



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 2000

No. 71

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

### PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, Father Paul Lavin, pastor, St. Joseph's Church on Capitol Hill, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Brothers and sisters, listen to the words of the Prophet Isaiah:

Cry out full throated and unsparingly,  
Lift up your voice like a trumpet blast;  
Is this the manner of fasting I wish,  
Of keeping a day of penance:  
That a man bow his head like a reed,  
And lie in sackcloth and ashes?  
Do you call this a fast,  
A day acceptable to the Lord?  
This, rather, is the fasting I wish,  
Releasing those bound unjustly,  
Untying the thongs of the yoke;  
Setting free the oppressed,  
Breaking every yoke;  
Sharing your bread with the hungry,  
Sheltering the oppressed and the homeless;  
Clothing the naked when you see them,  
And not turning your back on your own.  
Then your light shall break forth like the dawn,  
And your wound shall quickly be healed;  
Your vindication shall go before you,  
And the glory of the Lord shall be your rear guard.  
Then you shall call, and the Lord will answer,  
You shall cry for help, and he will say:  
Here I am!  
If you remove from your midst oppression,  
False accusation and malicious speech;  
If you bestow your bread on the hungry  
And satisfy the afflicted;  
Then light shall rise for you in the darkness,  
And the gloom shall become for you the midday;  
Then the Lord will guide you always  
And give you plenty even on the parched land.

Let us pray:

Blessed are you, Lord, God of mercy, who through Your Son gave us a marvelous example of charity and the great commandment of love for one another. Send down Your blessings on these United States, and send Your

blessings on the men and women who serve in this Senate. Give them wisdom; Give them insight; Give them courage; Give them strength. Let them faithfully serve You in their neighbor. Glory and praise to You for ever and ever. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable L. CHAFEE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE) The Senator from Alaska.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today the Senate will resume consideration of the Department of Defense appropriations bill. Under the order, there will be up to 10 minutes of debate on the pending Grassley amendment regarding accounting, with the vote to occur at approximately 9:40 on that amendment.

Following the vote, the Senate will continue debate on this Appropriations bill, with further amendments expected to be offered.

Again, Senator INOUE and I invite our friends to bring amendments to the floor now so that we might consider adopting them at this time.

It is hoped that the consideration of the Defense appropriations bill can be completed early next week.

We hope it will be by Tuesday so that we can take up one of the other bills. We will have several bills ready to take up by midweek next week. We hope to be able to get to them and get them to conference before the Fourth of July recess.

We thank our colleagues for their cooperation on this bill.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator JOHN KERRY, I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to be absent from the service of the Senate on Friday, June 9—today—due to family illness.

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

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 4576, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Grassley amendment No. 3279, to require the Department of Defense to match certain disbursements with obligations prior to payment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes of debate on amendment No. 3279 with the time equally divided.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might consume, obviously up to the limit, but I will not use all of it.

I will make a few brief remarks about the pending amendment which I laid down last night and spoke shortly on that particular time. My amendment requires the Department of Defense to match disbursements with obligations before making payments.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4915

I know this sounds like commonsense stuff—it is really basic accounting 101—but it goes to a very major problem we have within the Department of Defense. They don't always make payments based on invoices. They don't always match the check being mailed out for certain goods or services received.

I am sure my colleagues must be wondering why the Senator from Iowa has to offer an amendment such as this. They must be asking themselves this question: Isn't DOD already doing it?

Unfortunately, the fact remains that the Pentagon bureaucrats are not doing it.

Businesses do it on a routine basis. And most citizens do it, too. You just don't write out a check and pay a bill until you are absolutely certain that you owe the money. You must first verify that you have a legitimate obligation to pay the bill. And you have enough money in the bank to cover it.

This amendment and device that has been used now for several years to try to straighten things out in the Pentagon is a handy device also for deterring fraud. And it helps to prevent mismanagement and other abuses in the Pentagon's vast financial accounts.

This policy has been incorporated in the last six appropriations acts.

Each year we have ratcheted down the threshold or dollar level where the matching must be done.

In 1995, we started out with payments of \$5 million.

Each year since then, we have gradually lowered the threshold but always keeping the pressure on for reform.

Last year the Senate voted to lower the threshold to \$500,000.

This year—in the amendment—I am recommending that the threshold be maintained at \$500,000.

I think we should keep it at the current level for another year. I am not sure DOD is ready to move to a lower level—not meaning that it wouldn't be right to move to a lower level. But if they don't have the mechanical capability of moving to a lower level, we want to make sure that we make progress in this area. However, we don't want to hold up the normal way of doing business or the process of doing business in the Defense Department.

The General Accounting Office will look at this issue again and determine when and how the threshold should be lowered in the future, and in future years I would follow their recommendations.

I also take this opportunity to thank my good friend from Alaska, the chairman of the committee, Senator STEVENS, and my good friend from Hawaii, the ranking minority member, Senator INOUE, for their support of this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this measure.

I yield the floor.

If it is the desire that other Members yield back the remainder of their time, I will yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I and Senator INOUE welcome the cooperation of the Senator from Iowa to keep the current level for next year. We are trying our best to have the ability to take it down to zero in the near future.

For now, we do thank the Senator for once again calling the attention of the Department of Defense to the fact that Congress wants good accounting procedures followed. He is right that this is the procedure followed by profit and nonprofit entities in our country.

I ask my friend if he desires any time.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I join my chairman in supporting the measure.

Mr. STEVENS. With that, I yield back our time.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3279. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) would vote "yea."

Mr. REID. I announce the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) is absent because of family illness.

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

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Leg.]

YEAS—88

|            |            |            |
|------------|------------|------------|
| Abraham    | Coverdell  | Harkin     |
| Akaka      | Craig      | Hatch      |
| Allard     | Crapo      | Helms      |
| Ashcroft   | Daschle    | Hutchinson |
| Baucus     | DeWine     | Hutchison  |
| Bayh       | Dodd       | Inhofe     |
| Bennett    | Dorgan     | Inouye     |
| Biden      | Durbin     | Jeffords   |
| Bingaman   | Edwards    | Johnson    |
| Bond       | Enzi       | Kennedy    |
| Boxer      | Feingold   | Kerrey     |
| Breaux     | Feinstein  | Kohl       |
| Brownback  | Fitzgerald | Kyl        |
| Bryan      | Frist      | Landrieu   |
| Burns      | Gorton     | Lautenberg |
| Byrd       | Graham     | Leahy      |
| Campbell   | Gramm      | Levin      |
| Chafee, L. | Grams      | Lieberman  |
| Cleland    | Grassley   | Lincoln    |
| Cochran    | Gregg      | Lott       |
| Collins    | Hagel      | Lugar      |

|           |            |          |
|-----------|------------|----------|
| Mack      | Roth       | Specter  |
| McConnell | Santorum   | Stevens  |
| Mikulski  | Sarbanes   | Thomas   |
| Moynihhan | Schumer    | Thompson |
| Murkowski | Sessions   | Thurmond |
| Reed      | Shelby     | Warner   |
| Reid      | Smith (NH) | Wyden    |
| Robb      | Smith (OR) |          |
| Roberts   | Snowe      |          |

NOT VOTING—12

|          |         |             |
|----------|---------|-------------|
| Bunning  | Kerry   | Rockefeller |
| Conrad   | McCain  | Torricelli  |
| Domenici | Murray  | Voinovich   |
| Hollings | Nickles | Wellstone   |

The amendment (No. 3279) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator from North Carolina has an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair and the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to deliver my remarks from my desk.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3280

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on bringing peace to Chechnya)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask it be read in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] proposes an amendment numbered 3280:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

**SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BRINGING PEACE TO CHECHNYA.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Senate of the United States unanimously passed Senate Resolution 262 on February 24th, 2000, which condemned the indiscriminate use of force by the Government of the Russian Federation against the people of Chechnya and called for peace negotiations between the Government of the Russian Federation and the democratically elected Government of Chechnya led by President Aslan Maskhadov;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate received credible evidence reporting that Russian forces in Chechnya caused the deaths of innocent civilians and the displacement of well over 250,000 other residents of Chechnya and committed widespread atrocities, including summary executions, torture, and rape;

(3) the Government of the Russian Federation continues its military campaign in Chechnya, including using indiscriminate force, causing further dislocation of people from their homes, the deaths of noncombatants, and widespread suffering;

(4) the Government of the Russian Federation refuses to participate in peace negotiations with the democratically elected government of Chechnya;

(5) the war in Chechnya contributes to ethnic hatred and religious intolerance within the Russian Federation, jeopardizes prospects for the establishment of democracy in

the Russian Federation, and is a threat to the peace in the region; and

(6) it is in the interests of the United States to promote a cease-fire in Chechnya and negotiations between the Government of the Russian Federation and the democratically elected government of Chechnya that result in a just and lasting peace;

(7) representatives of the democratically elected President of Chechnya, including his foreign minister, have traveled to the United States to facilitate an immediate cease-fire to the conflict in Chechnya and the initiation of peace negotiations between Russian and Chechen forces;

(8) the Secretary of State and other senior United States Government officials have refused to meet with representatives of the democratically elected President of Chechnya to discuss proposals for an immediate cease-fire between Chechen and Russian forces and for peace negotiations; and

(9) the Senate expresses its concern over the war and the humanitarian tragedy in Chechnya and its desire for a peaceful and durable settlement to the conflict.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Government of the Russian Federation should immediately—

(A) cease its military operations in Chechnya and participate in negotiations toward a just peace with the leadership of the Chechen Government led by President Aslan Maskhadov;

(B) allow into and around Chechnya international missions to monitor and report on the situation there and to investigate alleged atrocities and war crimes; and

(C) grant international humanitarian agencies full and unimpeded access to Chechen civilians, including those in refugee, detention, and so-called "filtration camps", or any other facility where citizens of Chechnya are detained;

(2) the Secretary of State should meet with representatives of the government of Chechnya led by President Aslan Maskhadov to discuss its proposals to initiate a cease-fire in the war in Chechnya and to facilitate the provision of humanitarian assistance to the victims of this tragic conflict; and

(3) the President of the United States, in structuring United States policy toward the Russian Federation, should take into consideration the refusal of the Government of the Russian Federation to cease its military operations in Chechnya and to participate in peace negotiations with the government of Chechnya.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. First of all, I compliment the distinguished clerk because there was a name or two that was difficult to pronounce. I probably will have the same difficulty. In any case, I wanted the amendment to be read to serve notice that this is a matter of great importance and one that bothers me tremendously.

It grew out of a meeting yesterday morning with Mr. Ilyas Akhmadov, the Foreign Minister of Chechnya, who represents Chechnya's democratically elected President. He is visiting Washington hoping to discuss with the Clinton administration his government's efforts to bring an immediate cease-fire to the brutal war that has wrought so much misery and destruction upon the Chechen people. His proposals to achieve a cease-fire and peace negotiations deserve close consideration by

Russia and, indeed, the entire international community.

I find it incredible that Mr. Akhmadov's requests for a meeting with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and other senior U.S. Government officials have been flatly rejected. As a matter of fact, I resent the fact that they conducted themselves as they did because this is an outrage.

The United States should be working to facilitate peace in Chechnya, not to encourage the Kremlin to further its brutal campaign against the Chechen people.

There is simply no excuse for the Secretary of State to refuse even to meet with Mr. Akhmadov. Any meeting to discuss the democratically elected Government to Chechnya's legitimate peace proposal would not constitute a de facto recognition of Chechen independence. And the Secretary of State and others know that.

But this refusal even to meet with Mr. Akhmadov will certainly be interpreted, by Russia's President Putin, as yet another green light from the Clinton-GORE administration to continue its indiscriminate campaign of violence against the Chechen people—a campaign that has led to the death, starvation, and torture of countless of innocent people in Chechnya.

