human rights. Those want to be involved in an operation that is not going to emphasize the appropriate treatment of human rights, not only because that is the right thing to do but because in the long run that is the most effective way to get any type of support for drug eradication and to build respect for the legitimate institutions of government in Colombia.

We are aided in this effort by provisions that have already been included under the direction of Senator LEAHY. Essentially, under the Leahy provisions, units that receive assistance and training from the United States cannot receive that training unless an individual who faces any type of credible human rights violation has either been removed or appropriate justice has been rendered to that individual. In a practical sense, this means all the troops who are going to be trained are vetted for human rights abuses. And all of them must pass.

Also, the Minister of Defense of Colombia must, every 6 months, report on the process of bringing to justice those individuals who have been accused of human rights violations. As of today, both of the counternarcotics battalions have been vetted—the 1st Battalion and the 2nd Battalion. Also, other units of the Colombian Army have been vetted. In order to receive our training, these units must receive this vetting. And it has already had a positive effect. But rest assured, this is a constant struggle and we must insist and ensure that this human rights perspective is one that is not lost in our efforts to aid Colombia.

There is another point that I think is important to make. There have been many suggestions that the greatest human rights violation that the Colombian Army engages in is passive neglect of the innocent. Special forces, self-defense forces, or paramilitaries as they are called—they are the perception that they are really in cahoots with vigilante groups that are
One example of that is this particular section of last week’s major paper in Bogota, Colombia. This is an advertisement that was taken out by the military. Essentially it says that 785 families will not celebrate Father’s Day. There is an admission of the violence in Colombia. But I think it is significant to note that they clearly point out the violence that is the result of guerrilla, leftist activity, and the violence that is the result of what they determine are “autodefensas,” miltias, self-defense forces. This is a result, I believe, also based on my conversations, that the military authorities in Colombia are getting the message. They are getting the message that there is no way we will tolerate alliances with paramilitary forces who are trying to subvert our emphasis on human rights. I think this is discouraging, in the sense that it is a terrible litany of lost souls, but it is also important to note that at least the military is addressing the issue in an evenhanded way, the violence that both sides are doing to the fabric of peace in Colombia.

There is a situation here on human rights which is serious and in which the military must address the issue in terms of training, in terms of equipment, but not our troops. They recognize they must do that themselves. Also, their history suggests they have in the past done precisely that. They wanted our training for their police, in terms of intelligence, in terms of equipment, reports for their police, but they went after the cartels themselves. It was their responsibility. They carried it out successfully.

The other difference between Vietnam and the situation in Colombia is that our focus is on drugs. Our focus is on supporting Colombian military authorities to provide the security so that police authorities can destroy labs and destroy coca fields. That is a lot different from trying to win the hearts and minds, to win the political allegiance of a population, as we were by default forced to attempt in Vietnam.

Winning the political allegiance of the people of Colombia is strictly and must be the responsibility only of the Colombian Government. That is why President Pastrana’s peace plan represents a sincere effort to do just that. It is their plan, their peace plan. Our effort should rightfully be restricted, and is restricted, to the war on drugs.

Our role is also limited operationally because, as I mentioned before, we are providing equipment, we are providing trainers, and we are providing intelligence related only to counternarcotics operations. Again, this is very similar to what we did with the Colombian national police in their successful effort to destroy the cartel. One cannot totally dismiss history. I believe we have to be very careful and cautious so that these steps—appropriate steps and limited steps—do not lead to something more. Part of this debate then should be to not only reassure the American public that what we are doing is appropriate, but also that we will not be drawn into something else. Any commitment we make to Colombia will be limited and will strictly be a function of their capacity and their willingness to fight their own fight and not unwittingly involve Americans directly in that fight.

There are some other differences between Colombia and those who suggest the Vietnam analogy. First of all, this is an insurgency without any significant external support. They are trying to impose Castro as a potent revolutionary force in Latin America, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, this is not a situation where there are indigenous forces supported by outside powers. In Vietnam for the left and the paramilitary on the right are deriving is from their participation in the drug trade. There is no great popular support abroad for the leftist or for the rightist forces who are guerrillas or paramilitaries. Public opinion polls suggest they have very limited appeal.

Colombia is a country with strong democratic traditions. It has regular elections. Power transfers peacefully. It is a market economy, until recently a market economy that did very well. All of these reasons all of which we should be watchful, but the analogy to Vietnam at this juncture fails.

Let’s also look ahead. There are consequences to our operations in Colombia. First of all, if there is success in Colombia, we should not be surprised that the level of violence will increase because there are some guerrillas and paramilitary forces depend upon support from somewhere. If they cannot sell drugs—we hope they will not be able to sell drugs—they will return to their old ways—kidnapping, extortion, et cetera. We have to recognize, ironically, if the drug war is successful, we must see escalating levels of violence.

The Colombians recognize that, but they are still willing to pay the price, fight the fight, and destroy narcotics. We have to recognize the armed opponents, FARC and others, are well off. They will resist probably, and they will resist with sophisticated weapons and technology they have acquired through their contributions to their drug tactics.

There is another consequence that might develop if this plan is approved and funds provided to Colombia. That is, if these guerrilla and paramilitary units are deprived of their resources from the drug trade, they continue their operations, there will, I think, be more pressure for the peace settlement, more willingness on the part of these combatants to come to the table and try to work out an arrangement so that decision in Colombia are decided peacefully and not through armed conflict, as it has been so long and so often in that country.

There is another aspect, of course, that would be very helpful to the peace settlements there, and that would be whether the United States could support its voracious appetite for cocaine. That would go a long way to assist Colombia in being more peaceful and tranquil society.
So all of our efforts, not only to disrupt production in Colombia and elsewhere, but also to suppress demand here in the United States would, I think, be helpful.

But this particular plan, if it works---and I acknowledge the probability that it will work---could materially and, I hope, effectively lead to sincere and renewed peace discussions within Colombia.

There is also a consequence for failure or to fail to approve the resources or if the plan fails for other reasons. At least one result would be that President Pastrana, and his government, in the middle of the process, would likely also fail. That could lead to several consequences.

First, he could be replaced by someone who is less amenable to the peace process. Given the tides of violence in Colombia, there could be a resurgence or the surfacing of an authoritarian figure who would be much less sensitive to a peace process.

Another possibility would be a recurrence of what happened in a previous administration under President Samper, where, effectively, the President of Colombia was subverted by narco-terrorism, drug money, and the country was close to falling under the sway of narcotics dealers rather than the elected representatives of the people of Colombia. So there are consequences with which we must wrestle.

All in all, our most promising option is to support this bill and support Plan Colombia. To do nothing renders a severe psychological blow to the people of Colombia and to the administration of President Pastrana, who is committed not only to fighting the drug war, but also waging a peace process in negotiations with the insurgents.

I think we ultimately have to conclude that our best course of action is to provide the kind of support that is outlined in this legislation. Support that goes to the military aspects that have been created by the collision of the cocaine cultivation in the hinterlands, where armed bands roam and derive profit from coca production, together with a balanced approach that emphasizes economic development, particularly alternative development for the campesinos, the peasants, that strengthens the governance of Colombia, with particular emphasis on the judicial system and the penal system.

This comprehensive approach, representing about $1.6 billion in American resources, about $4 billion of Colombian resources, and hopefully contributions from other countries around the world, is, I believe, at this point the best hope of significantly undercutting drug production in Colombia, reducing the flow of cocaine into the United States, making our streets safer, and giving Colombia a chance to move to a peaceful, stable, civil society, which has alluded them for many years.

With that, Mr. President, I conclude my remarks.

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.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I think we all agree how important it is for our country's peace and for our Congress to consider the history of our nation and how the events of the past have helped to shape our country today and will continue to shape it in the future.

On August 3, 1949, Congress designated June 14 as Flag Day. Last week, a Dallas Morning News editorial reminded us of the origins and meaning of this national day of commemoration. Flag Day was established to ensure that each year on that day we recall our nation's proud history and its ideals as symbols of freedom and democracy to our citizens and to people around the world fighting for justice. I was much surprised to discover that this editorial, written with great wisdom and eloquence, was penned by Elizabeth McGarr, an intern at the Dallas Morning News in her first week with the newspaper.

America is a diverse and culturally rich country, but as Elizabeth points out in her editorial, we are all able to celebrate and to celebrate our commitment to the ideals embodied in the Declaration of Independence: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Elizabeth, who has just graduated from the Hockaday School in Dallas and will attend the University of Texas in the fall, is an outstanding role model for our citizens and to people around the world fighting for justice.

That could lead to several consequences.

First, he could be replaced by someone who is less amenable to the peace process. Given the tides of violence in Colombia, there could be a resurgence or the surfacing of an authoritarian figure who would be much less sensitive to a peace process.

Another possibility would be a recurrence of what happened in a previous administration under President Samper, where, effectively, the President of Colombia was subverted by narco-terrorism, drug money, and the country was close to falling under the sway of narcotics dealers rather than the elected representatives of the people of Colombia. So there are consequences with which we must wrestle.

All in all, our most promising option is to support this bill and support Plan Colombia. To do nothing renders a severe psychological blow to the people of Colombia and to the administration of President Pastrana, who is committed not only to fighting the drug war, but also waging a peace process in negotiations with the insurgents.

I think we ultimately have to conclude that our best course of action is to provide the kind of support that is outlined in this legislation. Support that goes to the military aspects that have been created by the collision of the cocaine cultivation in the hinterlands, where armed bands roam and derive profit from coca production, together with a balanced approach that emphasizes economic development, particularly alternative development for the campesinos, the peasants, that strengthens the governance of Colombia, with particular emphasis on the judicial system and the penal system.

This comprehensive approach, representing about $1.6 billion in American resources, about $4 billion of Colombian resources, and hopefully contributions from other countries around the world, is, I believe, at this point the best hope of significantly undercutting drug production in Colombia, reducing the flow of cocaine into the United States, making our streets safer, and giving Colombia a chance to move to a peaceful, stable, civil society, which has alluded them for many years.

With that, Mr. President, I conclude my remarks.

HonORING ELIZABETH McGARR

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I think we all agree how important it is for our country's peace and for our Congress to consider the history of our nation and how the events of the past have helped to shape our country today and will continue to shape it in the future.

On August 3, 1949, Congress designated June 14 as Flag Day. Last week, a Dallas Morning News editorial reminded us of the origins and meaning of this national day of commemoration. Flag Day was established to ensure that each year on that day we recall our nation's proud history and its ideals as symbols of freedom and democracy to our citizens and to people around the world fighting for justice. I was much surprised to discover that this editorial, written with great wisdom and eloquence, was penned by Elizabeth McGarr, an intern at the Dallas Morning News in her first week with the newspaper.

America is a diverse and culturally rich country, but as Elizabeth points out in her editorial, we are all able to celebrate and to celebrate our commitment to the ideals embodied in the Declaration of Independence: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Elizabeth, who has just graduated from the Hockaday School in Dallas and will attend the University of Texas in the fall, is an outstanding role model for our citizens and to people around the world fighting for justice. I was much surprised to discover that this editorial, written with great wisdom and eloquence, was penned by Elizabeth McGarr, an intern at the Dallas Morning News in her first week with the newspaper.

America is a diverse and culturally rich country, but as Elizabeth points out in her editorial, we are all able to celebrate and to celebrate our commitment to the ideals embodied in the Declaration of Independence: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Elizabeth, who has just graduated from the Hockaday School in Dallas and will attend the University of Texas in the fall, is an outstanding role model for our citizens and to people around the world fighting for justice.

That could lead to several consequences.

First, he could be replaced by someone who is less amenable to the peace process. Given the tides of violence in Colombia, there could be a resurgence or the surfacing of an authoritarian figure who would be much less sensitive to a peace process.

Another possibility would be a recurrence of what happened in a previous administration under President Samper, where, effectively, the President of Colombia was subverted by narco-terrorism, drug money, and the country was close to falling under the sway of narcotics dealers rather than the elected representatives of the people of Colombia. So there are consequences with which we must wrestle.

All in all, our most promising option is to support this bill and support Plan Colombia. To do nothing renders a severe psychological blow to the people of Colombia and to the administration of President Pastrana, who is committed not only to fighting the drug war, but also waging a peace process in negotiations with the insurgents.

I think we ultimately have to conclude that our best course of action is to provide the kind of support that is outlined in this legislation. Support that goes to the military aspects that have been created by the collision of the cocaine cultivation in the hinterlands, where armed bands roam and derive profit from coca production, together with a balanced approach that emphasizes economic development, particularly alternative development for the campesinos, the peasants, that strengthens the governance of Colombia, with particular emphasis on the judicial system and the penal system.

This comprehensive approach, representing about $1.6 billion in American resources, about $4 billion of Colombian resources, and hopefully contributions from other countries around the world, is, I believe, at this point the best hope of significantly undercutting drug production in Colombia, reducing the flow of cocaine into the United States, making our streets safer, and giving Colombia a chance to move to a peaceful, stable, civil society, which has alluded them for many years.

With that, Mr. President, I conclude my remarks.
As with the Kennedy Amendment, the Hatch Amendment gives statutory credence to creating a special class of protections for crimes committed against a behavior driven lifestyle. To place sexual orientation on par with race, color, gender, religion, and national origin is simply a terrible precedent for the Senate to be setting.

Before anyone accuses me of supporting violence directed against any particular person or group of persons, let me make it clear. I unequivocally oppose violence against anyone. Any crime of violence is a hate crime and should be punished to the fullest extent of the law.

I applaud the Senator from Utah’s efforts to provide what he sees as an alternative to what I think we would both agree is a worse piece of legislation. However, had I been present, I would have opposed his amendment.

While some may say that my NAY vote on the Hatch Amendment would have changed the outcome, the fact is this issue will be rewritten during conference.

KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 302

I would vote against the Kennedy amendment on hate crimes because I do not believe it is Constitutional, nor do I think it is good policy.

As with the Hatch Amendment, to place sexual orientation on an equal level with race, color, gender, religion, and national origin is wrong.

Again, I unequivocally oppose violence against anyone. Any crime of violence is a hate crime and must be punished to the fullest extent of the law.

As a conferee on the Department of Defense Authorization bill, I will work vigorously to drop this language from the bill.

HONORING THOSE WHO HAVE SERVED OUR NATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, Tony Snow wrote an editorial in the Washington Times. In this editorial, he captures the very essence of service to this Nation by those who have worn the uniform of our Nation throughout its history.

This weekend, I and others will be attending ceremonies in recognition of those who served in the Korean war. A few days ago, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Presiding Officer, I, and other Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives attended a magnificent ceremony in honor of those who served during the Korean war.

I was privileged to be in the Marine Corps and served in the 1st Marine Airwing for a brief period in Korea as a combat hospital officer. I have an indelible memory of the sacrifices of many others, those particularly, not myself included, who had to serve in a position in harm’s way and paid the ultimate price in life or in many cases in limb, and the suffering of their families.

Upon their return home, unlike World War II, in which I served a brief period towards the end, America did not welcome them with open arms. They were returned home from an operation of our military which was indecisive and inconclusive. Those wonderful veterans, these 50-some odd years, at long last deserve the recognition. I think Mr. Snow’s article captures it exceedingly well.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the article to which I referred.

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

[From the Washington Times, May 28, 2000]

(By Tony Snow)

On certain spring mornings, warm winds coax fog from the waters of the Potomac River. Clouds rise in wisps from the banks and march up nearby hillsides, sometimes as high as the quiet hills of Arlington National Cemetery.

At those times, the nation’s most famous burying ground takes on an ethereal look, its plain white grave markers rising not from earth, but cloud. And on these rare mornings, despite one cannot help but feel a sense of sacred awe, looking at the headstones, with the Potomac and the nation’s capital spread out below.

Most of those who rest here were of minor consequence as far as the history is concerned. They did not serve as presidents, or premiers, or executors of high office. They did not invent new machines or conquer disease. Many died before they were old enough to make an enduring mark on the world.

Yet, they all earned their place among generals and presidents because they did something few of us have done. They marched willingly into battle for the sake of our country.

This kind of heroism is becoming increasingly unfamiliar to us. We have not fought an all-out war in a quarter-century, and the nation has not united behind its military in more than 50 years. The draft expired long ago, and the bulk of our young no longer consider service as a career or even as an occupational way-station.

Furthermore, technology has brought us the possibility of “bloodless” wars, such as the kind of warless war in which we kill others from afar, while denying enemies the chance to kill our own. We no longer speak of “patriotic gore” or assume we pay for freedom with blood and treasure. For that reason, we don’t appreciate fully the lives and deaths of those we commemorate on Memorial Day.

But we owe to ourselves to try. The rows of markers at Arlington and other national cemeteries serve as stark reminders that evil lives and thrives in the world. Humans instituted and maintained slavery for centuries, and Americans tried to maintain discrimination through force of terror for nearly a century after the Civil War. Our fellow humans venerated such aloof killers as Josef Stalin—treating them as living gods and worshiping them as men of surprising vision and virtue.

It has become fashionable to talk about terms of good and evil. We like to pretend they are anteluvian categories that have given way to “subtle” distinctions—between justice and injustice, for instance, or between fairness or unfairness. But our own wooziness on matters of morality does not change the fact that good and evil exist—and that we should not crouch under the care of men and women who claim to be doing good.

The hills of Arlington attest to this. They tell us more. America became a superpower less than a century ago. We are relatively inexperienced at the business of winning peace. But we can learn a few lessons about how to avoid trouble. The most important is Teddy Roosevelt’s injunction that we carry a big stick.

Our military history teaches us an important lesson about such attitudes. When great powers refuse to keep up with the latest developments in technology, they fall. The best example of the phenomenon took place centuries ago, when Mongol hordes overran China. The attackers prevailed because they moved more swiftly and nimbly on the battlefields. They had adopted the very latest innovation—stirrups on saddles.

Memorial Day delivers an important lesson to those who will ignore it. We who are nations drop our guard or ignore the reality of evil, innocent people die. Nations endure crises and epidemics, but nothing sears the heart as much as war. If we want to avoid the necessity of building more Arlingtons, we should hear the testimony of those who revere there now: Walk softly. Carry a big stick. And never forget.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under Section 303(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for 1996.

This report examines the effects of congressional action on the budget through June 19, 2000. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 2001 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 290), which replaced the 2000 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 68).

The estimates show that current level spending is above the budget resolution by $2.3 billion in budget authority and by $6.8 billion in outlays. Current level spending is $28 billion below the revenue floor in 2000.

Since my last report, dated March 8, 2000, in addition to the changes in
We refer to the Congressional Record for this content.

**TABLE 1. FISCAL YEAR 2000 SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT, AS OF JUNE 19, 2000**

(In billions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Resolution</th>
<th>Current Level 1</th>
<th>Current Level 2 Under Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget authority</td>
<td>1,467.3</td>
<td>1,469.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>1,441.1</td>
<td>1,447.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>1,465.5</td>
<td>1,455.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Subject to Limit</td>
<td>5,628.3</td>
<td>5,558.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Outlays</td>
<td>326.5</td>
<td>326.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Revenues</td>
<td>479.6</td>
<td>479.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Current level is the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that the Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest information from the U.S. Treasury.

2 Equal less than $50 million.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

**TABLE 2. SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2000 SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES, AS OF JUNE 19, 2000**

(In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enacted in previous sessions:</th>
<th>Budget authority</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,465,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanents and other spending legislation</td>
<td>876,140</td>
<td>836,751</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation legislation</td>
<td>969,338</td>
<td>985,276</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting receipts</td>
<td>(284,184)</td>
<td>(284,184)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, enacted in previous sessions</td>
<td>1,461,274</td>
<td>1,442,274</td>
<td>1,465,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enacted this session:</th>
<th>Budget authority</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omnibus Parks Technical Corrections Act of 1999 (P.L. 106-170)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act (P.L. 106-181)</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Development Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-200)</td>
<td>834,184</td>
<td>843,751</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, enacted this session</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleared pending signature: Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (H.R. 2559)</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Level</td>
<td>1,461,274</td>
<td>1,442,274</td>
<td>1,465,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget Resolution</td>
<td>1,467,300</td>
<td>1,447,976</td>
<td>1,465,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level Over Budget Resolution</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>6,778</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level Under Budget Resolution</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Memorandum: Emergency designations for bills enacted this session. 0 0 0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: P.L. = Public Law, n.a. = not applicable.

**AGAINST AMNESTY FOR MILOSEVIC**

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to comment on an opinion piece in the June 20 edition of the Washington Post written by Mr. Milan Panic, former Prime Minister of Yugoslavia and an American citizen.

In this article, Mr. Panic argues for getting Russian President Putin to agree to offer Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic asylum, in a deal approved by the international community.

This is an appalling idea whose time, thank heavens, has not come. At least it would appear so, since it has been widely reported that at their recent summit meeting Putin told President Clinton that Miami seemed to be as good a place for Milosevic as Moscow.

President Putin may not be turning out to be a model democrat, but no one has accused him of being dumb. He obviously feels that having Milosevic enlivening the Moscow scene would not exactly burnish his own credentials. All kidding aside, the idea of blithely pronouncing all of our efforts in the former Yugoslavia over the last decade a hopeless failure and then letting the architect of the carnage skip off with his family to exile is both morally reprehensible and politically catastrophic. The international community has labored long and hard to set up the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in the Hague, and then to get it up and running.

Over the past year the number of individuals indicted for alleged war crimes in custody has risen dramatically. Why should we totally undercut the new, reformist government in Croatia, which has reversed the obstructionist course of the late strongman Tudjman and has begun cooperating with the Hague? If Milosevic is given a suspension of prosecution, then why shouldn’t all the Croats in custody get the same deal?

In arguing against undercutting the Hague Tribunal, I do not wish to imply that it has been a complete success. What is missing from the jail cells in the Hague, of course, are the really big fish—the chief villains of the massive slaughter in Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo.

I am, of course, talking about Radovan Karadzic, Ratko Mladic, and, above all, the boss of all bosses Slobodan Milosevic. That’s the point! To make this promising international effort work we need to do precisely the opposite from granting amnesty to public enemy number-one. We need to add him to the growing list of indicted suspects in detention.

The Panic op-ed argues that we won’t be able to capture Milosevic. In the short run, we probably won’t. But as
the vice tightens on Milosevic’s cronies and makes it clear to them that they will have absolutely no future in a Milosevic-run state, I think it may occur to them to serve Slobo up on a platter to the Hague.

We need to avoid not to make rash predictions about when Milosevic will fall, and I won’t fail into that trap today. But the signs of increasing discontent are everywhere—from the new student-run, grassroots resistance movement called Otpor to the rash of gangland style assassinations and assassination attempts among Milosevic’s retinue and allies.

So while I can’t say when Milosevic will fall, will he will. And it will be much better, both for Serbia and for the international community, if he falls as a result of pressure from his own people, rather than from some sor-did deal cooked up abroad.

In a larger sense, why should we nip a promising international judicial effort into the bud? And of course it shouldn’t be good clue as to why Milosevic so easily outmaneuvered him in 1993. Just as well be entitled ‘Enter Milosevic.’ It might be why the Serbs needed us to take the monkey off their back, and we’re sure that the other war criminals in the amnesty business. It’s just that the Serbs’ oft-noted passion for blaming others for their misfortunes has created. Why else would the Serbs needed us to take the monkey off their back? And for the Balkans right by way of shortcuts certainly isn’t one of them.

To have the United States as a melting pot, where diversity flourishes, is shat tered by news stories of hate related violence. Hate crimes are crimes of in tentional violence, in which a person’s civil rights are threatened because of prejudice. The Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999 clarifies that the defendant acted because of the victim’s race, religion, or ethnicity and because the victim was exercising a federally protected right, such as voting or attending public school, is too far constraining. Even the heinous dragging death of James Byrd, Jr. in Jasper, Texas did not qualify under current law as a federal hate crime. Never since the statute was enacted have there been more than 10 prosecutions for these hate-based crimes. However, the current law’s strictly dual intent requirement that the defendant acted because of the victim’s race, religion, or ethnicity and because the victim was exercising a federally protected right, such as voting or attending public school, is far too constraining. Even the heinous dragging death of James Byrd, Jr. in Jasper, Texas did not qualify under current law as a federal hate crime. Never since the statute was enacted have there been more than 10 prosecutions for hate crimes in a year.

The Smith-Kennedy amendment has two major components. First, it expands individuals covered by hate crime to include education, gender, and disability. Second, it eliminates constraints that make the current law ineffective. The federal government, with the approval of a state’s Attorney General, would be empowered to prosecute crimes that cause death or bodily injury “because of the actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, gender, or disability” of the victim. According to FBI statistics, in 1996, almost two thirds of the reported hate crimes were motivated by intention to race, while 12% were based on sexual orientation. It is important that protection from hate crimes be extended to all of America’s citizens.
The Supreme Court has already signaled the constitutionality of hate crime statutes. In Wisconsin v. Mitchell, the Supreme Court unanimously upheld the constitutional right of states to enact hate crimes statutes. I believe that it is now time for Congress to act.

