

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

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 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 source country 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 have inhaled?" 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 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 Ecuador, 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 judicial system 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 in-

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 advocate.

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 need treatment—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 poverty which plagues his country. But I am not convinced 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.

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, 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 Senator Wellstone—

Nice of him to say—

for his leadership on this issue and I urge other Senators to support his amendment.

I urge other Senators to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, is all time yielded 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. 6107. 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 (Public Law 101-510; relating to counter-drug assistance).

(B) Section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85; relating to counter-drug assistance 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 international narcotics control).

(E) Section 506 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-195; relating to emergency drawdown authority).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, the people of Colombia are good people. They maintained 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-oriented guerrilla groups who control nearly 50 percent of the territory of Colombia. 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 Colombia 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 trafficking.

The guerrilla organizations sustain themselves through the most active kidnapping in the world. Colombia has the highest number of kidnappings in the world. Its murder rate is probably the highest in the world. The guerrilla groups sell protection for drug traffickers, and that is how they make their money to maintain their existence.

I believe, as a former Federal prosecutor who has been involved in studying the drug issue and has prosecuted many cases in the district of Mobile, AL, involving quite a number of Colombian drug dealers and cartel members, we are going 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 strengthen 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, they want human rights, 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 administration in public statements, in testimony before committee hearings, has refused to say: We support Colombia in their efforts against these guerrillas. They suggest their only motive is to provide money to help knock down drug production in Colombia. That is distressing to me. Ambassador Pickering testified and I cross-examined him. He said: Our emphasis is drugs.

That is not the basis of what we are doing. We want to help Colombia. We want Colombia to create a peaceful government to take control of its country. We want to encourage strong leadership, 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, Colombia. We explicitly endorse and support your efforts through peace negotiations or warfare, if necessary, to unify your country, to bring peace so you can then eliminate the drug trafficking that is occurring there.

Drug trafficking is a major problem in Colombia. It is our No. 1 supplier of cocaine. The cocaine production in Colombia has more than doubled in 5 years. Heroin is going up. Seventy percent 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 amendment says so explicitly.

Mr. President, do I still have a minute under the agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator'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 vote on the Wellstone amendment, and that the time on the Sessions amendment be—

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object. What did the Senator ask for?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I will not ask unanimous consent that the time on the Sessions amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object. What is the Senator asking for?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware be recognized to offer a tabling motion on the Wellstone amendment and that a vote on or in relation to the Sessions amendment occur immediately after the Wellstone vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I move to table the Wellstone amendment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 3518. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 138 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Abraham	Enzi	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Allard	Fitzgerald	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Baucus	Gorton	Moynihan
Bayh	Graham	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Biden	Grassley	Reed
Bingaman	Gregg	Reid
Bond	Hagel	Robb
Breaux	Hatch	Roberts
Brownback	Helms	Rockefeller
Bryan	Hollings	Roth
Bunning	Hutchinson	Santorum
Burns	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Campbell	Inhofe	Schumer
Chafee, L.	Inouye	Sessions
Cleland	Jeffords	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerry	Stevens
Craig	Kohl	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
Daschle	Landrieu	Thurmond
DeWine	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dodd	Levin	Voinovich
Domenici	Lieberman	Warner
Durbin	Lincoln	Wyden
Edwards	Lott	

NAYS—11

Boxer	Grams	Murray
Byrd	Harkin	Specter
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Feingold	Mikulski	

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama, it is my understanding, would like to ask consent to

further modify his amendment after a discussion we have had.

AMENDMENT NO. 3492, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I have a further modified amendment consistent with the request of Senator LEAHY to strengthen the language that says our support for the Colombian Government would be conditioned upon their following defined standards of human rights, as Senator LEAHY placed in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator asking unanimous consent?

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent.

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

The amendment (No. 3492), as further modified, is as follows:

On page 155, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 6107. 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 conditions in section 6101, 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 (Public Law 101-510; relating to counter-drug assistance).

(B) Section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85; relating to counter-drug assistance 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 international narcotics control).

(E) Section 506 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-195; relating to emergency drawdown authority).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the underlying amendment.

The amendment (No. 3492), as further modified, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 (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 ask unanimous consent the Helms amendment be temporarily laid aside.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3519, 3528, AND 3532, EN BLOC

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 lien 12 after the word "Appropriations" insert the following: "Provided further, That foreign military financing program funds estimated to be outlayed 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: Provider further, That none of the interest accrued by the account shall be obligated 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 US 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 599E of Public Law 101-167.

AMENDMENT NO. 3519

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we received a request April 21 to allow fiscal year 2001 outlays—not budget authority—to be disbursed early into a Federal Reserve account. We have never structured accounts around outlays before, so we are looking at the scoring implications as well as what this will provide to Egypt in security assistance.

I am not prepared to write a blank check to any government. It is possible that this request could generate an additional \$35 to \$40 million for the Egyptians to spend on military equipment.

I would like to know what they plan to spend these resources on and no one can tell me. I think we need to be better informed before signing off on this approach.

Another problem with the proposal concerns actual control of the resources. The reason there are no scoring consideration is the entire amount is deemed obligated to Egypt once the funds are transferred into this account. That means the Egyptians could default or cancel a contract with an American company and we would have very little recourse because the money is already in their account. We must be sure that we will continue to have transparency and ongoing U.S. management of these resources, both the funds put into the account and the interest generated by the account.

Let me add, separate and apart form concerns about the actual account structure, I am not sure we should be increasing U.S. security assistance to Egypt. A short while ago, President Mubarak paid a visit to Lebanon and issued a statement of support for

Hezbollah's terrorist war against Israel. At this delicate juncture with rising concern about cross border violence against Israel, Mr. Mubarek's comments were and are extremely damaging to peace and stability, to say nothing of safety of Israeli civilians. I am not sure what signal 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 undermined those very principles and prospects.

In the State Department briefing justifying the request, U.S. officials urged our support because of Mubarek's need to address the requirements of "his key constituents, the military." Frankly, I think Mr. Mubarek needs to worry less about satisfying the military and spend more time and effort shoring up democratic institutions and civic society.

Once again this 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 spite of my concerns about the trends in Egypt, I am prepared 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 3528

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, S. 2522 contains \$934.1 million for Plan Colombia, a counternarcotics initiative. A portion of that is earmarked for the investigations of human rights abuses. Certainly a part of the drug culture that this bill is attempting to address is the abduction of individuals by paramilitary groups who either hold their hostages for ransom or use the abduction as a means of intimidation against law enforcement. Frequently we hear of witnesses, prosecutors and judges being taken from their homes, offices or off the street in broad daylight in an attempt to stop the prosecution of drug kingpins. However, innocent civilians, not involved in the war on drugs, are targets as well. The amendment I am introducing addresses the latter.

My colleagues may not be aware but currently there are three American citizens who are being held hostage by FARC, a narco-guerrilla group in Colombia. Many have been involved in obtaining their release but the 7 plus years of their captivity has complicated those efforts.

On the evening of January 31, 1993, a group of armed guerrillas entered the village of Pucuro Panama. Once control of the village had been secured, the guerrillas went to the homes of the Mankins, Riches, Tenenoffs, three mis-

sionary families with New Tribes Mission who were invited to live in Pucuro by village leaders to teach reading and writing and provide medical care to villagers. David Mankins, Mark Rich and Rick Tenenoff were tied up and their wives instructed to prepare small packages of clothing for them. The guerrillas then forced the men toward a trail that leads to the Colombian border.