In our meeting yesterday morning, Mr. Akhmadov and I discussed the atrocities that Russian forces are committing against the Chechen population. He shared with me, with tears in his eyes—and these were not pretended tears; this man was almost distraught about what is happening to his people—he gave me a grim picture of life in Chechnya under the repeated and indiscriminate assault by the Russian military.

Countless families continue to be bombed out of their homes. Chechens are still rounded up and sent to what are called "filtration camps" where they are tortured, raped, and then executed.

For too long, our President has refused to use his power and influence to pressure the Kremlin into genuine negotiations to end the bloody conflict in Chechnya which already has cost countless thousands of lives of men, women, and children.

Aside from empty rhetoric from the administration, not one finger has been lifted to make clear the outrage of the United States at the atrocities committed by Russian forces against innocent Chechen civilians.

Worse still, the administration has even legitimized Russia's military campaign in Chechnya with public declarations comparing this conflict to the Civil War in the United States.

For this reason, I submit this amendment to the Defense authorization bill. It calls upon the Kremlin to cease immediately its military operations in Chechnya.

It calls upon the Kremlin to grant international humanitarian organizations access to the victims of this con-

flict and do it immediately. And, this amendment calls upon Secretary of State Albright to meet with Mr. Akhmadov to at least consider his proposal to bring an end to this terrible war in Chechnya.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on this, and I will not take any length of time. I think we are on the Defense appropriations bill. I don't know whether his intent was to offer this on Defense authorization or Defense appropriations. My colleague does not have to rise.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am absolutely amazed that any Senate Democrat, particularly my long-time friend from Connecticut, would talk about offering legislation on appropriations bills. I hope he won't take this further because I will cite hundreds of instances in the last 2 years where his side has bollixed up the operation of the Senate.

Mr. DODD. My colleague said he was amending the Defense authorization bill. This is the Defense appropriations bill. I just wondered if he was clear as to what bill we were dealing with at this moment.

Mr. HELMS. Let me tell you something, my friend. I will put this amendment on anything I can, if it does one ounce of benefit for the Chechen people.

Mr. DODD. I appreciate that.

Mr. HELMS. And if it will encourage your President to at least stop some of his other activities and look at what is happening over there.

Mr. DODD. I had not seen the proposal that my good friend and colleague from North Carolina offered, but he made two observations. I don't disagree with the substance of his sense-of-the-Senate resolution, whether it is on an authorization bill or an appropriations bill. This body has spoken out unanimously expressing outrage over the atrocities in Chechnya.

I will say, on behalf of the Secretary of State and the President, that this matter has been raised by them with their counterparts at the highest levels, including a summit a few days ago when the President met with President Putin in Russia. I know the Secretary of State has raised it on numerous occasions in conversations I have had with her and others have had in hearings.

There is a sense, somewhat, of redundancy here, in that all of us have expressed this view, at the executive branch level and at the legislative branch level. I think the word has certainly gone forth directly to Mr. Putin on behalf of the President of the United States through our Department of State and through resolutions passed here.

I have no objection at all to the resolution and don't disagree with any of the substance of it. But Madeleine Albright has conducted herself admirably in this regard, as has the President. We all hope the tragedy there

will end and a political resolution will be what results from their efforts, and that the atrocities will stop.

It is obviously up to the floor managers on how they want to consider this, but I don't have any objection to it being on this bill or any other bill. I just wanted to make an observation. That was all I was trying to suggest to my friend and colleague. I do believe that Madeleine Albright and the President have done a good job expressing how all Americans feel about this. Nonetheless, we will support this sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Connecticut. I know he is sincere in every word he says. But let me tell him what my friend and his friend, Madeleine Albright's crowd, did down at the State Department. This gentleman with whom I met yesterday was told: Well, we will send some functionary from the State Department to meet you in a restaurant somewhere, but we will not meet with you at the State Department. Now, come on; that is the worst example of "get aside, we are not interested in you" to the Chechen people. I resent it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3280.

The amendment (No. 3280) was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes as in morning business.

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

#### VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking Democrat for their patience.

Every day that we have been in session over the last several weeks, the Democratic leader or his designees have identified those people who on this date in the year past lost their lives to gun violence in the United States. It is a way in which we have tried to highlight the significance of this issue. We have talked about Columbine High School and the tragedy of people losing their lives on that day.

The point the leader and those of us who support his efforts in the area of gun control have tried to make is that every single day in this country, there is a Columbine High School, and there has been for some time. So today, in that spirit of reminding our colleagues and the country again of the ongoing tragedy that occurs every single day in the United States, I will read the names of those people who on June 9, 1999, all across our country, lost their lives.

This is not the complete list in that this list only represents 100 cities with a population of more than 12,000 people.

There are many other communities for which we don't have data.

The names are the following: Humberto Albear, Houston, TX; Jeffrey Barbush, St. Louis, MO; Guido Colomo, Houston, TX; Maria Cruz, Philadelphia, PA; Bernard Freeman, Chicago, IL; Scott J. Hawkins, Baltimore, MD; Robert Koch, Davenport, IA; Johnnie Martin, Chicago, IL; Martin Mendoza, Memphis, TN; Terrance Morrison, Boston, MA; John Rice, Philadelphia, PA; Gerardo Rios, Charlotte, NC; Cherie Shaw, Charlotte, NC; Chon Tang, Houston, TX; Tracy Taylor, Chicago, IL; Oscar J. Tunaes, Laredo, TX; unidentified male, Norfolk, VA.

Mr. President, the violence still continues in this country. While there is no simple answer, including gun control, there are many other aspects that provoke and cause this level of violence. There are several measures that could be adopted by the Congress that would reduce this wave that continues every single day in our country.

In memory of these 17 people and more—I assume, since we do not reflect communities of 12,000 or more who lost their lives, that almost that many will lose their lives today somewhere in this country—it is our fervent hope that we will do a better job in reducing this level of violence in our country.

I yield the floor.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, when we were debating the authorization bill earlier this week, it had come to my attention that there would be an amendment offered dealing with the testing program of the National Missile Defense System and that some criticism was going to be cited in support of that amendment attributed to Mr. Ted Postol, who is a physicist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

That amendment has not yet been offered. We are now on the appropriations bill. I expect we will hear, during the debate on this bill, suggestions that we are either appropriating too much money for national missile defense or the program is flawed or in other ways criticism of this program on various—some imagined, some maybe real—bases, complaining about the national missile defense appropriations and theater missile defense appropriations contained in this bill.

I am rising today almost as a preemptive debate against these criticisms which I expect will be made by some Senators. They will use Mr. Ted Postol from MIT as the authority for their arguments. So I wish to give the Senate some background, particularly in view of the New York Times article this morning as an example of merchandising, again, of a lot of these arguments that have been made by Mr. Postol.

On May 11, Mr. Ted Postol, a physicist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, wrote to a number of Clinton administration officials claiming to have discovered evidence that the National Missile Defense system now being tested will be easily defeated by simple countermeasures, that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's own data proved this, and that BMDO and its contractors conspired to hide this information by tampering with flight test data. Mr. Postol also claimed that BMDO had altered the National Missile Defense flight test program in order to hide the truths he claimed to have discovered.

Mr. Postol says he discovered the fatal weakness in the NMD system after studying BMDO data from Integrated Flight Test 1A, which was conducted in June, 1997, and was a test of a prototype kill vehicle built by the Boeing Company for the NMD interceptor missile. The test was not an attempt to destroy the target, but only to understand the seeker's performance. It was intended specifically to understand how well the infrared sensor on the kill vehicle performed, compared to expectations, when it encountered a target warhead and a number of decoys and other penetration aids.

Mr. Postol contends that the results of Flight Test 1A showed that the NMD kill vehicle could not distinguish between a simple balloon decoy and an actual warhead, and that the entire test program, beginning with Integrated Flight Test 2, was restructured using far simpler targets to cover up this deficiency in the capacity of the vehicle to operate properly.

This contention by Mr. Postol is just not true. The facts are that Flight Test 1A involved a kill vehicle built by the Boeing Company. Flight Test 2 was conducted with a kill vehicle built by Raytheon, and used exactly the same target complex as Flight Test 1A, contrary to Mr. Postol's claims. Simpler targets were used in Flight Tests 3 and 4 because these tests had different objectives. Flight Tests 1A and 2 were intended to characterize the performance of the competing seekers; Flight test 3 was the first attempt to intercept and destroy a target warhead. Just as testing of any new aircraft begins with a taxi test, then a simple takeoff and landing, the first NMD intercept testing began with a single warhead accompanied by a balloon decoy. Subsequent tests will become progressively more difficult, an approach which follows the recommendations of a panel of experts headed by retired Air Force Chief of Staff Larry Welch. In fact, the Welch panel recommended that the Defense Department attempt its first intercept without countermeasures of any kind, in order to begin the testing as simply as possible, but BMDO believed it was worth the risk to attempt a more complicated test.

Mr. Postol appears to be unaware that the Boeing kill vehicle is no longer being used in the flight test program. The competing kill vehicle built

by Raytheon, which has independently developed software, was selected for the NMD system and has been used in every test since Flight Test 1A.

Mr. Postol claims to have discovered in the data from Flight Test 1A that—and I quote—“the Exoatmospheric Kill Vehicle (EKV) will be defeated by the simplest of balloon decoys.” The fact is that in Flight Test 3, on October 2, 1999, exactly the opposite happened, when the EKV disregarded a balloon decoy and successfully destroyed its target.

This isn't the first time Mr. Postol has been notoriously wrong about our missile defense program. In 1994, when the United States was preparing to conduct the first flight test of its Theater High Altitude Area Defense—or THAAD—system, he and some of his colleagues at MIT, in an article in *Arms Control Today*, claimed to have demonstrated that theater missile defenses like THAAD would—and I quote—“almost certainly have significant capabilities against strategic RVs [reentry vehicles]” and that any agreement permitting such capabilities would—I quote—“significantly erode the ability of the ABM Treaty to control strategic defenses by allowing systems that could defend areas of tens of thousands of square kilometers.”

As it turns out, in spite of that suggestion by Mr. Postol and his colleagues from MIT, even the government of Russia never complained about THAAD or similar systems which Mr. Postol said would so upset the strategic balance. And when other technical experts challenged his conclusions, Mr. Postol adopted the tactics of questioning the competence and integrity of his critics. A technical team under contract to the Defense Department reviewed Mr. Postol's THAAD findings and found they contained errors. Mr. Postol's response was to write a series of letters to government officials, accusing the technical team whose findings differed from his of “spreading false and misleading information” that “impugns the scholarly reputation of myself and my colleagues.” He accused the general officer heading the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization of mismanagement and of “providing false information to members of the Russian Duma” in an attempt to—in his words—“influence the Russian debate through subterfuge.” Mr. Postol demanded that the Defense Department retract its study and issue a letter acknowledging its errors. DoD did none of this because they were right all along and it was Postol and his MIT colleagues who were wrong again.

Two years later, in 1996, Mr. Postol's campaign against missile defenses had taken a new approach. In addition to arguing that systems like THAAD would undermine the Russian strategic deterrent, Mr. Postol argued that they would be easily defeated by countermeasures. He said in effect that U.S. TMD systems were so good that they

would threaten the Russian strategic force and at the same time so bad that they could be easily defeated by even the simplest of countermeasures. Both those claims could not be true.

Nonetheless, Mr. Postol continued to promote this argument, and created detailed drawings illustrating how an aspiring missile power might go about deploying countermeasures to U.S. defensive systems. These ideas were elaborated in an 80 page document which Mr. Postol distributed widely and which was eventually made available on the internet, so that anyone—including those who would benefit most from measures that could defeat U.S. weapon systems—could obtain it.