Mr. President, I cosponsored the Hate Crimes Prevention Act because it was the right thing to do. The issue here is civil rights, and as a nation we went a long way in the last century toward assuring our civil rights. All Americans were not infringed upon. Let's start this new century with another step in the right direction.

LEAHY AMENDMENT ON FUNDING FOR TUBERCULOSIS AND MALARIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to be sure there is no misunderstanding about my purpose in offering this amendment. It is one which would reduce funding in the bill by a total of $21 million for programs to combat tuberculosis and malaria. The funding for these activities was included at my request, and I want to express my appreciation to Chairman MCCONNELL for that.

Like every Senator, I would like to see the highest possible levels of funding to combat these two dreaded diseases, which cause immeasurable suffering in developing countries. I have worked to do that for several years, and I fully intend to continue doing so. If our FY01 budget allocation would permit it, I would recommend higher funding for global health programs, including to combat TB and malaria.

However, we are forced to make excruciating choices. I want to be sure that we allocate our resources wisely, and that we also have sufficient resources to support vital programs to combat anti-microbial resistance, which is a worldwide problem of great urgency in its different proportions, and to strengthen disease surveillance in developing countries.

The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that in addition to providing increased funding above the current levels for programs to combat TB and malaria, we are also able to at least maintain, and preferably increase funding for anti-microbial resistance and surveillance. My hope is that effects of this amendment will only be temporary, that we will receive higher allocation in the Conference, and that we will then be able to provide higher levels of funding for all of these critically important health activities.

PLACING CHECHNYA ON THE AGENDA OF THE G-7 SUMMIT

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to once again draw attention to the continuing war in Chechnya and to urge the Administration to include Chechnya high on the agenda at next months G-7 summit.

Colleagues, last Wednesday I met with Mr. Il-yas AK-ma-dov who was here to present a peace proposal on behalf of the Chechen people. This peace proposal calls for the immediate introduction of a formal cease-fire, the formation of an international commission to investigate allegations of war crimes on both sides of the conflict, and the start of political negotiations through the mediation of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Mr. Ak-ma-dov relayed to me his serious concern at the desperation of the people in Chechnya, and noted that many of the recent suicide attacks we have heard about are a direct result of that desperation.

Mr. President, colleagues, we must seize every opportunity, including the upcoming G-7 summit, to continue to relay our serious concerns with the intransigence of the Russian Federation to acknowledge the concerns of the international community. The G-7 summit, which became the G-8 with the inclusion of the Russian Federation, is an association of democratic societies with advanced economies. Although Russia is not yet a liberal democracy or an advanced economy, it was invited to take part in this summit in encouragement of democratic evolution. Today, as we watch Russia continue to deny international human rights monitors access to Chechnya in defiance of the international community, I must question that evolution.

In February, my staff body passed Resolution 262 which called on President Putin to allow international monitors immediate, full, and unimpeded access into and around Chechnya to report on the situation there and to investigate alleged atrocities and war crimes. In March, the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly suspended the voting rights of Russia due to the large number of reports of human rights violations in Chechnya. And Mr. President, at the 56th Session of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights last March, the Commission harshly criticized the Russian military's behavior in Chechnya. The Commission approved a Resolution calling on the Russian government to establish a commission of inquiry into human rights abuses in Chechnya and mandating visits to Chechnya by U.N. special envoy on torture, political killings, and violence against women. Yet, despite all this condemnation, Russia continues to ignore our calls.

The war in Chechnya from 1994-1996 left over 80,000 civilians dead. The number of deaths of innocent civilians rises daily as the current war continues. This is due not only to fighting, but to the inability of international organizations to easily distribute much needed humanitarian aid. A recent report from the U.N. High Commission on Refugees noted that elderly and sick people in the capital Grozny have difficulty reaching some villages on both sides of the front line, and that the city is scattered through a city due to continued fighting. Russia has closed investigations into alleged human rights abuses by Russian soldiers citing a lack of evidence, and none of the U.N. mandated special envoys to Chechnya have been given access to the area.

Just three weeks ago customs officials in Moscow confiscated an Amnesty International report on human rights violations in Chechnya.

Mr. President, this body and the international community has consistently spoken out demanding the Russian government allow into Chechnya international human rights monitors. It is important that we not turn silent now.

In her address to the U.N. Human Rights Commission in March, Secretary Albright said that no nation should feel threatened by the Commission's work since its task is to support the right of people everywhere to control their own destinies, and that the Commission asks only that its members play by global rules. Mr. President, colleagues, the United States should seize the opportunity of next month's G-7 summit to once again demand that Russia play by these rules. Our leadership within the G-7 and in the international community deserves no less. The people of Chechnya desire no less.

What I want to say on the floor of the Senate is that this is a brutal war. Many innocent people have been killed. Certainly, some of the Chechans are responsible for the murder of Russians; but, overall, what we have seen is a tremendous loss of life, the decimation of a country. I have sent letters to Putin. I have spoken out about this. I think it is a human rights question. I call upon our Government, in particular, to be much more actively involved in trying to bring about some resolution to this conflict.

There are entirely too many innocent people paying the price. Entirely too many innocent people are losing their lives. I think it is a role for our Government to push for some kind of a peaceful settlement to be negotiated with Putin and be in contact with the Russian Government and work with them. I am all for that. I am not at all interested in rekindling a cold war. My father is a Jewish immigrant who fled Russia. But I also believe we should not turn our head away from what is happening in Chechnya.

We ought to make it crystal clear to the Russian Government that the wholesale violation of human rights and to turn murder of innocent people is simply not acceptable. The sooner there is some kind of a political settlement, the better off the people in Chechnya and Russia and the world
will be. I don't believe there is any evidence at all that this military campaign is going to work. Violence begets violence. Violence is met with violence.

I think our Government can play a more positive role than we have played. For the Senate today, I call on the Secretary of State and President Clinton to be more much more actively involved in trying to bring about a resolution to this conflict.

NECESSARILY ABSENT

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, last Friday I was necessarily absent from the Senate to survey recent flood damage in North Dakota. For a period of three days, rain, hail and tornadoes inundated northeast North Dakota and, sadly, four people lost their lives. My duty was to my constituents who were in the middle of another devastating natural disaster. As a result, I missed one vote Friday morning.

For the record, had I been present, I would have voted yes on adoption of the conference report to S. 761, the Electronic Signatures Act. The legislation will have an important impact on the electronic marketplace and how business is conducted via the Internet. My vote would not have changed the outcome of this vote.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, June 20, 2000, the Federal debt stood at $5,653,559,850,881.99 (Five trillion, six hundred fifty-three billion, five hundred eighty-one million, eight hundred eighty-one dollars and ninety-nine cents).

Five years ago, June 20, 1995, the Federal debt stood at $4,895,341,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred ninety-five billion, three hundred forty-one million dollars).

Ten years ago, June 20, 1990, the Federal debt stood at $3,121,083,000,000 (Three trillion, one hundred eighty-three billion, eight hundred eighty-three million dollars).

Fifteen years ago, June 20, 1985, the Federal debt stood at $1,761,499,000,000 (One trillion, seven hundred sixty-one billion, four hundred ninety-nine million dollars).

Twenty-five years ago, June 20, 1975, the Federal debt stood at $325,258,000,000 (Three hundred twenty-five billion, two hundred fifty-eight million dollars) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,128,301,850,881.99 (Five trillion, one hundred twenty-eight billion, eight hundred eighty-one million, eight hundred eighty-one dollars and ninety-nine cents) during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF THE CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to talk to you today about the Career and Technical Education Program in Walla Walla, Washington. Students in this program are learning skills that are highly important in the working world and will give them a leg up on the competition as they enter the workforce. The program has made a tremendous impact on the school's learning environment and also gives students an incentive to stay in school.

Fifteen years ago, the faculty at Walla Walla High School wanted to create a program in which students would gain practical knowledge to supplement what is learned in the traditional classroom setting. The Career and Technical Education Program, created with the help of grant money, gives students the opportunity to gain technical skills along with the school's curriculum.

For example, students enrolled in anatomy or physiology class can put their knowledge to work by taking Sports Medicine where they learn about treating sports injuries, CPR and other first aid skills. In addition, technology labs have been interwoven into the curriculum with flight simulation, and bridging analysis to enhance math and physics classes. Through this programs, students can see a direct link between their work in the classroom to a potential job.

Gerald Cummins, Director of Career and Technical Education, says the Career and Technical Education Program has drastically improved the college bound population in Walla Walla over the last fifteen years. Fifteen years ago, there were barely any kids continuing on to the college level. Now most kids are achieving college credits through our program before even being accepted into college.

The faculty at Walla Walla High School also has established strong communication between parents, the school and community members, giving students a sense of support that will encourage them to continue in their academic pursuits.

Much credit should be given to the vision of the Walla Walla School Board and staff who have worked to ensure high standards. They have found new ways to improve upon their curriculum and provided excellent opportunities for each student to expand his or her horizons.

TRIBUTE TO RONALD L. FREELAND, NEWLY ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE OF MINORITY TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated and respected leader in public transportation, Ronald L. Freeland, Administrator of the Maryland Department of Transportation. Ron has recently been chosen to be President of the Board of the National Conference of Minority Transportation Officials, COMTO, and I would like to express my appreciation for the work he has done for Maryland, and my congratulations and best wishes as he assumes his new leadership responsibilities.

Throughout his career, Ron Freeland has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to ensuring quality transportation in Maryland. Since 1997, Ron has overseen the Mass Transit Administration, MTA, which operates the bus, light rail, Metro, and MARC systems throughout the Baltimore-Washington area—systems that provide transportation services to 355,000 people every day. Prior to his service at MTA, Ron was Administrator of the Motor Vehicle Administration, where he made key reforms in that agency's operations, including improvements in the operation of the Vehicle Emissions Inspection Program. His public service also includes tenure as Director of Operations at MTA, membership on the Board of Directors for the Maryland Transportation Authority, and membership on the Board of the Canton Railroad. Well-maintained highways and reliable transit systems provide safe travel for millions daily, and I want to commend Ron for his dedication to improving transportation services in Maryland. I have known Ron for many years and have had the opportunity to work closely with him on many issues affecting transportation in Maryland. I have found him to be a dedicated public servant and a steadfast ally to the friends of public transportation.

In addition to his work for the people of Maryland, Ron has fought tirelessly for equality within the transportation community. He is about to assume leadership of the Conference of Minority Transportation Officials, a national organization founded in 1971, which represents over 2,000 members and over 25 local chapters throughout the United States. Ron has been working with COMTO for almost twenty years, and has demonstrated unyielding devotion to COMTO's dual mission of achieving inclusion and upward mobility for minorities and women within the industry, and advocating for citizens and groups who are underserved by existing transportation services. His leadership and integrity in this pursuit inspired the members of COMTO to choose Ron as National President—and they could not have made a better choice. I am confident that, as President, Ron will inspire his colleagues across the country to dedicate themselves to ensuring minorities and women equal access to transportation jobs and services. It is the courage and hard work of people like Ron Freeland that will make certain no one is left behind as the transportation industry evolves to meet America's growing needs in the 21st century.
TRIBUTE TO BERT M. CONCKLIN

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to a patriot, federal servant, and industry leader, Bert M. Conklín. I have worked with him closely for nearly twenty years in his capacity as president of the Professional Services Council (PSC), as representative of two of the largest employers in Virginia, PSC and Computer Sciences Corporation, and as a driving influence on numerous advisory panels.

Throughout his career, Bert has proven himself to be an effective leader and an even-handed advocate. The fact that he has been such a dynamic leader for the professional and technical services industry, which is populated by so many of our nation’s most innovative names, has in no small way made our jobs in the United States Senate that much easier. Those companies represent the very heart of our national defense and I know that Bert’s dedication originates in large part from a love of our country that I share. Perhaps this trait comes from his days at the United States Naval Academy, but I suspect he had it even before.

Bert is not stranger to federal service. During his many years of service with the federal government he has held a number of distinguished positions including, Assistant Secretary and Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; Deputy Administrator for Policy Evaluation for the Federal Energy Administration; Administrator of Price Controls for the Cost of Living Council; and Director of Information Systems with the Management and Budget. He has also held significant special assignments including membership on the FAA Blue Ribbon Advisory Committee.

I wish every success to Mr. Conklín as he starts the next chapter of his truly remarkable career and thank him for a job exceedingly well done.

DUKES CELEBRATE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to congratulate The Rev. and Mrs. Morgan Dukes of Summersville, S.C., who recently celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary. During the past 50 years, Morgan and Marie Dukes have lived throughout South Carolina, including Furman University from 1958–1965 and as pasteur of First Baptist Church in Walhalla.

In 1970, Morgan and Marie moved to Washington, D.C., where Morgan was pastor of Brookland Baptist Church and later joined the staff of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs. For 15 years Marie worked as a secretary in the office of the Dean of the College of Engineering at the University of Maryland.

Morgan retired in 1997. Marie worked for 10 years as a realtor in Summerville.

The Dukes have accomplished a great deal in their 50 years of marriage and have enriched many communities in South Carolina and here in our nation’s capital. Peatsy and I join with David and granddaughter, Lauren, in celebrating this important milestone in their life together.

SALUTING LOUISIANA’S COLLEGE ATHLETES

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the baseball teams at Louisiana State University, LSU, and the University of Louisiana-Lafayette, ULL. The LSU women’s track team and all Louisiana student-athletes.

If there is one thing Louisianians take as seriously as our politics and cooking, it is our athletics. In fact, Louisiana has an excellent tradition when it comes to producing great athletes. This is easily demonstrated in the number of athletes from Louisiana who have played or currently play professional sports. Sports teaches us the importance of teamwork, goal-setting and determination. It also teaches us to never give up, even when faced with seemingly insurmountable odds.

No one has to tell the University of Louisiana-Lafayette’s baseball team about perseverance and defying the odds. They had to defeat the nation’s number one ranked team twice in one day to get to the College World Series. But once there, they defied expectations by posting a respectable two wins and two losses, and etched the mascot “Ragin’ Cajuns” into the vocabulary of every college baseball fan.

Teams at LSU have also applied the lessons taught in athletics, as well as Yogi Berra’s oft-repeated truism “it ain’t over till it’s over,” to become one of the finest athletic programs in the country.

The LSU baseball team, after starting the season 6–0, struggled to a 6–5 record at mid-season. But, with the help of tremendous senior leadership, self-confidence and the will to win, LSU finished strong by ending the season with an outstanding 52–17 record and their fifth national championship in nine years.

And the LSU women’s track team is no stranger to dramatic finishes, either. Down 46 points on the final day of competition, they scored just enough points to win and advance to the final event to win their 12th NCAA outdoor championship in 14 years.

In all, LSU had one of its finest athletic years ever during the 1999–2000 season. Outside of these two national titles, a total of 11 teams finished in the nation’s top 10 in their respective sports.

This year’s two national championships gives LSU a total of 35 national championships, the most of any school in the Southeastern Conference. And of the 20 sports LSU sponsors on the varsity level, 14 finished the year in the nation’s top 25 and participated in NCAA championship events.

I salute the student-athletes who have helped make Louisiana one of the finest states in the country. I especially congratulate the LSU baseball and women’s track teams who have proved once again it isn’t how you start the game that matters, but how you finish. It is the value that will transcend the playing field to make Louisiana’s student-athletes champions in the biggest game of all—the game of life.

TRIBUTE TO ALICE M. MCCUE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am delighted to rise today to pay tribute to a well-respected and remarkable public servant, Ms. Alice M. McCue, who has worked for the Department of Veterans Affairs Regional Office in Hartford since 1945. On June 29th, the Department of Veterans Affairs will recognize her 55 years of service to our nation’s veterans, and I want to take a few moments to discuss Alice McCue’s remarkable career.

Alice started working for the VA following her graduation from high school at Mt. St. Joseph Academy in Hartford. She began in 1945 as a typist in the Communications and Records Section, and moved to the Administrative Division in 1949. Between 1950 and 1978, Alice held a number of different positions, including several years as a clerk in the office of the Chief Attorney. Since that time, Alice has been a Veterans Claims Examiner.

Alice has been a constant force since her first days of employment. Her hard work and dedication to the veterans of Connecticut have earned her a number of awards and special accommodations. Alice received five Special Contributions Awards over the past several years, as well as a Time-Off Award in 1995, the same year in which she was the recipient of a Superior Performance Award.

Over the years, Alice was involved in a plethora of activities at the VA’s Hartford office and became an integral component of every project in which she was engaged. In the State Income
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:51 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 215. An act to present a congressional gold medal to astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, the crew of Apollo 11.

H.R. 238. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 424 South Michigan Street in South Bend, Indiana, as the "J ohn Brademas Post Office." 

H.R. 389. An act to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security and Medicare surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms.

H.R. 4201. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 213(c) of the current resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2003 to reduce the public debt and to decrease the statutory limit on the public debt.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 215. An act to present a congressional gold medal to astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, the crew of Apollo 11; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-929. A communication from Assistant Secretary for Planning and Analysis, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "The Enhanced Veterans' Education Benefits Act of 2000"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-990. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the pay-as-you-go report 507 dated June 8, 2000, to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-930. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the HUD Management Reform Plan Progress Review and Accomplishments report entitled "Promises Made—Promises Kept"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC-9301. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the exchange of land between the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency at the George Washington Parkway in McLean, Virginia; to the Committee on Energy, and Natural Resources.

EC-9302. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules and Regulations for the Allocation of Fiduciary Responsibility, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board" (RIN 1210-AA79) received on June 1, 2000, to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9303. A communication from the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting a report relative to the Science and Technology budget; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-9304. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety, and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "DOE Limited Statewide Standard; Hazard Analysis Reports" (DOE-STD-3016-99) received on June 16, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9305. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the exchange of land between the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency at the George Washington Parkway in McLean, Virginia; to the Committee on Energy, and Natural Resources.

EC-9306. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a request for a revision to the fiscal year 2001 budget submission for the DOE Office of Science; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-9307. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to substances to be classified as oils; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9308. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Withdrawal of Direct Rule for the Interim Enhanced Surface Treatment Rule (Stage 1) Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (Stage 1 DBPR) and Revisions to State Primary Requirements to Implement the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments" (FRL 6715-4) received on June 19, 2000, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9309. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety, and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Non-reactor Nuclear Safety Design Criteria and Explosives Safety Criteria Guide for Use With DOE 0-420.1, Facility Safety" (DOE-STD-3077-00) received on June 14, 2000, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9310. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety, and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "DOE Standard; Hazard Categorization and Accident Analysis Techniques for Compliance with DOE Order 5488.23, Nuclear Safety Analysis Reports" (DOE-STD-1027-12) received on June 14, 2000, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9311. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety, and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Enhance Veterans' Education Benefits Act of 2000"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-9312. A communication from the General Attorney, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "jacob K. javits Gifted and Talented Education Program: National Research and Development Center—Notice of Final Priority" received on June 15, 2000, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-9313. A communication from the Deputy Executive Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (Health Resources and Services Administration), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Final Rule for the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Program" (RIN 0936-AA56) received on June 14, 2000, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-9314. A communication from Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Federal Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Obstetrical and Gynecological Disease Classification and Reporting Systems" (RIN 99N-1309) received on May 24, 2000, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-9315. A communication from Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Federal Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indirect Food Additives: Paper and Paperboard Components" (RIN 01F-0813) received on June 1, 2000, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-9316. A communication from Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Federal Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule
entitled "Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption" (RIN 000F-0796); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-9348. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Federal Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sterility Requirement for Aqueous-Base Drug Products for Oral Inhalation" (RIN84-224) received on June 3, 2000, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-9349. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Program Federal Activities—The Challenge Newsletter" received on June 13, 2000, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-9352. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Program Federal Activities—Grant Competition to Reduce Student Sus- pensions and Expulsions and Ensure Educational Progress of Students Who Are Suspended or Expelled" received on June 13, 2000, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 842: A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 701 South Santa Fe Avenue in Compton, California, as the "Merwyn Malcolm Dyamally Post Office Building".

H.R. 843: A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 10301 South Compton Avenue, in Los Angeles, California, known as the Watts Finance Office, as the "Augustus F. Hawkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 1666: A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 300 East Pinckney Street in Madison, Florida, as the "Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 2197: A bill to designate the building of the United States Postal Service located at 5 Cedar Street in Hopkinton, Massachusetts, as the "Thomas J. Brown Post Office Building".

H.R. 2367: A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 3675 Warrensville Center Road in Shaker Heights, Ohio, as the "Augustus F. Hawkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 2460: A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 125 Border Avenue West iniggins, Mississippi, as the "J. Ray Hanna "Dizzy" Deen Post Office".

H.R. 2591: A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 713 Elm Street in Winkfield, Kansas, as the "William H. Avery Post Office".

H.R. 2592: A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Orchard Park Drive in Greenville, South Carolina, as the "Keith D. Oglesby Station".

H.R. 2638: A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 557 East Bay Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "Maryelle H. Howe Post Office".

H.R. 3701: A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the "J.gel T. Brohyhill Post Office Building".

H.R. 4241: A bill to designate the United States Post Office building located at 3101 College Avenue in Santa Ana, California, as the "Hector E. Gonzalez Post Office Building".

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

S. 2579: A bill to amend the Illinois Land Conservation Act of 1995 to provide for the use of certain fees and receipts collected under that Act for public schools and public roads in the vicinity of Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie, Illinois; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2760: A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to establish performance standards for the reduction of microbiological pathogens in meat and poultry; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEAHEY (for himself and Mr. MILL):

S. 2761: A bill to fund task forces to locate and apprehend fugitives in Federal, State, and local felony criminal cases and to provide administrative subpoena authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2762: A bill to establish SHARE Net grants to support the development of a comprehensive, accessible, high-technology infrastructure of educational and cultural resources for nonprofit institutions, individuals, and others for educational purposes through a systematic effort to coordinate, link, and enhance, through technology, existing specialized resources and expertise in public and private cultural and educational institutions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 2763: A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to permit owners and operators to use certain practices to meet the require- ments of that Act by establishing approved vegetative cover on highly erodible crop land subject to conservation reserve contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SPECKER, Mr. DODD, Mr. DEWINE, Ms.
Mikulski, Mr. Smith of Oregon, Mr. Bingaman, Mr. L. Chafee, Mr. Wellstone, Mr. Jeffords, Mrs. Murray, Ms. Collins, Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Specter, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Kerry, Mr. Voinovich, Mr. Cleland, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Baucus, Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Lieberman, and Mr. Breaux. S. 2764. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 to extend the authorizations of appropriations for the programs carried out under such Acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. Schumer. S. 2765. A bill to amend the securities laws to provide for regulatory parity for single stock futures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. Harkin:

S. 2760. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to establish performance standards for the reduction of microbiological pathogens in meat and poultry; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

MICROBIOLOGICAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. Harkin. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Microbiological Performance Standards Clarification Act of 2000. Passage of this bill is vital because on May 25th, the District Court of the Northern District of Texas struck down the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) authority to enforce its Microbiological Performance Standard for Salmonella. The District Court's decision in Supreme Beef v. USDA (Supreme) seriously undermines the sweeping food safety changes adopted by USDA in its 1996 Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point and Pathogen Reduction (HACCP) rule.

The District Court's decision in Supreme says that USDA does not have the authority to enforce Microbiological Performance Standards for reducing viral and bacterial pathogens.

The Pathogen Reduction Rule recognized that bacterial and viral pathogens were the foremost food safety threat in America, responsible for 5,000 deaths and 33 million illnesses. To address the threat of foodborne illness, USDA developed a modern inspection system based on two fundamental principles.

The first was that industry has the primary responsibility to determine how to produce the safest products possible. Industry had to examine their plants and determine how to control contamination at every step of the food production process, from the moment a product arrives at their door until the moment it leaves their plant.

The second, even more crucial principle was that plants nationwide must reduce levels of dangerous pathogens in meat and poultry products. To ensure the new inspection system accomplished this, USDA developed Microbiological Performance Standards. These standards provide targets for reducing pathogens and require all USDA-inspected facilities to meet them. Facilities failing to meet a standard are shut down until they create a corrective action plan to meet the standard.

To date, USDA has only issued one Microbiological Performance Standard, for Salmonella. The vast majority of plants in the U.S. have been able to meet the standards so it is clearly workable. In addition, USDA reports that Salmonella levels for meat and poultry products have fallen substantially. The Salmonella standard, therefore, has been successful. The District Court's decision threatens to destroy this success and set our food safety system back years.

Congress cannot let a court's unfortunate misinterpretation of USDA's authority undermine our efforts to produce the safe and strongest food safety system available. Whatever the ultimate outcome of the Supreme Beef case, it is intolerable to have so much uncertainty about USDA's authority to enforce food safety regulations. The public and producers should not have to worry about whether the products on their table have met food safety standards. This legislation provides the necessary clarification and assurance that if a product bears the USDA stamp of approval, it has met all of USDA's food safety requirements.