Shortly after the kidnaping, FARC made contact with New Tribes Mission, claimed credit for the abduction and demanded a \$5 million ransom. The mission refused to pay the ransom and shortly thereafter contact ceased. Since then there has been many rumors and reports, but not proof on their whereabouts.

David Mankins, Mark Rich and Rick Tenenoff have the dubious distinction of being the longest held American hostages. Their families have lived the last 7 years without knowing whether they are dead or alive.

My amendment condemns the kidnaping; urges members of the European Community to assist in the safe return of these men by including in any dialogue with them the objectives of the safe return of these missionaries; and appeals to the United Nations Commission to pressure FARC to resolve this situation.

I am proposing this amendment for a couple reasons: first, FARC has aggressively courted a dialogue with several in the European community. In fact, I understand that in the upcoming weeks there will be representatives of FARC in Europe looking for support of their "revolution." I fear any recognition would be viewed as legitimizing the illegal and cowardly activities of FARC and thereby compound efforts to either gain release of these Americans to learn of their fate.

Secondly, Dr. Larry Maxwell of Patterson Baptist Church in Patterson, New York has begun a 240 mile walk to Washington, D.C. to bring attention to the tragic situation of these families. Dr. Maxwell will culminate his walk at the Capitol this coming Monday, June 26th, where he will be joined by the families of the kidnapped men.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment because these American citizens can easily be forgotten and we must not do that. Dave, Mark and Rick needs our prayers and their families need to know that their loved ones have not been abandoned. Finally, we need to encourage all those who have worked during the last 7 years to bring an end to this horrific ordeal to continue their effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 3519, 3528, and 3532) were agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished Senator from Washington is here and ready to offer an amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 3517

(Purpose: To reduce the amount of funds made available for South American and Caribbean counternarcotics activities, and for other purposes)

Mr. GORTON. I have an amendment at the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], proposes an amendment numbered 3517.

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

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

The amendment is 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."

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the effect of this amendment would be to strike the Colombian drug money appropriation of \$934 million and substitute for that number \$200 million. In other words, the passage of the amendment would result in savings—that is to say, not spending—almost three-quarters of a billion dollars, and by implication using that money to pay down the national debt.

Curiously enough, I think the justification for the amendment is as eloquently stated in the bill being managed by my friend from Kentucky and by the committee report—which I commend to my colleagues—that accompanies that amendment.

I will read one paragraph now from the committee report:

Historically, INL has provided support to the Colombian National Police. The Supplemental anticipates a 7:1 shift in funding from the Police to the Army. Given the past limited role and resources provided for counternarcotics activities in Colombia and the region, the Committee is concerned about the rapid, new, and unprecedented levels of spending requested. The fiscal year 2000 program level of \$50,000,000 for Colombia will now rise to nearly \$1,000,000,000. The Committee has grave reservations regarding the Administration's ability to effectively manage the use of these resources to achieve the expected results of reducing production and supply of cocaine while protecting human rights.

I could hardly state my case better. We have a profound and dramatic shift in focus. We have a huge 19-1 increase in the amount of money in this bill focused on this particular problem, and we lack even a clue as to whether or not it will have any positive impact on

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 sometimes fatuously denominate a war 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 goal. 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 go to the heart of the question 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 almost always the way we begin an adventure of this nature, with pious 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, a civil war in which 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 \$934 million and then the President will tell 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—not just in a couple of hearings 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 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 we make on a home or an automobile. It is a downpayment on which we don't know the schedule of future payments; we don't know the total amount of future pay-

ments; 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 that joint resolution, without 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 though they may be. That means, unfortunately, the conference committee will end up spending more money than we are spending here and probably with fewer and less responsible 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. I repeat that. 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? Isn't there somewhere that you can think of that \$700 million would be spent more wisely, even in connection with our struggle against illegal drug usage in the United

States or for some other program entirely or for the reduction in the national debt to which we all give so much lipservice, except when it comes up against a new spending program?

What I offer is an amendment that will still have us 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 that are set out 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; we can't quit now; we won't show constancy; 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 bill, is not responsible. It is not the right 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, not until there is a far greater justification than any that you have presented 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 Gorton 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 amend-

ment 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 propounded?

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 I am going 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 that.

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, and 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 the 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 this evening.

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 Connecticut.

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 Wash-

ington, 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 before us. I understand with 535 Members of Congress and a Defense Department and a State Department and dealing with regional governments as well in the hemisphere who are as concerned about this issue as we are, we cannot craft 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.

I do not engage 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.

The 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, regretfully, 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.

Whether we like it or not, we are engaged in the conflict in Colombia. Because of events in that country and because of our own habits in this Nation, people are dying in the streets of America. This is not some distant conflict without any ramifications here at home.

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 through a variety of measures and means. 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 have had the temerity to stand up to the narcotraffickers 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 victim of this 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 narcotraffickers, 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 position and gain resources through their illegal trade in death, 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 illegal 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 rejected, as was 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 narcotrafficking 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, and 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 respect 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 guer-

rilla 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 here a partial map 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, and come down into the llanos areas, 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. Just recently, he also made a 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 Ecuador and 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 shown here 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 narcotraffickers 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 narcotraffickers 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.

Their government has pleaded with us for some help for over a year. We are now almost finished with this session

of Congress, and we still have not addressed this issue.

Again, I respect my colleague from Washington. But there was another time, a half a century ago, when neighbors in another part of the world asked for our help—not our direct involvement—in something called the Lend-Lease Program. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in a national address to the country, described it to the American public in terms of a house being on fire and neighbors asking for some help.

In a sense, today, that is what we are being asked to do. 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 narcotraffickers 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 our kids. They want to know if 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 will, in an expeditious fashion, 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 carnage 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 why is 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 grown, 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 and their efforts to 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 money for 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 to help 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 142, 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 the 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 decisions about which helicopters 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, with 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, not what 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 aid package in support of 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 Caqueta 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 a year alone. 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 to the source, the coca-producing regions of Putumayo and Caqueta 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, which is airlift capacity, 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-passed emergency supplemental 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 equipment with which we 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 colleague from Washington, 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 Pentagon 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 critical 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 superiority 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 top 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 here in northern Colombia and 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 this program in serious jeopardy.

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 16,000 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, in virtually 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. My amendment says let 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 you what 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—speed, maximum passengers, 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 experienced with 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 provide Colombia. 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 2-for-1 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 substitution 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. The mission cost for a typical mission of transporting 88 troops from a base, at a distance of 98 miles or less, would cost essentially the same.

The committee has asserted in its committee report that one of the rationales for substituting Hueys for Blackhawks was the more immediate availability of Huey II's. I think that is disputable, in light of the fact that the 60 Hueys would require major refurbishing. 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 delivery schedule that Sikorsky 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 fly those Hueys, or the Blackhawks for that matter. In the case of Hueys, at least double the number of pilots will need to be trained to enable the Colombian Army to have an equivalent air mobility for its elite battalions. You will need at least double the 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, my amendment does 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 demanding choice in the bill.

Again, whether or not you agree with this policy overall, I hope you will support this amendment. In fact, if you will oppose the policy because you think it is not likely to work well,

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 on the chart, the red 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 similar 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 they 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 Colombian 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 Blackhawks 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 Blackhawks.

In comparison, the Huey II 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 Blackhawks 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. So to address the issue, we doubled the number of aircraft we are 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 up" either Blackhawk or Huey pilots, I don't see this aspect as particularly decisive.

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 we have assured 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 for equipment, training, and related support for counternarcotics battalions.