The claims that Theater Missile Defenses would both threaten deterrence and at the same time be overwhelmed by simple countermeasures is now being made by Postol and his co-authors for National Missile Defense. He is arguing that any nation which can build a long-range ballistic missile can necessarily build in measures that will allow it to penetrate missile defenses.

At the same time, these scientists believe, or say they believe, that deployment of a limited NMB system—even though they believe they can scientifically prove it will not work—will cause Russia to maintain higher force levels and China to construct a strategic buildup. All of this is contained in an elaborate, glossy, 175-page document which Mr. Postol and his colleagues have distributed widely.

It is relatively easy to conceive of devices that are theoretically possible using scientific principles. The best science fiction employs just such an approach. But it is another thing altogether to transform those concepts from the realm of ideas into hardware. Actually engineering a complex device like a weapon system is far different from merely imagining it. For every idea that is transformed into hardware and subjected to the real world's trials, many others, thought up by smart people with Ph.D.s from the best universities, are discarded as impractical. Countermeasures are no less subject to this reality than are the weapon systems they are intended to frustrate. Imagining is one thing; designing, building and testing is quite another.

Countermeasures aren't free. Every countermeasure which someone attempts to put on a ballistic missile costs real money. Countermeasures also consume weight and space, which mean lowered performance or less payload. Countermeasures introduce complexity, which means more things can go wrong and engineers must spend more time trying to ensure they go right. Engineers trying to perfect countermeasures are diverted from other activities they could be working on, such as extending a missile's range or improving its reliability. In short, successful pursuit of countermeasures means sacrificing something else, and some may not choose to make that sacrifice.

Countermeasures are an issue that must be taken seriously by the designers of our missile defense systems. And, fortunately, they are. Whether the weapon is an artillery piece or a ballistic missile, it will have to confront efforts to counter it. In fact, missile defense is itself a countermeasure to the ballistic missile. Missile defense should not be abandoned because of the probability that someone will attempt to develop a countermeasure. The talented men and women of our National Missile Defense program—who are operating in the real world in which ideas must be translated into hardware that works—are anticipating and preparing for countermeasures. This is a point that has apparently been lost on Mr. Postol and his concerned colleagues, who would have us believe that new capabilities materialize because they can imagine them.

I believe we are going to see more not less criticism as we move forward to implement the provisions of Public Law 106-38 and deploy our national missile defense system. Some of the critics have impressive academic credentials. Fortunately, however, people who are impressive experts in the design and construction of our modern weapons are working hard to carry out the mandates of our government to build missile defense systems that will protect our country and all our American citizens.

An interesting article was published this week in the June 5 issue of *National Review*, written by John O'Sullivan, entitled “By Winding Stair,” which discusses missile defenses and its antagonists. This is an interesting article and is relevant to the subject I have discussed. I ask unanimous consent a copy of that article be printed in the RECORD.

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

BY WINDING STAIR  
(By John O'Sullivan)

Although at a glacial speed, and obstructed at every stage by the Clinton administration, America is moving steadily toward the deployment of a national system of missile defense. Public opinion has always been in favor of a commonsense protection against missile attacks from rogue states or accidental launches. Most Americans believe, indeed, that they already enjoy such a defense and are shocked when pollsters inform them otherwise. It was the politicians who needed convincing.

A growing sense of U.S. vulnerability led Congress to pass legislation in May 1999 mandating the deployment of a limited national missile-defense system as soon as technically possible. President Clinton signed the legislation, though he continues to drag his feet, insisting that a final decision to deploy will not be made until later this year on the basis of interceptor tests. Given that 2000 is an election year, however, and that there is growing bipartisan support for a decision to deploy, it looks a foregone conclusion.

If this progress is a reminder of Bacon's dictum that “all rising to a great place is by winding stair,” it is at least spiraling in the right direction. But among America's NATO

allies, a very different mood prevails. Europe as a whole has not fundamentally rethought its view of missile defense since the morning after Ronald Reagan's "Star Wars" speech, when it collectively decided that such schemes were technically impractical, strategically destabilizing, and a threat to arms control. To these earlier criticisms it now adds the post-Cold War complaint that an American decision to build missile defenses would alienate the Russians. Thus, Europeans on the NATO conference circuit regularly snipe at the proposed U.S. missile defense.

What is curious about this frozen attitude is not so much that it neglects the new risks from rogue states as that it ignores the fact that they especially threaten Europe. As seasoned defense expert William Schneider Jr. points out: "Current developments will enable proliferators in the Middle East and Asia to place all of Europe within range of ballistic missiles [possibly armed with mass-destruction warheads] within five years." And this threat is growing—with 36 nations possessing ballistic missiles, 17 nations thought to have chemical- and/or biological-warfare programs, 8 nations certainly owning nuclear weapons, and 4 nations believed to be "of nuclear-proliferation concern." Unfortunately for Europe, three of these last four are Iran, Iraq, and Libya, all on the periphery of the continent.

When such inconvenient facts are pointed out—and they seldom are—Europeans take refuge in the argument that deterrence will protect them against minor rogue states even more securely than it did against the mighty Soviet Union. Now, deterrence may well work for the major powers like Russia and China, which have relatively stable political establishments and a great deal to lose—though it has to fail only once for disaster to occur. But there are a number of reasons for doubting this assurance in other regards. In the first place, deterrence cannot protect against accidental launches, the danger of which increases with proliferation among states that currently operate unsafe airlines. Nor can it protect against a missile launched by a terrorist group with no return address. Nor can it provide a cast-iron defense against the miscalculation of a megalomaniac warlord.

And there is a more subtle danger. Will European nations be prepared to intervene to prevent the spread of Third World conflicts if their intervention provokes threats to retaliate with ballistic missiles? This danger is discussed in "Coming into Range," a report by the all-party Missile Proliferation Study Group in London. As it points out, Britain's defense planners have rightly been praised for their proposed creation of a Joint Rapid Reaction Force, built around two new aircraft carriers. The JRRF is intended to enable Britain to intervene swiftly and in force around the globe, and it is doubtless especially welcome to the Pentagon and the State Department as both potential military assistance and political cover. But the absence of a missile-defense system covering Britain may render the force largely useless. "The reality," says the study group's report, "is that in the absence of protection the crisis might literally come to us as the result of dispatching our forces to the crisis and, that being so, no decision to deploy those forces could be made." And if that is true for Britain, which, like France, still retains a culture of military patriotism, how much more likely it is that largely debellized nations like Germany and Belgium will shrink from military actions that entail such heavy risks. If Saddam Hussein had had long-range ballistic missiles capable of hitting Berlin, Paris, and London in 1990, how many European nations would have taken part in the Gulf War?

The implications of this for Europe are very serious. If no Western power deploys missile defense, which is what the Europeans now seem to want, then within a short time every NATO member will be a potential target of nuclear, chemical, or biological attack. Yet if only the U.S. has such a system, that might lead to rogue states' threatening to strike at European targets in retaliation for purely American military interventions. In either event, Europeans would be hostages—and the present system of international relations that rests ultimately on the West's willingness to use force would gradually unravel. The logical solution would seem to be an American-led worldwide system of missile defense organized and deployed, at least in part, through NATO.

Why do the Europeans not agitate for this? In part, no doubt, the explanation is intellectual inflexibility. They have been assuring the Americans for so long now, that "Star Wars" is a pipe dream that they cannot easily bring themselves to see that it has become a strategic necessity. And since one thread of French foreign policy in recent years has been to restrain what it sees as the overwhelming "hyper-power" of the U.S., Paris instinctively opposes anything that buttresses it. The unspoken objection to a missile-defense system is that it would work.

The Europeans' spoken, or admitted, objections are another matter. One is that the continent's governments, especially the Germans, have made arms control an unquestionable desideratum of foreign policy. They are accordingly very reluctant to endorse a policy that requires the rewriting or abandonment of the ABM treaty. It would ease their consciences if the Russians could be induced to go along with any such renegotiation. But the Clinton administration called off negotiations with Moscow on missile-defense cooperation in its first term, and at present it seems to see Mr. Putin as its ally against Congress on the issue. Both the Russians and (therefore) the Germans can probably be won over by a sufficiently determined president and a few sweeteners. But that probably requires a new man in the White House.

The other big problem is the nexus of money and the European Security and Defense Policy. The ESDP is a non-solution to a non-existent problem. It has no military value, but has the potential to divide the NATO alliance. In their zeal for Euro-integration, the Europeans have committed themselves to it, and the Americans, not wishing to confirm the French stereotype of a hegemonic Uncle Sam, have grudgingly gone along. Useless though it is, the ESDP will cost money at a time when the Europeans have very little to spare—indeed, the budgetary rules of the Maastricht treaty actually prevent their increasing defense expenditure. So there is great reluctance to consider any other program, in particular anything as costly as a NATO missile defense, even though, unlike the ESDP, it would actually provide Europe with more defense.

Of course, there are hopeful signs. Realization of their vulnerability is finally beginning to dawn on the British—notably on defense secretary Geoff Hoon. Because the U.S. wants to use British facilities such as the Fylingdales Early Warning Station in its own system, London sees the prospect of Anglo-American cooperation in return for military contracts and a share of the anti-missile umbrella. And much would change in NATO, as it did in 1981, if the next president proved to be a determined advocate of missile defense. After all, the Europeans have not been the only skeptics. Missile defense has had to contend with a hostile White House since 1993.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Chairman of the Budget Committee, who is necessarily absent, I submit his budget statement and scoring table on S. 2593, the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

I support S. 2593, the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. As scored by the Congressional Budget Office without any further adjustments, the pending bill provides \$287.6 billion in total budget authority and \$178.9 billion in new outlays for the Department of Defense and related activities. When adjusted for outlays from prior years, the bill totals \$277.2 billion in outlays.

The bill, as reported, is consistent with the level of budget authority made available by the 2001 congressional budget resolution. It is also within the allocation of budget authority and outlays made available pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

S. 2593 provides a 2.4 percent increase in overall procurement spending, a 4.5 percent increase in research and development, and a 0.4 percent increase in Operations and Maintenance.

I support this bill, and I urge its adoption. I want to complement the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his work on this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Senate Budget Committee table displaying the budget impact of this bill be placed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2593, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 2001—SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL  
[Fiscal year 2001, in millions of dollars]

|                                          | General purpose | Mandatory | Total   |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| <b>Senate-reported bill:</b>             |                 |           |         |
| Budget authority .....                   | 287,415         | 216       | 287,631 |
| Outlays .....                            | 276,959         | 216       | 277,175 |
| <b>Senate 302(b) allocation:</b>         |                 |           |         |
| Budget authority .....                   | 287,415         | 216       | 287,631 |
| Outlays .....                            | 279,578         | 216       | 279,794 |
| <b>2000 level:</b>                       |                 |           |         |
| Budget authority .....                   | 268,605         | 209       | 268,814 |
| Outlays .....                            | 261,933         | 209       | 262,142 |
| <b>President's request:</b>              |                 |           |         |
| Budget authority .....                   | 284,305         | 216       | 284,521 |
| Outlays .....                            | 275,871         | 216       | 276,087 |
| <b>SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:</b> |                 |           |         |
| <b>Senate 302(b) allocation:</b>         |                 |           |         |
| Budget authority .....                   | .....           | .....     | .....   |
| Outlays .....                            | -2,619          | .....     | -2,619  |
| <b>2000 level:</b>                       |                 |           |         |
| Budget authority .....                   | 18,810          | 7         | 18,817  |
| Outlays .....                            | 15,026          | 7         | 15,033  |
| <b>President's request:</b>              |                 |           |         |
| Budget authority .....                   | 3,110           | .....     | 3,110   |
| Outlays .....                            | 1,088           | .....     | 1,088   |

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

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

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

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

## GRADUATING PAGES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the spring 2000 graduating Page class. They have been an integral part of the everyday proceedings of the U.S. Senate and without their hard work and dedication this deliberative body would not be able to complete our work in a timely manner. Throughout the year young men and women come to Washington, D.C. from all parts of the nation to serve a vital role as Pages in the U.S. Senate. During the spring and fall these high school students attend the Page School in the early mornings and continue their day as U.S. Senate Pages often working long days and into the night. I must say, this group of Pages was of the highest caliber and are among the best youth our Nation has to offer. At this time, I would like to commend them for their service and enter their names in the RECORD.