I plan to seek every opportunity to get this language enacted. I think it is essential, both to ensuring the modernization of our food safety system, and ensuring consumers that we are making progress in reducing dangerous pathogens.

I hope that both parties, and both houses of Congress will be able to act to pass this legislation before the July 4th weekend and, as a result, reestablish public's confidence in our meat and poultry inspection system is at stake.

By Mr. Leahy (for himself and Mr. Kneschke):

S. 2761. A bill to fund task forces to locate and apprehend fugitives in Federal, State, and local felony criminal cases and to provide administrative subpoena authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CAPTURING CRIMINALS ACT OF 2000

Mr. Leahy. Mr. President, as a former prosecutor, I am well aware that fugitives from justice are an important problem and that their capture is an essential function of law enforcement. According to the FBI, nearly 550,000 people are currently fugitives from justice on federal, state, and local felony charges combined. This means that there are almost as many fugitive felons as there are citizens residing in my home state of Vermont.

The fact that we have more than one half million fugitives from justice, a significant portion of whom are convicted felons in violation of probation or parole, who have been able to flout courts order and avoid arrest, breeds disrespect for our laws and poses undeniable risks to the safety of our citizens. We must do better. The Leahy-Kohl “Capturing Criminals Act of 2000,” which I introduce today, will provide additional tools and resources to our federal law enforcement agencies to pursue and capture fugitive felons on both federal and state charges.

In 1994, I introduced the “Federal Law Enforcement Agency Act,” which was signed into law and allows federal law enforcement agencies to be reimbursed for any additional costs incurred in apprehending fugitives.

The Leahy-Kohl “Capturing Criminals Act of 2000” will provide other tools and resources to our federal law enforcement agencies to pursue and capture fugitive felons. If passed, this bill will provide additional resources that allow federal law enforcement agencies to pursue fugitives and to work with state and local law enforcement agencies, which are our primary law enforcement agencies.

According to the FBI, in prior years, including 2000, the FBI has arrested over 120,000 federal, state, and local fugitives in the past four years, including more federal fugitives than all the other federal agencies combined. In prior years, the FBI has arrested over 34,000 fugitive felons. Additionally, the FBI has established twenty-four Safe Streets Task Forces exclusively focused on apprehending fugitives in cities around the country. Over the period of 1995 to 1999, the FBI’s efforts have resulted in the arrest of a total of 132,292 fugitives, including 64,336, who were state fugitives.

The Capturing Criminals Act would help our law enforcement agencies keep the pressure on fugitives by authorizing administrative subpoenas for use in obtaining records relevant to fugitive apprehension and, secondly, providing a mechanism for additional fugitive apprehension task forces, to be coordinated by the United States Marshals Service; authorizing administrative subpoenas for use in obtaining records relevant to fugitive apprehension.

The FBI’s efforts have been singularly successful in arresting over 34,000 fugitive felons. Additionally, the FBI has established twenty-four Safe Streets Task Forces exclusively focused on apprehending fugitives in cities around the country. Over the period of 1995 to 1999, the FBI’s efforts have resulted in the arrest of a total of 132,292 fugitives, including 64,336, who were state fugitives.

The Capturing Criminals Act would help our law enforcement agencies keep the pressure on fugitives by authorizing administrative subpoenas for use in obtaining records relevant to fugitive apprehension and, secondly, providing a mechanism for additional fugitive apprehension task forces, to be coordinated by the United States Marshals Service; authorizing administrative subpoenas for use in obtaining records relevant to fugitive apprehension.

Our federal law enforcement agencies work closely with state and local law enforcement agencies, which have also been doing to date on capturing federal fugitives and helping the states and local communities bring their fugitives to justice. The U.S. Marshals Service, our oldest law enforcement agency, has arrested over 120,000 federal, state and local fugitives in the past four years, including more federal fugitives than all the other federal agencies combined. In prior years, the FBI has arrested over 34,000 fugitive felons. Additionally, the FBI has established twenty-four Safe Streets Task Forces exclusively focused on apprehending fugitives in cities around the country. Over the period of 1995 to 1999, the FBI’s efforts have resulted in the arrest of a total of 132,292 fugitives, including 64,336, who were state fugitives.

The Capturing Criminals Act would help our law enforcement agencies keep the pressure on fugitives by authorizing administrative subpoenas for use in obtaining records relevant to fugitive apprehension and, secondly, providing a mechanism for additional fugitive apprehension task forces, to be coordinated by the United States Marshals Service; authorizing administrative subpoenas for use in obtaining records relevant to fugitive apprehension.

The FBI’s efforts have been singularly successful in arresting over 34,000 fugitive felons. Additionally, the FBI has established twenty-four Safe Streets Task Forces exclusively focused on apprehending fugitives in cities around the country. Over the period of 1995 to 1999, the FBI’s efforts have resulted in the arrest of a total of 132,292 fugitives, including 64,336, who were state fugitives.
grand jury subpoenas to obtain phone or bank records to track down a fugitive would be an abuse of the grand jury. Trial subpoenas may also not be used, either because the fugitive is already convicted or no trial may take place because the fugitive is a fugitive.

This inability to use trial and grand jury subpoenas for fugitive investigations creates a disturbing gap in law enforcement procedures. Law enforcement partially fills this gap by using the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), which authorizes federal courts to “issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law.” The procedures, however, for obtaining orders under this Act, and the scope and non-disclosure terms of such orders, vary between jurisdictions.

Thus, authorizing administrative subpoena power will help bridge the gap in fugitive investigations to allow federal and state law enforcement agencies to obtain records useful for tracking a fugitive’s whereabouts. The Leahy-Kohl Capturing Criminals Act makes clear that the approval of a court remains necessary to obtain an order for nondisclosure in this subpoena and production of the requested records to the subscriber or customer to whom the records pertain.

I am certainly not alone in recognizing the problem this nation has with fugitives from justice. Senators THURMOND and BIDEN have introduced the “Fugitive Apprehension Act,” S. 2516, specifically to address the difficulties facing law enforcement in this area. I commend both my colleagues for their leadership. While I agree with the general purposes of S. 2516, aspects of that bill would be problematic. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee to resolve the differences in our bills.

Without disputing all of the differences in the bills, let me provide some examples. As introduced, S. 2516 would limit use of an administrative subpoena to those fugitives who have been “indicted,” which fails to address the fact that fugitives flee after arrest on the basis of a “complaint” and may flee after the prosecutor has filed an “information” in lieu of an indictment. The Leahy-Kohl “Capturing Criminals Act,” by contrast, would allow use of such subpoenas to track fugitives who have been accused in a “complaint, information or indictment.”

In addition, S. 2516 requires the U.S. Marshal Service to report quarterly to the Attorney General (who must transmit the report to Congress) on use of the administrative subpoenas. In my view, while a reporting requirement is useful, the requirement as described in S. 2516 is overly burdensome and insufficiently specific. The Leahy-Kohl “Capturing Criminals Act” would require the Attorney General to report for the next three years to the Judiciary Committees of both the House and Senate with the following information about the use of administrative subpoenas in fugitive investigations: the number issued, by which agency, identification of the charges on which the fugitive was wanted and whether the fugitive was wanted on federal or state charges.

Although S. 2516 outlines the procedures for enforcement of an administrative subpoena, it is silent on the mechanisms for both contesting the subpoena by the recipient and for delay in producing records about whom the record pertains. The Leahy-Kohl “Capturing Criminals Act” expressly addresses these issues. This legislation will help law enforcement—with increased resources for regional fugitive apprehension task forces and administrative subpoena authority—bring to justice both federal and state fugitives who, by their conduct, have demonstrated a lack of respect for our nation’s criminal justice system. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure swift passage of this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my legislation be printed in the Record.

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

S. 2763

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Capturing Criminals Act of 2000.”

SEC. 2. FUGITIVE APPREHENSION TASK FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General is authorized to establish, upon consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and appropriate law enforcement officials in the States, Fugitive Apprehension Task Forces, consisting of Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities in designated regions of the United States to be coordinated by the Director of the United States Marshals Service, for the purpose of locating and apprehending fugitives, as defined by section 1075 of title 18, United States Code, as added by this Act.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the United States Marshals Service to carry out the provisions of this section $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, and $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2004.

(c) OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority under any other provision of Federal or State law to locate or apprehend a fugitive.

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS TO APPREHEND FUGITIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may subpoena witnesses and items that constitute or contain evidence that the Attorney General finds, for the purpose of the production of any records (including books, papers, documents, electronic data, and other tangible and intangible items that constitute or contain evidence) that the Attorney General finds, based upon articulable facts, are relevant to discerning the fugitive’s whereabouts. A subpoena under this subsection shall describe the records or items required to be produced and prescribe a return date within a reasonable period of time within which the records or items can be assembled and made available.

(b) SCOPE.—In any investigation with respect to the apprehension of a fugitive, the Attorney General is authorized to serve subpoenas on any person whom the Attorney General finds that the particular circumstances of the request give rise to a Federal interest sufficient for the exercise of Federal jurisdiction under any provision of law.

(c) MONITORING.—In any investigation with respect to the apprehension of a fugitive, the Attorney General is authorized to serve subpoenas on any person whom the Attorney General finds is subject to suit under a complaint or indictment, or having been convicted or no trial may take place because the fugitive is a fugitive.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of its enactment.
the subpoena. The court may issue an order requiring the subpoenaed person to appear before the Attorney General to produce records if so ordered. Any failure to obey the order may be punished as a contempt of court. All process in any such case may be served in any judicial district in which the person may be found.

"(3) SUBPOENA RECIPIENT.—Not later than 20 days after the date of service of an administrative subpoena under this section upon any person, or at any time before the required date specified in the subpoena, whichever period is shorter, such person may file, in the district court of the United States for the judicial district within which such person is found, or transacts business, a petition to modify or quash such subpoena on grounds that—

"(A) the terms of the subpoena are unreasonable or unnecessary;

"(B) the subpoena fails to meet the requirements of this section; or

"(C) the subpoena violates the constitutional rights or any other legal right or privilege of the subpoenaed party.

"(3) TIME FOR RESPONSE.—The time allowed for compliance with a subpoena in whole or in part may be suspended during the pendency of a petition filed under paragraph (2). Such petition shall specify the grounds upon which the petitioner relies in seeking relief.

"(4) DISALLOWED NOTICE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Where an administrative subpoena is issued under this section to a provider of electronic communication service as defined in section 1109 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (18 U.S.C. 3121), the Attorney General may—

"(A) in accordance with section 2709(a) of this title, delay notification to the subscriber or customer to whom the record pertains;

"(B) apply to a court, in accordance with section 2707(b) of this title, for an order compelling the provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to not notify any other person of the existence of the subpoena or court order.

"(2) SUBPOENAS FOR FINANCIAL RECORDS.—If a subpoena is issued under this section to a financial institution for financial records of any customer of such institution, the Attorney General may apply to a court under section 1109 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (18 U.S.C. 3129) for an order to delay customer notice as otherwise required.

"(5) NONDISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the Attorney General may apply to a court for an order requiring the party to whom an administrative subpoena is directed to refrain from notifying any other party of the existence of the subpoena or court order for such period as the court deems appropriate. The court shall enter such order if it determines that there is reason to believe that notificati- on of the existence of the administrative subpoena will result in—

"(A) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

"(B) flight from prosecution;

"(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

"(D) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

"(E) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or undue delay of a trial.

"(g) IMMUNITY FROM CIVIL LIABILITY.—Any person, including officers, agents, and employees, who in good faith produce the records or items requested in a subpoena shall not be liable in any court of any State or the District of Columbia to any customer or other person for such production or for nondisclosure of that production to the custome-, in compliance with the terms of a court order for nondisclosure.

==(h) DELEGATION.—The Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue guidelines governing the issuance and service of administrative subpoenas. Such guidelines shall mandate that administrative subpoenas may be issued only after review and approval of senior officials within the Department of Justice and the Department of the Treasury.

==(i) REPORT.—The Attorney General shall report in January of each year to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the number of administrative subpoenas issued under this section, whether each matter involved a fugitive from Federal or State charges, and of administrative personnel within the Department of Justice and the Department of the Treasury.

==(j) DELEGATION.ÐThe Attorney General shall complete a study on the use of administrative subpoena power and the scope of such subpoena and imposing the charges. This reporting requirement shall terminate in 3 years after enactment."

==SEC. 4. STUDY AND REPORT OF THE USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS.==

Not later than December 31, 2001, the Attorney General shall complete a study of the use of administrative subpoena power by executive branch agencies or entities and shall report the findings to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The study shall include:

"(1) a description of the sources of administrative subpoena power and the scope of such subpoena power within executive branch agencies;

"(2) a description of applicable subpoena enforcement mechanisms;

"(3) a description of notification provisions and any other provisions relating to safeguarding privacy interests;

"(4) a description of the standards governing the issuance of administrative subpoenas; and

"(5) recommendations from the Attorney General regarding necessary steps to ensure that administrative subpoena power is used and enforced consistently and fairly by executive branch agencies.

==By Mr. DODD:==

S. 2762. A bill to establish SHARE Net grants to support the development of a comprehensive, accessible, high-technology infrastructure of educational and cultural resources for nonprofit institutions, individuals, and others for educational purposes through a systematic effort to coordinate, link and enhance, through technology, existing specialized resources and expertise in public and private cultural and educational institutions; to the Committee on Labor, and Pensions.

==SAVING HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION NETWORKING ACT OF 2000 (SHARE NET ACT)==

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation which will help light the way to a stronger educational system with broader reach and deeper substance—the SHARE Net (Saving Humanities, Arts, and Resources for Education Networking) Act of 2000.

Education is not just about schools and colleges. Education is everything from our very first breath as infants to our last days. We learn at work, at school, at home and in our cars. We learn from the people around us, from books, newspapers, artwork, radio and television, and more and more, we learn from the Internet and computers. Education has become a central part of life in America. We have an impressive system of public education, with fundamentally strong public schools—yes, some need help, but they continue to reach all children and open the doors of learning to over 50 million children each year. The strength of our post-secondary education system is unmatched in the world with an estimated 80 percent of our high school graduates going on to some post-secondary education. We have public libraries across the country that contribute the building blocks of lifelong learning with educational programs and access to books and other educational resources for the public—from the youngest to the oldest. We enjoy significant cultural resources—museums, art galleries and other centers—that allow us to explore and continue to learn.

This infrastructure of learning has not been achieved without the concerted effort. From our very first days, leading Americans have dedicated time and resources to developing schools, universities and other institutions of learning. Thomas Jefferson viewed the creation of the University of Virginia as one of his greatest accomplishments. Other Americans are well known for their passion and vision for learning—from Helen Keller to the Little Rock 9.

There have been many here in Congress too who have lead on education issues. We tend to remember the more recent steps—the creation of the Pell Grant program or Head Start. But in fact, our commitment and involvement in these issues began much earlier. I believe one of the most significant, and overlooked, initiatives was the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. These initiatives brought about a sea-change in our Nation's educational system by allocating the proceeds from the sale of federal-held western lands to states for the creation of practical, accessible Land Grant Colleges and Universities. These Land Grant institutions sparked a revolution in higher education, which had been solely the purview of the Church and privileged; Land Grant Institutions focused on reaching real people with helpful knowledge. They focused on agriculture, teaching and research into other practical areas—they encouraged and facilitated broader participation in post-secondary education with low costs and continuing education programs.

Today, Land Grant colleges and universities continue to fulfill their original missions of research, outreach and teaching. They have grown to be the very backbone of post-secondary education—providing access to quality, affordable higher education. These institutions have also emerged as leaders in
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S. 2762. A bill to establish SHARE Net grants to support the development of a comprehensive, accessible, high-technology infrastructure of educational and cultural resources for nonprofit institutions, individuals, and others for educational purposes through a systematic effort to coordinate, link and enhance, through technology, existing specialized resources and expertise in public and private cultural and educational institutions; to the Committee on Labor, and Pensions.

==SAVING HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION NETWORKING ACT OF 2000 (SHARE NET ACT)==

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation which will help light the way to a stronger educational system with broader reach and deeper substance—the SHARE Net (Saving Humanities, Arts, and Resources for Education Networking) Act of 2000.

Education is not just about schools and colleges. Education is everything from our very first breath as infants to our last days. We learn at work, at school, at home and in our cars. We learn from the people around us, from books, newspapers, artwork, radio and television, and more and more, we learn from the Internet and computers. Education has become a central part of life in America. We have an impressive system of public education, with fundamentally strong public schools—yes, some need help, but they continue to reach all children and open the doors of learning to over 50 million children each year. The strength of our post-secondary education system is unmatched in the world with an estimated 80 percent of our high school graduates going on to some post-secondary education. We have public libraries across the country that contribute the building blocks of lifelong learning with educational programs and access to books and other educational resources for the public—from the youngest to the oldest. We enjoy significant cultural resources—museums, art galleries and other centers—that allow us to explore and continue to learn.

This infrastructure of learning has not been achieved without the concerted effort. From our very first days, leading Americans have dedicated time and resources to developing schools, universities and other institutions of learning. Thomas Jefferson viewed the creation of the University of Virginia as one of his greatest accomplishments. Other Americans are well known for their passion and vision for learning—from Helen Keller to the Little Rock 9.

There have been many here in Congress too who have lead on education issues. We tend to remember the more recent steps—the creation of the Pell Grant program or Head Start. But in fact, our commitment and involvement in these issues began much earlier. I believe one of the most significant, and overlooked, initiatives was the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. These initiatives brought about a sea-change in our Nation's educational system by allocating the proceeds from the sale of federal-held western lands to states for the creation of practical, accessible Land Grant Colleges and Universities. These Land Grant institutions sparked a revolution in higher education, which had been solely the purview of the Church and privileged; Land Grant Institutions focused on reaching real people with helpful knowledge. They focused on agriculture, teaching and research into other practical areas—they encouraged and facilitated broader participation in post-secondary education with low costs and continuing education programs.

Today, Land Grant colleges and universities continue to fulfill their original missions of research, outreach and teaching. They have grown to be the very backbone of post-secondary education—providing access to quality, affordable higher education. These institutions have also emerged as leaders in
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S. 2704. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to include the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 to extend the authorities of appropriations for the programs carried out under such acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

THE NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2000

Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce a bill to reauthorize National Service, along with 25 co-sponsors from both sides of the aisle.

In 1993 Congress created the Corporation for National Service to enhance opportunities for all Americans to participate in their communities by actively engaging in local service programs. Community service should not be an option only for those who can afford to perform an important job without pay. It should be an opportunity for everyone. Every week, I have the privilege of reading with a third grade student in Washington, and I have seen her make very impressive progress during the last three years. I know first-hand that those who engage in community service gain as much as they give to their communities.

The Corporation for National Service is expanding these opportunities for service by offering stipends and education awards to AmeriCorps members, and stipends to senior volunteers. It also has developed opportunities to teachers and identified leader schools, who will mentor other schools interested in beginning to pursue service learning. In the last five years, 150,000 adults have given a year of service to communities across the country as AmeriCorps members.

500,000 senior citizens each year provide service to their communities in Foster Grandparent Programs, Senior Companion Programs, and the Retired Senior Volunteer Corps. In addition, over 1 million school children each year participate in service learning programs.

The national service movement has also encouraged businesses to become actively involved in improving their communities. Immunity leaders have stepped up to the plate to sponsor service corps programs, to offer technical support for existing programs, and to use community service as a way to work with local schools.

As Robert Kennedy said, in words that became the hallmark of his life, “Some people see things as they are and say why. I dream things that never were, and say why not?” Because of community service, more and more citizens are asking that question every day in communities across the country.

In Massachusetts, under the leadership of Maureen Curley and her talented Board of Directors, the Massachusetts Service Alliance has helped citizens to act against the injustices that they see around them. From City Year and Peace Games in Boston to Greenfield READS and the Barnstable Land Trust, they have created new opportunities to provide useful information on health care, to fight domestic violence, to help senior citizens live independent lives, and to repair and revitalize their communities in many other ways. They have found that many citizens in their communities are eager to be involved and to stay involved, and they have been successful in creating large numbers of opportunities for that involvement. Last year, 180,000 citizens contributed 35 million hours of service in communities across the state. Programs such as City Year, which began as a dream of Michael Brown and Alan Khazee in Boston, has a program in 13 sites across the country, engaging over 2,000 Corps members in their newest site here in Washington in September.

This bipartisan bill that we offer today will allow these programs to continue to grow and enable many more Americans to participate in improving their communities and building a stronger America.

Our former colleague, Dan Coats, has written an eloquent article in support of AmeriCorps. The article appeared in the weekend edition of the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the RECORD.

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

WHY I CHANGED MY MIND ABOUT AMERICORPS

(By Dan Coats)

When I was in the Senate, I did not support the legislation that created AmeriCorps because of my fundamental belief in private government-supported volunteers, also torturing the mission of the civic sector, my mind about AmeriCorps. Instead of distorting the mission of the civic sector, AmeriCorps has provided new power and energy for nonprofit organizations across the country.

Why I changed my mind about AmeriCorps is in no small measure because of the leadership that Harris Wofford, my Democratic former Senate colleague from Pennsylvania, has given to that program. Wofford and I did not vote on the same side very often in the Senate, and we still differ on many issues. But his leadership of AmeriCorps has convinced me that I should have voted with him on this issue.

First, thanks to Wofford’s steadfast commitment to place national service above partisan politics, AmeriCorps has become the political program that some of us initially feared. Second, he shares my belief that the solutions to some of our most intractable problems lie in the civic sector. He has set AmeriCorps to the work of supporting, not supplanting, the civic sector.

I have seen firsthand how AmeriCorps members have provided a jolt of new energy to the civic sector from my experience as president of Big Brothers Big Sisters of America. As Millard Fuller, founder of Habitat for Humanity and another former skeptic of government-supported volunteers, also discovered, the leadership provided by full-time AmeriCorps members is a key addition for nonprofit and faith-based organizations that are tackling the most difficult community and human problems.
AmeriCorps members, through their idealism, enthusiasm and can-do spirit, have multiplied the impact of organizations like Big Brothers Big Sisters and Habitat, and hundreds of organizations large and small. The number of Republicans who have changed their mind about AmeriCorps continues to grow.

In the last year, Sens. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Mike DeWine (R-Ohio) and Rep. John Kasich (R-Ohio) have spoken out about the positive role AmeriCorps plays in strengthening the civic sector. Together, we are joining a growing bipartisan list of present and former federal and state legislators, governors and civic leaders in support of AmeriCorps.

Their support is part of a quiet, yet remarkable, transformation in American politics that has occurred since the white-hot debate that took place a few years ago between those who believed that government should take the lead in solving community problems and those who thought government could accomplish little or nothing, and was even likely to be a negative force.

Now, as evidenced by both major party presidential candidates and by growing bipartisan support for AmeriCorps, a new ground has emerged, leading to a unique partnership between AmeriCorps, the nonprofit and faith-based sectors and the government. These institutions that are critical to strengthening our communities. It is these institutions that transmit values between generations that encourage cooperation between citizens, and make our communities stronger.

In a recent speech to the nation’s governors, former Calif. Gov. Pete Wilson declared himself “a strong supporter of AmeriCorps.”

After spending two years working with the organization, Powell concluded “[W]hat they do in any other instance to volunteer is really incredible. So it is a tremendous investment in your people, a tremendous investment in the future. . .

Later this month, a bipartisan coalition in the Senate will introduce legislation to reinstate AmeriCorps and its parent agency, the Corporation for National Service. I hope that Congress will move quickly to enact this legislation so that AmeriCorps can continue to work with the nonprofit and faith-based sectors to strengthen our communities and build the American Dream for all of us.

Mr. DODD: Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today as an original cosponsor of the National and Community Service Act of 2000 and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the reauthorization of the Corporation for National Service through this legislation.

While Americans often wonder what, exactly, it is that the numerous agencies and commissions scattered around town do, it is clear what the Corporation for National Service does. It pairs members with those who need help. Reducing the number of homeless families, bringing books to children, tutoring English to adults—these are important tasks. They empower our citizens. They build our communities. They renew our country. That is what the Corporation for National Service does in my view—provide a true national service to the citizens of this country.

The Corporation for National Service is one of the most impressive success stories in recent memory. The numbers alone tell that story. Since its inception in 1993, more than 150,000 Americans have served or are currently serving as AmeriCorps members. They have provided much-needed assistance to thousands of older neighbors in more than 4,000 communities.

Specifically, AmeriCorps members have helped nearly 3 million children succeed in school through tutoring and mentoring initiatives. They have worked with the police and other community organizations to safeguard our neighborhoods—establishing, operating and expanding over 40,000 safety patrols and working with 600,000 at-risk youth in after-school programs.

AmeriCorps members have improved schools, built or rehabilitated over 25,000 homes, working with 340,000 people to find jobs, and providing food, clothing and other necessities to over 2.5 million homeless people. With regard to our environment, AmeriCorps members have planted over 50 million trees and removed 70,000 tons of trash from our neighborhoods.