Senator DODD's chart points out the precise reason we chose to fund 60 Huey IIs rather than 30 Blackhawks. His chart points out that the cost to operate the Huey is \$617 per hour compared with 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 Blackhawks in the future years when Hueys would do?

These are U.S. units, which do not have Blackhawks, 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 here today principally because I was fortunate enough last week 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.

These are both excellent systems. But the question of what system do you purchase and deploy is a function of the mission that the platform, the helicopter, the system must execute.

Senator DODD did a very good job of providing the context for the proposed operation. Let me add a bit of detail, if I may.

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 context of the operation that is 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 these counternarcotics troops will perform 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 2 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 10 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 if in fact he were deploying Super Hueys 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 issue of cost because obviously, 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 Blackhawks. 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 more capability 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 what system is 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 it an advantage 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 Blackhawks, that will stress their logistical ability to train pilots, to provide mechanics, to provide crews, 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, practically, that 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 information. It is appropriate we should be considering 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 we have all talked about, 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.

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, but I have to leave quickly.

Mr. DODD. I would like to attend the ceremony, as well. Perhaps the leadership could provide a window for those who want to attend that 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 now. Does anyone think year after year after year after year we will be able to declare an emergency on this account?

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 Blackhawks. The Blackhawks are fighting machines. They will be the tip of a sword going into another Vietnam, 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 without coming back to this Congress year after year after year to ask for money to maintain what we 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 Blackhawks to be a part of our operation against the drug lords. What we need to do is provide the 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 supply of drugs coming literally 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 Blackhawks—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 even surviving the Senate. We 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. INHOFE). The Senator from Connecticut.

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 this. I respect their position, but I disagree. 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 Blackhawks, as originally proposed:

The 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 supporting 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 building 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—the 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 is right. It doesn't say you have to take the Blackhawk. It says make the proper, intelligent decision.

We heard from my colleague from Rhode Island, a graduate of West Point 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 change we are offering at least offers this program a much higher chance of success down the road by allowing 60 Blackhawks, which every military expert who has looked at this says is what you ought to have to deal with the altitude of 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 and ship on an hourly basis to this country 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 now have Colombians who can 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 about the Hueys 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 decision about what makes the best sense. I will live with whatever decision that is. But I don't want to have a political decision, I don't want to be told I have to accept 60 or 90 Hueys, when I know in Colombia you don't have the personnel to support it. It will take too long, you will never get it done, and you don't have the capacity to get the job accomplished.

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 like 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 Blackhawks yet, that will have to wait while Blackhawks 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 Blackhawks, if we go in that direction, is going to come back every year and that is \$1,000 an hour more than operating the Huey—\$1,000 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 for 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 less cost this year, next year, and in years down the road, which is not to say I am sure the Colombians would not like to have Blackhawks; 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 of the subcommittee.

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 and the Gorton 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 rollcall 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 some of those by 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. I thank my distinguished colleague.

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, but I judge from the managers, 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 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.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3529, 3536, 3540, 3544, AND 3568,  
EN BLOC

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we have some more amendments that have been cleared on both sides. Therefore, en bloc, I call up amendments Nos. 3529, 3536, 3540, 3544, and 3568.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3529

(Purpose: To allocate development assistance funds for Habitat for Humanity International)

On page 12, line 14, before the period insert the following: "Provided further, That of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading, \$1,500,000 shall be available only for Habitat for Humanity International, to be used to purchase 14 acres of land on behalf of Tibetan refugees living

in northern India and for the construction of a multiunit development for Tibetan families".

AMENDMENT NO. 3536

(Purpose: Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining, and Related Programs (NADR) budget)

On page 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following section:

**SEC. —. NONPROLIFERATION AND ANTI-TERRORISM PROGRAMS.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the programs contained in the Department of State's Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining, and Related Programs (NADR) budget line are vital to the national security of the United States; and

(2) funding for those programs should be restored in any conference report with respect to this Act to the levels requested in the President's budget.

AMENDMENT NO. 3540

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on the importance of combating mother-to-child transmission of HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. . (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) According to the World Health Organization, in 1999, there were 5.6 million new cases of HIV/AIDS throughout the world, and two-thirds of those (3.8 million) were in sub-Saharan Africa.

(2) Sub-Saharan Africa is the only region in the world where a majority of those with HIV/AIDS—55 percent—are women.

(3) When women get the disease, they often pass it along to their children, and over 2 million children in sub-Saharan Africa are living with HIV/AIDS.

(4) New investments and treatments hold out promise of making progress against mother-to-child transmission of HIV/AIDS. For example—

(A) a study in Uganda demonstrated that a new drug could prevent almost one-half of the HIV transmissions from mothers to infants, at a fraction of the cost of other treatments; and

(B) a study of South Africa's population estimated that if all pregnant women in that country took an antiviral medication during labor, as many as 110,000 new cases of HIV/AIDS could be prevented over the next five years in South Africa alone.

(5) The Technical Assistance, Trade Promotion, and Anti-Corruption Act of 2000, as approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 23, 2000, ensures that not less than 8.3 percent of USAID's HIV/AIDS funding is used to combat mother-to-child transmission.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that of the funds provided in this Act, the USAID should place a high priority on efforts, including providing medications, to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV/AIDS.

AMENDMENT NO. 3544

(Purpose: To require a report on the delivery of humanitarian assistance to Sudan, and for other purposes)

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

**SEC. —. 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—

(1) describing—

(A) the areas of Sudan open to the delivery of humanitarian or other assistance through or from Operation Lifeline Sudan (in this section referred to as "OLS"), both in the Northern and Southern sectors;

(B) the extent of actual deliveries of assistance through or from OLS to those areas from January 1997 through the present;

(C) areas of Sudan which cannot or do not receive assistance through or from OLS, and the specific reasons for lack or absence of coverage, including—

(i) denial of access by the government of Sudan on a periodic basis ("flight bans"), including specific times and duration of denials from January 1997 through the present;

(ii) denial of access by the government of Sudan on an historic basis ("no-go" areas) since 1989 and the reason for such denials;

(iii) exclusion of areas from the original agreements which defined the limitations of OLS;

(iv) a determination by OLS of a lack of need in an area of no coverage;

(v) no request has been made to the government of Sudan for coverage or deliveries to those areas by OLS or any participating organization within OLS; or

(vi) any other reason for exclusion from or denial of coverage by OLS;

(D) areas of Sudan where the United States has provided assistance outside of OLS since January 1997, and the amount, extent and nature of that assistance;

(E) areas affected by the withdrawal of international relief organizations, or their sponsors, or both, due to the disagreement over terms of the "Agreement for Coordination of Humanitarian, Relief and Rehabilitation Activities in the SPLM Administered Areas" memorandum of 1999, including specific locations and programs affected; and

(2) containing a comprehensive assessment of the humanitarian needs in areas of Sudan not covered or served by OLS, including but not limited to the Nuba Mountains, Red Sea Hills, and Blue Nile regions.

AMENDMENT NO. 3568

(Purpose: To allocate funds to combat trafficking in persons)

On page 20, line 18, before the period insert the following: "Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading and made available to support training of local Kosovo police and the temporary International Police Force (IPF), not less than \$250,000 shall be available only to assist law enforcement officials better identify and respond to cases of trafficking in persons".

On page 24, line 14, before the period insert the following: "Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$1,500,000 shall be available only to meet the health and other assistance needs of victims of trafficking in persons".