Shannon Coe, Ashley Burnett, Kelly Morgan, Shannon Montague, Emily Schlect, Loki Gale Tobin, Kyle Brown, Misty Lebatard, Clinton Lee Johnson Jr., Chase Dubay, Benton Keatley, Anjel Jefferson, Nicole Tailleart, Rebecca Manning, Jean-Paul Isabelle, Andriea Aden, Seema Mittal, James Dolan, Nathaniel Haefs, Hannah Pierson-Compeau, Jay Oliphant, Allison Conley, Megan Gilbert.

## MANDATING DISCLOSURE BY SECTION 527 ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, first, I commend Senators LIEBERMAN, MCCAIN, FEINGOLD, DASCHLE and LEVIN for all of their hard work on the issue of Section 527 organizations. This latest mutation in fundraising is just another example of the failure of our existing campaign finance laws.

Hopefully, the passage of our amendment yesterday, which mandates disclosure by Section 527 organizations, will close yet another legal loophole being exploited by clever campaign fundraisers. This amendment should make unregulated and unlimited contributions to these so-called Section 527 committees much less attractive. Although donors will be able to continue to make as many tax-deductible contributions as they want, they will no longer be able to do so in absolute secrecy.

These Section 527 organizations, named after a section of the tax code, skirt existing campaign finance laws by carefully avoiding the endorsement of any particular candidate. This convoluted reasoning proceeds as follows: if a Section 527 committee does not en-

dorse a particular candidate, then it is not engaged in political activity; if it is not engaged in political activity, then there is no requirement for it to disclose who has contributed money to the committee; since it is not engaged in political activity, it can run unlimited issue ads without obeying existing campaign finance laws regarding disclosure.

We all know from past experience that it is just a matter of time before enormous amounts of campaign cash are funneled through more and more of these secret organizations. The amendment which passed yesterday, which I was pleased to cosponsor, will force Section 527 organizations to emerge from the shadows. They will be required to disclose their existence to the IRS, file publicly available tax returns, make public reports specifying annual expenditures over \$500, and identify those making contributions of \$200 or more a year to the organization.

Although disclosure is only part of the solution, the passage of this amendment ensures that the public understands who these committees are, who gives them their money, and how they spend that money. I was pleased to give it my support.

## ACCESS TO INNOVATION FOR MEDICARE PATIENTS ACT OF 2000

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I think we all recognize that the Medicare Program is outdated. The bill introduced by the Senator from Washington would modernize Medicare's coverage to include new biotechnology innovations. Currently, the Medicare program covers physician-administered therapies that are given in an office by infusion or injection, but not those that are injected by a patient or a caregiver at home. Biotechnology has brought us new innovative biologics that are made with large proteins that are so unlike other drugs that they must be formulated as injectables. Science has allowed us to make many of these new products in the form of simple injections that do not have to be given by a health care professional in a clinical setting.

The bill I have cosponsored today would bring Medicare up to date with these developments by ensuring that new biological therapies are available to Medicare beneficiaries. It just does not make sense to continue Medicare's bias toward treatments that are more expensive and less convenient for patients.

I would like to add one point about the bill's cost. We do not know yet what the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] will determine the estimated cost of this change in Medicare policy will be. I understand the cosponsors of this legislation have requested an estimate from CBO. An analysis by the Lewin Group found that this legislation would not result in increasing the cost to the Medicare program. This finding is not surprising given that the

bill would reduce certain costs, such as physician office visits and other expensive services, which would no longer be needed. I am hopeful that the CBO will reach the same conclusion. While it is important to modernize Medicare, it is equally important that we do so in a way that does not weaken the financial strength of the program.

I commend Senator GORTON for his leadership on this legislation. It represents the kind of constructive reform that is needed in the Medicare program; reform that would advance and modernize Medicare without imposing additional costs to the program.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

## TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL VALMORO III

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of an outstanding American, Mr. Michael Valmoro of Mahwah, New Jersey. Serving his community as a teacher of English, world literature and the works of William Shakespeare at Teaneck High School for the past thirty-eight years, he is one of the longest serving teachers in the history of the New Jersey school system. That tremendous achievement alone is worthy of praise. However, his commitment to his students by opening their young minds to the world's great literature and the genius of William Shakespeare has made him a respected educator and pillar of the community.

Cicero once professed, "What nobler employment, or more valuable to the state, than that of the man who instructs the rising generation." It is clear that Mr. Valmoro has taken Cicero's wisdom to heart during the course of the last four decades, as he has enlightened and inspired the thousands of students fortunate enough to have passed through his classroom.

Whether he was teaching his students to express themselves through creative writing, introducing them to the tragedy of "Romeo and Juliet" or reveling in the simple joy found in one of Shakespeare's sonnets, Mr. Valmoro approached each of his lessons with the wisdom and perspective of a scholar and the unbridled enthusiasm of an eager student.

In one of the scenes of "King Lear," the titular monarch asks his audience, "Who is it who can tell me who I am?" This question often presents itself to an individual upon the twilight of their career. If the outpouring of accolades, fond reminiscence and affection are any indication, the answer to this probing question for Mr. Valmoro is, an excellent teacher, a trusted mentor, a lover of great literature and an inspiration to his colleagues, students and family.

Throughout his distinguished tenure, Mr. Valmoro has exemplified the ideals which the American people value in their educators. It is with my most sincere congratulations and respect that I recognize him today in the Senate. ●

IN RECOGNITION OF GEORGE  
ABRAHAM THAMPY

• Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of George Abraham Thampy, of Maryland Heights, Missouri. George correctly spelled "démarche" to win the National Spelling Bee held last week in Washington, D.C. The week prior, George placed second in the National Geography Bee, also held in Washington, D.C.

I would like to offer my congratulations to this young scholar who has worked diligently to not only reach, but also win, the National Spelling Bee. George's performance has been exemplary and I'm confident it will serve to promote a heightened interest in academic achievement. George also tied for fourth place in 1998 and finished in a third place tie last year.

I look forward to the continued success of Missouri home school families such as George's, and hope to continue promoting the kind of freedom that encourages parents to take an active role in guiding the course of their children's education. I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, delivered during the adjournment of the Senate, announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Mr. RODRIGUEZ of Texas.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 291. An act to convey certain real property within the Carlsbad Project in New Mexico to the Carlsbad Irrigation District.

S. 356. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain works, facilities, and titles of the Gila Project, and designated lands within or adjacent to the Gila Project, to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER  
COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-9179. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9180. A communication from the Director for Administration and Management, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of agreements and transactions relative to acquisition and cross-serving agreements with non-

NATO countries for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-9181. A communication from the Commissioner of Social Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Supplemental Security Income Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-9182. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the status of activities that respond to the National Transportation Safety Board's recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-9183. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on progress on Superfund implementation in fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9184. A communication from the Administration of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Status of the State Small Business Stationary Source Technical and Environmental Compliance Programs" for calendar year 1998; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9185. A communication from the Chair of the State Energy Advisory Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy: A Clean Energy Agenda for the 21st Century"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-9186. A communication from the Chair of the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-9187. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the financial audit and financial statement for calendar years 1998 and 1999 for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-9188. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-9189. A communication from the Director of the National Legislative Commission of the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of consolidated financial statements for calendar years 1998 and 1999; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-9190. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to the Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9191. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs for U.S. Agency For International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the accountability report for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9192. A communication from the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report entitled "Auditor's Review of Unauthorized Disbursements From ANC 8B's Checking Account"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9193. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9194. A communication from the Chairman and General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting jointly, pursuant to law, the report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9195. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-9196. A communication from the Chairman of the National Endowment For the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND  
JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THOMPSON (for himself and Mr. FRIST):

S. 2710. A bill to recognize the rights of grandparents in cases involving international parental kidnapping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND  
SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. L. CHAFEE, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBB, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 319. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Senate should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 320. A resolution to authorize testimony by Senate employee in state administration proceeding; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. MURKOWSKI):

S. Con. Res. 121. A concurrent resolution congratulating Representative Stephen S.F. Chen on the occasion of his retirement from the diplomatic service of Taiwan, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to remove the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 922

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 922, a bill to prohibit the use of the "Made in the USA" label on products of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and to deny such products duty-free and quota-free treatment.

S. 1074

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1074, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to waive the 24-month waiting period for medicare coverage of individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), and to provide medicare coverage of drugs and biologicals used for the treatment of ALS or for the alleviation of symptoms relating to ALS.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to expand homeownership in the United States.

S. 1988

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1988, a bill to reform the State inspection of meat and poultry in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2018

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2018, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise the update factor used in making payments to PPS hospitals under the medicare program.

S. 2107

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 2107, a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to reduce securities fees in excess of those required to fund the operations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to adjust compensation provisions for employees of the Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 2241

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 2241, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust wages and wage-related costs for certain items and services furnished in geographically reclassified hospitals.

S. 2366

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2366, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend provisions relating to the Organ Procurement Transplantation Network.

S. 2394

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2394, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 2589

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2589, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require periodic cost of living adjustments to the maximum amount of deposit insurance available under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2703

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, a bill to amend the provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to the manner in which pay policies and schedules and fringe benefit programs for postmasters are established.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 121—CONGRATULATING REPRESENTATIVE STEPHEN S. F. CHEN ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF TAIWAN, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 121

Whereas Representative Stephen S. F. Chen has been a member of Taiwan's diplomatic service for forty-seven years;

Whereas Representative Chen has represented Taiwan's interests in such countries as the Philippines, Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, and the United States;

Whereas Representative Chen has held a number of important positions in his government at home, including those of Vice Foreign Minister and Deputy Secretary-General to President Lee Teng-hui;

Whereas Representative Chen's many years of service in the United States include appointments as Taiwan's Consul-General in Atlanta from 1973 to 1979 and as Director of the Coordination Council for North American Affairs in Chicago from 1980 to 1982 and Los Angeles from 1988 to 1989;

Whereas Representative Chen has served with distinction as Taiwan's senior diplomat in the United States since 1997, when he became the Representative of the Taipei Eco-

nomie and Cultural Representative Office in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas Representative Chen has been a friend of the United States and earned the respect and genuine affection of many Members of the Senate and House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—*

(1) Representative Stephen Chen is to be congratulated for his many years of distinguished service to Taiwan and for his friendship to the United States; and

(2) the best wishes of Congress are to be extended to Representative Chen and his family on the occasion of his retirement.