When I talk about the leverage created through AmeriCorps members recruiting and training others, I am talking about nearly two million volunteers brought to bear on locally generated programs because of the efforts of AmeriCorps members.

The National Senior Service Corps has been another resounding success. What Tom Brokaw has dubbed “The Greatest Generation” is still ready to meet the needs of their communities and they have been energized by the Corporation for National Service.

AmeriCorps members have worked with 15,000 Senior companions and 467,000 Retired and Senior Volunteer Program members, nearly 250,000 children—including 58,000 with learning disabilities or suffering from abuse and neglect—have been given an invaluable source of loving care. Sixty-two thousand older Americans in need of a little extra help have been paired with Senior Corps members to make daily life more manageable. These Senior Corps members provide a critical bridge to independence for these seniors. Whether by helping with the daily tasks or simply being a friendly companion, these Senior Corps members are making a huge difference.

Learn and Serve, yet another initiative of the Corporation for National Service, has served more than 1.5 million students in kindergarten through college and helped them apply academic skills to meet community needs. And I want to add a tangible, Take the word of accomplishment, Mr. President. One that according to recent study returns $1.66 for every dollar invested.

While compiling the numbers, however, we often forget the impact this program has on those who dedicate themselves as volunteers. But we must not forget the impact that service has on those who give of themselves—their time and their dedication make a difference.

The personal satisfaction one receives from working for others is a feeling I can speak about personally. Long before AmeriCorps was a reality, I was Peace Corps volunteer in a small town in the Dominican Republic. But whether it is in the Dominican Republic or in my home state of Connecticut—or any state across this nation—there are many small towns that skillfully sustain their educational system or providing health care to their neighbors or maintaining their environment or any number of areas. And an honest day’s work on behalf of those efforts translates in any language. It is a want the tremendous satisfaction and pride. These are emotions that drive participants in either the PeaceCorps abroad or AmeriCorps here at home, to continue to work and continue to build their communities, something that can only be taught.

There is also a real period of personal learning that AmeriCorps members go through. A study by Aguirre Internacional determined that participation in AmeriCorps results in substantial gains in life skills for more than three-quarters of the members who participate. When we talk about life skills here, we are talking about communications skills, interpersonal skills, analytical problem-solving, organizational skill and using information technology. These are necessary skills for the 21st century. AmeriCorps members take these skills with them after their term of service, back to employers who wanted, back to communities who need them.

The Corporation for National Service awakens in its members a strong ethic of civil responsibility and a lifelong desire to serve. By immersing its members in local, state and national issues, and asking them to address and interact with these issues, the Corporation for National Service is a catalyst for civic participation. And regardless of which side of the aisle you sit on, I think we can all agree that an active and involved constituency is what we all hope for.

Across the range of initiatives that I have touched upon today, are a couple of points on which I believe our efforts are initiated from the ground-up. These programs were not crafted by Senators or Congressmen or someone employed here in Washington, they are generated by people within the communities by those who need help sustained, that drive participants in either the PeaceCorps abroad or AmeriCorps here at home, to continue to work and continue to build their communities, something that can only be taught.

Secondly, these programs harness what we all know is the true strength of America, it’s citizens. The Corporation for National Service is channeling
works with the “Books on Wheels” bookmobile program. Emily drives the bookmobile and as she eloquently stated, “brings books and stories to seven rural villages and towns that vary in population from 350-5,000 residents.” Emily explained her AmeriCorps experience by saying: “Although the best part of my AmeriCorps experience has been meeting with kids at the various stops, learning how they see the world and introducing them to books which help them see a wider world, I have some other long-term ways to work and serve in the community. I feel that service has become a part of me and will be incorporated into my life and career. It’s great to feel good about what you do, knowing you are making a difference in your community.”

Other community service programs include Learn and Serve America which provides assistance to over one million students from kindergarten through college in community service activities that are aligned with the students’ academic programs. In my home State of Vermont, Learn and Serve is making a difference in elementary and secondary schools, including vocational technical educational centers. Another service program, the National Senior Service Corps, serves nearly half a million Americans, age fifty-five and older. The program is called Foster Grandparents, serving as mentors to young people with special needs. In addition, the Senior Companions program helps other seniors live independently. Retired and Senior Volunteer Program members provide an array of services for unmet community needs. The senior programs are very essential to rural communities. In Springfield, Vermont, the Windsor County Retired and Senior Volunteer Program provides services to isolated seniors and persons with disabilities.

A key aspect of the National and Community Service Act is the State Commission on National and Community Service. Under this Act, the states are required to establish the State Commission on National and Community Service. The state commissions, which I chair, hold a hearing regarding the reauthorization of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973. One of the witnesses who testified was Emily Zollo, an AmeriCorps member from Cabot, Vermont. Emily and these volunteers are a part of the successful Kingdom Initiative AmeriCorps Program in Lyndonville, Vermont. Her assignment involves the Cobleigh Public Library in Lyndonville where she

Community service is not a democ-
rat, republican, or independent issue—
it’s an ideal—an ideal that is central to the philosophy of America—neighbor helping neighbor. It is in that spirit that I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the National and Community Service Amendments Act of 2000.

- Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today Senator KENNEDY and a bipartisan coalition are introducing the National and Community Service Amendments Act of 2000 to strengthen this program of community service throughout our country. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill because I know how public service has enriched my life. As elected representatives, we are entrusted with preserving the strong democracy and just society that our founders envisioned. The programs supported by this legislation, such as AmeriCorps, extend the opportunity to young people to do something for others.

When serving in the Peace Corps, at an Asian desk, I was motivated to accept the challenge made by President Kennedy and I joined VISTA. Through VISTA, I came to West Virginia and a “coal camp,” a small, struggling town called Emmons. We were inspired to improve the quality of life in Emmons was not easy. But after a lot of effort, I was able to both make friends and work to make some kind of difference. We pulled down an abandoned school house in southern West Virginia and hauled it back to Emmons, where we built a community center. We brought a mobile health van for women to get Pap smears for the first time. And we waged a long, hard fight to get the school bus to stop close enough so the teenagers did not have to drop out of school just because the transportation to high school did not exist. Those two years in Emmons, and the experiences gained there, changed my life forever. I stayed in West Virginia and chose to make public service my career.

When President Clinton chose to unveil a new domestic civil-service program in 1993, I was proud to stand by him as he announced the creation of AmeriCorps in Princeton, New Jersey. AmeriCorps is an exciting program promoting community service, like VISTA. Under AmeriCorps, members invest their time in community service and earn educational awards that help finance college or pay back student loans. While working.

Since its inception just a few years ago, AmeriCorps has renewed community service across our nation with a network of programs designed to meet the specific needs of an area. In West Virginia, AmeriCorps has established more than a half dozen programs that help children learn how to read, provide them with caring mentors, and promote healthy lifestyles.

In highlighting a few of these programs, and must begin with the AmeriCorps Promise Fellows. These individuals service eighteen West Virginia counties, striving to mobilize
communities to provide children with resources critical to their development. In the same way that I helped the community of Emmons build a center where young people could learn and play, AmeriCorps Promise Fellows work to create spaces and structured activities in their local areas. Another program, Energy Express, provides balanced meals, an environment that abounds with literature, and the attention of mentors to school-aged children during the summer months. I visited the Energy Express site in Pineville, West Virginia, and read to children there. AmeriCorps programs also aid adult members of the community, as evidenced by the success of Project MOVE in west-central West Virginia that strives to move people from welfare to work. After the first year, the heads of households in twenty families had become employed and had sustained themselves for more than three months.

These three programs are just a sampling of what AmeriCorps does in a rural state like West Virginia. In more urban areas throughout the country, AmeriCorps has programs that address the unique needs of those cities and their populations. I place an enormous value on public service, and I know that I gained much from my VISTA experience in Emmons. Continuing AmeriCorps, VISTA and our range of community service programs will enhance the lives of Americans, young and old, who join and enrich our communities.

**ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS**

At the request of Mr. Grassley, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Gramm) was added as a cosponsor of S. 353, a bill to provide for class action reform, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. L. Chafee, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. Gorton) was added as a cosponsor of S. 662, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program.

At the request of Mr. DeWine, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Edwards) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to improve the administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts and the quality and availability of training for judges, attorneys, and volunteers working in such courts, and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

At the request of Mr. Craig, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Nickles) was added as a cosponsor of S. 729, a bill to ensure that Congress and the public have the right to participate in the declaration of national monuments on federal land.

At the request of Mr. Mack, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Baucus) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1017, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on the low-income housing credit.

At the request of Mr. Roberts, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Kerrey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1066, a bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to encourage the use of and research into agricultural best practices to improve the environment, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Daschle, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Lautenberg) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1322, a bill to prohibit health insurance and employment discrimination against individuals and their family members on the basis of predictive genetic information or genetic services.

At the request of Mr. L. Chafee, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1443, a bill to amend section 10102 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding elementary school and secondary school counseling.

At the request of Mr. Kennedy, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1805, a bill to restore food stamp benefits for aliens, to provide States with flexibility in administering the food stamp vehicle allowance, to index the excess shelter expense deduction to inflation, to authorize additional appropriations to purchase and make available additional commodities under the emergency food assistance program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. Hutchison, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2018, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise the update factor used in making payments to PPS hospitals under the medicare program.

At the request of Mr. Hatch, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Bunning) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2045, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to H-1B nonimmigrant aliens.

At the request of Mr. Fitzgerald, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Ashcroft) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2070, a bill to improve safety standards for child restraints in motor vehicles.

At the request of Mr. Gorton, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Bunning) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2071, a bill to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system.

At the request of Mr. DeWine, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Edwards) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2271, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to improve the quality and availability of training for judges, attorneys, and volunteers working in the Nation's abuse and neglect courts, and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

At the request of Mr. DeWine, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Edwards) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2272, a bill to improve the administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

At the request of Mr. L. Chafee, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. Graham) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2299, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to continue State Medicaid disproportionate share hospital (DSH) allotments for fiscal year 2001 at the levels for fiscal year 2000.

At the request of Mr. Moynihan, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Jeffords) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2394, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize indirect graduate medical education payments.

At the request of Mr. Durbin, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kerry) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2423, a bill to provide Federal Perkins Loan cancellation for public defenders.

At the request of Mr. Jeffords, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Robb) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2505, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide increased access to healthcare for medical beneficiaries through telemedicine.

At the request of Ms. Collins, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Jeffords) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2528, a bill to provide funds for the purchase of automatic external defibrillators and the training of individuals in advanced cardiac life support.

At the request of Mrs. Feinstein, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Grassley) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2586, a bill to reduce the backlog in the processing of immigration benefit applications and to make improvements to infrastructure necessary for
the effective provision of immigration services, and for other purposes.
S. 2609

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 2609, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act to enhance the funds available for grants to States for fish and wildlife conservation projects, and to increase opportunities for recreational hunting, bow hunting, trapping, archery, and fishing, by eliminating chances for waste, fraud, abuse, maladministration, and unauthorized expenditures for administration and implementation of those Acts, and for other purposes.
S. 2609

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2612, a bill to combat Ecstasy trafficking, distribution, and abuse in the United States, and for other purposes.
S. 2612

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUx), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2639, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide programs for the treatment of mental illness.
S. 2639

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2644, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand Medicare coverage of certain self-injected biologics.
S. 2644

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BRYAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2645, a bill to provide for the application of certain measures to the People's Republic of China in response to the illegal sale, transfer, or misuse of certain controlled goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes.
S. 2645

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 2688, a bill to amend the Native American Languages Act to provide for the support of Native American Language Survival Schools, and for other purposes.
S. 2688

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2689, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Andrew Jackson Higgins (posthumously), and to the D-Day Museum in recognition of the contributions of Higgins Industries and the more than 30,000 employees of Higgins Industries to the Nation and to world peace during World War II.
S. 2689

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2698, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an incentive to ensure that all Americans gain timely and equitable access to the Internet over current and future generations of broadband capability.
S. 2698

At the request of Mrs. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2699, a bill to strengthen the authority of the Federal Government to protect individuals from certain acts and practices in the sale and purchase of social security numbers and social security account numbers, and for other purposes.
S. 2699

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2741, a bill to amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants for States to develop and to implement programs dealing with agricultural issues, and for other purposes.
S. 2741

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2742, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase disclosure exemptions to not more than $225,600,000 shall be provided for the support of Native American Language Survival Schools, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2750, a bill to establish an Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior to participate constructively in the implementation of the Las Vegas Wash Water Restoration and Lake Mead Water Quality Improvement Project, Nevada.
S. CON. RES. 124

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 254, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Olympics.
S. RES. 254

At the request of Mr. EDWARDS, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELELLI) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 268, a resolution designating July 17 through July 23 as "National Fragile X Awareness Week."  S. RES. 268

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBASE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 301, a resolution designating August 16, 2000, as "National Airborne Day."  S. RES. 301

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINGOLD) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 304, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the development of educational programs on veterans' contributions to the country and the designation of the week that includes Veterans Day as "National Veterans Awareness Week" for the presentation of such educational programs.
S. RES. 304

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3495 proposed to S. 2522, an original bill making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.
S. AMENDMENT NO. 3495

Provided that of the funds appropriated under this heading, not more than $225,600,000 shall be expended: Provided, that the amount "$909,100,000" shall be available for the Push into Southern Colombia, of which amount not less than $25,000,000
shall be available for resettlement and alternative development activities of the Push into Southern Colombia: Provided further: .

HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 3498

Mr. HELMS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

SEC. 3. SUPPORT BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION FOR SERBIA.

(a) FINDINGS. Congress finds that—

(1) General Dragoljub Ojdanic, Minister of Defense of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and an indicted war criminal, visited Moscow from May 9 through May 12, 2000, as a guest of the Government of the Russian Federation, attended the inauguration of President Vladimir Putin, and held talks with Russian Defense Minister Igor Sergeyev and Army Chief of Staff Anatoly Kvaishin;

(2) General Ojdanic was military Chief of Staff of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia during the Kosovo war and has been indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) for crimes against humanity and violations of the laws and customs of war for alleged atrocities against Albanians in Kosovo;

(3) International warrants have been issued by the Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia for General Ojdanic's arrest and extradition to the Hague;

(4) The Government of the Russian Federation, a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council which established the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, has an obligation to arrest General Ojdanic and extradite him to the Hague;

(5) On May 16, 2000, Russian Minister of Economics Andrei Shapovalyants announced that his government had accepted the Serbian regime of Slobodan Milosevic $102,000,000 of a $150,000,000 loan it had reactivated and will sell the Government of Serbia $32,000,000 of oil despite the fact that the international community has imposed economic sanctions against the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Government of Serbia;

(6) The Government of the Russian Federation is providing the Milosevic regime such assistance while it is seeking debt relief from the International Monetary Fund and loans from the International Monetary Fund, and while it is receiving corn and grain as food aid from the United States;

(7) The possibility provided to General Ojdanic demonstrates that the Government of the Russian Federation rejects the indictments brought by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia against him and other officials, including Slobodan Milosevic, for alleged atrocities committed during the Kosovo war; and

(b) ACTIONS. (1) The President of the United States shall instruct his representatives to negotiate a $102,000,000 of a $150,000,000 loan it had reactivated and will sell the Government of Serbia $32,000,000 of oil despite the fact that the international community has imposed economic sanctions against the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Government of Serbia to promote and support a negotiated settlement of the conflict in Colombia.

HARKIN AMENDMENT NO. 3499

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

On page 142, on line 5 strike: `Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, not less than $5,000,000 shall be made available for the transportation and rehabilitation of blind children in Colombia' and insert in lieu thereof: `Provided further, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not less than $5,000,000 shall be made available for the transportation and rehabilitation of blind children in Colombia.'
McCONNELL AMENDMENTS NOS. 3505-3506

Mr. McCONNELL proposed two amendments to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3505

On page 38, line 6, strike ‘‘$330,000,000’’ and insert ‘‘$340,000,000’’.

AMENDMENT NO. 3506

On page 63, on line 9 after the words ‘‘Sec. 530.’’ strike all through line 15 and insert the following: ‘‘(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subsection (b), the United States may not sell or otherwise make available under the Arms Export Control Act or chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 any Stinger ground-to-air missiles to any country bordering the Persian Gulf.

(b) ADDITIONAL TRANSFERS AUTHORIZED.—In addition to other defense articles authorized to be transferred by section 581 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriation Act, 1990, the United States may sell or make available, under the Arms Export Control Act or chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, Stinger ground-to-air missiles to any country bordering the Persian Gulf in order to replace, on a one-for-one basis, Stinger missiles previously furnished to such country if the Stinger missiles to be replaced are nearing the scheduled expiration of their shelf-life.’’

MCCONNELL (AND LEAHY) AMENDMENT NOS. 3507-3508

Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) proposed two amendments to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3507

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new general provision.

PROCUREMENT AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REFORM

Sec. __. (a) Of the funds made available under the heading ‘‘International Financial Institutions’’ in this or any prior Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Act, 10 percent of the United States portion or payment to such International Financial Institution shall be withheld by the Secretary of Treasury, until the Secretary certifies—

(1) the institution is implementing procedures for conducting semi-annual audits by qualified independent auditors for all new lending;

(2) the institution has taken steps to establish an independent fraud and corruption investigation organization or office;

(3) the institution has implemented a program to assess a recipient country’s procurement and financial management capabilities including an assessment of the risks of corruption prior to initiating new lending; and

(4) the institution is taking steps to fund and implement measures to improve transparency of procurement programs and procurement and financial management controls in recipient countries.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall, on March 1, 2011, to the Committee on Appropriations on progress made to fulfill the objectives identified in subsection (A).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—The term ‘‘International Financial Institutions’’ means the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Financial Corporation, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Inter-American Investment Corporation, the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund, the Asian Development Bank, the Asian Development Fund, African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund.

AMENDMENT NO. 3508

On page 21, line 21, after the word ‘‘organizations’’ insert ‘‘;’’.

Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading not less than $570,000 shall be made available to support the National Albanian American Council’s training program for Kosovar women’’.

GREGG AMENDMENT NO. 3509

Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. GREGG) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

On page 103, beginning in line 13, strike ‘‘Committee on Appropriations’’ and all that follows through ‘‘Representatives’’ and insert ‘‘Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and International Relations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives’’.

SHELBY AMENDMENT NO. 3510

Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

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

Sec. ___. USE OF FUNDS FOR THE UNITED STATES-ASIA ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries, funds appropriated by this Act or any other Act making appropriations pursuant to part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 that are available for the United States-Asia Environmental Partnership may be made available for activities for the People’s Republic of China.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Baucus-Roberts amendment, that provides to China with the environmental and humanitarian U.S.-Asia Environmental Partnership (USAEP). This program provides an invaluable service to the rapidly developing countries of Asia. Through sharing knowledge and technologies development problems with the water, land and sky, the USAEP improves the lives of hundreds of millions of people.

Unfortunately, China has yet to take part in this important program. Our amendment seeks to undo this outdated sanction on Asia’s largest and most environmentally sensitive nation.

Let me share a few highlights about the program. First, the USAEP provides trained environmental and commercial specialists that provide business counseling to Asians and Americans. They help to link prospective business partners and identify innovative, cost-effective solutions to sensitive environmental problems.

Making USAEP funds available for U.S.-China Partnerships would benefit both our countries. For example, access to funding for partnerships with China would have a tremendous positive effect on many states such as Montana. These funds would open large markets for environmental services that, for all practical purposes, have been closed to business from the United States.

The Chinese need for environmental services is extreme. China requires more than $10 billion in annual investment to combat water pollution, air pollution, municipal and industrial waste, agricultural runoff and protection of natural environments. Much of the expertise required to address these problems will have to come from outside of China.

Montana possesses an outstanding environmental industry with the skills and experience to help China address these problems. Despite the fact that Montana companies have exactly the expertise that China needs to address its environmental problems, Montana companies have been unable to enter the Chinese market. The State government and the companies themselves lack the funding required to develop long-term relationships with appropriate Chinese companies or government officials.

Montana already has extensive environmental cooperation with Canada, Europe and Japan. Environmental Minister Xie Zhenhua has attributed the relative lack of cooperation between U.S. businesses and China to the low level of U.S. government funding for business development and technology transfer.

This lack of funding for has not only limited U.S. access to Chinese markets for environmental services but it has also meant that the income generated between large exporting states and rural states like Montana, California and Washington, states that can afford to promote business development, have seen exports to China grow significantly over the past 5 years. Meanwhile, the incomes of Montanans have experienced a steady decline relative to these richer states.

USAEP funding to support development of U.S.-Chinese business relationships is vital to the growth of Montana’s environmental industry. Even modest funding for business development could lead to millions of dollars to the Montana economy. Without a
Mrs. LINCOLN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

BROWNBACK AMENDMENT NO. 3512
Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BROWNBACK) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

LOTT (AND COCHRAN) AMENDMENT NO. 3513
Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

SHELBY AMENDMENTS NOS. 3514-3515
(Ordered to lie on the table.)

On page 103, beginning on line 13, strike “Committee on Appropriations” and all that follows through “Representatives” and insert “Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and International Relations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives”.

WELLSTONE AMENDMENT 3518
Mr. WELLSTONE proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

On page 143, line 9, insert before the period the following: “Provided further, That, subject to the 2 preceding provisos, of the funds appropriated for military purposes under this heading for the ‘Push into Southern Colombia’, $225,000,000 shall be made available to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration for carrying out subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Services Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-21 et seq.); Provided further, That amounts made available under the preceding proviso are hereby designated by the Congress to be emergency supplemental appropriations pursuant to section 252(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: Provided further, That such amounts shall be made available 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”.

GORTON AMENDMENT NO. 3517
(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GORTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

Beginning page 141, line 9, strike “$934,100,000” and all that follows through line 18 on page 155 and insert the following: “$200,000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be utilized in Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, and other countries in South and Central America and the Caribbean at the discretion of the Secretary of State.”.

GORTON AMENDMENT NO. 3517
Mr. GORTON proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2522, supra; as follows:

Beginning page 141, line 9, strike “$934,100,000” and all that follows through line 18 on page 155 and insert the following: “$200,000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be utilized in Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, and other countries in South and Central America and the Caribbean at the discretion of the Secretary of State.”.

STEVENSON AMENDMENT 3518
Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. STEVENSON (for himself, Mr. INOUE, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

On page 38, on line 12 after the word “Propriations” insert the following: “Provided further, That foreign military financing program funds estimated to be outlayed for Egypt during the fiscal year 2001 shall be transferred to an interest bearing account for Egypt in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York within 30 days of enactment of this Act or by October 31, 2000, whichever is later: Provided further, that withdrawal from the account shall be made only on authenticated instructions from the Defense Finance and Accounting Service: Provided further, That in the event the interest being account is closed, the balance of the account shall be transferred promptly to the current appropriations account under this heading: Provided further, That none of the interest accruing to the account shall be obligated except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations”.

FEINGOLD AMENDMENT NO. 3520
(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2522, supra; 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 obligations and expenditures”.

COVERDELL AND LEAHY AMENDMENT NO. 3521
(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. COVERDELL (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HELMS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. PERU.

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Organization of American States (OAS) Electoral Observer Mission, led by Eduardo Stein, deserves the recognition and gratitude of the United States for having performed an extraordinary service in promoting representative democracy in the Americas by working to ensure free and fair elections in Peru and by exposing efforts of the Government of Peru to manipulate the national elections in April and May of 2000 to benefit the president in power.
(2) The Government of Peru failed to establish the conditions for free and fair elections—both for the April 9 election as well as for the May 28 run-off—by not taking effective action to prevent the "insider manipulation, irregularities, inconsistencies, and inequities" documented by the OAS Electoral Observation Mission.

(3) The United States Government should support the work of the OAS high-level mission, and that such mission should base its specific recommendations on the views of civil society and international human rights organizations by their government to respect human rights, the rule of law, the independence and constitutional role of the judiciary and national congress, and freedom of expression and journalism.

(4) In accordance with P.L. 106-186, the United States should review and modify as appropriate its political, economic, and military relations with Peru and work with other democracies in this hemisphere and elsewhere toward a restoration of democracy in Peru.

(5) The President shall instruct the United States executive directors to the international financial institutions to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose loans to the Government of Peru, except those loans specifically dedicated to humanitarian assistance, drug interdiction, counter-narcotics assistance, or assistance to support bi-national peace activities involving Peru and Ecuador.

(6) Cuban authorities have cooperated with United States authorities to intercept illegal drug shipments.

(7) The Government of Cuba has expressed its desire to expand cooperation with the United States on drug interdiction efforts by accepting an upgrading of the current telex link between the Cuban Border Guard and the United States Coast Guard and by allowing a United States Coast Guard officer to be stationed at the United States Interests Section in Havana, Cuba.
(1) illegal paramilitary groups in Colombia pose a serious obstacle to U.S. and Colombian counter-narcotics efforts;
(2) abduction of innocent civilians is often used by such groups to gain influence and recognition;
(3) three U.S. citizens, David Mankins, Mark Rich, and Rick Teneroff, who were engaged in humanitarian and religious work were abducted by one such group and have been held hostage in Colombia since January 31, 1993;
(4) these 3 men have the distinction of being the longest-held American hostages;
(5) their kidnappers are believed to be members of the FARCs narco-guerrilla organization in Colombia;
(6) the families of these American citizens have not had any word about their safety or welfare for 7 years; and
(7) such acts against humanitarian workers are acts of cowardice and are against basic human dignity and are perpetrated by criminals and thus not deserving of any form of recognition.