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, they have been cleared on both sides of the aisle. I ask unanimous consent the amendments be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 3529, 3536, 3540, 3544, and 3568) were agreed to.

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.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3521, AS MODIFIED, AND 3584,  
AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk modifications to amendments Nos. 3521 and 3584.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], for Mr. COVERDELL, for himself and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 3521, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, is 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 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 the May 28 run-off—by not taking effective steps to correct the “insufficiencies, 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 in Peru regarding commitments 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 must 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.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report evaluating United States political, economic, and military relations with Peru, in accordance with P.L. 106-186. Such report should review, but not be limited to, the following.

(1) The effectiveness of providing United States assistance to Peru only through independent non-governmental organizations or international organizations;

(2) Scrutiny of all United States anti-narcotics assistance to Peru and the effectiveness of providing such assistance through legitimate civilian agencies and the appropriateness of providing this assistance to any military or intelligence units that are known to have violated human rights, suppressed freedom of expression or undermined free and fair elections.

(3) The need to increase support to Peru through independent non-governmental organizations and international organizations to promote the rule of law, separation of powers, political pluralism, and respect to human rights, and to evaluate termination of support for entities that have cooperated with the undemocratic maneuvers of the executive branch; and

(4) The effectiveness of United States policy of supporting loans or other assistance for Peru through international financial institutions (such as the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank), and an evaluation of terminating support to entities

of the Government of Peru that have willfully violated human rights, suppressed freedom of expression, or undermined free and fair elections.

(5) The extent to which Peru benefits from the Andean Trade Preferences Act and the ramifications of conditioning participation in that program on respect for the rule of law and representative democracy.

(c) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall determine and report to the appropriate committees of Congress whether the Government of Peru has made substantial progress in improving its respect for human rights, the rule of law (including fair trials of civilians), the independence and constitutional role of the judiciary and national congress, and freedom of expression and independent journalism.

(d) PROHIBITION.—If the President determines and reports pursuant to subsection (c) 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 to the international financial institutions to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose loans to the Government of Peru, except loans to support basic human needs.

(e) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (d) shall not apply to humanitarian assistance, democracy assistance, anti-narcotics assistance, assistance to support binational peace activities involving Peru and Ecuador, assistance provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, or assistance provided by the Trade and Development Agency.

(f) WAIVER.—The President may waive subsection (d) for periods not to exceed 90 days 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 and the rule of law in Peru.

(g) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this section, “appropriate committees of Congress” means the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and Committee on International Relations in the House of Representatives. For the purposes of this section, “humanitarian assistance” includes but is not limited to assistance to support health and basic education.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator 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 made available from Economic Support Fund assistance fun assistance”.

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.

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if the Senator would withhold.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I withhold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the managers for their efforts on this very important piece of legislation. They will have my support.

Mr. President, I have been associated with this very important piece of legislation providing aid to Colombia since it was first recommended to the Congress of the United States.

I commend the administration and, in particular, General McCaffrey. I have had an opportunity, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and, indeed, for some 22 years to work with General McCaffrey, particularly during the period of the Gulf War in 1991 when he showed extraordinary leadership as a troop commander in that decisive battle to turn back Saddam Hussein's threats.

Now he has volunteered, once again, as an American patriot, to take on this somewhat thankless task of dealing with the almost insoluble problems of the importing into this country of drugs. This is one effort by the general—indeed, the administration, and others—to try to curtail this illegal importation of drugs.

I heard a colleague earlier today concerned about: Well, we are not spending enough money here at home. My quick research and consultation with other colleagues indicates that I think some \$500 million in taxpayers' money has been added by this Congress to the Administration's budget requests for domestic programs over the past 3 years. This money has been expended in an effort to educate and to, in every other way, help Americans, first, avoid the use of drugs and then, if misfortune does strike an individual and their families, to try to deal with the tragic consequences.

So I rise to speak in support of the U.S. counternarcotics activities in the Andean ridge and neighboring countries, as provided for in this bill, and to address the impact of drug trafficking on the stability of the region.

The importance of this region to the United States cannot be overestimated. I will give you one example. The region provides the United States with almost 20 percent of the supply of foreign oil. The number is likely to increase with the recent discovery, in Colombia's eastern plains, of reserves estimated at 2 million barrels. The ongoing controversy over the price of gas by the American motorists at this very moment is reason to help Colombia fight this problem.

When I say help this nation, I have been privileged to meet with their President in the course of his visits here, and also 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 all those, certainly here in 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 in support 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 in Colombia's eastern plains of reserves 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 and other acts for that purpose, 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 provided 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 contained 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 Colombia 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 an internal 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? and
- (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 territory.

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 the time in the quorum call be divided equally to both sides.

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

Mr. WARNER. 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 a 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 past human rights abuses. The way to deal with this is through the conditions 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 investigate and prosecute 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 population in Colombia.

Our provisions were not only developed to punish 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. It 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 heavy 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 to 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. It is our own country's drug use that 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, as 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 illicit cause, which only makes 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 insurgents in Colombia.

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 now 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 is now the law of the land. This 3-year plan is designed to restore international eradication, interdiction, and crop alternative development funding. With this law, which we passed on a bipartisan basis, we have already made a \$800 million downpayment—\$200 million of which represents the first substantial investment in Colombia for counternarcotics activities.

The emergency assistance package that we have before us this afternoon is based on a blueprint that Senator COVERDELL and I developed and introduced last October—3 months before the administration unveiled its proposal. As our plan, the emergency assistance package the Senator from Kentucky has crafted goes beyond counternarcotics assistance and crop alternative development programs in Colombia. It goes beyond Colombia and targets other Latin-American countries, including Bolivia, Peru, Panama, and Ecuador.

This regional approach is the only approach, it is the right approach, and

it is critical. Both Peru and Bolivia have made enormous progress in reducing drug cultivation in their respective countries, and they have done it with the help, candidly, of our assistance, and it has worked. Now, an emphasis only on the Colombian drug problems risks the obvious "spillover" effect of Colombia's drug trade shifting to adjacent countries in the region.

Some of my colleagues have taken the floor today to express hesitancy and reluctance and opposition to this assistance package. I wish to take a moment to direct my comments specifically to them and specifically to some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle.

Our Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act was an attempt to change the direction of our national drug policy—a drug policy that clearly was not working. We took that first step. Today, we must take the second step. We passed that very important legislation because we had to; we had to because the current administration, unfortunately, had presided over the literal dismantling of our international drug-fighting capability.

Let me explain. When President George Bush left the White House, we were spending approximately one-quarter of our total Federal antidrug budget on international drug interdiction, either on law enforcement in other countries, on our own Customs, on the DEA, and on crop eradication. Basically, it was taking that huge chunk of the Federal antidrug budget and spending it to try to stop drugs from ever reaching our shores. It was a balanced approach and it made sense.

After 6 years of the Clinton Presidency, that percentage of our budget—that one-quarter of our total budget—was reduced to 13 to 14 percent, which is a dramatic reduction in the percentage of money we are spending on international drug interdiction.

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 foreign policy. We need to get back to that balanced approach, where we spend money on international interdiction, 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 had 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 COVERDELL, GRASSLEY, FEINSTEIN, 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 colleague from Kentucky has 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 democratic, keeping it as our friend, keeping it as our trading partner, and keeping its drugs off our streets.

Colombia faces a crisis that is different than 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. I 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; each one benefits from the 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 all of us in the United States. It directly impacts you; it directly impacts me, our children, and our grandchildren.

I ask my colleagues to really consider the great human tragedy that Colombia is today. 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 to our country.