SENATE RESOLUTION 319—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE SENATE SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES TO PROVIDE DECENT HOMES FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAU, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. L. CHAFEE, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBB, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 319

Whereas the United States promotes and encourages the creation and revitalization of sustainable and strong neighborhoods in partnership with States, cities, and local communities and in conjunction with the independent and collective actions of private citizens and organizations;

Whereas establishing a housing infrastructure strengthens neighborhoods and local economies and nurtures the families who reside in them;

Whereas an integral element of a strong community is a sufficient supply of affordable housing;

Whereas affordable housing may be provided in traditional and nontraditional forms, including apartment buildings, transitional and temporary homes, condominiums, cooperatives, and single family homes;

Whereas for many families a home is not merely shelter, but also provides an opportunity for growth, prosperity, and security;

Whereas homeownership is a cornerstone of the national economy because it spurs the production and sale of goods and services, generates new jobs, encourages savings and investment, promotes economic and civic responsibility, and enhances the financial security of all people in the United States;

Whereas although the United States is the first nation in the world to make owning a

home a reality for a vast majority of its families, 1/3 of the families in the United States are not homeowners;

Whereas a disproportionate percentage of families in the United States that are not homeowners are low-income families;

Whereas the community building activities of neighborhood-based nonprofit organizations empower individuals to improve their lives and make communities safer and healthier for families;

Whereas one of the best known nonprofit housing organizations is Habitat for Humanity, which builds simple but adequate housing for less fortunate families and symbolizes the self-help approach to homeowner-ship;

Whereas Habitat for Humanity is organized in all 50 States with 1544 local affiliates and its own 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporate status and locally elected completely voluntary board of directors.

Whereas Habitat for Humanity will build its 100,000th house worldwide in September 2000 and endeavors to complete another 100,000 homes during the next 5 years.

Whereas Habitat for Humanity provides opportunities for people from every segment of society to volunteer to help make the American dream a reality for families who otherwise would not own a home; and

Whereas the first week of June 2000 has been designated as "National Homeownership Week": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) everyone in the United States should have a decent home in which to live;

(2) the Members of the Senate should demonstrate the importance of volunteerism;

(3) during the year between National Homeownership Week 2000 and National Homeownership Week 2001, the Members of the Senate, Habitat for Humanity, and contributing organizations, should sponsor and construct 2 homes in the District of Columbia each of which should be known as a "House That the Senate Built";

(4) each "House That the Senate Built" should be constructed primarily by Members of the Senate, their families and staffs, and the staffs of sponsoring organizations working with local volunteers involving and symbolizing the partnership of the public, private, and nonprofit sectors of society;

(5) each "House That the Senate Built" should be constructed with the participation of the family that will own the home;

(6) in the future, the Members of the Senate and their families and staff should participate in similar house building activities in their own States as part of National Homeownership Week; and

(7) these occasions should be used to emphasize and focus on the importance of providing decent homes for all of the people in the United States.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 320—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY BY SENATE EMPLOYEE IN STATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING

Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 320

Whereas, in the Inquiry Relative to the Claim for Benefits of Yolanda Nock, pending before the Department of Labor, in the County of Sussex, State of Delaware, a subpoena for testimony has been issued to Elinor Hughes, an employee of the Senate on

the staff of Senator William V. Roth, Jr.;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, that Elinor Hughes is authorized to testify in the Inquiry Relative to the Claim for Benefits of Yolanda Nock, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED—JUNE 8, 2000

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

#### SMITH OF OREGON (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3247

Mr. WARNER (for Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BRYAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 2549, supra; as follows:

On page 155, line 4, strike "(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This" and insert the following:

"(g) VICE CHIEF OF NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study of the advisability of increasing the grade authorized for the Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau to Lieutenant General.

"(2) As part of the study, the chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an analysis of the functions and responsibilities of the Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the Chief's recommendation as to whether the grade authorized for the Vice Chief should be increased.

"(3) Not later than February, 1, 2001, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the study. The report shall include the following:

"(A) The recommendation of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and any other information provided by the Chief to the Secretary of Defense pursuant to paragraph (2).

"(B) The conclusions resulting from the study.

(C) The Secretary's recommendation regarding whether the grade authorized for the Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau should be increased to Lieutenant General.

"(h) EFFECTIVE DATES.—Subsection (g) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of the Act. Except for that subsection, this".

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED—JUNE 9, 2000

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2000

#### HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 3280

Mr. HELMS proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

#### SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BRINGING PEACE TO CHECHNYA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Senate of the United States unanimously passed Senate Resolution 262 on February 24th, 2000, which condemned the indiscriminate use of force by the Government of the Russian Federation against the people of Chechnya and called for peace negotiations between the Government of the Russian Federation and the democratically elected Government of Chechnya led by President Aslan Maskhadov;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate received credible evidence reporting that Russian forces in Chechnya caused the deaths of innocent civilians and the displacement of well over 250,000 other residents of Chechnya and committed widespread atrocities, including summary executions, torture, and rape;

(3) the Government of the Russian Federation continues its military campaign in Chechnya, including using indiscriminate force, causing further displacement of people from their homes, the deaths of noncombatants, and widespread suffering;

(4) the Government of the Russian Federation refuses to participate in peace negotiations with the democratically elected government of Chechnya;

(5) the war in Chechnya contributes to ethnic hatred and religious intolerance within the Russian Federation, jeopardizes prospects for the establishment of democracy in the Russian Federation, and is a threat to the peace in the region; and

(6) it is in the interests of the United States to promote a cease-fire in Chechnya and negotiations between the Government of the Russian Federation and the democratically elected government of Chechnya that result in a just and lasting peace;

(7) representatives of the democratically elected President of Chechnya, including his foreign minister, have traveled to the United States to facilitate an immediate cease-fire to the conflict in Chechnya and the initiation of peace negotiations between Russian and Chechen forces;

(8) the Secretary of State and other senior United States Government officials have refused to meet with representatives of the democratically elected President of Chechnya to discuss proposals for an immediate cease-fire between Chechen and Russian forces and for peace negotiations; and

(9) the Senate expresses its concern over the war and the humanitarian tragedy in Chechnya and its desire for a peaceful and durable settlement to the conflict.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Government of the Russian Federation should immediately—

(A) cease its military operations in Chechnya and participate in negotiations toward a just peace with the leadership of the

Chechen Government led by President Aslan Maskhadov;

(B) allow into and around Chechnya international missions to monitor and report on the situation there and to investigate alleged atrocities and war crimes; and

(C) grant international humanitarian agencies full and unimpeded access to Chechen civilians, including those in refugee, detention, and so-called "filtration camps", or any other facility where citizens of Chechnya are detained;

(2) the Secretary of State should meet with representatives of the government of Chechnya led by President Aslan Maskhadov to discuss its proposals to initiate a ceasefire in the war in Chechnya and to facilitate the provision of humanitarian assistance to the victims of this tragic conflict; and

(3) the President of the United States, in structuring United States policy toward the Russian Federation, should take into consideration the refusal of the Government of the Russian Federation to cease its military operations in Chechnya and to participate in peace negotiations with the government of Chechnya.

INTERNET NONDISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2000

JOHNSON AMENDMENT NO. 3281

Mr. JOHNSON proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 3709) to extend for 5 years the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

TITLE XX—LOAN GUARANTEES FOR RURAL TELEVISION

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Launching Our Communities' Access to Local Television Act of 2000".

SEC. 02. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to facilitate access, on a technologically neutral basis and by December 31, 2006, to signals of local television stations, and related signals (including high-speed Internet access and National Weather Service warnings), for households located in unserved areas and underserved areas.

SEC. 03. LOCAL TELEVISION LOAN GUARANTEE BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the LOCAL Television Loan Guarantee Board (in this title referred to as the "Board").

(b) MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Board shall consist of the following members:

(A) The Secretary of the Treasury, or the designee of the Secretary.

(B) The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or the designee of the Chairman.

(C) The Secretary of Agriculture, or the designee of the Secretary.

(2) REQUIREMENT AS TO DESIGNEES.—An individual may not be designated a member of the Board under paragraph (1) unless the individual is an officer of the United States pursuant to an appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(c) FUNCTIONS OF THE BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall determine whether or not to approve loan guarantees under this title. The Board shall make such determinations consistent with the purpose of this title and in accordance with this subsection and section 04.

(2) CONSULTATION AUTHORIZED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out its functions under this title, the Board shall consult with such departments and agencies of the Federal Government as the Board considers appropriate, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(B) RESPONSE.—A department or agency consulted by the Board under subparagraph (A) shall provide the Board such expertise and assistance as the Board requires to carry out its functions under this title.

(3) APPROVAL BY MAJORITY VOTE.—The determination of the Board to approve a loan guarantee under this title shall be by a vote of a majority of the Board.

SEC. 04. APPROVAL OF LOAN GUARANTEES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO APPROVE LOAN GUARANTEES.—Subject to the provisions of this section and consistent with the purpose of this title, the Board may approve loan guarantees under this title.

(b) REGULATIONS.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator (as defined in section 05), under the direction of and for approval by the Board, shall prescribe regulations to implement the provisions of this title and shall do so not later than 120 days after funds authorized to be appropriated under section 09 have been appropriated in a bill signed into law.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) set forth the form of any application to be submitted to the Board under this title;

(B) set forth time periods for the review and consideration by the Board of applications to be submitted to the Board under this title, and for any other action to be taken by the Board with respect to such applications;

(C) provide appropriate safeguards against the evasion of the provisions of this title;

(D) set forth the circumstances in which an applicant, together with any affiliate of an applicant, shall be treated as an applicant for a loan guarantee under this title;

(E) include requirements that appropriate parties submit to the Board any documents and assurances that are required for the administration of the provisions of this title; and

(F) include such other provisions consistent with the purpose of this title as the Board considers appropriate.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—(A) Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit the Board from requiring, to the extent and under circumstances considered appropriate by the Board, that affiliates of an applicant be subject to certain obligations of the applicant as a condition to the approval or maintenance of a loan guarantee under this title.

(B) If any provision of this title or the application of such provision to any person or entity or circumstance is held to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this title, or the application of such provision to such person or entity or circumstance other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

(c) AUTHORITY LIMITED BY APPROPRIATIONS ACTS.—The Board may approve loan guarantees under this title only to the extent provided for in advance in appropriations Acts. The Board may delegate to the Administrator (as defined in section 05) the authority to approve loan guarantees of up to \$20,000,000. To the extent the Administrator is delegated such authority, the Adminis-

trator shall comply with the terms of this title applicable to the Board.

(d) REQUIREMENTS AND CRITERIA APPLICABLE TO APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall utilize the underwriting criteria developed under subsection (g), and any relevant information provided by the departments and agencies with which the Board consults under section

03, to determine which loans may be eligible for a loan guarantee under this title.

(2) PREREQUISITES.—In addition to meeting the underwriting criteria under paragraph (1), a loan may not be guaranteed under this title unless—

(A) the loan is made to finance the acquisition, improvement, enhancement, construction, deployment, launch, or rehabilitation of the means by which local television broadcast signals, and related signals (including high-speed Internet access and National Weather Service warnings), will be delivered to an unserved area or underserved area;

(B) the proceeds of the loan will not be used for operating expenses;

(C) the proposed project, as determined by the Board in consultation with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, is not likely to have a substantial adverse impact on competition that outweighs the benefits of improving access to the signals of a local television station in an unserved area or underserved area;

(D)(i) the loan (including Other Debt, as defined in subsection (f)(2)(B))—

(I) is provided by any entity engaged in the business of commercial lending—

(aa) if the loan is made in accordance with loan-to-one-borrower and affiliate transaction restrictions to which the entity is subject under applicable law; or

(bb) if item (aa) does not apply, the loan is made only to a borrower that is not an affiliate of the entity and only if the amount of the loan and all outstanding loans by that entity to that borrower and any of its affiliates does not exceed 10 percent of the net equity of the entity; or

(II) is provided by a nonprofit corporation, including the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation, engaged primarily in commercial lending, if the Board determines that such nonprofit corporation has one or more issues of outstanding long-term debt that is rated within the highest 3 rating categories of a nationally recognized statistical rating organization, and, if the Board determines that the making of the loan by such nonprofit corporation will cause a decline in the debt rating mentioned above, the Board at its discretion may disapprove the loan guarantee on this basis;

(ii)(I) no loan (including Other Debt as defined in subsection (f)(2)(B)) may be made for purposes of this Act by a governmental entity or affiliate thereof, or by the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation, or any institution supervised by the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, the Federal Housing Finance Board, or any affiliate of such entities;

(II) any loan (including Other Debt as defined in subsection (f)(2)(B)) must have terms, in the judgment of the Board, that are consistent in material respects with the terms of similar obligations in the private capital market;

(III) for purposes of clause (i)(I)(bb), the term "net equity" means the value of the total assets of the entity, less the total liabilities of the entity, as recorded under generally accepted accounting principles for the fiscal quarter ended immediately prior to the date on which the subject loan is approved;

(E) repayment of the loan is required to be made within a term of the lesser of—

(i) 25 years from the date of the execution of the loan; or

(ii) the economically useful life, as determined by the Board or in consultation with persons or entities deemed appropriate by the Board, of the primary assets to be used in the delivery of the signals concerned; and

(F) the loan meets any additional criteria developed under subsection (g).