**BYRD AMENDMENT NO. 3531**

(Ordained to lie on the table.)

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

Sec. 1. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, $18,500,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense for the purpose of conducting emergency evacuation or search and rescue operations for the purpose of conducting emergency evacuation or search and rescue operations for the Central Government of Colombia to exceed 350.

(2) Congress enacts a joint resolution approving the request of the President under subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The President may waive the limitation in subsection (b)(1) if:

(1) for a single period of up to 90 days in the event that the Armed Forces of the United States are involved in hostilities or that imminent involvement by the Armed Forces of the United States is clearly indicated by the circumstances; or

(2) for the purpose of conducting emergency evacuation or search and rescue operations.

(2) REPORTS.—Beginning within 90 days of the date of enactment of this Act, and every 60 days thereafter, the President shall submit a report to Congress setting forth all costs (including incremental costs incurred by the Department of Defense) incurred by Executive agencies during the two previous fiscal quarters for support of counter-drug activities of Colombia.

**AMENDMENT NO. 3534**

Strike line 19 on page 151 through line 7 on page 152 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

**BUDGETARY ESTIMATES AND REPORTS ON SUPPORT FOR PLAN COLOMBIA.—**

(a) REPORTS ON SUPPORT FOR PLAN COLOMBIA.—

(1) BUDGET REQUEST.—For each of the next four fiscal years, the President shall include with each budget for a fiscal year submitted to the Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, information that clearly identifies and justifies, by Executive agency, amounts requested in the budget for appropriation for that fiscal year for support of Plan Colombia.

(2) REPORTS ON EXPENDITURES.—Not later than June 1, 2001, and June 1 and December 1 of each of the succeeding four fiscal years, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on expenditures incurred by the President for Plan Colombia.

**AMENDMENT NO. 3535**

Strike line 19 on page 151 through line 2 on page 154 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

**BUDGETARY ESTIMATES AND REPORTS ON SUPPORT FOR PLAN COLOMBIA AND LIMITATIONS ON THE ASSIGNMENT OF UNITED STATES PERSONNEL IN COLOMBIA.—**

(a) REPORTS ON SUPPORT FOR PLAN COLOMBIA.—

(1) BUDGET REQUEST.—For each of the next four fiscal years, the President shall include with each budget for a fiscal year submitted to the Congress under title 31, United States Code, information that clearly identifies and justifies, by Executive agency, amounts requested in the budget for appropriation for that fiscal year for support of Plan Colombia.

(2) REPORTS ON EXPENDITURES.—Not later than June 1, 2001, and June 1 and December 1 of each of the succeeding four fiscal years, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on expenditures incurred by the President for Plan Colombia.
shall provide a breakdown of expenditures by Executive agency.

""(b) LIMITATION ON ASSIGNMENT OF UNITED STATES PERSONNEL IN COLOMBIA.--

(1) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), more of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for any other Act during fiscal year 2001 and the next four fiscal years (including unobligated balances of prior appropriations) may be available for—

(A) the reassignment of any United States military personnel for temporary or permanent duty for support of counter-drug activities of Colombia if that assignment would cause the number of United States military personnel so assigned in Colombia to exceed 250 (excluding military personnel assigned to the United States diplomatic mission in Colombia);

(B) the employment of any United States individual civilian retained as a contractor in Colombia if that employment would cause the total number of United States individual civilian contractors employed in Colombia in support of counter-drug activities of Colombia to exceed 300.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The limitation contained in paragraph (1) shall not apply if—

(A) the President submits a report to Congress requesting that the limitation shall not apply; and

(B) Congress enacts a joint resolution approving the request of the President under subparagraph (A).

(c) The President may waive the limitation in subsection (b)(1)—

(1) for a single period of up to 90 days in the event that the Armed Forces of the United States are involved in hostilities or that imminent involvement by the Armed Forces of the United States is clearly indicated by the circumstances; or

(2) for the purpose of conducting emergency evacuation or search and rescue operations.

(d) REPORTS.—Beginning within 90 days of the date of enactment of this Act, and every 60 days thereafter, the President shall submit a report to Congress that shall include the aggregate number, locations, activities, and lengths of assignment for all United States military personnel, and United States individual civilians employed as contractors, in support of counter-drug activities of Colombia.

BIDEN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3536

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. DOMENICI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. 6106. LIMITATIONS ON SUPPORT FOR PLAN COLOMBIA AND ON THE ASSIGNMENT OF UNITED STATES PERSONNEL IN COLOMBIA.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by any Act shall be available for support of Plan Colombia unless and until—

(A) the President submits a report to Congress requesting the availability of such funds; and

(B) Congress enacts a joint resolution approving the request of the President under subparagraph (A).

(2) EXCEPTION.—The limitation in paragraph (1) does not apply to—

(A) appropriations made by this Act, the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2001, or the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001, for the purpose of support of Plan Colombia; or

(B) the unobligated balances from any other program used for their originally appropriated purpose to combat drug production and trafficking, foster peace, increase the rule of law, improve human rights, expand economic development, and institute justice reform in the countries covered by Plan Colombia.

BIDEN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3537

Beginning on page 151, line 21, strike "(a)" and all that follows through line 7 on page 152 and insert the following:

AMENDMENT NO. 3537

Beginning on page 151, line 21, strike "(a)" and all that follows through line 7 on page 152 and insert the following:

AMENDMENT NO. 3538

Beginning on page 151, line 21, strike "(a)" and all that follows through line 7 on page 152 and insert the following:

BYRD AMENDMENTS NOS. 3537-3538

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BYRD submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:
(f) BIMONTHLY REPORTS.—Beginning within 90 days of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and every 60 days thereafter, the President shall submit a report to Congress that shall include the aggregate number, locations, activities, and lengths of assignment for all temporary and permanent United States military personnel and United States government civilian and contractor employees involved in the anticoparcial campaign in Colombia.

(g) CONGRESSIONAL PRIORITY PROCEDURES.—

(1) JOINT RESOLUTIONS DEFINED.—

(A) For purposes of subsection (a)(1)(B), the term “joint resolution” means only a joint resolution introduced not later than 10 days of the date on which the report of the President under subsection (a)(1)(A) is received by Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That Congress approves the request of the President for additional funds for Plan Colombia contained in the report submitted by the President under section 6106(a)(1) of the 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.”

(B) For purposes of subsection (b)(2)(B), the term “joint resolution” means only a joint resolution introduced not later than 10 days of the date of the report of the President under subsection (a)(1)(A) is received by Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That Congress approves the request of the President for exemption from the limitation applicable to the assignment of personnel in Colombia contained in the report submitted by the President under section 6106(b)(1)(B) of the 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.”

(2) PROCEDURES.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B) shall be considered in a House of Congress in accordance with the procedures applicable to joint resolutions under paragraphs (3) through (8) of section 806(c) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1985 (as contained in Public Law 98-473, 98 Stat. 1936).

(h) PLAN COLOMBIA DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Plan Colombia” means the plan of the Government of Colombia instituted by the administration of President Pastrana to combat drug production and trafficking, foster peace, increase the rule of law, improve human rights, expand economic development, and institute justice reform.

BROWNBACK AMENDMENT NO. 3539

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

On page 20, line 2 after the word “Development”, insert the following: “Provided further, That up to $15,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading, shall be used, notwithstanding other provision of law, to provide material assistance to the National Democratic Alliance of Sudan to strengthen its ability to protect civilians from attacks by Sudanese air, artillery, and non-lethal, non-food aid such as, but not limited to, blankets, medicine, fuel, mobile clinics, water drilling equipment, communications equipment for the protection of civilians of aerial bombardment, non-military vehicles, tents, and shoes.”

BOXER AMENDMENTS NOS. 3540-3542

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mrs. BOXER submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by her to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3540

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. 6107. (a) SUPPORT FOR COUNTERINSURGENCY OPERATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for the assignment of any personnel, equipment, or other resources of the Department of Defense for the support of any training program involving a Colombian unit that engages in counterinsurgency operations.

(b) LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for the direct participation of a member of the Armed Forces or a civilian employee of the Department of Defense in any law enforcement activities in Colombia, including search, seizure, arrest, or similar activities.

(c) COUNTERDRUG FIELD OPERATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for the support of any training program in Colombia that includes the aggregate number, location, and activities of United States military personnel and United States government civilian and contractor employees involved in the support of any training program involving a Colombian unit that engages in counterinsurgency operations.

AMENDMENT NO. 3541

At the end, add the following:

TITLE —INTERNATIONAL HEALTH EMERGENCIES

In addition to any funds otherwise appropriated in this Act, $64 million shall be available for programs to combat HIV/AIDS; provided further, That the funds appropriated under this title, not less than $75 million shall be made available for programs to combat tuberculosis; provided further, That the funds appropriated under this title, not less than $19 million shall be available for the prevention, treatment, and control of malaria; provided further, That such amounts made available under this title 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 3543

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

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

ADOPTION INCENTIVE PAYMENTS

Sec. 591. Section 473A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (h)(1), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2001 and each succeeding fiscal year;”;

and

(2) in subsection (j), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) EXTENSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—For purposes of making grants under this subsection for fiscal year 2001—

“(A) paragraph (1) shall be applied by substituting ‘1999’ and ‘2000’ for ‘1998’ and ‘1999’ respectively; and

“(B) paragraph (2) shall be applied by substituting ‘$36,000,000’ and ‘$23,000,000’ for ‘$23,000,000’ and ‘$20,000,000’ respectively.”.

FRIST AMENDMENT NO. 3544

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. FRIST) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2522, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. 6107. (a) REPORTING REQUIREMENT ON SUDAN.

One hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees—
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(b) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) DOWRY DEATH.—The term ‘‘dowry death’’ means the death of a woman because of a dowry dispute.

(2) HONOR KILLING.—The term ‘‘honor killing’’ means the murder of a woman suspected of dishonoring her family.

**Amendment No. 3547**

On page 12, line 14, strike ‘‘loans.’’ and insert the following: ‘‘loans: Provided further, That no funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $1,000,000 shall be used to develop and integrate, where appropriate, educational programs aimed at eliminating the practice of female genital mutilation.’’

**Amendment No. 3548**

On page 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following: ‘‘elimination of female genital mutilation.’’

**Amendment No. 3549**

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

SEC. 2522. ELIMINATION OF FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION.

Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ‘‘Department of State, Migration and Refugee Assistance’’, not more than $1,000,000 may be used for the Secretary of State to—

(1) conduct a study to determine the prevalence of the practice of female genital mutilation, including the existence and enforcement of laws prohibiting the practice; and

(2) the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury should explore ways to alleviate the losses of debt relief by lender developing countries, including Costa Rica.

(b) Amendments.—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury should explore ways to alleviate the losses of debt relief by lender developing countries, including Costa Rica.

L. CHAFFEE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3551

Mr. MCCONNELL (for L. CHAFFEE for himself, Mr. MACK, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. WOLLSTONE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. DODD, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. JEFFORDS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2522, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. 2522. SENSE OF SENATE ON DEBT RELIEF FOR WORLD’S POOREST COUNTRIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The burden of external debt has become a major impediment to economic growth and poverty reduction in many of the world’s poorest countries.

(2) Until recently, the United States Government and other official creditors sought to address this problem by rescheduling loans and in some cases providing limited debt reduction.

(3) Despite such efforts, the cumulative debt of many of the world’s poorest countries continued to grow beyond their capacity to repay.

(4) In 1996, the Group of Seven, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund adopted the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC), a commitment by the international community that all bilateral and multilateral creditors, acting in a coordinated and concerted fashion, would reduce poor country debt to a sustainable level.

(5) A wide range of organizations and institutions, including leading churches worldwide, have endorsed the concept of writing off the debt of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries.

(6) In 1999, Congress passed and the President signed into law funding for the forgiveness of a portion of the bilateral debt owed by the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries to the United States.

(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the relevant committees of the Senate report to the full Senate legislation authorizing comprehensive debt relief for poor countries;

(2) these authorizations of bilateral and multilateral debt relief should be designed to strengthen and expand eligible countries that—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 citizenry, 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 prevent 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 a 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 currently pending before the relevant committees, Congress should fully fund bilateral and multilateral debt relief to ensure the maximum leverage of international funds and the maximum benefit to the eligible countries.

HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 3552

Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2522, supra; as follows:

On page 34, line 19, insert the following: ‘‘: Provided further, That notwithstanding the previous proviso, $250,000,000 of the funds appropriated for Israel shall not be disbursed until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the appropriate committees of the Congress that the proposed transfer by Israel to China of equipment and technology associated with the “Phalcon” radar system does not pose a threat to the national security of the United States or has been canceled by the Government of Israel.’’

MCCONNELL AMENDMENT NO. 3553

Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2522, supra; as follows:

On page 33, line 18, insert, ‘‘: Provided further, That funds made available as a U.S. contribution to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Trust Fund shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committee on Appropriations’’

COCHRAN AMENDMENT NO. 3554

Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2522, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs", $50,000,000, to remain available until expended, for (a) grants to public works projects, and (b) revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene; provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to the extent that the President submits to Congress an official budget request for a specific grant; and includes a designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901 et seq.); provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
RURAL COMMUNITY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM
For an additional amount for the rural community advancement program under the heading "Rural Development Block Grants", as authorized under section 381E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009d), $50,000,000, to remain available until expended, for (a) providing financial assistance to rural community facilities grant program under section 306(a)(19) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(19)); (b) approved, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

EDWARDS AMENDMENT NO. 3557
Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. EDWARDS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2522, supra; as follows:
At the appropriate place, insert:
For an additional amount for "Community Development Block Grants", as authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Act of 1974, for emergency expenses resulting from Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, and Hurricane Irene, and Hurricane Andrew events, $150,000,000, to remain available until expended for all activities eligible under title I, except for activity reimbursable by the Federal Emergency Management Agency or available through the Small Business Administration: Provided, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

KYL (AND DOMENICI) AMENDMENT NO. 3558
Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI)) proposed two amendments to the bill S. 2522, supra; as follows:
At an appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:
SEC. 2. IMPLEMENTATION OF SECURITY REFORMS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.
I. FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) On March 17, 1999, President Clinton asked the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) to undertake an inquiry and issue a report on "the security posture at the Department of Energy's weapons labs and the adequacy of the measures that have been taken to address it."
(2) In June 1999, the PFIAB issued a report titled "Science at its Best, Security at its Worst," which concluded the Department of Energy "represents the best of America's scientific workforce and achievement, and it has been responsible for the worst security record on secrecy that the members of this panel have ever encountered."
(3) The PFIAB further stated, "Organizational disarray, managerial neglect, and a culture of arrogance—both at DOE headquarters and the labs themselves—conspired to create an espionage scandal waiting to happen."
(4) The PFIAB report further stated, "The Department of Energy's political and bureaucratic bungling has failed to resolve the many specific problems with security and counterintelligence in the weapons laboratories, but also to address the lack of accountability that has become endemic throughout the entire Department." * * * Real and lasting security and counterintelligence reform at the weapons labs is simply unworkable within DOE's current structure and culture:
(ii) the bipartisan Select Committee on U.S. National Security and International Relations, chaired by Mr. Kyl of Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 3555
Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. Smith of New Hampshire) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2522, supra; as follows:
At the appropriate place, add the following:
SEC. 1. TRANSPARENCY.
(1) The report of the Select Committee shall designate the Department of Commerce as having the responsibility to ensure transparency in compiling its report.
(2) The Department of Commerce shall consult with interested private sector representatives in compiling its report.

SMITH OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
AMENDMENT NO. 3555
Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. Smith of New Hampshire) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2522, supra; as follows:
At the appropriate place, insert the following:
SEC. 1. IMPACT OF THE LACK OF TRANSPARENCY.
(1) On March 18, 1999, President Clinton asked the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) to undertake an inquiry and issue a report on "the security posture at the Department of Energy's weapons labs and the adequacy of the measures that have been taken to address it."
(2) In June 1999, the PFIAB issued a report titled "Science at its Best, Security at its Worst," which concluded the Department of Energy "represents the best of America's scientific workforce and achievement, and it has been responsible for the worst security record on secrecy that the members of this panel have ever encountered.
(3) The PFIAB further stated, "Organizational disarray, managerial neglect, and a culture of arrogance—both at DOE headquarters and the labs themselves—conspired to create an espionage scandal waiting to happen."
(4) The PFIAB report further stated, "The Department of Energy's political and bureaucratic bungling has failed to resolve the many specific problems with security and counterintelligence in the weapons laboratories, but also to address the lack of accountability that has become endemic throughout the entire Department. * * * Real and lasting security and counterintelligence reform at the weapons labs is simply unworkable within DOE's current structure and culture:
(ii) the bipartisan Select Committee on U.S. National Security and International Relations, chaired by Mr. Kyl of Arizona.

EDWARDS AND TORRICELLI
AMENDMENT NO. 3556
Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. EDWARDS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2522, supra; as follows:
At the appropriate place, insert the following:
SEC. 1. IMPACT OF THE LACK OF TRANSPARENCY.
(1) On March 18, 1999, President Clinton asked the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) to undertake an inquiry and issue a report on "the security posture at the Department of Energy's weapons labs and the adequacy of the measures that have been taken to address it."
(2) In June 1999, the PFIAB issued a report titled "Science at its Best, Security at its Worst," which concluded the Department of Energy "represents the best of America's scientific workforce and achievement, and it has been responsible for the worst security record on secrecy that the members of this panel have ever encountered.
(3) The PFIAB further stated, "Organizational disarray, managerial neglect, and a culture of arrogance—both at DOE headquarters and the labs themselves—conspired to create an espionage scandal waiting to happen."
(4) The PFIAB report further stated, "The Department of Energy's political and bureaucratic bungling has failed to resolve the many specific problems with security and counterintelligence in the weapons laboratories, but also to address the lack of accountability that has become endemic throughout the entire Department. * * * Real and lasting security and counterintelligence reform at the weapons labs is simply unworkable within DOE's current structure and culture:
(ii) the bipartisan Select Committee on U.S. National Security and International Relations, chaired by Mr. Kyl of Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 3555
Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. Smith of New Hampshire) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2522, supra; as follows:
At the appropriate place, add the following:
SEC. 1. IMPACT OF THE LACK OF TRANSPARENCY.
(1) On March 18, 1999, President Clinton asked the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) to undertake an inquiry and issue a report on "the security posture at the Department of Energy's weapons labs and the adequacy of the measures that have been taken to address it."
(2) In June 1999, the PFIAB issued a report titled "Science at its Best, Security at its Worst," which concluded the Department of Energy "represents the best of America's scientific workforce and achievement, and it has been responsible for the worst security record on secrecy that the members of this panel have ever encountered.
(3) The PFIAB further stated, "Organizational disarray, managerial neglect, and a culture of arrogance—both at DOE headquarters and the labs themselves—conspired to create an espionage scandal waiting to happen."
(4) The PFIAB report further stated, "The Department of Energy's political and bureaucratic bungling has failed to resolve the many specific problems with security and counterintelligence in the weapons laboratories, but also to address the lack of accountability that has become endemic throughout the entire Department. * * * Real and lasting security and counterintelligence reform at the weapons labs is simply unworkable within DOE's current structure and culture:
Under Secretary, on October 5, 1999, President Clinton issued a statement which said, “Until further notice, the Secretary of Energy shall perform all duties and functions of the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security. The Secretary is instructed to guide and direct all personnel of the National Nuclear Security Administration.”

(12) The nomination of General John Gordon to head the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) was received by the Senate from the President on June 14, 2000. General J. Gordon had been confirmed by the Senate by a vote of 97 to 0. He has said that NNSA has failed to fully implement the law signed by the President on October 5, 1999. For example, Section 3013 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65) states that, with the exception of the Secretary of Energy, NNSA employees, “shall not be responsible to, or subject to the authority, direction, or control of, any officer, employee, or agent of the Department of Energy.” Yet page 16 of the Department of Energy’s Implementation Plan for the National Nuclear Security Administration released on January 1, 2000, states that in order to manage the performance of non-weapons related work at NNSA facilities such as the three nuclear labs, “non-NNSA officers or employees of the Department retain the authority to direct NNSA employees and contractors employed by them regard to the accomplishment of such work.”

(14) On May 26, 1999, Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson said, “American’s can be reassured: Our national secrets are today, safe and secure.”

(15) In response to a question from Senator Fitzgerald at a joint hearing of the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources, and Governmental Affairs of the Senate on October 19, 1999, Senator Richard said, “If there’s a problem, God forbid, with security at our nation’s labs while we have not fulfilled or appointed somebody as Under Secretary in this new agency within an agency, you would be willing to assume full responsibility. . . .” Secretary Richardson testified that, “I would assume full responsibility.”

(16) The recent security lapses at Los Alamos National Laboratory demonstrates that security and counterintelligence measures continue to be significantly deficient at United States nuclear facilities.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) The national security of the United States has been significantly harmed due to weak security and counterintelligence measures at America’s nuclear facilities.

(2) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, if implemented, will improve security and counterintelligence measures at United States nuclear facilities by establishing clear lines of authority and accountability to enable lasting reforms to be put in place.

(3) The President and the Secretary of Energy must immediately implement the provisions of Public Law 106-65, which established the National Nuclear Security Administration.

(4) The Secretary of Energy should permit the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to manage all aspects of the nuclear weapons programs without interference.

(5) The Secretary of Energy should drop efforts to ‘dual-hat’ officers or employees of the Department of Energy to serve concurrently in positions within the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Energy. Such efforts to excessively “dual-hat” officials are contrary to the intent of Congress when it passed Public Law 106-65.

(b) The Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration shall take all appropriate steps to ensure that the protection of sensitive and classified information becomes the highest priority of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

TORRICELLI (AND EDWARDS) AMENDMENT NO. 3559
Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself and Mr. EDWARDS)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2522, supra, as follows:

Amendment No. 3559
At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANT
For an additional amount for “Community Development Block Grants”, as authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 2000, for emergency expenses resulting from Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, and Hurricane Irene, and surrounding events, $250,000,000, to remain available until expended for all activities eligible under title I, except those activities reimbursable by the Federal Emergency Management Agency or otherwise available under the rural business Administration: Provided, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TORRICELLI (AND EDWARDS) AMENDMENTS NO. 3560–3567
(Ordered to lie on the table.)
Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself and Mr. EDWARDS) submitted eight amendments intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 2522, supra, as follows:

Amendment No. 3560
At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT AGRICULTURE
RURAL COMMUNITY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM
For an additional amount for the rural community advancement program under section 381E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 901b), $3 million, to remain available until expended, to provide grants under the rural community facilities grant program under section 306(a)(19) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(19)): Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Manville, New Jersey: Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Trenton, New Jersey.

Amendment No. 3561
At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
RURAL COMMUNITY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM
For an additional amount for the rural community advancement program under section 381E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 901b), $7 million, to remain available until expended, to provide grants under the rural community facilities grant program under section 306(a)(19) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(19)): Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated for Bound Brook, New Jersey: Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Bound Brook, New Jersey: Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Bound Brook, New Jersey: Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Bound Brook, New Jersey.

Amendment No. 3565
At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
For an additional amount for “Economic Development Assistance Programs,” $17 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Passaic, New Jersey: Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Passaic, New Jersey: Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Passaic, New Jersey: Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Passaic, New Jersey: Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Passaic, New Jersey: Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Passaic, New Jersey: Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Passaic, New Jersey: Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Passaic, New Jersey.
planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Patterson, New Jersey. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3566
At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," $77 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Patterson, New Jersey. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

NICKLES AMENDMENT NO. 3569
(Ordered to lie on the table.)
Mr. NICKLES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

On page 142, line 11 after the word "purposes:" insert the following:

"Provided further. That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Patterson, New Jersey."

EDWARDS AMENDMENTS NO. 3570-3581
(Ordered to lie on the table.)
Mr. EDWARDS submitted twelve amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3570
At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," $50 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Bound Brook, New Jersey. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3571
At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," $3 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Manville, New Jersey. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3572
At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," $4 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Tarboro, North Carolina. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3573
At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," $1.5 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Rocky Mount, North Carolina. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3574
At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," $3 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Pinetops, North Carolina. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3575
At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," $1.3 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Nashville, North Carolina. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).
AMENDMENT NO. 3576

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," $2.5 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Duplin County, North Carolina. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3577

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," $2.5 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Edgecombe County, North Carolina. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3578

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

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," $15 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Columbus County, North Carolina. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3579

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

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," $2.5 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Duplin County, North Carolina. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3580

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

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs," $1.5 million to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene: Provided, That the entire amount made available under this heading shall be available only to Beaufort County, North Carolina. Provided further, That the entire amount made available under this heading is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3581

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

CHAPTER 1
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FARM SERVICE AGENCY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", $77,560,000, 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 shall be available only to the extent an official budget request 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.

RURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

For an additional cost of water and waste grants, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1968(a)(2), to meet the needs of small rural communities, $75,000,000 to remain available until expended; and for an additional amount for community facilities grants pursuant to section 306 of the Farmers Home Administration and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009d(d)(1)) for emergency purposes, $15,872,000 from the Rural Housing Insurance Fund for section 515 rental housing, to remain available until expended, to address emergency needs resulting from Hurricane Floyd, or Irene, or the Secretary may use the proceeds of such sales to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans estimated to be
$40,000,000: Provided further, 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.

For additional gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans as authorized by this amendment is to be available from funds in the Rural Housing Insurance Fund to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters, as follows: $258,000,000, to remain available until expended; and $13,000,000, for section 504 housing repair loans.

For the additional cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters, as follows: $258,000,000, to remain available until expended; and $13,000,000, for section 504 housing repair loans.

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.

For an additional amount for "Economic Development Administration Programs", $25,800,000, to remain available until expended, for planning, public works grants and revolving loan funds for communities affected by hurricane Floyd and other recent hurricanes and disasters: 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.

That no funds shall be transferred to and merged with appropriations for "Salaries and Expenses" for indirect administrative expenses: Provided, Further, That the total 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.

For an additional amount for "Operation, Research and Facilities", $19,400,000, to remain available until expended, to provide disaster assistance pursuant to section 321(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Management Act, and for repairs to the Beaufort Laboratory, resulting from Hurricane Floyd and other recent hurricanes and disasters: 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.

For an additional amount for "Operations, Research, and Facilities", $4,000,000, to remain available until expended, to provide disaster assistance pursuant to section 321(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Management Act, and for repairs to the Beaufort Laboratory, resulting from Hurricane Floyd and other recent hurricanes and disasters: 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.

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses'': Provided, That no funds shall be transferred to and merged with appropriations for "Salaries and Expenses" for indirect administrative expenses: Provided, Further, That no funds shall be transferred to and merged with appropriations for "Salaries and Expenses" for indirect administrative expenses: Provided, Further, 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.

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.

For an additional amount for "Operations, Research, and Facilities", $12,500,000, to remain available until expended, to provide disaster assistance pursuant to section 321(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Management Act, and for repairs to the Beaufort Laboratory, resulting from Hurricane Floyd and other recent hurricanes and disasters: 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.

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.
and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION**

SEC. 301. (a) Subject to subsection (d) and notwithstanding other provisions of law, from any amounts made available for assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) that remain unobligated at the end of the fiscal year, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, for each request described in subsection (b), make a 1-year grant to the entity making the request in the amount requested.

(b) A request described in this subsection is a request for a grant under subtitle C of the title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homelessness Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381 et seq.) for permanent housing for homeless persons with disabilities or subtitle F of such title (42 U.S.C. 11403 et seq.) that—

1. submitted in accordance with the eligibility requirements established by the Secretary and pursuant to the notice of funding availability for fiscal year 1999 covering such programs, but was not approved;
2. was made by an entity that received such a grant pursuant to the notice of funding availability for a previous fiscal year; and
3. requested renewal of funding made under such grant for use for eligible activities because funding under such previous grant expires during calendar year 2000.

(c) The amount under this subsection is the amount necessary, as determined by the Secretary, to renew funding for the eligible activities under the grant request for a period of up to 2 years, but only in consideration of the amount of funding requested for the first year of funding under the grant request.

(d) The entire amount for grants under this section is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for fiscal year 2000, for an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs"; $125,000,000, to remain available until expended, for planning assistance, public works grants, and revolving loan funds to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene.

(2) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The $125,000,000—

(A) shall be available only to the extent that the President submits to Congress an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.); and

(B) is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

(3) COMMUNITY FACILITIES GRANTS.—

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for fiscal year 2000, for an additional amount for the Balancing Budget and Economic Recovery Act of 1999 (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), as a result of Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The $125,000,000 is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

**KYL (AND DOMENICI) AMENDMENT NO. 3583**

Ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 2522, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. 3. IMPLEMENTATION OF SECURITY RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) On March 18, 1999, President Clinton asked the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) to undertake an inquiry and issue a report on "the security threat at the Department of Energy's weapons labs and the adequacy of the measures that have been taken to address it."

(2) In June 1999, the PFIAB issued a report titled "Security at Its Worst," which concluded the Department of Energy "represents the best of America's scientific talent and achievement, but it has given responsible personnel the worst security record on secrecy that the members of this panel have ever encountered."

(3) The PFIAB report stated, "Organizational disarray, managerial neglect, and a culture of arrogance—both at DOE headquarters and the labs themselves—conspired against the agency they have an espionage scandal waiting to happen."

(4) The PFIAB report further stated, "The Department of Energy is a dysfunctional bureaucracy that has provided a model of reforming itself... Reorganization is clearly warranted to resolve the many specific problems with security and counterintelligence in the weapons labs, but also to address the lack of accountability that has become endemic throughout the entire Department ... real and lasting security improvements can only be achieved if the weapons labs is simply unworkable within DOE's current structure and culture."

Mr. KYL. "Specifically, we recommend that the Congress pass and the President sign legislation that: Creates a new, semi-autonomous Agency ...[to] oversee all nuclear weapons-related matters previously housed in DOE."

(b) The bipartisan Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China of the House of Representatives released an unclassified report on May 25, 1999 which concluded that "The People's Republic of China (PRC) has stolen U.S. nuclear weapons technology on the United States' most advanced thermonuclear weapons. These thefts of nuclear secrets from our national weapons laboratories have enabled the PRC to develop, and successfully test modern strategic nuclear weapons sooner than would otherwise have been possible. The stolen U.S. nuclear secrets give the PRC design information on thermonuclear weapons on a par with our own."

(c) The report of the Select Committee further concluded that, "Despite repeated PRC thefts of the most sophisticated U.S. nuclear weapons technology, security at our national nuclear weapons laboratories does not meet even minimal standards."

(8) In response to the findings of the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China of the House of Representatives and the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, Senators KYL, DOMENICI, and Murkowski introduced Amendment 446 to the Fiscal Year 2000 Intelligence Authorization Act calling for the creation of a semi-autonomous agency to manage all national nuclear weapons programs, which was passed by the Senate on July 21, 1999, by a vote of 96 to 1. This amendment called for the semi-autonomous agency to be organized with clear lines of authority and accountability to replace the previous structure with confused, overlapping reporting channels and diffused responsibility that led to greater security failures.

(9) The provisions of Amendment 446 were incorporated in the Fiscal Year 2000 Defense Authorization Conference Report, which was passed by the House of Representatives on September 15, 1999, by a vote of 375 to 45, and the Senate on September 22, 1999, by a vote of 99 to 5.


(11) Notwithstanding his signing into law the legislation creating the National Nuclear Security Administration headed by a new Under Secretary, on October 5, 1999, President Clinton issued a statement which said, "Until further notice, the Secretary of Energy shall perform all duties and functions of the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security. The President hereby directs the Secretary of Energy to perform all duties and direct all personnel of the National Nuclear Security Administration. ..."
The President and the Secretary of Energy should faithfully implement the provisions of Public Law 106-65, which established the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the Department of Energy to serve concurrently.

The Secretary of Energy should drop efforts to "dual-hat" officers or employees of the Department of Energy to serve concurrently in positions within the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Energy. Such efforts to extensively "dual-hat" officials are contrary to the intent of Congress when it passed Public Law 106-65.

The Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration shall take all appropriate steps to ensure that the protection of classified information becomes the highest priority of the National Nuclear Security Administration.
Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.); and
(b) is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

(2) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The $125,000,000 is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2000. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2000 at 9:30 a.m., in open and closed session to receive testimony on security failures at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 21, 2000, at 9:30 a.m. on the United/US Airways merger.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, for purposes of conducting a Full Committee business meeting which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this business meeting is to consider pending calendar business.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2000, at 3:30 p.m. to hear testimony on the following bills:

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Wednesday, June 21, 2000, at 10 a.m., in SD-226.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2000, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a joint closed hearing on intelligence matters with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES, WILDLIFE AND WATER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Water be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2000, at 10 a.m., to receive testimony on S. 1787, the Good Samaritan Abandoned or Inactive Mine Waste Remediation Act.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Water and Power be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2000, at 10 a.m., to receive testimony on S. 1848, a bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Denver Water Reuse project; S. 1761, the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 1999; S. 2301, a bill to amend the Navajo and Colorado River Compact Reclamation Act to provide $150 million to the Water and Power Administration; and S. 2499, a bill to extend the deadline for completion of the construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Pennsylvania;

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 4601 AND H.R. 3859

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand the following bills are at the desk, H.R. 4601 and 3859. I ask for the first reading of each of these bills and ask that it be in order to read the titles consecutively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4601) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 213(c) of the current resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 to reduce the public debt and to decrease the statutory limit on the public debt.

A bill (H.R. 3859) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security and Medicare surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on these bills at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.
ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 2000

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 22. I further ask consent that on Thursday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period for morning business until 10 a.m., with the time equally divided between Senator AKAKA and Majority Leader LOTT or his designee.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, when the Senate convenes tomorrow, it will be in a period for morning business to be followed by the consideration of the House Labor-HHS appropriations bill as under the previous order. Amendments are expected to be offered and debated throughout the morning. Under a previous order, the amendments debated tonight with regard to foreign operations appropriations bill will be voted on tomorrow at 2 p.m. Any votes ordered relative to the Labor-HHS bill will be stacked to occur at the end of the series of votes in relation to the foreign operations appropriations bill. Therefore, Senators may expect votes into the evening.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order. There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:14 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 22, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO ASTRONAUTS NEIL A. ARMSTRONG, BUZZ ALDRIN, AND MICHAEL COLLINS

SPEECH OF HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN OF NEW YORK IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2815, authorizing a Congressional Gold Medal to astronauts and national heroes Neil A. Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, in recognition of their monumental and unprecedented feat of space exploration, as well as for their achievements in the advancement of science and promotion of the space program.

The Apollo program was designed to land humans on the Moon and bring them safely back to Earth. Six of the missions achieved this goal, but Apollo 11 was the first and with this amazing feat accomplished, three men became national heroes to millions of Americans.

These three men set out on their historic voyage on July 16, 1969 at 9:32 a.m. from the Kennedy Space Center in Cape Canaveral, Florida powered by the mighty Saturn V rocket. Their spacecraft reached lunar orbit 76 hours later and after a rest period, Armstrong and Aldrin entered the Lunar Module and prepared for the descent to the moon’s surface. On July 20, 1969 at 4:18 p.m., their small craft touched down at what has become known as the Sea of Tranquility. After eating their first meal on the moon, Armstrong and Aldrin began their surface operations earlier than planned.

At 10:56 p.m. millions around the world were glued to their television sets as a live television feed provided the first images from the moon’s surface as Neil Armstrong uttered those now famous words, “That’s one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.” Minutes later Buzz Aldrin joined him on the surface and they began their task of collecting 47 pounds of lunar surface material which would return to Earth for analysis. Two and a half hours later, the crew returned to the Lunar Module and prepared to dock with the Service and Command modules.

While Armstrong and Aldrin were on the moon’s surface, Michael Collins was responsible for providing critical assistance to his fellow astronauts by piloting the Command Module ‘Columbia’ in the moon’s orbit and communicating with Earth, thereby allowing his fellow Apollo 11 astronauts to successfully complete their mission on the surface of the Moon. In addition, he was responsible for helping the Lunar Module dock after the lunar surface mission had been completed.

Apollo 11 splashed down on July 24, 1969 at 12:50 p.m. in the Pacific Ocean and the mission was declared a success as the mission went beyond landing Americans on the Moon and returning them safely to Earth by: establishing the technology to meet other national interests in space; achieving preeminence in space for the United States; carrying out a program of scientific exploration of the Moon; and developing man’s capability to work in the lunar environment.

Upon their return to Earth, these men became instant national heroes as they became the first men to land on the moon. Apollo 11 once again sparked the interest and wonder of all Americans regarding the space program, which would continue on through to the birth of the Shuttle program in the 1970s and which still exists today.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I support this legislation authorizing the presentation of Congressional Gold Medals to Neil A. Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to do the same.

CONNETICUT NATIONAL GUARD MARKS 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ACTIVATION IN KOREAN WAR

HON. JOHN B. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 2000

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, today I mark a very significant anniversary in the history of the Connecticut National Guard. Fifty years ago this week, the Connecticut National Guard’s Company K, 169th Infantry Regiment, 43d Division was called into active duty for service in the Korean War.

On June 25, 1950, Communist-supported North Korea invaded South Korea by crossing the 38th Parallel. That same day President Harry S. Truman began the activation of the National Guard. It was only a few short months after Truman’s activation that Connecticut’s National Guard received its official orders from the United States Army. On September 5, 1950, at 7:15 a.m., Company K, based in the Middlesex County, reported for roll call.

The Company, along with the rest of the Division, was sent to Camp Pickett in Virginia for training. On July 19, 1951, the Division received its orders to report for overseas duty in Germany. The 43d Infantry Division was the first National Guard Division ever to go to Europe in peacetime. Its orders were part of a determined effort to strengthen the free world’s defenses against Russian aggression.

In name, it stayed there for more than 2½ years. Company K went into the portions of Bavaria that directly faced the Iron Curtain on the Czechoslovakian border. There it organized the terrain and built a defense system as part of a strengthening NATO force.

A June 25, 1990 article in U.S. News and World Report aptly describes the reason why Company K’s involvement was so crucial in the Korean War, “The war’s effects were felt far from its battlefields. Worried that Korea was only a diversion in advance of a Soviet attack on Berlin, the Truman Administration sent four divisions to Europe to bolster the two already on occupation duty and began pressing to transform occupied West Germany into a rearmed anti-Communist bastion.”

On June 25, 2000, the members of Company K will hold their 50th Anniversary Reunion. I would like to urge my colleagues to join me not only in celebrating their anniversary, but also in recognizing the service and sacrifice these individuals gave to their country in its time of need.

IN HONOR OF BETTY WYTIAS

HON. DIANA DeGETTE OF COLORADO IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 2000

Ms. DeGETTE. Mr. Speaker, today I honor and recognize the laudable efforts and accomplishments of Betty Wytias. It is both fitting and proper to recognize Ms. Wytias because of her exceptional record of service and civic leadership.

Betty Wytias has touched the lives of many people and made a tremendous impact on our community. As a working professional, she gives freely of her time and energy to domestic violence prevention efforts, especially through the Colorado Bar Association and SafeHouse Denver. She is a former co-chair of the Denver Domestic Violence Task Force, a member of the Colorado Coalition for Elder Rights and Adult Protection, the International Women’s Rights Action Watch and has been a member of the SafeHouse Denver Advocacy Committee since 1994.

Betty Wytias is an Assistant Attorney General and has been instrumental in the formulation of the domestic violence prevention agenda for the Colorado Attorney General’s Office. Her primary focus is child abuse and neglect cases and she sits on the Department of Human Services’ statewide child fatality review team.

Recently, Ms. Wytias was honored by SafeHouse Denver with the Carolyn Hamilton-Henderson Memorial Award which is given to individuals who have provided inspiration and leadership in efforts to end domestic violence in our community. She knows the pain of family violence and is an outspoken, determined and compassionate advocate on issues related to domestic abuse. In her own words, “The issue of family violence is so widespread and the abused are still so isolated. People don’t understand that . . . I have a voice and intend to use it.”

Please join me in commending Betty Wytias for her courage, dedication and invaluable service to our community. It is the strong leadership she exhibits daily that continually enhances our lives and builds a better future for all Americans.
Mr. Speaker, although Mr. John Gardiner may be gone, his spirit will live on with the love of tennis that he inspired in others as well. Mr. Gardiner is survived by his wife of 20 years, Monique Gardiner: two sons, John C. Gardiner and John F. Gardiner; and eight grandchildren. Mr. Gardiner is survived by his wife of 20 years, Monique Gardiner: two sons, John C. Gardiner and John F. Gardiner; and eight grandchildren. Mr. Gardiner is survived by his wife of 20 years, Monique Gardiner: two sons, John C. Gardiner and John F. Gardiner; and eight grandchildren. Mr. Gardiner is survived by his wife of 20 years, Monique Gardiner: two sons, John C. Gardiner and John F. Gardiner; and eight grandchildren. Mr. Gardiner is survived by his wife of 20 years, Monique Gardiner: two sons, John C. Gardiner and John F. Gardiner; and eight grandchildren.

Gardiner's love for the sport propelled him to build a first-of-its-kind tennis ranch in Carmel Valley. This love and devotion for the sport will forever keep Jack Gardiner's memory alive for all.

John Gardiner's love first developed as a child in Philadelphia, where he would often play at the municipal tennis courts. His love was further developed once he moved to Monterey Peninsula. As a teacher and football coach at Monterey High, he led the Toreadores to victory in 1948 in an undefeated season in 27 years. Former student, Dan Albert recalls, "Something special happened with that team and John Gardiner was the cause of that something special with that group of young men." Later, Gardiner's tennis resort would become most noted for offering clinics for adults and a tennis camp for children.

I too have witnessed the, "something special" that Dan Albert spoke of. My first job was as a lifeguard at John Gardiner's Tennis Ranch with a pay of 59 cents an hour. Mr. Gardiner would often joke with me and reply with, "It's the last honest job you've had." Without a doubt, John Gardiner has touched lives and made a difference in mine. In addition to his efforts with youth, Gardiner also exercised an equal compassion with his philanthropic nature. Gardiner established an annual Senators Cup Tournament, where 52 U.S. senators played tennis to raise money for charity. Through the course of 20 years, the tournament raised $4 million that was used to build a hospice in Scottsdale, Arizona, which was named in memory of Barbara Gardiner who died of cancer.

Mr. Speaker, although Mr. John Gardiner may be gone, his spirit will live on with the love of tennis that he inspired in others as well. Mr. Gardiner is survived by his wife of 20 years, Monique Gardiner: two sons, John C. Gardiner, Jr and Thomas Gardiner; his two daughters, Tricia McKnight and Tenise Kyger; and eight grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and the other distinguished members to acknowledge the impact that Mr. John Gardiner has left on this world.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Blue Water Mental Health Clinic. For the last half a century, the residents of St. Clair County have been well served by the area's most professional, social workers and psychologists. The Blue Water Mental Health Clinic has provided outpatient care to assist tens of thousands of adults, children and families in dealing with the emotional issues and difficulties of substance abuse.

Recognition is key to the success of any municipal facility. Whether it is a hospital, a surgical center, or a clinic, one always seeks the best possible care based on what they have read and heard. The Blue Water Mental...
Health Clinic has been a respected top notch facility for as long as it has been in operation. They have a tradition of assembling a strong and diverse Board of Directors representing the best of the Blue Water area.

I would like to salute all those who have been associated with building and maintaining the quality and reputation of the Blue Water Mental Health Clinic as it begins its fifty-first year of offering the best available care to our citizens and neighborhoods. From their preventative educational programs to their operation of Big Brothers Big Sisters of St. Clair County, the Clinic has always reached out to the community and help make it a better place to live, work and raise a family. I am proud to have such a cooperative, community-oriented institution serving us, and wish them many more years of inspired leadership and quality care.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT RUDOLPH B. Davila

HON. RON PACKARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 2000

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor Staff Sergeant Rudolph B. Davila of the United States Army from my congressional district in California. Staff Sergeant Davila was awarded The Congressional Medal of Honor today for extraordinary heroism in action on May 28, 1944 near Artena, Italy.

During an offensive which broke through the German mountain strongholds surrounding the Anzio beachhead, Staff Sergeant Davila risked death to provide heavy weapons support for a rifle company that was under attack. After being painfully wounded in the leg, he dashed to a burned tank and continued to engage a second enemy force from the tank’s turret. Staff Sergeant Davila managed to provide the desperately-needed heavy weapons support and silenced four machine gunners, forcing the enemy to abandon their prepared positions.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Staff Sergeant Davila’s bravery, and thank him for fighting to preserve freedom and protecting our great nation. Staff Sergeant Davila’s extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and bring great honor to himself and his country.

TRIBUTE TO DOUG RAND

HON. SAM FARR
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 2000

Mr. FARR of California, Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to honor the spirit and dedication of a man whose life was committed to world peace and community empowerment. Doug Rand will be remembered as a determined, compassionate, and inspirational man who was committed to the fight for social justice.

On March 5, 2000, Doug Rand passed away at the age of 45. As a longtime member of the Resource Center for Nonviolence staff, friends recall the activist as persistent, yet that being his “greatest strength”. Through his efforts at the Center, Rand’s most noteworthy accomplishment came with the installation of the “Collateral Damage” statue. The controversial statue was dedicated in 1995, on the eve of the bombing on Hiroshima. The statue symbolizes the human cost of Rand’s commitment to this project and others like it led him to further acclaim as a political minister.

Rand was known to counsel men about the draft. In particular, he took up the case of Eric Larsen, a Marine who refused duty during the Persian Gulf War. Rand later approached Eric Larsen to work at the Resource Center. This effort later led him to take other anti-militarist ventures, such as his anti-war toys campaign.

Friends of Doug Rand quietly gathered after the death, yet this day would be committed to celebrating the accomplishments of Rand in his life. Rand is survived by his wife, Mathilda, loving friends and an aware community. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to reflect on the role that Mr. Doug Rand has had in his political journey for enlightenment and discovery for us all.

HON. SCOTT McINNIS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 2000

Mr. McINNIS, Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to speak today to honor the life of Bus Bergman. Born in Denver on June 11, 1920, Bus’ athletic credentials are great, it is Bus Bergman. Born in Denver on June 11, 1920, Bus’ athletic credentials are great, it is Bus Bergman. Born in Denver on June 11, 1920, Bus’ athletic credentials are truly unsurpassed. As a school boy at Denver North High School, Bus was a three sport star who propelled each of his respective teams to greatness. In fact, Bergman made the winning basket to clinch North’s first state basketball championship.

Following a prodigious high school career, Bus went on to excel as a student-athlete at Colorado A&M, where he earned 10 varsity letters in three sports. Beyond athletics, Bus excelled both academically and in an array of extra-curricular pursuits. He was the sophomore class president, a four year member of the student council, a four year member of Sigma Pi Epsilon, and was named to the select list of Who’s Who in American Colleges and Universities.

Although Bus had a range of professional athletic opportunities at his disposal after his great college career—including an offer from the Philadelphia Eagles—he chose instead to commit himself to the great cause of freedom during World War II, where he served with great valor and distinction. Bus was involved in numerous marine operations in the Pacific and was awarded the prestigious Bronze Star for his extraordinary heroism in action against enemy Japanese during the assault and capture of Okinawa. In 1948, he was discharged as a Captain and was later upgraded to the status of Major.

Upon his return from WWII, Bus returned to Colorado A&M to pursue higher learning. After completing his studies, he was named the football and baseball coach at Fort Lewis College where he served until 1950, when he accepted the top jobs in the football and baseball programs at then Mesa College. At Mesa, Bus’ football teams went 102–63–9, winning three conference championships; while his baseball teams were 378–201, winning twenty conference championships and finishing second three times at the JUCO World Series.

While it would be impossible to list the litany of awards and achievements garnered during his remarkable career, it is safe to say that Bus has achieved beyond what most could ever dream. Throughout his career as a player and coach, Bus was the very symbol of greatness.

For those who know Bus, it is clear that, above all else, Bus is a family man. Bus and his beloved wife Elinor Pitman were married in 1946, later giving birth to three children: Judy Black, Walter Bergman, Jr., and Jane Norton. Bus and Elinor are also the proud grandparents of six grandchildren. While his athletic and professional accomplishments are many, Bus’ enduring legacy will be his family.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, Bus Bergman has achieved beyond measure in his distinguished life. He is a model citizen who represents all of the best that Colorado and America has to offer.

As he celebrates his 80th birthday, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this opportunity to say thank you and congratulations on behalf of his family, friends, and the United States Congress. In every sense, Bus Bergman is a great American who deserves the praise and admiration of us all.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTION, PRESERVATION, AND REFORM COMMISSION ACT OF 2000

HON. JIM SAXTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 2000

Mr. SAXTON of New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of my bill in the House that puts partisan politics aside and ensures Social Security is preserved for our seniors today and in the future.

We’ve all heard about the economic outlook for the Social Security program. We must be concerned. By 2037, the trust funds of the Social Security program will be depleted, jeopardizing the retirement security of future retirees.

And while 2037 sounds far away, it will be here before we know it. With each passing session in Congress, the opportunity to work towards a meaningful solution to the financial woes of our nation’s retirement program slips through our fingers.

Political rhetoric has worked its way into the debate over preserving Social Security. The time has come to separate politics from the substance of this important debate. We must put the financial security of our nation’s retirees first, instead of allowing politics between
our two parties to get in the way. Working to-
ger to protect Social Security will be essen-
tial if we are to find a sensible solution to pre-
serving the future of the most critical pillar of
retirement security.