The emergency aid package before us today is in the best interests 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 trying to make 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 Americas 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—whether it is trade, 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 spending. 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 own 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 of my constituents, of 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 deeply 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—but its primary use would 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 Colombia issue, we in this body are not, 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 could 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 antidrug 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 engage the 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 contrast, for 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 and photographs 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 improved its record 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 to 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 southern 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 recently suspended 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, or ACRI, 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 national 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. fails—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 falls \$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 fiscal year 2001. Yet we continue the disturbing trend, a trend that I believe runs counter to our national interest and counter to our national identity, of turning our back on the rest of the world.

I yield the floor, and 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. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3517

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington. Is there time remaining on that issue?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont controls the time, and there are 17 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am sorry. I was distracted. What is the Senator from Florida asking?

Mr. GRAHAM. Is the Senator controlling the time in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LEAHY. Well, by default I am. Would the Senator like some time?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. I request 8 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield 8 minutes to my good friend, the senior Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I have spoken earlier this afternoon on the issue of Colombia in the context of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota. But now that we have another amendment relative to this provision within the foreign operations appropriations bill, I am pleased to have been afforded this opportunity to speak a second time.

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 destabilizing effect on Colombia's stated 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 is 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.

What a horrendous consequence it would be if, 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 Presiding 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. Peru is in the midst of a very 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 due, 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 who are all working together in various places in Colombia, particularly in the southern most 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 20 percent unemployment, a 3- to 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 Colombia, and 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 trying to legally 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 still will have some work to do, in particular work to do in terms of internationalizing 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 Andean pact nations vis-a-vis the 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 369

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 between now and 6:15 divided equally 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 cosponsor 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 that includes a flourishing 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 of a continued massive 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.

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 help from its friends abroad. 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 abuses, internally displaced people, and economic deterioration.

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 Blackhawks 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 for 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 forces and believes it is the best solution for providing helicopter support to the newly formed counternarcotics 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 simply will not work at all.

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 operational effectiveness and support requirements of the Blackhawks versus the Huey IIs in Colombia. In a preliminary report on its finding, the team said:

The superior troop carrying capacity and range of the UH-60L, 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 micromanage 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 amendment, and proudly support and 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 involve us in some new armed conflict without seriously examining the consequences of that involvement, the cost 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 that 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 why it should 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 received to 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 downpayment—and this is a downpayment only. Next year, maybe we will need a lot more money if they are not doing very well down there. And how much of the equipment is going to end up in the hands of rebels by sale or capture or otherwise? We have no way of controlling that without a presence on the ground.

I urge this body to say to the administration: No, we are not going to do this until you first come to us with a formal overall plan with a beginning, middle, and an end, and a plan for how we are going to achieve our goals. Get the authority first and then fund it. It is 10 times better for this society to put that \$700 million on our debt and not get in a civil war in South America. That is what this debate is all about—not that we don't like the Colombians or that we don't want them to be successful, but we don't want a part of their war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, let me remind my colleagues that the WELLSTONE amendment was defeated 89-7. That would have taken \$225 million out of the committee's proposal to fight the war on drugs in Colombia. The amendment of the Senator from Washington, my good friend, would leave only \$200 million. It would, in fact, completely terminate this effort, as he candidly admits would be his desire. I hope the GORTON amendment will not be approved.

Mr. President, there are several amendments cleared on both sides

which I would like to get out of the way at this point. Temporarily, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the two amendments upon which we are about to vote.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3495, 3491 AND 3539, AS MODIFIED, EN BLOC

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send amendments Nos. 3495, 3491, and 3539, as modified, to the desk en bloc and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] proposes amendments en bloc numbered 3495, 3491, and 3539, as modified.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3495

(Purpose: 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)

On page 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. — 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 150 members of the Parliament in Zimbabwe (98 percent) belong to the same political party;

(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 faces a food emergency due to 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 delegation accreditation 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.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—The Senate—

(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 accepted principles of 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 education, domestic 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. 591. 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" should 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. 3539, AS 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 \$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading, should 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, communications equipment to notify civilians of aerial bombardment, non-military vehicles, tents, and shoes."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, these amendments have been cleared on 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. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington, Mr. GORTON.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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. INOUE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 79, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 139 Leg.]

YEAS—19

Allard	Gorton	Leahy
Boxer	Gramm	Mikulski
Collins	Grams	Murray
Craig	Gregg	Specter
Crapo	Harkin	Thomas
Enzi	Hutchinson	
Fitzgerald	Kohl	

NAYS—79

Abraham	Bond	Chafee, L.
Akaka	Breaux	Cleland
Ashcroft	Brownback	Cochran
Baucus	Bryan	Conrad
Bayh	Bunning	Coverdell
Bennett	Burns	Daschle
Biden	Byrd	DeWine
Bingaman	Campbell	Dodd

Dorgan	Kyl	Roth
Durbin	Landrieu	Santorum
Edwards	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Feingold	Levin	Schumer
Feinstein	Lieberman	Sessions
Frist	Lincoln	Shelby
Graham	Lott	Smith (NH)
Grassley	Lugar	Smith (OR)
Hagel	Mack	Snowe
Hatch	McCain	Stevens
Helms	McConnell	Thompson
Hollings	Moynihan	Thurmond
Hutchison	Murkowski	Torricelli
Inhofe	Nickles	Voinovich
Jeffords	Reed	Warner
Johnson	Reid	Wellstone
Kennedy	Robb	Wyden
Kerrey	Roberts	
Kerry	Rockefeller	

NOT VOTING—2

Domenici

Inouye

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 conjunction 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 ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICA DE COLOMBIA,  
MINISTERIO DE DEFENSA NACIONAL,  
*Santa Fe De Bogota, June 21, 2000.*

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 CHAIRMEN: 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 all 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-60 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 greater range. Therefore, the need for 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 in counter narcotics operations, specially taking in consideration the areas where poppy cultivation takes place.

While the Huey II helicopter may be less expensive to purchase and operate, there are considerable indirect expenses not being factored in by the Huey II advocates. For ex-

ample, 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, equipment, 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 more important, our force structure planning for the future is based in this type of aircraft. As for today, our government has already acquired Blackhawks with our own resources and has the appropriate logistic facilities to operate and maintain up to 30 additional UH-60L Blackhawks.

Some members of the US 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 will pose a major logistic problem and extra efforts, since the fleet must be jointly operated increasing tactical, technical and administrative costs. The Ministry does believe that the UH-1Ns will be vitally 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-1Ns after 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 operative and logistical capabilities, the government of Colombia should receive a number of Bell 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 RANGEL,  
*Commander in Chief of  
the Army.*

GENERAL FERNANDO TAPIAS  
STAHELIN,  
*Commander in Chief of  
the Military Forces.*

LUIS FERNANDO RAMIREZ  
ACUNA,  
*Minister of National  
Defense.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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 the 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.