(3) PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INTERESTS.—The Board may not approve the guarantee of a loan under this title unless—

(A) the Board has been given documentation, assurances, and access to information, persons, and entities necessary, as determined by the Board, to address issues relevant to the review of the loan by the Board for purposes of this title; and

(B) the Board makes a determination in writing that—

(i) to the best of its knowledge upon due inquiry, the assets, facilities, or equipment covered by the loan will be utilized economically and efficiently;

(ii) the terms, conditions, security, and schedule and amount of repayments of principal and the payment of interest with respect to the loan protect the financial interests of the United States and are reasonable;

(iii) to the extent possible, the value of collateral provided by an applicant is at least equal to the unpaid balance of the loan amount covered by the loan guarantee (the "Amount" for purposes of this clause); and if the value of collateral provided by an applicant is less than the Amount, the additional required collateral is provided by any affiliate of the applicant; and if the combined value of collateral provided by an applicant and any affiliate is not at least equal to the Amount, the collateral from such affiliate represents all of such affiliate's assets;

(iv) all necessary and required regulatory and other approvals, spectrum rights, and delivery permissions have been received for the loan, the project under the loan, and the Other Debt, if any, under subsection (f)(2)(B);

(v) the loan would not be available on reasonable terms and conditions without a loan guarantee under this title; and

(vi) repayment of the loan can reasonably be expected.

(e) CONSIDERATIONS.—

(1) TYPE OF MARKET.—

(A) PRIORITY CONSIDERATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Board shall give priority in the approval of loan guarantees under this title in the following order: First, to projects that will serve the greatest number of households in unserved areas and the number of States (including noncontiguous States); and second, to projects that will serve the greatest number of households in underserved areas. In each instance, the Board shall consider the project's efficiency in providing service given the area to be served.

(B) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Board should give additional consideration to projects which also provide related signals (including high-speed Internet access and National Weather Service warnings).

(C) PROHIBITION.—The Board may not approve a loan guarantee under this title for a project that is designed primarily to serve 1 or more of the 40 most populated designated market areas (as that term is defined in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code).

(2) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—The Board shall consider other factors, which shall include projects that would—

(A) offer a separate tier of local broadcast signals, but for applicable Federal, State, or local laws or regulations;

(B) provide lower projected costs to consumers of such separate tier; and

(C) enable the delivery of local broadcast signals consistent with the purpose of this title by a means reasonably compatible with existing systems or devices predominantly in use.

(f) GUARANTEE LIMITS.—

(1) LIMITATION ON AGGREGATE VALUE OF LOANS.—The aggregate value of all loans for which loan guarantees are issued under this title (including the unguaranteed portion of loans issued under paragraph (2)(A)) and Other Debt under paragraph (2)(B) may not exceed \$1,250,000,000.

(2) GUARANTEE LEVEL.—A loan guarantee issued under this title—

(A) may not exceed an amount equal to 80 percent of a loan meeting in its entirety the requirements of subsection (d)(2)(A). If only a portion of a loan meets the requirements of that subsection, the Board shall determine that percentage of the loan meeting such requirements (the "applicable portion") and may issue a loan guarantee in an amount not exceeding 80 percent of the applicable portion; or

(B) may, as to a loan meeting in its entirety the requirements of subsection (d)(2)(A), cover the amount of such loan only if that loan is for an amount not exceeding 80 percent of the total debt financing for the project, and other debt financing (also meeting in its entirety the requirements of subsection (d)(2)(A)) from the same source for a total amount not less than 20 percent of the total debt financing for the project ("Other Debt") has been approved.

(g) UNDERWRITING CRITERIA.—Within the period provided for under subsection (b)(1), the Board shall, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and an independent public accounting firm, develop underwriting criteria relating to the guarantee of loans that are consistent with the purpose of this title, including appropriate collateral and cash flow levels for loans guaranteed under this Act, and such other matters as the Board considers appropriate.

(h) CREDIT RISK PREMIUMS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Board may establish and approve the acceptance of credit risk premiums with respect to a loan guarantee under this title in order to cover the cost, as determined under section 504(b)(1) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of the loan guarantee. To the extent that appropriations of budget authority are insufficient to cover the cost, as so determined, of a loan guarantee under this title, credit risk premiums shall be accepted from a non-Federal source under this subsection on behalf of the applicant for the loan guarantee.

(2) CREDIT RISK PREMIUM AMOUNT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall determine the amount of any credit risk premium to be accepted with respect to a loan guarantee under this title on the basis of—

(i) the financial and economic circumstances of the applicant for the loan guarantee, including the amount of collateral offered;

(ii) the proposed schedule of loan disbursements;

(iii) the business plans of the applicant for providing service;

(iv) any financial commitment from a broadcast signal provider; and

(v) the concurrence of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget as to the amount of the credit risk premium.

(B) PROPORTIONALITY.—To the extent that appropriations of budget authority are sufficient to cover the cost, as determined under section 504(b)(1) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of loan guarantees under this title, the credit risk premium with respect

to each loan guarantee shall be reduced proportionately.

(C) PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS.—Credit risk premiums under this subsection shall be paid to an account (the "Escrow Account") established in the Treasury which shall accrue interest and such interest shall be retained by the account, subject to subparagraph (D).

(D) DEDUCTIONS FROM ESCROW ACCOUNT.—If a default occurs with respect to any loan guaranteed under this title and the default is not cured in accordance with the terms of the underlying loan or loan guarantee agreement, the Administrator, in accordance with subsections (h) and (i) of section 05, shall liquidate, or shall cause to be liquidated, all assets collateralizing such loan as to which it has a lien or security interest. Any shortfall between the proceeds of the liquidation net of costs and expenses relating to the liquidation, and the guarantee amount paid pursuant to this title shall be deducted from funds in the Escrow Account and credited to the Administrator for payment of such shortfall. At such time as determined under subsection (d)(2)(E) when all loans guaranteed under this title have been repaid or otherwise satisfied in accordance with this title and the regulations promulgated hereunder, remaining funds in the Escrow Account, if any, shall be refunded, on a pro rata basis, to applicants whose loans guaranteed under this title were not in default, or where any default was cured in accordance with the terms of the underlying loan or loan guarantee agreement.

(i) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The decision of the Board to approve or disapprove the making of a loan guarantee under this title shall not be subject to judicial review.

#### SEC. 05. ADMINISTRATION OF LOAN GUARANTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service (in this Act referred to as the "Administrator") shall issue and otherwise administer loan guarantees that have been approved by the Board in accordance with sections 03 and 04.

(b) SECURITY FOR PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INTERESTS.—

(1) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—An applicant shall agree to such terms and conditions as are satisfactory, in the judgment of the Board, to ensure that, as long as any principal or interest is due and payable on a loan guaranteed under this title, the applicant—

(A) shall maintain assets, equipment, facilities, and operations on a continuing basis;

(B) shall not make any discretionary dividend payments that impair its ability to repay obligations guaranteed under this title; and

(C) shall remain sufficiently capitalized.

(2) COLLATERAL.—

(A) EXISTENCE OF ADEQUATE COLLATERAL.—An applicant shall provide the Board such documentation as is necessary, in the judgment of the Board, to provide satisfactory evidence that appropriate and adequate collateral secures a loan guaranteed under this title.

(B) FORM OF COLLATERAL.—Collateral required by subparagraph (A) shall consist solely of assets of the applicant, any affiliate of the applicant, or both (whichever the Board considers appropriate), including primary assets to be used in the delivery of signals for which the loan is guaranteed.

(C) REVIEW OF VALUATION.—The value of collateral securing a loan guaranteed under this title may be reviewed by the Board, and may be adjusted downward by the Board if the Board reasonably believes such adjustment is appropriate.

(3) LIEN ON INTERESTS IN ASSETS.—Upon the Board's approval of a loan guarantee under this title, the Administrator shall have liens

on assets securing the loan, which shall be superior to all other liens on such assets, and the value of the assets (based on a determination satisfactory to the Board) subject to the liens shall be at least equal to the unpaid balance of the loan amount covered by the loan guarantee, or that value approved by the Board under section 04(d)(3)(B)(iii).

(4) PERFECTED SECURITY INTEREST.—With respect to a loan guaranteed under this title, the Administrator and the lender shall have a perfected security interest in assets securing the loan that are fully sufficient to protect the financial interests of the United States and the lender.

(5) INSURANCE.—In accordance with practices in the private capital market, as determined by the Board, the applicant for a loan guarantee under this title shall obtain, at its expense, insurance sufficient to protect the financial interests of the United States, as determined by the Board.

(c) ASSIGNMENT OF LOAN GUARANTEES.—The holder of a loan guarantee under this title may assign the loan guaranteed under this title in whole or in part, subject to such requirements as the Board may prescribe.

(d) MODIFICATION.—The Board may approve the modification of any term or condition of a loan guarantee or a loan guaranteed under this title, including the rate of interest, time of payment of principal or interest, or security requirements only if—

(1) the modification is consistent with the financial interests of the United States;

(2) consent has been obtained from the parties to the loan agreement;

(3) the modification is consistent with the underwriting criteria developed under section 04(g);

(4) the modification does not adversely affect the interest of the Federal Government in the assets or collateral of the applicant;

(5) the modification does not adversely affect the ability of the applicant to repay the loan; and

(6) the National Telecommunications and Information Administration has been consulted by the Board regarding the modification.

(e) PERFORMANCE SCHEDULES.—

(1) PERFORMANCE SCHEDULES.—An applicant for a loan guarantee under this title for a project covered by section 04(e)(1) shall enter into stipulated performance schedules with the Administrator with respect to the signals to be provided through the project.

(2) PENALTY.—The Administrator may assess against and collect from an applicant described in paragraph (1) a penalty not to exceed 3 times the interest due on the guaranteed loan of the applicant under this title if the applicant fails to meet its stipulated performance schedule under that paragraph.

(f) COMPLIANCE.—The Administrator, in cooperation with the Board and as the regulations of the Board may provide, shall enforce compliance by an applicant, and any other party to a loan guarantee for whose benefit assistance under this title is intended, with the provisions of this title, any regulations under this title, and the terms and conditions of the loan guarantee, including through the submittal of such reports and documents as the Board may require in regulations prescribed by the Board and through regular periodic inspections and audits.

(g) COMMERCIAL VALIDITY.—A loan guarantee under this title shall be incontestable—

(1) in the hands of an applicant on whose behalf the loan guarantee is made, unless the applicant engaged in fraud or misrepresentation in securing the loan guarantee; and

(2) as to any person or entity (or their respective successor in interest) who makes or contracts to make a loan to the applicant for

the loan guarantee in reliance thereon, unless such person or entity (or respective successor in interest) engaged in fraud or misrepresentation in making or contracting to make such loan.