This bill outlines objectives for comprehen-
sive reform of the Social Security system and
establishes a bipartisan Congressional Com-
mision to develop a reform plan consistent with
those objectives.

Specifically, this legislation sets forth six
broad objectives for Social Security reform, in-
cluding (1) beneficiaries must receive the ben-
etits to which they are entitled based on a fair
and equitable reform of the system, (2) long-
term solvency of the system must be guaran-
teed for at least 75 years, (3) every generation
of workers must be guaranteed a reasonable
rate of return on their payroll tax contributions,
(4) all workers must be given the opportunity
to share in the national’s economic prosperity
through participation in a private investment
account within the Social Security system, (5)
Social Security Trust Funds must be protected
from congressional or other efforts to spend
on non-Social Security purposes, and (6) Non-
Social Security surplus revenues must be
available to shore up the system while imple-
menting reform.

Also, the bill establishes a 13-member So-
cial Security Protection, Preservation, and
Reform Commission charged with developing a
legislative proposal for comprehensive reform of
the Social Security system, consistent with
the objectives stated in the bill. This Commis-
sion is composed of 12 voting Congressional
Members, equally divided between Repub-
licans and Democrats. The members would in-
clude the Chairmen and Ranking Members of
the Senate Finance and House Ways and
Means Committees, and two Congressional
appointees each by the Speaker and the Mi-
nority Leader in the House and the Majority
Leader in the Senate. The Com-
missoner of Social Security would also serve
as a non-voting, ex-officio member of the
Commission.

In order to ensure Congress doesn’t con-
tinue to drag its feet on this issue, the bill re-
quires the Commission to submit a detailed
legislative proposal to Congress by September
2001 and includes a process for expedited
Congressional action on the Commission’s recom-
nendations by the end of next year.

The concept is simple: principles and proc-
есс for Social Security reform. This bill fo-
cuses on the goals we want to achieve in any
proposal that protects Social Security while
ensuring action is taken in an expedient mat-
ter. It forces Congress to forget about the poli-
tics and concentrate on what matters most:
safeguarding Social Security for our nation’s
retirees. With this plan, we can work together
and concentrate on what’s best for the millions
of Americans who depend on our nation’s re-
tirement system.

Retirees don’t need political rhetoric; they
need a Social Security system they can de-
pend on. For this reason, I am honored that
Representatives NEIL ABERCROMBIE (D-HI)
and Marc Schofield (SC) have joined me in
supporting this legislation. Together, we can
work in a bipartisan fashion and find a sensi-
tible solution to the financial problems of the
Social Security program once and for all.

HONORING VERONICA MACKENZIE
FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE ON
THE OCCASION OF HER RETIRE-
MENT

HON. ROSA L. DELAURO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 2000

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great
pleasure that I rise today to join Area Cooper-
ative Educational Services [ACES] in paying
tribute to Veronica Mackenzie, as she cele-
brates her retirement. For over three decades,
Ronnie has dedicated herself to ensuring that
the special needs children of the Greater New
Haven area have access to a quality edu-
cation.

I have often spoken of our nation’s need for
talented, creative, enthusiastic teachers who
are ready to help our children learn and grow.
Ronnie is just that kind of educator. Through-
out her career, she has touched the lives of
thousands of young people. Ronnie’s career
began as a special education teacher at Jor-
done Harrison in North Branford, Connecticut.

For over two decades, Ronnie has worked at
ACES, an exceptional organization which has
strived to meet the challenges of special


needs students. As the Coordinator of the
Academy since 1980, Ronnie has been instru-
mental in creating a supportive environment
where children with disabilities can realize
their potential and build a strong foundation for
their future success.

Before the U.S. Supreme Court acted to
protect their basic freedoms, hundreds of
thousands of disabled children received no
formal education at all because they were
deemed unable to learn. We should never go
to back to a time when the potential of so many
bright young people, with so much to offer,
was squandered due to a lack of under-
standing. Ronnie has been an unparalleled
advocate for these children—giving them a
strong voice and the opportunity to learn and
thrive.

With thirty-two years in special edu-
cation, Ronnie is a true model, not only to her
students, but to us all.

I have always had deep respect and tremen-
dous admiration for our nation’s edu-
cators. The commitment and dedication that
Ronnie has demonstrated is remarkable and I
applaud her many contributions to our commu-


nity. I am proud to stand today to join with the
friends, family, and colleagues who have gath-
ered this evening to recognize her outstanding
accomplishments and to celebrate her retire-
ment. Ronnie has indeed become an irre-
replaceable member of our community. I would
like to extend my sincere thanks and apprecia-
tion to her for her courage, love and commit-
mnt to the children of our community, as well as my best
wishes for continued health and happiness.

TRIBUTE TO VIDLER’S 5 & 10

HON. JACK QUINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 2000

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to
rise today to pay tribute and officially recog-
nize the Seventieth Anniversary of the Vidler’s
5 & 10 store in historic East Aurora, which I’m


proud to say is part of the Thirtieth Congres-
sional District of the State of New York.

On June 21, 1930, Mr. Robert S. Vidler
opened his store on Main Street in East Au-
rora, in the midst of the Great Depression. De-
spite those humble beginnings, Vidler’s has
become a landmark in the quaint village of
East Aurora, and is a shining example of the
proud tradition and heritage of our Western
New York community.

Throughout the past seventy years, this
terrific store has served as a shining example of
the small-town family businesses that our Na-
tion has been founded upon.

Currently owned and operated by Mr.
Vidler’s two sons, Ed and Bob. Not only has
this great store survived these many years, it
has prospered. Today’s Vidler’s is about ten
times as big as the original, and continues to
thrive in this vibrant community.

The store occupies four connected, vintage
1890 buildings on two levels. It offers an ec-
lectic blend of merchandise that ranges from
the nostalgic to the very latest. It’s famous red
and white awning is a common stop for area
tourists seeking a shopping experience like
those of the past in the many “five and dime”
stores across the country.

As Members of Congress, we pause to
honor and recognize those family businesses
whose proud history of dedicated service and
commitment have helped to strengthen our
communities. I’m pleased to include this fine
business as among our very best.

Mr. Speaker, today I join with the Village of
East Aurora, the Vidler Family, and indeed,
our entire Western New York community in
speaking recognition and commendation of the
Vidler’s 5 & 10 Store on this historic Anniver-
sary. We all wish them continued success and
prosperity.

RURAL LETTER CARRIERS

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 2000

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Postal
Service links together cities and towns, large
and small, across America through delivery of
the mail. Since our nation’s founding, mail de-


livery has been especially important to rural
America, places that were at first a long walk
away, then a long horse ride, and even for
years a long automobile ride from the nearest
downtown of a major city. The Internet today
has helped reduce the distance between cit-
es, and even countries, but mail delivery con-
tinues to be an important function for all Amer-
icans.

Most Americans, probably, are unaware that
for decades rural letter carriers have used
their own transportation to deliver the mail.
This includes rural letter carriers who today
drive their own vehicles in good weather and
bad, in all seasons, in locations that can range
from a canyon bottom to mountain top, ocean
view to bayou. Rural letter carriers drive over
3 million miles daily and serve 24 million
American families on over 66,000 rural and
suburban routes. The mission of rural letter
carrier has changed little over the years, but
the type of mail they deliver has changed sub-
stantially—increasing to over 200 billion pieces
a year. And although everyone seems to be
communicating by email these days, the Postal Service is delivering more letters than at any time in our nation’s history. During the next decade, however, we know that will change.

Electronic communication is expected to accelerate the growth of disposable mail. It has in the last few years. Some of what Americans send by mail today will be sent online. According to the General Accounting Office [GAO], that will include many bills and payments. In its study, U.S. Postal Service: Challenges to Sustaining Performance Improvements: Remarks for Violation—on the Brink of the 21st Century, dated October 21, 1999, the GAO reports that the Postal Service’s core business—letter mail—will decline substantially. As a result, the revenue the Postal Service collects from delivering First-Class letters also will decline.

While the Internet will eventually reduce the amount of letter mail rural letter carriers deliver, the Internet will present some new opportunities for delivering parcels. Rural letter carriers have for decades delivered the packages we order from catalogs, and now they deliver thousands of parcels every week, which are ordered online. For some rural and suburban Americans the Postal Service still remains the only delivery service of choice. Today, the Postal Service has about 33 percent of the parcel business. However, if the Postal Service continues as successful as it has been in attracting more parcels, that could create a problem for rural carriers. Most items ordered by mail are shipped in boxes that, once filled with packing materials, can be bulky—so bulky, in fact, that many rural letter carriers already see the need for larger delivery vehicles.

In exchange for using their own vehicles, rural letter carriers are reimbursed for their vehicle expense by the Postal Service through the Equipment Maintenance Allowance [EMA]. Congress intended to exempt EMA from tax through a specific provision for rural letter carriers. If actual business expenses exceed the EMA, a deduction for those expenses should be allowed. I believe we must correct this inequity, and so I am introducing a bill that would reinstate the deduction for a rural letter carrier to claim the actual cost of the business use of a vehicle in excess of the EMA reimbursement as a miscellaneous itemized deduction.

In the next few years, more and more Americans will use the Internet to get their news and information, and perhaps one day to receive and pay their bills. But mail and parcel delivery by the United States Postal Service will remain a vital service to rural Americans—especially those in rural and suburban parts of the nation. Therefore, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill and ensure fair taxation for rural letter carriers.

CONFERENCE ON THE ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 2000

Mr. DINGELL, Mr. Speaker, as Ranking Member of the Committee on Commerce, and senior House Democrat confer on the conference committee to resolve differences between S. 761, the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, and the amendments of the House to the bill, I rise to clarify a matter involving the legislative history and intent of this legislation. My remarks are an extension of remarks that I made during House consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 761 (June 14, 2000, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at H4357—H4359). Mr. MARKET, the other House Democrat, disagrees on this matter, he has authorized me to indicate that he concurs in these remarks.

Rule XXII, clause 7(d) of the Rules of the House provide that each conference report must be accompanied by a joint explanatory statement prepared jointly by the managers on the part of the Senate and the House, and that the joint explanatory statement shall be sufficiently detailed and explicit to inform the House of the effects of the report on the matters committed to conference. This is pivotal in guiding affected parties and the courts in interpreting the laws that we enact.

Late in the conference negotiations, we reluctantly agreed to a request from the staff of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that we expedite filing and consideration of the conference agreement by not extending the negotiations to include drafting and reaching agreement on a statement of managers. Accordingly, the conference report did not and does not include the required joint explanatory statement of managers. This is contrary to the agreed-upon legislative language. The rule by which the conference report was considered by the House waived any point of order regarding this deficiency.

Given this chain of events and what we thought was a binding gentlemen’s agreement, I was dismayed to discover that material had been inserted in both the House and Senate debate (June 14, 2000, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at H4352—H4357 as an extension of Representative BILLY’s floor remarks and at S5283—S5288 as an extension of Senator ABRAHAM’s remarks) in the fortmat of ajoint statement of managers. Our Senate Demo-cratic colleagues also have expressed concerns with this language (June 15, 2000, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at S5216, 3rd column, last para. and carry over on S. 5217 remarks of Senator WYDEN and at S5220, 1 st column, 3rd para. remarks of Senator LEAHY).

While I respect the right of the distinguished Chairman of the conference committee and other conferees to have an opinion on such matters and to express them in the RECORD, I want to clarify that this material is not the statement of managers for the conference agreement, notwithstanding its format. Both Mr. BILLY and Senator ABRAHAM indicated in their remarks that the explanatory document had been prepared by them and expressed their views, and it should be taken as such. In several instances, their guidance does not reflect the intent or understanding of all the members of the conference. A number of their statements are simply not correct, and some of their views conflict with the very words of the statute. There is insufficient time to consult with the other conferees and prepare a joint point-by-point discussion of each of the statements the Chairman and Senator ABRAHAM made that we disagree with. However, without prejudice, there are a few things that I would like to have more clearly reflected in the record.

While agencies should seek to take advantage of the benefits that electronic records offer, they also have the obligation to see that the public is kept informed of their views and that they will be able to enforce the law and protect the public, to help avoid waste, fraud and abuse in those programs, and to see that the taxpayer funds in their care are not squandered. In some circumstances, the bill gives agencies authority to set standards or formats; in doing so, they may decide in some cases not to adopt an electronic process at all for filings if they determine (consistent with the Government Paperwork Elimination Act), after careful consideration, that this alternative is not practicable.

For example, section 104(a) preserves the authority of federal regulatory agencies, self-regulatory organizations, and state regulatory agencies to set standards and formats for the
filing of records with such agencies or organizations. The authority contained in section 104(a) is not subject to the limitations set forth in section 104(b) or other limitations contained in the Act. The preservation of agency authority contained in section 104(a) is subject only to the requirements of the Government Paperwork Elimination Act.

Agencies that seek to promote electronic filings may set standards and formats for such filings as they deem appropriate. Standards and formats for electronic filings may be appropriate to ensure the integrity of electronic filings from security breaches by computer hackers. Likewise, agencies may set standards and formats for filings to promote uniform filing systems that will be accessible to regulators and the public alike, and to advance the agencies’ statutory mission.

Section 104(b) allows agencies to adopt regulations, orders and guidance to assist in implementing the legislation, subject to standards set forth in section 104(b). Section 104(b) contains criteria for agencies to use, but because of the vast numbers of transactions that agencies regulate, agencies must necessarily have appropriate discretion to apply those criteria to determine when to require performance standards or, in some limited circumstances, to offer electronic filing (in a manner consistent with the this bill and the Government Paperwork Elimination Act).

Having recognized in Section 101(d) the importance of accuracy and accessibility in electronic records, Section 104(b)(3)(A) recognizes the ability of federal regulatory agencies to provide for such standards. Section 104(b)(3)(B) requires Federal regulatory agencies to consider the flexibility to specify performance standards to assure accuracy, record integrity, and accessibility of records.

Although agencies should seek to implement the goals of the statute, the bill also provides federal and state regulatory agencies the necessary latitude to prevent waste, fraud and abuse, and to enforce the law and to protect the public, by interpreting section 101 in the appropriate way for their programs and activities, subject to any applicable criteria in the bill. It is important that courts not rewrite the statute nor rewrite any such agency interpretations or applications of such criteria would apply the same deference that they give to other agency action. It is not my understanding that the conference report would demand unusual scrutiny beyond applying the criteria set forth in the statute.

Consumers are given many protections in this legislation, and among those protections is the continued right to receive paper (or other non-electronic) notices on certain important subjects. For example, section 103(b)(2)(A) leaves intact laws that require paper notification of the cancellation or termination of utility services. This includes—but is not limited to—water, heat and power.

Other utilities, such as telephone service (a utility critical to safety in modern times), would also be protected. Obviously, Internet service would also be included in this exemption, to avoid the anomalous situation of a consumer trying to obtain, understand and respond to a disconnection notice that is available only through the very medium that has been disconnected.

Consumer consent to electronic transactions is, in general, a critical safeguard that is maintained in this bill. The Chairman was absolutely correct when he began his statement by saying, “... under E-Sign, engaging in electronic transactions is purely voluntary. No one will be forced into using or accepting an electronic signature or record. Consumers that do not want to participate in electronic commerce will not be forced to do so. However, the conferees recognized that there may be some specific instances in which stringent requirements for verifying consent might not actually be needed to protect consumers. Therefore, under the bill, agencies have a very limited authority to require certain transactions from the consent verification provisions. In those instances where it is truly necessary to eliminate a consent verification requirement— in part because there is no other way to eliminate a substantial burden on electronic commerce—agencies may sometimes be able to do so. However, even when eliminating a consent verification requirement is the only way to avoid a substantial burden on electronic commerce, an agency may do so only when there will not be any material risk of harm to consumers.

I would also like to make another point that is very important to keep in mind when trying to understand the impact of this legislation. Of course, the bill does not force Federal and State government agencies to use or accept electronic signatures and electronic records in all transactions. Therefore, the limitations in parts of the conference reports such as sections 102(a), 104(b)(2) and 104(c)(1) on the ability of Federal and State agencies to interpret section 101 do not apply to contracts in which such agencies are parties. Agencies need to make specific decisions as to what specific methods to use. When the government is a party to a contract, it naturally has the same rights. The restrictions in the sections that I cited do not apply in that circumstance and do not diminish those rights.

Also, it is important to understand that this legislation was consciously drafted to avoid displacing the carefully-crafted provisions of the Government Paperwork Elimination Act, Pub. L. No. 105-277 sections 1701-1710 (1998), or GPEA. That Act set a timetable for Federal agencies to make available electronic alternatives to traditional paper processes, and set standards for agencies to apply in determining whether and how to adopt such alternatives. To the extent that the two bills do overlap, this bill is crafted to allow agencies the flexibility to comply with the existing standards set forth in GPEA.

Finally, I would like to raise an important law-enforcement issue. Senator Abraham’s “guidance” states that “if a customer enters into an electronic contract which was capable of being retained or reproduced, but the customer chooses to use a device such as a Palm Pilot or cellular phone that does not have a printer or a disk drive allowing the customer to make a copy of the contract at that particular time, this section is not invoked.” (June 16, 2000, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at S9284, 3rd Session)

Section 101(e) addresses more than the application of the statute of frauds to contracts entered into electronically. Section 101(e) provides that the legal effect of an electronic record may be denied if it is not in a form capable of being retained and accurately reproduced. As a threshold matter, businesses create the electronic systems being used by the consumer. Those designing and implementing these systems are obligated to ensure that their systems produce an accurate and dependable form of records that are capable of being retained. Notably, the bill also applies to businesses that are obligated to make and keep accurate electronic records for examination by government regulators (and, if necessary, for enforcement action).

The fact that a consumer uses particular technology that does not immediately produce an electronic record does not excuse the other party’s regulatory obligation to have accurate and accessible records or otherwise exempt the transaction from this provision. To suggest otherwise, flies in the face of the plain meaning of the statute and opens up a gaping loophole for fraudsters to take advantage of.

Conferees should be given adequate time to review and reach agreement on the statement of managers required under the Rules. This short-cut has proven to be a dangerous and unacceptable alternative.
the Department of Veterans Affairs be the same as the rate for private vehicle reimbursement for Federal employees.

This is an equity issue and also a matter of respect in the way we treat our veterans. Our vets deserve the same travel reimbursement rate as Federal employees. Please join me in supporting this bill.
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MEETINGS SCHEDULED
JUNE 26
1 p.m.
Aging
To hold hearings on the hardships that dialysis patients endure and the options for improving the government’s oversight.
SD-628

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Armored Services
To hold hearings on the nominations of Lt. Gen. Tommy R. Franks, United States Army, to be General; and Lt. Gen. William F. Kernan, United States Army, to be General.
SR-222

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on the operations of the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution.
SR-301

10 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine reprocessing of single-use medical devices.
SD-430

2 p.m.
Judiciary
Immigration Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the border crisis in Arizona, and the impact on the state and local communities.
SD-226

Judiciary
Administrative Oversight and the Courts Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to examine the 1996 campaign finance investigations.
SH-216

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research, Development, Production and Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the April 2000 GAO report entitled “Nuclear Waste Cleanup—DOE’s Paducah Plan Faces Uncertainties and Includes Costly Cleanup Activities.”

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nomination of Karl William Hofmann, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Togolese Republic; Howard Franklin Jeter, of South Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Nigeria; John W. Limbert, of Vermont, to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania; Roger A. Meece, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Malawi; Donald Y. Yamamoto, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Djibouti; and Sharon P. Wilkinson, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mozambique.
SD-419

JUNE 27
9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Armed Services
To hold hearings on the nominations of Lt. Gen. Tommy R. Franks, United States Army, to be General; and Lt. Gen. William F. Kernan, United States Army, to be General.
SR-222

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on the operations of the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution.
SR-301

10 a.m.
Finance
Business meeting to mark up proposed legislation relating to the marriage tax penalty.
SD-215

Judiciary
To hold hearings on the struggle for justice for former U.S. World War II POWs.
SD-226

11 a.m.
Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD-419

JUNE 28
9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting to mark up S. 2437, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States; and other pending calendar business.
SD-406

10 a.m.
Finance
Business meeting to mark up proposed legislation relating to the marriage tax penalty.
SD-215

Judiciary
To hold hearings on the struggle for justice for former U.S. World War II POWs.
SD-226

11 a.m.
Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD-419

JUNE 29
9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Investigations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the nation-wide crisis of mortgage fraud.
SD-342

JUNE 30
9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Investigations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the nation-wide crisis of mortgage fraud.
SD-342

JULY 1
2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
SD-366

1 p.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to examine the rising oil prices and the efficiency and effectiveness of the Executive Branch Response.
SD-342

2 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
Superfund, Waste Control, and Risk Assessment Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2700, to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to promote the cleanup and reuse of brownfields, to provide financial assistance for brownfields revitalization, to enhance State response programs.
SD-406

JULY 2
2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 134, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study whether the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore should be protected as a wilderness area. S. 2511, to revise the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area; S. 2279, to authorize the addition if land to Sequoia National Park; and S. 2512, to convey certain Federal properties on Governors Island, New York.
SD-366

JULY 12
2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement implementing the October 1999 announcement by the President to review approximately 40 million acres of national forest for increased protection.
SD-366

Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on risk management and tort liability relating to Indian matters.
SR-485

JULY 19
2:30 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the National Indian Gaming Commission.
SR-485
JULY 26
2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on potential timber sale contract liability incurred by the government as a result of timber sale contract cancellations.
SD-366

SEPTEMBER 26
9:30 a.m.
Veterans’ Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs on the Legislative recommendation of the American Legion.
345 Cannon Building

CANCELLATIONS
JUNE 27
10 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings on S. 1016, to provide collective bargaining for rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.
SD-430

Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2526, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to revise and extend such Act.
SR-485
HIGHLIGHTS

House Committees ordered reported 17 sundry measures.

The House failed to pass H.J. Res. 90, withdrawal of the United States from the WTO.

The House passed H.R. 4635, VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5479–S5581

Measures Introduced: Seven bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2759–2765. Pages S5555–S5556

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 642, to redesignate the Federal building located at 701 South Santa Fe Avenue in Compton, California, and known as the Compton Main Post Office, as the “Mervyn Malcolm Dymally Post Office Building”.

H.R. 643, to redesignate the Federal building located at 10301 South Compton Avenue, in Los Angeles, California, and known as the Watts Finance Office, as the “Augustus F. Hawkins Post Office Building”.

H.R. 1666, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 200 East Pinckney Street in Madison, Florida, as the “Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. Post Office”.

H.R. 2307, to designate the building of the United States Postal Service located at 5 Cedar Street in Hopkinton, Massachusetts, as the “Thomas J. Brown Post Office Building”.

H.R. 2357, to designate the United States Post Office located at 3675 Warrensville Center Road in Shaker Heights, Ohio, as the “Louise Stokes Post Office”.

H.R. 2460, to designate the United States Post Office located at 125 Border Avenue West in Wiggins, Mississippi, as the “Jay Hanna ‘Dizzy’ Dean Post Office”.

H.R. 2591, to designate the United States Post Office located at 713 Elm Street in Wakefield, Kansas, as the “William H. Avery Post Office”.

H.R. 2952, to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Orchard Park Drive in Greenville, South Carolina, as the “Keith D. Oglesby Station”.

H.R. 3018, to designate the United States Post Office located at 557 East Bay Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the “Marybelle H. Howe Post Office”.

H.R. 3699, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the “Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building”.

H.R. 3701, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the “Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building”.

H.R. 4241, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1818 Milton Avenue in Janesville, Wisconsin, as the “Les Aspin Post Office Building”.