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. INOUE) 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	Graham	McCain
Baucus	Grams	Moynihan
Bayh	Hagel	Murray
Biden	Harkin	Reed
Boxer	Hollings	Reid
Breaux	Johnson	Robb
Bryan	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kerrey	Santorum
Cleland	Kerry	Sarbanes
Conrad	Landrieu	Schumer
Daschle	Lautenberg	Smith (OR)
Dodd	Leahy	Snowe
Durbin	Levin	Specter
Edwards	Lieberman	Torricelli
Feingold	Lincoln	Wellstone
Feinstein	Mack	

NAYS—51

Abraham	Dorgan	Lugar
Allard	Enzi	McConnell
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Bennett	Frist	Murkowski
Bingaman	Gorton	Nickles
Bond	Gramm	Roberts
Brownback	Grassley	Roth
Bunning	Gregg	Sessions
Burns	Hatch	Shelby
Campbell	Helms	Smith (NH)
Chafee, L.	Hutchinson	Stevens
Cochran	Hutchison	Thomas
Collins	Inhofe	Thompson
Coverdell	Jeffords	Thurmond
Craig	Kohl	Voinovich
Crapo	Kyl	Warner
DeWine	Lott	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Domenici Inouye

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LOTT. 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. I commend the managers for the work they have been doing and commend Members for the help we have been receiving from them on both sides in terms of disposing of amendments one way or another.

I believe we are very 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 stacked 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 rollcall 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, then we 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, Senators have been working very hard on both sides to clear things.

I suggest this as an alternative to some of my colleagues. A number of matters are things that could just as well be handled in report language.

The Senator from Kentucky and I, in some of those instances, have been able to work that out. With the help of both the Republican leadership and the Democratic leadership, we have been able to get rid of many of these amendments. I think we are so close to working out the suggestion the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has made, that Senators should look at that. It is one that is strongly supported by the managers of this bill. I hope we might make it possible to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in cooperation with the manager on our side, we have worked very hard to move this legislation along. On the proposed unanimous consent request that would be propounded by the majority leader, we would complete debate on all amendments tonight and vote, as the leader indicated, tomorrow after 12

o'clock. We have one outstanding objection on that. We are in the process of working to have that resolved. We hope to have that done in the near future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3553, 3537, 3515, 3546, AS MODIFIED, 3547, AS MODIFIED, 3549, AS MODIFIED, 3545, AS MODIFIED, 3172, AS MODIFIED, AND 3522, AS MODIFIED, EN BLOC

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we have some more 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 moment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Senator says there is a question about the Chafee amendment?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 Dodd 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 appropriations levels.

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 we consider this matter, 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 replace outdated 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; 3537; 3515; 3546, as modified; 3547, as modified; 3549, as modified; 3172, as modified; and 3522, as modified), en bloc, were agreed to as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3553

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 Committees 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) EXCEPTIONS.—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.

On page 152, line 17, insert “in connection with support of Plan Colombia” after “Colombia”.

On page 152, line 19, strike “250” and insert “500”.

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 “60”.

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 “subsection (a)(1)” and insert “subsection (a)(1)(A)”.

On page 155, line 12, strike “(f)” and insert “(h)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3515

(Purpose: 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)

On page 155, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(g) NATIONAL SECURITY EXEMPTION.—The limitation contained in subsection (b)(1) shall not apply with respect to any activity subject to reporting under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.).

AMENDMENT NO. 3546, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: 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, and for other purposes)

On page 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_. **ELIMINATION OF DOWRY DEATHS AND HONOR KILLINGS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State should meet with representatives from countries that have a high incidence of the practice of dowry deaths or honor killings with a view toward working with the representatives to increase awareness of the practices,

to develop strategies to end the practices, and to determine the scope of the problem within the refugee population.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DOWRY DEATH.—The term “dowry death” means the killing 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, 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 12, line 14, strike “loans.” and insert the following: “loans: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, up to \$1,500,000 may be used to develop and integrate, where appropriate, educational programs aimed at eliminating the practice of female genital mutilation.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3549, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: 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)

On page 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_. **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. 3172, AS MODIFIED

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

On page 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_. **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 Sergeev and Army Chief of Staff Anatoly Kvashnin;

(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 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 \$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 community and loans from the International Monetary Fund, and while it is receiving corn and grain as food aid from the United States;

(7) the hospitality 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

(8) the relationship between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Governments of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Serbia only encourages the regime of Slobodan Milosevic to foment instability in the Balkans and thereby jeopardizes the safety and security of American military and civilian personnel and raises questions about Russia's commitment to its responsibilities as a member of the North American Treaty Organization-led peacekeeping mission in Kosovo.

(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 entities acting on its behalf has provided since June 1999, and intends to provide to the Government of Serbia or the Government of 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 to 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)(i) The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors of the international financial institutions to oppose, and vote against, any extension by those institutions of any financial assistance (including any technical assistance or grant) of any kind to the Government of the Russian Federation except for loans and assistance that serve basic human needs.

(ii) In this subparagraph, the term "international financial institution" includes the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, the Multilateral Investment Guaranty Agency, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(C) The United States shall suspend existing programs to the Russia 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 may waive the actions described in subsections 2A, 2B, and 2C if he determines and reports to Congress that it is in the national interests of the United States of America.

(3) It is the sense of the Senate that—The President of the United States should instruct his representatives to negotiations on Russia's international debt to oppose further forgiveness, restructuring, 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 are associated with the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, done at Cologne June 10, 1999 (commonly known as the "Balkan Stability Pact"), particularly those projects that encourage bilateral 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.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Senator HELMS be added as a cosponsor to the Coverdell 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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, amendment No. 3584 was accepted earlier. The sponsor of that amendment, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. ABRAHAM, has agreed to a modification of his amendment. I ask unanimous consent to send the modification to the desk and ask that it be accepted in lieu of the earlier amendment No. 3584.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment, as further modified, is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3584, as further modified) was agreed to, as follows:

In lieu of amendment No. 3584, insert the following:

On page 14, line 4, strike "\$15,000,000" and insert: "\$18,000,000".

On page 14, line 7, after "Lebanon" insert: "": *Provided*, That not less than \$15,000,000 of the funds made available under the previous proviso shall be made available from funds appropriated under the Economic Support Fund."

Mr. LEAHY. 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. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3568

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I don't know whether we have reached agreement or not or whether there will be time for discussion tomorrow.

I thank my colleagues. I believe amendment No. 3568 has been accepted.

This is an amendment I have offered with Senator BROWNBAC, who is in the chair. I point out to colleagues that this amendment would use \$250,000 of the funds appropriated to Kosovo to help police better identify and respond to cases of trafficking. It also would provide some help for those who live in the Newly Independent States of the former Soviet Union who have been victims of trafficking. I thank both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Vermont for accepting this amendment.

I especially thank Senator BROWNBAC for the work I have been able to do with him dealing with the awful aspect of this new global economy: the trafficking of women forced into prostitution, and terrible labor conditions. We have a great piece of legislation. Both of us hope it will pass soon. This amendment to this piece of legislation is a good step in the right direction. I thank my colleague, Senator BROWNBAC, for his support. I thank Senators for supporting this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT NO. 3588

(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 interdiction of illicit drugs being transported over Cuba 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: The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] proposes an amendment numbered 3588.

Mr. SPECTER. 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. . UNITED STATES-CUBAN MUTUAL ASSISTANCE IN THE INTERDICTION OF ILICIT DRUGS.**

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Of the amount appropriated under the heading "Department of State, International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement", up to \$1,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, on behalf of the United States Coast Guard, the United States Customs Service, and other bodies, 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 Cuban airspace and waters, provided that such assistance may only 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) that there is no evidence of the involvement of the government of Cuba in drug trafficking.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the essence 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 other mutual assistance in the interdiction of illegal drugs being transported over Cuban airspace and waters, provided that such assistance may be provided after the President determines and certifies to Congress that Cuba has appropriate procedures in place to protect against innocent loss of life in the air and that there is no evidence of the involvement of the Government of Cuba in drug trafficking.