(h) DEFAULTS.—The Board shall prescribe regulations governing defaults on loans guaranteed under this title, including the administration of the payment of guaranteed amounts upon default.

(i) RECOVERY OF PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall be entitled to recover from an applicant for a loan guarantee under this title the amount of any payment made to the holder of the guarantee with respect to the loan.

(2) SUBROGATION.—Upon making a payment described in paragraph (1), the Administrator shall be subrogated to all rights of the party to whom the payment is made with respect to the guarantee which was the basis for the payment.

(3) DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY.—

(A) SALE OR DISPOSAL.—The Administrator shall, in an orderly and efficient manner, sell or otherwise dispose of any property or other interests obtained under this title in a manner that maximizes taxpayer return and is consistent with the financial interests of the United States.

(B) MAINTENANCE.—The Administrator shall maintain in a cost-effective and reasonable manner any property or other interests pending sale or disposal of such property or other interests under subparagraph (A).

(j) ACTION AGAINST OBLIGOR.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO BRING CIVIL ACTION.—The Administrator may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States in the name of the United States or of the holder of the obligation in the event of a default on a loan guaranteed under this title. The holder of a loan guarantee shall make available to the Administrator all records and evidence necessary to prosecute the civil action.

(2) FULLY SATISFYING OBLIGATIONS OWED THE UNITED STATES.—The Administrator may accept property in satisfaction of any sums owed the United States as a result of a default on a loan guaranteed under this title, but only to the extent that any cash accepted by the Administrator is not sufficient to satisfy fully the sums owed as a result of the default.

(k) BREACH OF CONDITIONS.—The Administrator shall commence a civil action in a court of appropriate jurisdiction to enjoin any activity which the Board finds is in violation of this title, the regulations under this title, or any conditions which were duly agreed to, and to secure any other appropriate relief, including relief against any affiliate of the applicant.

(l) ATTACHMENT.—No attachment or execution may be issued against the Administrator or any property in the control of the Administrator pursuant to this title before the entry of a final judgment (as to which all rights of appeal have expired) by a Federal, State, or other court of competent jurisdiction against the Administrator in a proceeding for such action.

(m) FEES.—

(1) APPLICATION FEE.—The Board may charge and collect from an applicant for a loan guarantee under this title a fee to cover the cost of the Board in making necessary determinations and findings with respect to the loan guarantee application under this title. The amount of the fee shall be reasonable.

(2) LOAN GUARANTEE ORIGINATION FEE.—The Board may charge, and the Administrator may collect, a loan guarantee origination fee with respect to the issuance of a loan guarantee under this title.

(3) USE OF FEES COLLECTED.—Any fee collected under this subsection shall be used to

offset administrative costs under this title, including costs of the Board and of the Administrator.

(n) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO AFFILIATES.—

(1) INDEMNIFICATION.—The United States shall be indemnified by any affiliate (acceptable to the Board) of an applicant for a loan guarantee under this title for any losses that the United States incurs as a result of—

(A) a judgment against the applicant or any of its affiliates;

(B) any breach by the applicant or any of its affiliates of their obligations under the loan guarantee agreement;

(C) any violation of the provisions of this title, and the regulations prescribed under this title, by the applicant or any of its affiliates;

(D) any penalties incurred by the applicant or any of its affiliates for any reason, including violation of a stipulated performance schedule under subsection (e); and

(E) any other circumstances that the Board considers appropriate.

(2) LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF LOAN PROCEEDS.—An applicant for a loan guarantee under this title may not transfer any part of the proceeds of the loan to an affiliate.

(o) EFFECT OF BANKRUPTCY.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever any person or entity is indebted to the United States as a result of any loan guarantee issued under this title and such person or entity is insolvent or is a debtor in a case under title 11, United States Code, the debts due to the United States shall be satisfied first.

(2) A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11, United States Code, shall not release a person or entity from an obligation to the United States in connection with a loan guarantee under this title.

#### SEC. 06. ANNUAL AUDIT.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct on an annual basis an audit of the administration of the provisions of this title.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on each audit conducted under subsection (a).

#### SEC. 07. SUNSET.

No loan guarantee may be approved under this title after December 31, 2006.

#### SEC. 08. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AFFILIATE.—The term “affiliate”—

(A) means any person or entity that controls, or is controlled by, or is under common control with, another person or entity; and

(B) may include any individual who is a director or senior management officer of an affiliate, a shareholder controlling more than 25 percent of the voting securities of an affiliate, or more than 25 percent of the ownership interest in an affiliate not organized in stock form.

(2) UNSERVED AREA.—The term “unserved area” means any area that—

(A) is outside the grade B contour (as determined using standards employed by the Federal Communications Commission) of the local television broadcast signals serving a particular designated market area; and

(B) does not have access to such signals by other widely marketed means.

(3) UNDERSERVED AREA.—The term “underserved area” means any area that—

(A) is outside the grade A contour (as determined using standards employed by the Federal Communications Commission) of the local television broadcast signals serving a particular designated market area; and

(B) has access to local television broadcast signals from not more than one commercial, for-profit multichannel video provider.

(4) COMMON TERMS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) through (3), any term used in this Act that is defined in the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) has the meaning given that term in the Communications Act of 1934.

**SEC. 09. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) COST OF LOAN GUARANTEES.—For the cost of the loans guaranteed under this title, including the cost of modifying the loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661(a)), there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 2001 through 2006, such amounts as may be necessary.

(b) COST OF ADMINISTRATION.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, other than to cover costs under subsection (a).

(c) AVAILABILITY.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorizations of appropriations in subsections (a) and (b) shall remain available until expended.

**PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR**

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to two members of my staff, Justin Walker and Kristin Hedger, today.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bob Herbert, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges during the consideration of the Defense appropriations bill.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michael Daly of Senator ABRAHAM's office be granted floor privileges during the consideration of this bill.

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dan Hodges from my staff be allowed floor privileges.

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

**ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 12, 2000**

Mr. STEVENS. On behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday, June 12. I further ask that on Monday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business until 2 p.m., with Senators speaking therein for up to 10 minutes each with the following exceptions: Senator DURBIN, or his designee, from 12 to 1 p.m., Senator THOMAS, or his designee, from 1 to 2 p.m.

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

**PROGRAM**

Mr. STEVENS. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will convene at 12 noon on Monday and be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the Defense appropriations bill. Amendments will be offered, and it is expected the two managers will agree to exchange a list of amendments at 2 p.m. Monday.

**ORDER FOR FILING OF AMENDMENTS**

Mr. STEVENS. With that in mind, I ask unanimous consent that all first-degree amendments to this bill must be filed by 3 p.m. on Monday.

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

**VITIATION OF ORDER**

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order with respect to rule XVI regarding the Defense appropriations bill be vitiated.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, in addition, any votes regarding those amendments will be scheduled to occur on Tuesday morning, June 13. As a reminder, Senators should inform the bill managers, Senator INOUE and myself, if they have amendments to the Defense appropriations bill. It is my hope we will have an announcement on Monday that any amendments that are stacked on Tuesday will commence very early in the day.

**ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senators DASCHLE, ENZI, DORGAN, and BROWNBACK.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

**CONGRATULATING NOFAS ON 10 YEARS OF PROGRESS**

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, 10 years ago, I met with an extraordinary group of people in the basement of a home in suburban Maryland, just outside Washington, DC. They came from

all kinds of backgrounds and fields, but they were united by one common desire, and that was to try to prevent fetal alcohol syndrome and help children and families who are living with its consequences.

The other night, I saw some of those same people again at a reception celebrating the 10th anniversary of NOFAS, the National Organization for Fetal Alcohol Syndrome.

Born in that suburban Maryland basement 10 years ago, NOFAS is now the world's leading clearinghouse for information on fetal alcohol syndrome and fetal alcohol effects. I am proud to say that my wife and I serve on its board of directors.

At the reception the other night, I was asked to say a few words about why I support NOFAS. I could have cited its pivotal role in the significant advances in our understanding of fetal alcohol syndrome and fetal alcohol effect. Ten years ago, we knew very little about fetal alcohol syndrome or fetal alcohol effects, its only slightly milder version. Today, we know that as many as 40,000 children are born each year in this country with FAS and other alcohol-related conditions, costing Americans more than \$3 billion a year in direct health care expenses.

We know that fetal alcohol syndrome is the leading known cause of mental retardation among children. We know that FAS and FAE are both 100 percent preventable when pregnant women abstain from alcohol. And we know now that there is no safe level of alcohol use during pregnancy. That is progress, and it is possible we still would not know these things today were it not for 10 years of diligent and dedicated work by the National Organization for Fetal Alcohol Syndrome. Instead, I talked about two other reasons that I support NOFAS. Those reasons are Karli Schrider and Lucy Klene. If you ever drop by the NOFAS office in Washington on a Friday afternoon, there is a good chance you will run into Karli. She volunteers at NOFAS every Friday stuffing information packets. It is one of her many volunteer jobs.

Twenty-eight years ago, when Karli's mother, Kathy, was pregnant with Karli, it was not uncommon for expectant mothers to be told to "drink a beer a day for a fat, healthy baby." Women who were in danger of miscarrying were sometimes hospitalized and given alcohol intravenously for 5 or 6 hours in the mistaken belief it would prevent miscarriage. Back then, it never crossed Kathy's mind that her occasional glasses of wine might be harming her unborn child. Besides, just the year before, Kathy had had another baby who was perfectly healthy, and she drank during that pregnancy, too. The first time Karli was misdiagnosed, she was an infant. A doctor attributed her developmental delays to chronic ear infections.

When he was 4 years old, a psychologist offered another explanation for Karli's difficulties. He said she was

being “willfully disobedient.” When Karli was 8, a team of specialists misdiagnosed her again with cerebral palsy. Eight years later, when Karli was 16, Kathy was training to be a substance abuse counselor. As part of her training, she attended a conference on crack babies. Sitting in the audience, she was stunned. Every characteristic of crack babies the lecturer described, Karli had. But Kathy had never used crack. She tracked down the few studies that had been done at that time on the effects of alcohol on fetuses. Again, she saw the same list of symptoms.

Years later, researchers would announce that most of the symptoms they originally thought were the result of fetal exposure to crack were actually the result of fetal alcohol exposure, and that alcohol is much more devastating to fetuses than crack or any other drug. That was 11 years ago, before NOFAS was born. Learning the real cause of Karli’s special challenges has not erased those challenges. FAS and FAE are lifelong conditions.

But knowing the truth has enabled Kathy—and others in Karli’s life to focus less on Karli’s deficits, and more on her strengths. One of those strengths is Karli’s extraordinary kindness and empathy. In addition to her volunteer work at NOFAS, Karli also volunteers to help people with cerebral palsy and the elderly. Two years ago, she was named one of America’s “Thousand Points of Life” by former President Bush. She is an inspiration to everyone who meets her, and one of the reasons I believe so deeply in the work NOFAS does.

Another reason I believe in NOFAS is because of a pint-sized little girl named Lucy Klene. Lucy is 4 years old. She spent the first two years of her life in an orphanage in Russia. When she was 2, she was adopted by Stephan and Lydia Klene, of Herndon, VA. The Klenes also adopted a son from Russia, Paul, who is 3 years old and has no apparent fetal alcohol effects. Within a month after bringing Lucy and Paul home, Stephan and Lydia began to suspect that Lucy had special challenges. Over the next 16 months, Lucy was evaluated eight times by pediatricians and other specialists. Not one of them recognized the symptoms of Lucy’s fetal alcohol effects. Finally, scouring the Internet, Stephan stumbled on the truth. He and Lydia took their research to Lucy’s pediatrician, who read it and confirmed their hunch.