S. 2043, to designate the United States Post Office building located at 3101 West Sunflower Avenue in Santa Ana, California, as the “Hector G. Godinez Post Office Building”. Page S5555

Foreign Operations Appropriations: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 2522, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Adopted:

Leahy (for Harkin) Amendment No. 3499, to provide funds for the Secretary of State for transfer to the Department of Labor for the administration of the demobilization and rehabilitation of children soldiers in Colombia. Pages S5484–S5486
Leahy Amendment No. 3500, to require the Secretary of State to submit a report concerning human rights in Colombia. Pages S5484–86

Leahy Amendment No. 3501, to provide not less than $35,000,000 for programs for the prevention, treatment, control of, and research on tuberculosis; and not less than $50,000,000 for the prevention, treatment, control of, and research on malaria. Pages S5484–86

Leahy Amendment No. 3502, to remove Panama from the list of countries subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations. Pages S5484–86

Leahy Amendment No. 3503, to provide not less than $1,200,000 to assist blind children. Pages S5484–86

Leahy Amendment No. 3504, to require certification that the use of certain herbicides are safe and nontoxic to human health, and that such herbicide does not contaminate ground or surface water, prior to making funding available. Pages S5484–86

McConnell Amendment No. 3505, to provide not more than $340,000,000 for expenses incurred by the Department of Defense during fiscal year 2001 pursuant to section 43(B) of the Arms Export Control Act. Pages S5484–86

McConnell Amendment No. 3506, to prohibit selling, or making available, Stinger ground-to-air missiles to any country bordering the Persian Gulf, unless replacing, on a one-for-one basis, previously furnished Stinger missiles nearing the scheduled expiration of their shelf-life. Pages S5484–86

McConnell/Leahy Amendment No. 3507, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to withhold ten percent of the United States portion or payment to International Financial Institutions until certain implemented reforms are certified. Pages S5484–86

McConnell/Leahy Amendment No. 3508, to make certain funds available to support the National Albanian American Council’s training program for Kosovar women. Pages S5484–86

McConnell (for Gregg) Amendment No. 3509, to make certain funds available for a joint project developed by the University of Pristina, Kosovo and the Dartmouth Medical School, U.S.A., to help restore the primary care capabilities at the University of Pristina Medical School and in Kosovo. Pages S5484–86

McConnell (for Shelby) Amendment No. 3510, to require the submittal to the congressional intelligence committees of reports on waivers relating to assistance to countries providing sanctuary to indicted war criminals. Pages S5484–86

Leahy (for Baucus/Roberts) Amendment No. 3511, to make available certain environmental assistance funds for the People’s Republic of China. Pages S5484–86

McConnell (for Brownback) Amendment No. 3512, to make available certain funds for education and anti-corruption programs of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Pages S5484–86

McConnell (for Lott/Cochran) Amendment No. 3513, to make certain funds available for the Foundation for Environmental Security and Sustainability to support environmental threat assessments with interdisciplinary experts and academicians utilizing various technologies to address issues such as infectious disease, and other environmental indicators and warnings as they pertain to the security of an area. Pages S5484–86

Sessions Further Modified Amendment No. 3492, to require the Secretary of State to certify that the U.S. Government publicly supports the military and political efforts of the Government of, and the rule of law in, Colombia, prior to making assistance available under Plan Colombia. Pages S5483, S5508–09, S5510

McConnell (for Stevens) Amendment No. 3519, to provide that foreign military financing program funds estimated to be outlaid for Egypt during fiscal year 2001 shall be transferred to an interest bearing account for Egypt in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Pages S5510–11

McConnell (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 3528, to express the sense of the Senate regarding United States citizens held hostage in Colombia. Pages S5510–11

Leahy/Kennedy Amendment No. 3532, to provide that any national of Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos who was paroled into the United States before October 1, 1997 shall be eligible to make an application for adjustment of status. Pages S5510–11

McConnell (for Domenici) Amendment No. 3529, to allocate development assistance funds for Habitat for Humanity International. Page S5520

Leahy (for Biden) Amendment No. 3536, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining, and Related Programs budget. Page S5520

Leahy (for Boxer) Amendment No. 3540, to express the sense of the Senate on the importance of combating mother-to-child transmission of HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa. Page S5520

McConnell (for Frist) Amendment No. 3544, to require a report on the delivery of humanitarian assistance to Sudan. Page S5520
Leahy (for Wellstone) Amendment No. 3568, to allocate funds to combat trafficking in persons.  

Page S5520

McConnell (for Coverdell/Leahy) Modified Amendment No. 3521, to review U.S. relations with Peru and to support the restoration of democracy in Peru.  

Pages S5520–21

McConnell (for Abraham) Modified Amendment No. 3584, to increase assistance for Lebanon.  

Pages S5520–21

Subsequently, the amendment was further modified.

McConnell (for McCain) Amendment No. 3495, to express the sense of the Senate concerning the violence, breakdown of rule of law, and troubled pre-election period in the Republic of Zimbabwe.  

Pages S5527–28

Leahy (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 3491, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the significance of the availability of certain funds under this Act for an acceleration of the accession of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.  

Pages S5527–28

McConnell (for Brownback) Modified Amendment No. 3539, to authorize non-lethal, material assistance to protect civilians in Sudan from attacks, slave raids, and aerial bombardment.  

Pages S5527–28

McConnell Amendment No. 3553, to provide that funds made available as a U.S. contribution to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Trust Fund shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.  

Pages S5531–32

Leahy (for Byrd) Amendment No. 3537, to make technical amendments to language limiting support for Plan Colombia.  

Pages S5531–32

McConnell (for Shelby) Amendment No. 3515, to make the limitation on assignment of United States personnel in Colombia inapplicable to certain intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government.  

Pages S5531–32

Leahy (for Reid) Modified Amendment No. 3546, to allocate funds for the Secretary of State to meet with representatives of countries with a high incidence of the practice of dowry deaths or honor killings to develop a strategy for ending the practices.  

Pages S5531–32

Leahy (for Reid) Modified Amendment No. 3547, to require that funding for the United States Agency for International Development be used to develop and integrate, where appropriate, educational programs aimed at eliminating the practice of female genital mutilation.  

Pages S5531–32

Leahy (for Reid) Modified Amendment No. 3549, to authorize the Secretary of State to determine the prevalence of the practice of female genital mutilation and to develop recommendations for eliminating the practice.  

Pages S5531–32

McConnell (for Chafee) Amendment No. 3545, 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.  

Pages S5531–32

Subsequently, adoption of the amendment was initiated.  

McConnell (for Helms) Modified Amendment No. 3172, relating to support by the Russian Federation for Serbia.  

Pages S5531–32

Leahy (for Landrieu) Modified Amendment No. 3522, to provide for the rehabilitation of the transportation infrastructure of Bulgaria and Romania.  

Pages S5531–32

McConnell (for Dodd) Amendment No. 3527, to make certain funds available for the Peace Corps to bring fiscal year 2001 funding up to fiscal year 2000 levels.  

Pages S5530–31

McConnell (for Specter) Amendment No. 3588, to make available up to $1,000,000 to fund the Secretary of Defense to work with the appropriate authorities of the Cuban government to provide for greater cooperation, coordination, and other mutual assistance in the interdiction of illicit drugs being transported over Cuba airspace and waters.  

Pages S5532–33

McConnell (for Edwards) Amendment No. 3589, to provide emergency funding to the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture to assist communities affected by Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Dennis, or Hurricane Irene.  

Pages S5534–36

Rejected:

Wellstone Amendment No. 3518, to provide additional funding for the substance abuse and mental health services. (By 89 yeas to 11 nays (Vote No. 138), Senate tabled the amendment.)  

Pages S5493–S5509

By 19 yeas to 79 nays (Vote No. 139), Gorton Amendment No. 3517, to reduce the amount of funds made available for South American and Caribbean counternarcotics activities.  

Pages S5511–15, S5525–26, S5528

By 47 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 140), Dodd/Lieberman Amendment No. 3524, to provide not less than $110,000,000 for procurement and support for helicopters to support missions to eradicate the cultivation and processing of illicit drugs in remote areas of Colombia.  

Pages S5515–20, S5526–27, S5528–29

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.  

Pages S5483–84, S5510
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 counter narcotic activity initiatives.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill and pending amendments, with certain amendments to be proposed thereto, on Thursday, June 22, 2000. Further, the Senate will proceed to vote on the motion to advance the bill to third reading; following which, the bill will then be placed back on the Senate calendar, awaiting the House companion bill.

Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for consideration of H.R. 4577, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, on Thursday, June 22, 2000.

Messages From the House:

Measures Read First Time:

Communications:

Statements on Introduced Bills:

Additional Cosponsors:

Amendments Submitted:

Authority for Committees:

Additional Statements:

Privileges of the Floor:

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—140)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 8:14 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, June 22, 2000. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S5581.)

Committee Meetings

COMMODITY FUTURES MODERNIZATION ACT

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded joint hearings with Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs on S. 2697, to reauthorize and amend the Commodity Exchange Act to promote legal certainty, enhance competition, and reduce systemic risk in markets for futures and over-the-counter derivatives, after receiving testimony from Lawrence H. Summers, Secretary of the Treasury; Alan Greenspan, Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System; Arthur Levitt, Chairman, United States Securities and Exchange Commission; and William J. Rainer, Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded open and closed hearings to examine recent security failures at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, after receiving testimony from William B. Richardson, Secretary, T.J. Glauthier, Deputy Secretary, John C. Browne, Director, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Edward J. Curran, Director, Office of Counterintelligence, and Gen. Eugene E. Habiger, USAF (Ret.), Director, Office of Security and Emergency Operations, all of the Department of Energy.

UNITED AIRLINES-US AIRWAYS MERGER


Hearings continue tomorrow.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 2071, to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

WATER AND POWER

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power concluded hearings on S. 1848, to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Denver Water Reuse project, S. 1761, to direct the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to conserve and enhance the water supplies of the Lower Rio Grande Valley, S. 2301, to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Lakehaven water reclamation project for the reclamation and reuse of water, S.
2400, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain water distribution facilities to the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, S. 2499, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Pennsylvania, and S. 2594, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos Water Conservancy District to use the Mancos Project facilities for impounding, storage, diverting, and carriage of nonproject water for the purpose of irrigation, domestic, municipal, industrial, after receiving testimony from Representative Hinojosa; Eluid L. Martinez, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; Wayne Halbert, Harlingen Irrigation District, Harlingen, Texas, on behalf of the Texas Irrigation Council; Sonia Kaniger, Cameron County Irrigation District #2, San Bonita, Texas; Beverly J. Tweddle, Lakehaven Utility District, Federal Way, Washington; Mary Hoddinott, Denver Water Board, Denver, Colorado; Eric Wilkinson, Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, Loveland; and Gary Kennedy, Mancos Water Conservancy District, Mancos, Colorado.

MINE WASTE REMEDIATION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Drinking Water concluded hearings on S. 1787, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve water quality on abandoned or inactive mined land, and the related recommendations of the Western Governors’ Association, after receiving testimony from J. Charles Fox, Assistant Administrator for Water, Environmental Protection Agency; South Dakota Governor William J. Janklow, Pierre, on behalf of the Western Governors’ Association; Katherine Kelly, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, and Jack Lyman, Idaho Mining Association, both of Boise; William B. Goodhard, Echo Bay Mines, Englewood, Colorado, on behalf of the National Mining Association; Sara Kendall, Western Organization of Resource Councils, Washington, D.C.; and David Gerard, Political Economy Research Center, Bozeman, Montana.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded hearings on the nominations of John Edward Herbst, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Uzbekistan; Carlos Pascual, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Ukraine; Lawrence George Rossin, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Croatia; and Ross L. Wilson, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Azerbaijan, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded hearings to examine improvements to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, after receiving testimony from Senators Durbin and Thomas; former Senator Dole; David R. Loesch, Assistant Director in Charge, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; Stuart Smith, Utah Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Identification, Salt Lake City; Max Schlueter, Vermont Department of Public Safety, Crime Information Center, Waterbury; and Robin Ball, Sharp Shooting Indoor Range, Spokane, Washington.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts concluded oversight hearings to examine certain issues relating to the 1996 campaign finance investigation, receiving testimony from Lee J. Radek, Chief, Public Integrity Section, Robert S. Litt, former Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General, Steven A. Mansfield, former Assistant United States Attorney, and Robert Conrad, Head of Campaign Finance Task Force, all of the Department of Justice; and Darryl Wold, Chairman, and Danny L. McDonald, Vice-Chairman, both of the Federal Election Commission.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded joint closed hearings with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on intelligence matters, after receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.
House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 4704–4716; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 358–360, were introduced. 

Pages H4816–17

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows.

Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2001 (H. Rept. 106–686);


Page H4816

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Nelson Price of Marietta, Georgia. Page H4787

Withdrawal from the WTO: The House failed to pass H.J. Res. 90, withdrawing the approval of the United States from the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization by a yeas to 363 nays with 3 voting “present”, Roll No. 320. Pages H4793–H4814 (continued next issue)

Agreed to H. Res. 528, the rule that provided for consideration of the joint resolution by a yea and nay vote of 343 yeas to 61 nays, Roll No. 298.

Pages H4787–93

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations: The House passed H.R. 4635, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 by a yea and nay vote of 256 yeas to 169 nays, Roll No. 319. The bill was also considered on June 19. 

(See next issue.)

Agreed To:

Kelly amendment, debated on June 20, that increases funding for the Public Housing Operating Fund by $1 million and decreases HUD Management and Administration, Salaries and Expenses funding accordingly (agreed to by a recorded vote of 250 ayes to 170 noes, Roll No. 299); (See next issue.)

Olver amendment that clarifies the prohibitions against the use of funding by the EPA to implement the京都 Protocol (agreed to by a recorded vote of 314 ayes to 108 noes, Roll No. 301); (See next issue.)

Cummings amendment no. 33 printed in the Congressional Record that increases NASA university research center funding by $2.8 million and decreases Human Space Flight funding accordingly; (See next issue.)

Kaptur amendment that requires a report on the Mental Illness Research, Education, and Clinical Centers at VA Medical Centers no later than March 30, 2001; (See next issue.)

Collins amendment that stops the designation of any area as an ozone nonattainment area under the Clean Air Act until the Supreme Court renders a decision on the EPA air quality standards that were earlier stayed by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals; (agreed to by a recorded vote of 226 ayes to 199 noes, Roll No. 305); and (See next issue.)

Hostettler amendment No. 24 printed in the Congressional Record that prohibits the use of any funding to administer the Communities for Safer Gun Coalition (agreed to by a recorded vote of 218 ayes to 207 noes, Roll No. 306). (See next issue.)

Rejected:

Hinchey amendment No. 22 printed in the Congressional Record, debated on June 20 that sought to increase funding for the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight by $4.7 million (rejected by a recorded vote of 207 ayes to 211 noes, Roll No. 300); (See next issue.)

Saxton amendment that sought to increase funding for the National Estuary program by $33.9 million and decrease NASA funding accordingly; (See next issue.)

Roemer amendment No. 48 printed in the Congressional Record that sought to terminate the international space station program thereby reducing Human Space Flight funding by $1.8 billion and retaining $300 million for termination costs (rejected by a recorded vote of 98 ayes to 325 noes, Roll No. 302); (See next issue.)

Hinchey amendment No. 23 printed in the Congressional Record that sought to prohibit funding to implement or administer the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation system (rejected by a recorded vote of 145 ayes to 277 noes, Roll No. 303); (See next issue.)

Hinchey amendment No. 35 printed in the Congressional Record, as modified, that sought to remove a limitation (in report language) on EPA’s use of funding for dredging or other invasive sediment remediation technologies or enforcing drinking water standards for arsenic (rejected by a recorded vote of 208 ayes to 216 noes, Roll No. 304); (See next issue.)

Nadler amendment No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record that sought to increase funding for the section 8 voucher program for housing assistance by $344 million and decrease funding for the international space station accordingly (rejected by a recorded vote of 138 ayes to 286 noes, Roll No. 307); and (See next issue.)

Hostettler amendment No. 25 printed in the Congressional Record that sought to prohibit any HUD funding to implement the provisions of the settlement with Smith & Wesson (rejected by a recorded vote of 206 ayes to 219 noes, Roll No. 308). (See next issue.)
Points of order sustained against:
Language on page 63 lines 4 through 9 in the bill that sought to deal with studies on drinking water contaminants;
(See next issue.)
Boyd amendment that sought to increase FEMA disaster relief funding by $2.6 billion;
(See next issue.)
Language on page 67 lines 4 through 14 in the bill that sought to deal with emergency requirement designations;
(See next issue.)
Mollohan amendment No. 39 printed in the Congressional Record that sought to increase NASA funding by $322.7 million;
(See next issue.)
Holt amendment that sought to increase funding for the National Science Foundation by $528 million; and
(See next issue.)
Edwards amendment that sought to increase Veterans Administration medical care and research funding by $535 million.
(See next issue.)
Withdrawn:
Bilirakis amendment No. 14 printed in the Congressional Record was offered and subsequently withdrawn that sought to make $2 million available for the purposes of the National Hazardous Waste and Superfund Ombudsman; and
(See next issue.)
Pascarella amendment was offered and subsequently withdrawn that sought to make available funding for a program to inform veterans on the benefits and services available to them.
(See next issue.)
Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H4818–21.
Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea and nay votes and ten recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H4792–93 (continued next issue). There were no quorum calls.
Adjournment: The House met at 9:00 a.m. and adjourned at midnight.

Committee Meetings

USDA’S EXPORT AND MARKET PROMOTION PROGRAMS
Committee on Agriculture: Held a hearing to review the USDA’s export and market promotion programs. Testimony was heard from Dan Glickman, Secretary of Agriculture.

CHINA—STRATEGIC INTENTIONS AND GOALS
Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on the strategic intentions and goals of China. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HOUSING FINANCE REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT
Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Sub-committee on Capital Markets, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises concluded hearings on improving regulation of housing Government Sponsored Enterprises, focusing on H.R. 3703, Housing Finance Regulatory Improvement Act. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

WEALTH THROUGH THE WORKPLACE ACT
Committee on Education and the Workforce: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 3462, Wealth Through the Workplace Act of 1999.

FORCE PROTECTION

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND THE ENVIRONMENT
Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade held a hearing on International Trade and the Environment. Testimony was heard from Mildred O. Calleve, Vice President and Treasurer, Department of Financial Management and Statutory Review, Overseas Private Investment Corporation; Barbara Bradford, Deputy Director, U.S. Trade and Development Agency; Daniel Renberg, member of the Board, Export-Import Bank of the United States; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on the Judiciary: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 3485, Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act.
The Committee began mark up of H.R. 1248, Violence Against Women Act.
Will continue June 27.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on Resources: Ordered reported the following bills: S. 986, Griffith Project Prepayment and Conveyance Act; H.R. 1113, amended, Colusa Basin Watershed Integrate Resources Management Act; H.R. 1142, Landowners Equal Treatment Act of 1999; S. 1275, Hoover Dam Miscellaneous Sales
Act; H.R. 1787, Deschutes Resources Conservancy Reauthorization Act of 1999; H.R. 2984, amended, to direct the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to convey to the Loup Basin Reclamation District, the Sargent River Irrigation District, and the Farwell Irrigation District, Nebraska, property comprising the assets of the Middle Loup Division of the Missouri River Basin Project, Nebraska; H.R. 3160, Common Sense Protections for Endangered Species Act; H.R. 3595, amended, to increase the authorization of appropriations for the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978; and H.R. 4389, amended, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain water distribution facilities to the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District.

IMPROVING SBA'S OFFICE OF ADVOCACY
Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing on Improving SBA's Office of Advocacy. Testimony was heard from Jere W. Glover, Chief Counsel for Advocacy, SBA; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Ordered reported the following: H.R. 4210, amended, Preparedness Against Terrorism Act of 2000; H.R. 1959, amended, to designate the Federal building located at 743 East Durango Boulevard in San Antonio, Texas, as the “Adrian A. Spears Judicial Training Center”; H.R. 3323, to designate the Federal building located at 158–15 Liberty Avenue in Jamaica, Queens, New York, as the “Floyd H. Flake Federal Building”; H.R. 4519, Baylee’s Law; H.R. 4608, to designate the United States courthouse located at 220 West Depot Street in Greeneville, Tennessee, as the “James H. Quillin United States Courthouse”; GSA’s repair and alteration; GSA’s design program; GSA’s non-courthouse construction program; Three out-of-cycle leases; and Corps of Engineers Survey Resolutions.

MEDICARE RX 2000
Committee on Ways and Means: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 4680, Medicare RX 2000 Act.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to consider pending business.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS
(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D612)


H.R. 2484, to provide that land which is owned by the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota but which is not held in trust by the United States for the Community may be leased or transferred by the Community without further approval by the United States. Signed June 20, 2000. (P.L. 106–217)

H.R. 3639, to designate the Federal building located at 2201 C Street, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, currently headquarters for the Department of State, as the “Harry S Truman Federal Building”. Signed June 20, 2000. (P.L. 106–218)


S. 291, to convey certain real property within the Carlsbad Project in New Mexico to the Carlsbad Irrigation District. Signed June 20, 2000. (P.L. 106–220)

S. 356, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain works, facilities, and titles of the Gila Project, and designated lands within or adjacent to the Gila Project, to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District. Signed June 20, 2000. (P.L. 106–221)

S. 777, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable farmers and other persons to file paperwork electronically with selected agencies of the Department of Agriculture and to access public information regarding the programs administered by these agencies. Signed June 20, 2000. (P.L. 106–222)

S. 2722, to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to Ed W. Freeman, James K. Okubo, and Andrew J. Smith. Signed June 20, 2000. (P.L. 106–223)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 2000
(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate
Committee on Appropriations, business meeting to mark up proposed legislation making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, 2:30 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to continue hearings to examine the proposed United-US Airways merger, focusing on its effect on competition in the industry, and the likelihood it would trigger further industry consolidation, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, to hold hearings on S. 1643, to authorize the addition of certain parcels to the Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa; and S. 2547, to provide for the establishment of the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Great Sand Dunes National Preserve in the State of Colorado, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations, to hold hearings on the nominations of Rust Macpherson Deming, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Tunisia; Mary Ann Peters, of California, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of Bangladesh; Janet A. Sanderson, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria; and E. Ashley Wills, of Georgia, to be
Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Maldives, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Subcommittee on International Operations, to hold hearings to examine the role of security in the Department of State foreign service promotion process, 3 p.m., SD-419.

Committee on Indian Affairs, business meeting to consider S. 1658, to authorize the construction of a Reconciliation Place in Fort Pierre, South Dakota; S. 1148, to provide for the Yankton Sioux Tribe and the Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska certain benefits of the Missouri River Basin Pick-Sloan project; and S. 2719, to provide for business development and trade promotion for Native Americans; to be followed by a hearing on Indian Trust Resolution Corporation, 11 a.m., SR-485.

Committee on the Judiciary, business meeting to mark up S. 2448, to enhance the protections of the Internet and the critical infrastructure of the United States; S. 353, to provide for class action reform, and the proposed Violence Against Women Act, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Subcommittee on Criminal Justice Oversight, to hold hearings on the threat of fugitives to safety, law, and order, 2 p.m., SD-226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to hold hearings on the nomination of Thomas L. Garthwaite, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and Robert M. Walker, of West Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Memorial Affairs, 9:30 a.m., SR-412.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Risk Management, Research, and Specialty Crops, to consider H.R. 4521, Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000, 9:30 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, hearing on the technical status of the National Missile Defense program, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, hearing on Monetary Stability in Latin America: Is Dollarization the Answer? 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Defense and International Relations Task Force, hearing on TRICARE Claims Processing: Why Does It Cost So Much? 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled: "DOE's Fixed-Price Cleanup Contracts: Why are Costs Still Out of Control?" 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.


Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing on OSHA's Compliance Directive on Bloodborne Pathogens and the Prevention of Needlestick Injuries, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on the Census, oversight hearing of the 2000 Census: Status of Non-Response Followup and Close Out," 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.


Committee on International Relations, to continue oversight hearings on the State Department, Part IV: Technology Modernization and Computer Security, 10 a.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, oversight hearing on an update on Forest Service Rulemakings and Regional Plans, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 3033, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make certain adjustments to the boundaries of Biscayne National Park in the State of Florida; H.R. 3520, White Clay Creek and Scenic Rivers System Act; H.R. 4125, to provide a grant under the urban park and recreation recovery program to assist in the development of a Millennium Cultural Cooperative Park in Youngstown, Ohio; H.R. 4275, Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area and the Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness Act of 2000; H.R. 4404, to permit the payment of medical expenses incurred by the United States Park Police in the performance of duty to be made directly by the National Park Service, to allow for waiver and indemnification in mutual law enforcement agreements between the National Park Service and a State or political subdivision when required by State law; H.R. 4579, Utah West Desert Land Exchange Act of 2000; and H.R. 3693, Castle Rock Ranch Acquisition Act of 2000, 10:30 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Technology, hearing on E-Commerce: A Review of Standards and Technology to Support Interoperability, 10:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Ground Transportation, oversight hearing on the Department of Transportation's Proposed Hours of Service regulations for Motor Carriers, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, to mark up the Full and Fair Political Activities Disclosure Act of 2000, 3 p.m., 1100 Longworth.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10 a.m.), Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 4577, Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations.

At 1:40 p.m., Senate will continue consideration of S. 2522, Foreign Operations Appropriations.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Thursday, June 22

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 4516, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (structured rule, one hour of debate); and

Consideration of H.R. 4690, Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Appropriations (open rule, one hour of debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bonior, David E., Mich., E1068
DeGette, Diana, Colo., E1067
Delahunt, William D., Mass., E1068
DelAuro, Rosa L., Conn., E1070
Dingell, John D., Mich., E1071
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1068, E1069
Gilman, Benjamin A., N.Y., E1067
Larson, John B., Conn., E1067
McInnis, Scott, Colo., E1068, E1069
Packard, Ron, Calif., E1069
Quinn, Jack, N.Y., E1070
Saxton, Jim, N.J., E1069
Shaw, E. Clay, Jr., Fla., E1070
Stupak, Bart, Mich., E1072