The Government of Cuba has been prepared for some time to provide further 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, obviously, a sharp disagreement as to what our policy should be toward Cuba with respect to the embargo. But whatever anybody may think about those subjects, it is my view that there is no doubt that we ought to take up the availability of assistance from Cuba on drug interdiction. That is what this amendment will do.

There is a real issue about U.S. policy toward Cuba. I voted against the Dodd amendment, which would create a commission to make recommendations on that policy, because I think

that the issue of policy really ought to be decided by the next President of the United States in conjunction with the Congress. The times have certainly changed, so that Castro no longer presents a threat to export communism to Latin America. I believe that the consideration of change in policy really ought not to be entrusted to a commission at the present time, which would report after January 20 of next year, when the issue really is for the President of the United States—whoever may be elected.

I supported the Gorton amendment, which would strike the funds for Colombia, although I knew at the time that the funding for Colombia would pass by a large number. I have visited Colombia on a number of occasions over the past decade. I am very much in favor of assisting Colombia in restoring law and order to that nation, to try to avoid the destabilizing effect of the drug cartels. But I do not believe that it is appropriate to spend hundreds of millions of dollars—almost a billion dollars in the Senate appropriations and \$1.4 billion in the House. I believe there is currently an imbalance in the \$18 billion a year spent on drugs, with about two-thirds of that—or \$12 billion—going to the so-called supply side, and some \$6 billion going to the so-called demand side.

My view is that we would be doing better to spend money on rehabilitation and education to try to eliminate the demand for drugs. I was an original sponsor of legislation many years ago to bring in the military on interdiction, and I think that it is a good policy. But no matter how strong our interdiction is, drugs will come into the United States as long as there is a demand for drugs. My experience as district attorney of Philadelphia shows that a great deal can be done to prosecute drug dealers and street crime and move up the chain to drug kingpins. But, again, as long as there is a demand for drugs, there will be a supply. So it is my view that the wiser course of action is to spend more money on education and rehabilitation through the drug courts, which are now part of the crime bill of 1994. It is because of my view that funds are better spent on rehabilitation and education and the demand side that I supported the Wellstone amendment.

I thank my many colleagues who have worked with me to clear this amendment. As with most Senators, I would like to have a rollcall vote. We are trying to bring this matter to a conclusion. Tomorrow, we are going to start on the appropriations bill of Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education, which comes from the subcommittee I chair. So I appreciate the acceptance of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3588) was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3569

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3569.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] proposes an amendment numbered 3569.

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 "purposes:" insert the following: "Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, 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 specifically policing initiatives to combat methamphetamine production and trafficking and to enhance policing initiatives in drug 'hot spots'".

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, just briefly, this amendment would transfer \$100 million away from the Colombian aid into the Department of Justice to be used for drug interdiction, for counternarcotic activities including and especially to combat methamphetamine production and trafficking, which is rampant throughout the United States, and also to use this money to enhance policing initiatives throughout the country in drug hotspots.

I appreciate the cooperation of my colleagues and hope we will have an affirmative vote on that.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we may need a moment more to have a chance to review the unanimous consent proposal. I believe we have one worked out that is fair and acceptable to Senators on both sides of the aisle. If we can get this agreement entered into, then there would be no further votes tonight, nor in the morning. Then we would begin the final debate at 1:30, with the votes that are necessary stacked at 2 p.m., and final passage at that time.

In the morning, though, we would go to Labor-HHS Appropriations at 9:30. Any votes relative to that bill would also be put in a stacked sequence beginning at 2 p.m., if any are ready. We certainly hope good progress can be made on that bill tomorrow. We look forward to working with the managers of that legislation.

I see Senator REID is looking over the consent request. If he has any questions, I will be glad to respond.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all remaining first-degree amendments in order to the pending bill be offered and debated tonight, along with any relevant second-degree amendments, and the votes occur in relation to those amendments beginning at 2 p.m. on Thursday, with

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 filed amendment regarding 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 relative 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 Senator gets it worked out, or something changes his mind, he obviously 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 we have talked about their reviewing that very closely to see if something can be worked out. Today, there was a very emotional event at the White House. Senator INOUE was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. It was one of the most dramatic events I have ever attended. Senator AKAKA is calling and he desires some morning business to talk about this. There are lots of people in from Hawaii and from around the country. We are coming in at 9:30 a.m. to begin Labor-HHS.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, why don't we amend the request to say that we come in at 9:30, and after the opening

and the prayer, we go to Senator AKAKA for 30 minutes, and we will begin Labor-HHS bill at 10 o'clock. We are all certainly very proud of Senator INOUE and how he and the men of his unit served this country. For it to be appropriately memorialized in this Chamber by his colleague from Hawaii is more than appropriate. I am pleased to make that addition.

Mr. REID. Further reserving the right to object, when Senator MCCONNELL finishes his business tonight—and that should be shortly—I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Rhode Island be recognized for 30 minutes, and that the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, be able to speak. I have amendments that the committee has worked on during the day, and I would like to speak on those after Senator REED from Rhode Island speaks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to further clarify that there would be no prohibition in this unanimous consent agreement if it would be necessary to withdraw the amendment which I propose.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I certainly know of no reason the Senate wouldn't agree to the Senator's amendment being withdrawn if the Senator desires to do so.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, will the majority leader simply have that reflected in the agreement?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I include in the unanimous consent request that if Senator FEINGOLD wishes to withdraw his amendment, that would be in order.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in light of this agreement, there will be no further votes tonight, and the next series of votes will occur at 2 p.m. on Thursday.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would simply like to thank the majority leader. Much of this was done to accommodate my daughter's graduation tomorrow morning. He went out of his way. I thank him, as well as 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.

I yield the floor.

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, will the Senator yield before the majority leader leaves?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

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, and Senator TORRICELLI, and Senator ROBB.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator 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. 5 \_\_\_\_ (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—

(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 for the purposes 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)).

(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 306(a)(19) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(19)) with respect to areas subject to a declaration of a major disaster 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.

(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)).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, let me begin by thanking Senators STEVENS, LOTT, MCCONNELL, LEAHY, and BYRD for accepting this amendment, No. 3582. Throughout the process of dealing with Hurricane Floyd and its impact on my State they have been unstinting in their help and deserve the thanks and deep appreciation of the people of North Carolina. I've also had the honor of working with Senators TORRICELLI and ROBB on this amendment. They have fought hard for their States.

This amendment would provide \$125 million in funding to the Economic Development Administration this year. It would also provide \$125 million in funding this year for USDA's Community Facilities program.

Mr. President, this money is desperately needed. Although 9 months

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.

I am enormously pleased that this amendment has been accepted. We have a lot more work to do in order to enact it into law. I hope this provision will be incorporated into the final supplemental appropriations package that is being negotiated as part of the Military Construction appropriations conference. The innocent victims of Hurricane Floyd deserve no less.

Indeed, the Federal Government has consistently provided this type of aid to disaster victims. I ask unanimous consent that a list of previous assistance packages be printed in the RECORD. It is only fair to treat this disaster in the same manner.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the RECORD following the amendment.

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

EXAMPLES OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS THAT REQUESTED EDA FUNDS COULD FUND (50% MAXIMUM PARTICIPATION UNLESS WAIVED)

District and county	Applicant	Total project cost	Project description
7—Brunswick	Brunswick County	\$6,600,000	Construct 1.65 mgd WWTP that will immediately serve a new industry creating 300 jobs.
5—Alamance	Burlington	5,000,000	Upgrade existing 12.0 mgd East Burlington facilities to meet effluent limits (400 jobs).
7—Duplin	Duplin County/Beulaville	2,500,000	Water improvements to serve three existing industries retaining/saving 350 jobs and the construction of a multi-tenant building.
1—Edgecombe	Edgecombe W/S Districts No. 1&2	4,242,000	Water and sewer improvements to serve a new industry that will create 800 jobs.
4—Chatham	Goldston-Gulf Sanitary District	227,389	Water improvements (50 jobs).
2—Harnett	Harnett County/Fuquay-Varina	4,000,000	Regional water transmission main and municipal sewer improvements to serve an expanding industry (400 jobs) and industrial development.
3—Lenoir	Lenoir County	3,512,700	Upgrade and expand the city's 4.08 mgd plant to 6.0 mgd. The expansion requires upgrades to more stringent effluent limits. (300 jobs).
—Nash	Rocky Mount	10,000,000	Infrastructure for new subdivisions of affordable housing.
4—Chatham	Siler City	2,050,000	Collection system rehabilitation to eliminate inflow/infiltration adversely impacting WWTP's treatment capacity. (125).
5—Rockingham	Town of Reidsville	2,537,512	Water, sewer and street construction to develop phase I of the Town of Reidsville's 300 acre industrial park (800 jobs).
1—Warren	Warren County	2,943,999	Sanitary sewer replacement to eliminate inflow and infiltration that is reducing the WWTP's treatment capacity that will create 600 jobs.
3—Wayne	Wayne County	2,080,000	Sewer improvements that will serve industries creating 700 jobs.
2—Wilson	Wilson County	1,751,065	Replacement of a major sewer interceptor to correct inflow/infiltration resulting in WWTP operating under a moratorium and SOC (400 jobs).
Total		47,444,665	

POTENTIAL EDA PROJECTS—FY 2000 SUPPLEMENTAL

District and county	Applicant	Total project cost	Project description
1—Edgecombe	Tarboro	\$3,000,000	Water and sewer improvements in Kingsboro corridor to retain commerce and support industrial growth in non flood-prone areas.
1—Edgecombe	Pinetops	1,500,000	Waste water treatment plant flooded during Hurricane Floyd. Funds would allow for expansion of industrial and residential capacity of facility.
1—Edgecombe	Tarboro	600,000	Water and sewer lines to accommodate the expansion of commerce and the development of 2 low to moderate income subdivisions.
1—Edgecombe	Tarboro Area Development Corporation/NC Department of Commerce, Division of Community Assistance.	350,000	As part of NC "Main Street" project, rehabilitate Royster-Clark Building. This project will increase utilization of downtown properties, including mixed-use development; increase tax base in Tarboro area, including property and sales tax; create employment opportunities through an enhanced commercial district; and encourage private sector development in real property, related improvements, and job creation. \$300,000 for construction/renovation; \$50,000 for planning and technical assistance.
2—Nash	Rocky Mount	4,000,000	Water and sewer and natural gas improvements to Whitakers industrial park to accommodate the relocation of businesses to non flood-prone areas.
3—Lenior	Coastal Community College	1,300,000	Acquire and renovate existing building to accommodate the relocation of businesses located in flood-prone areas (business incubator).
3—Lenior	La Grange	3,000,000	Expansion of water and sewer capacity will support the relocation of existing businesses and residents to non flood-prone areas.
3—Onslow	Onslow County	3,000,000	Water and sewer extensions to county owned industrial park to support the relocation of commercial activities to non flood-prone areas.
7—Duplin	Duplin County/Beulaville	2,500,000	Water improvements to serve existing industries (retaining more than 300 jobs) and the construction of multi-tenant commercial building to serve flood-displaced businesses.
7—Pender	Pender County	1,400,000	Berming and drainage improvements to save more than 600 jobs at industrial sites severely impacted by Hurricane Floyd.
1 and 8—Pitt	Farmville	1,500,000	Provide sewer pump stations and extensions to serve new ethanol facility that will create 1000 jobs—replenishing the 450 jobs lost after hurricanes.
1 and 8—Beaufort	Beaufort EDC	1,500,000	Construct industrial building for lease to flood-displaced businesses.
1 and 3—Pitt	Greenville	3,000,000	Water and sewer extensions to serve business and housing relocations to non flood-prone areas.
1 and 3—Pitt	Farmville	1,000,000	Provide water and sewer pump station to serve US 258/US 264 interchange area to provide for the expansion of commerce and the development of subdivisions/housing.
Multiple	NC Department of Commerce, Division of Community Assistance.	1,400,000	The "Main Street" program is an ongoing, successful State initiative to revitalize commercial districts in North Carolina communities. Targeting vacant or abandoned buildings for rehabilitation, the program infuses new activity into commercial districts by reclaiming and renovating structures for commercial and mixed-use. Building renovation is an important part of comprehensive projects that enhance quality of life and commerce for North Carolina towns. Planning and technical assistance and construction funds for "Main Street" program in disaster impacted communities (Clinton, Elizabeth, Wilson, Farmville, Goldsboro, Kinston, Lumberton, New Bern, Smithfield, Southport, Tarboro, and Washington). \$400,000 in planning and technical assistance funds would support economic improvement feasibility analyses of "Main Street" projects, including use of appropriate hazard mitigation technologies. \$1 million in construction funds would facilitate the implementation of project/rehabilitation of buildings—supporting new jobs and the revitalization of towns and commercial areas.
Multiple	Multiple Counties	20,000,000	2 urban and 5 rural communities were under water/sewer moratoriums due to capacity prior to the 1999 hurricane season (Wilson, Bethel, Fremont, Mount Olive, Snow Hill, Kinston, and Ahoskie). \$300 in RM alone—4 additional rural facilities are now operating under moratorium due to flood damage (Fountain, Winton, Aulander, and Pikeville). As a critical component of the repair and recovery and reconstruction process, especially regarding the reconstruction of affordable housing and relocation of commercial activities, the capacity of these facilities must be addressed.
Total		49,050,000	

<sup>1</sup> Unless waived, EDA projects require a 50% cost-share.

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—\$200 million for EDA plus \$200 million for CDBG; Northridge Earthquake in 1994—\$55 million for EDA plus more than \$225 million for CDBG; Tropical Storm Alberto in 1994—\$50 million for EDA plus \$180 million for CDBG; Red River Valley Floods in 1997—\$52 million in EDA plus \$500 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. 3589) 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 INOUE OF HAWAII

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there has been discussion of the great honor that the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii earned. He actually earned it when I was a child. He earned it on the battlefield in Europe, particularly in Italy, my mother country.

I will speak further on this at a more appropriate time. But I have served with DAN INOUE for 25 years, and only because I was managing this bill was I not with him when he received the honor today. I talked to him before. I told him how enormously proud I am of him—all of his colleagues are proud of him—for the 25 years that I have served with him.

While he did not receive the honor at 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 this time.

I think of one thing. I was overseas for the 50th anniversary of D-Day, and when DAN INOUE 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 was also cheered, from the Presiding Officer's State, Senator 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 we open a new chapter in our country—closing not a very good chapter—and we did the right thing telling everybody that DAN INOUE earned the Congressional Medal of Honor.

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 COVERDELL, 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's future.

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 needed to 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 re-

luctance, 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 successive 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 produces 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 will work with you and consult you as we put this package together. I highly value your expertise on Lebanon.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I thank the Senator 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. BYRD. 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 25, 1997. That resolution calls on the Administration to support an approach to climate change that protects the economic interests of the United States and seeks commitments from