Today, Lucy is a talented little gymnast who attends special education preschool. While it is still too early to know for sure, her doctor and parents think there is a good chance she will be able to live an independent and productive life when she grows up. Together, Karli and Lucy illustrate some of the progress that has been made in the 10 years since NOFAS was born. We still have a long way to go. Today children with FAS and FAE are being diagnosed earlier. That means they are getting help earlier, which means they have a

better chance at full and productive lives.

It took Karli’s family 16 years to get a correct diagnosis. It took Lucy’s family 16 months. That is progress. Eleven years ago, when Karli was diagnosed, there was very little research on the effects of alcohol on fetuses. Ten years later, Lucy’s father was able to find an enormous amount of information on the Internet. Slowly but surely, the studies are being done and the information is reaching the people who need it. That is real progress. When Karli was diagnosed, there were few, if any, people Kathy could turn to for support and advice. Today, Stephan and Lydia attend a NOFAS support group for parents of children with FAS and FAE, and they know they are not alone. That, too, is progress.

At the reception the other night, we celebrated an incredible milestone, the 10th anniversary of NOFAS. But next Thursday, June 15, will mark another milestone. At the urging of Stephan and Lydia, in Fairfax, VA, the school district will hold its first ever meeting to help preschool teachers recognize FAS and FAE and help children and families living with this challenge each and every day. And NOFAS will conduct the training. That is real progress.

I hope everyone today will recognize how fortunate we are—those of us lucky enough to be born healthy, those of us lucky enough to be born without fetal alcohol syndrome or fetal alcohol effect.

I hope everyone will congratulate those who have worked so diligently over the course of the last 10 years to make NOFAS what it is today, and to recognize NOFAS for the difference they are making in the lives of Karli and Lucy and hundreds of thousands of others who live with the challenges of FAS and FAE, and for millions of babies who have been born healthy these last 10 years because of NOFAS. May their next 10 years be even more remarkable.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

#### THE HOUSE THE SENATE BUILT

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, today the Senate has resolved to embark upon a unique partnership with Habitat for Humanity International. That is what I want to speak about this morning. In honor of National Homeownership Week, which concludes tomorrow, the Senate will resolve today to lend its support and its elbow grease to a project we call “The House the Senate Built.”

The idea of this project is to bring Members of the Senate, their staffs, local Habitat affiliates, volunteers, and sponsors together to build simple and decent, affordable housing for low-income families in all 50 States and the District of Columbia, and to do this by the end of 2001.

The project will begin with a “model build” right here in Washington, DC, slated to begin before National Homeownership Week in 2001. Following this event, Habitat for Humanity International will link Senators with local Habitat affiliates in their respective States. The Senators will then work with these local affiliates to build at least one Habitat house in their States during 2001.

So we are going to have 51 houses built by the Senate before the end of 2001.

For over 24 years, Habitat for Humanity International has been at the forefront of turning the American dream of owning a home into a reality. Founded by Millard Fuller in 1976, Habitat for Humanity is an ecumenical Christian housing organization to eliminate poverty housing, end homelessness worldwide, and make a decent shelter a matter of conscience and action.

Since its inception, Habitat has built over 80,000 homes that have housed over 400,000 people worldwide. This September, Habitat will build its 100,000th home, and they seek to build another 100,000 by 2005. So they started 24 years ago. By September they will have built their first 100,000. In the next 5 years, they hope and anticipate building their next 100,000 homes.

I have talked personally and visited a number of times with Millard Fuller. I have had him out to Kansas and hosted him there. He is quite a dynamic individual. He has a great heart and wants to see people around the world living in good housing. And he is getting there, one home at a time, but they are building up fast.

Habitat for Humanity relies solely on volunteer labor to build their homes. The remarkable success of Habitat is in large part attributed to the tireless efforts of its founder, Millard Fuller, to continually bring new building partners on board.

Over the years, Millard has enlisted the services of foreign Ambassadors, former Presidents—President Carter probably being the most noteworthy and most frequent builder—and even the House of Representatives has helped to aid in building homes at various sites across the country. This year, Millard Fuller has turned to the Senate to build some houses.

I ran into Millard as I was waiting to catch my flight back home at the airport in Kathmandu, Nepal, this past January. Sitting there in a small waiting room, thousands of miles away from home, Millard shared with me the vision he had for bringing the Senate together with Habitat for Humanity International.

He was in Nepal, building houses and announcing a program there, but at the same time he was also thinking, what could he do to build some through the Senate? That is where we discussed this program.

The “House the Senate Built” project that was born out of this vision

will undoubtedly be a successful one. We will build the houses. I think we will build a lot more than 51 houses. That is our target. Benjamin Franklin once wrote: "Well done is better than well said." I think that may particularly apply to the Senate. We talk frequently about things. Here is a chance for us to do something about homeownership.

I think it is going to be a great project for us to be able to put people in homes. I can come to the floor today in the middle of National Homeownership Week and tell you that we should be committed to end homelessness across the country and eliminate poverty housing, but instead of telling you that, I would rather show you. I would rather pick up a hammer and demonstrate my commitment to affordable housing, nail by nail.

I am proud to come to the floor today and discuss this important initiative. This Senate is saying that words of support are not enough. Nothing less than the sweat of our brows will do in expressing how committed the Senate is in making the American dream of homeownership a true reality.

I thank the Chair and hope we are going to be able to adopt this resolution yet today. I believe it has been cleared.

#### PARTICIPATION IN AND SUPPORT OF ACTIVITIES TO PROVIDE DECENT HOMES FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 319, submitted by myself and others. I believe it is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 319) expressing the sense of the Senate that the Senate should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, we have 55 cosponsors in the Senate on this bill. My understanding is it has been cleared by both sides of the aisle, that there is no objection. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and, finally, any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 319) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

#### S. RES. 319

Whereas the United States promotes and encourages the creation and revitalization of

sustainable and strong neighborhoods in partnership with States, cities, and local communities and in conjunction with the independent and collective actions of private citizens and organizations;

Whereas establishing a housing infrastructure strengthens neighborhoods and local economies and nurtures the families who reside in them;

Whereas an integral element of a strong community is a sufficient supply of affordable housing;

Whereas affordable housing may be provided in traditional and nontraditional forms, including apartment buildings, transitional and temporary homes, condominiums, cooperatives, and single family homes;

Whereas for many families a home is not merely shelter, but also provides an opportunity for growth, prosperity, and security;

Whereas homeownership is a cornerstone of the national economy because it spurs the production and sale of goods and services, generates new jobs, encourages savings and investment, promotes economic and civic responsibility, and enhances the financial security of all people in the United States;

Whereas although the United States is the first nation in the world to make owning a home a reality for a vast majority of its families, 1/3 of the families in the United States are not homeowners;

Whereas a disproportionate percentage of families in the United States that are not homeowners are low-income families;

Whereas the community building activities of neighborhood-based nonprofit organizations empower individuals to improve their lives and make communities safer and healthier for families;

Whereas one of the best known nonprofit housing organizations is Habitat for Humanity, which builds simple but adequate housing for less fortunate families and symbolizes the self-help approach to homeownership;

Whereas Habitat for Humanity is organized in all 50 States with 1544 local affiliates and its own 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporate status and locally elected completely voluntary board of directors.

Whereas Habitat for Humanity will build its 100,000th house worldwide in September 2000 and endeavors to complete another 100,000 homes during the next 5 years.

Whereas Habitat for Humanity provides opportunities for people from every segment of society to volunteer to help make the American dream a reality for families who otherwise would not own a home; and

Whereas the first week of June 2000 has been designated as "National Homeownership Week": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) everyone in the United States should have a decent home in which to live;

(2) the Members of the Senate should demonstrate the importance of volunteerism;

(3) during the year between National Homeownership Week 2000 and National Homeownership Week 2001, the Members of the Senate, Habitat for Humanity, and contributing organizations, should sponsor and construct 2 homes in the District of Columbia each of which should be known as a "House That the Senate Built";

(4) each "House That the Senate Built" should be constructed primarily by Members of the Senate, their families and staffs, and the staffs of sponsoring organizations working with local volunteers involving and symbolizing the partnership of the public, private, and nonprofit sectors of society;

(5) each "House That the Senate Built" should be constructed with the participation of the family that will own the home;

(6) in the future, the Members of the Senate and their families and staff should participate in similar house building activities in their own States as part of National Homeownership Week; and

(7) these occasions should be used to emphasize and focus on the importance of providing decent homes for all of the people in the United States.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I am delighted we were able to pass S. Res. 319. We are going to build some houses.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Kansas. I believe I am a cosponsor of his resolution. If not, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. DORGAN. I think the Senator from Kansas has described it well. I am proud that the Senate has adopted the resolution. I think what Habitat for Humanity has done is really quite remarkable. I am glad he calls attention to it on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for as much time as I may consume.

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

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO MAGGIE MILLER

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to let my colleagues know about a woman who, this morning, is working at the post office in Knox, ND. Knox, ND, is a little town of 42 people, but it is big enough to have a post office.

Just recently, the postmaster of the Knox, ND, post office, a woman named Vivian Seter, retired. Upon Vivian's retirement at age 73, Maggie Miller took over the job.

Now maybe my colleagues are thinking there is nothing unusual in that. But Maggie is 83 years old, and she just took over the running of the post office in Knox from her 73-year-old friend Vivian.

The post office has cut its hours a bit since Maggie took over, so it is open now from 8:30 until 10:30 a.m. In fact, in about 10 minutes from now, central time in Knox, ND, Maggie will be hanging it up for the day. But for now, at age 83, after working 62 years in the postal system, Maggie has assumed the reins of the Knox Post Office.

The reason I mention this today is that I have talked a lot over the years about rural values. There is something quite remarkable and unique about life in the small towns of rural America. I represent a wonderful State, North Dakota, with a lot of small communities. Knox, ND, is one of them.

There are also a lot of hard-working, remarkable people in these small towns, and Maggie Miller is one of them. Again, she has been working for the postal system for 62 years, and I read in the newspaper that the postmaster from Rolla, ND, had to come

train her for her new position. Vivian, the retiring postmaster, joked: She has only been doing this 62 years, so she needs a little training.

The article I read about her said that last year Maggie, who was age 82 at the time, bowled a 204. Then she broke her wrist and has had to take the summer off. But Maggie being Maggie, she vows to make a comeback to her bowling league.

When I saw this story in the paper, I just had to call Maggie. When she answered the phone, I said: Maggie, this is BYRON DORGAN calling from Washington, DC. I wanted to tell you that it is wonderful that you are stepping in as postmaster at age 83. Maggie said: Tell me another one. I said: No, Maggie, it really is BYRON DORGAN. And she said: I bet it is.

So Maggie, if you happen to be watching this debate in Congress, I really did call you. I say congratulations. You have a lot of spunk. I am proud of all the things you have done and of the values that you represent of folks in small towns helping each other and working together. I know the post office in many small towns is the hub of the community, and I am confident you will serve Knox well.

Congratulations to Maggie and to the town of Knox.

#### SANCTIONS ON FOOD AND MEDICINE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will speak for a few moments about the issue of the sanctions on food and medicine that exist in this country with respect to other countries.

I have a chart that describes what has happened to our family farmers. I represent a State with a lot of wheat growers. This chart shows what has happened to the price of wheat. As my colleagues can see, it has collapsed. Over a period of a few years, the price of wheat has just flat collapsed. I guess it is because the grain markets have determined that the food our family farmers produce does not have much value.

So our farmers, at a time when their prices have collapsed, are struggling mightily. They have a very difficult time trying to deal with collapsed prices. Yet all their expenses continue to increase. They have a difficult time understanding what is happening in the world relative to their prices and to people around the world who need what they produce.

This is a picture that is in stark contrast to the graph that shows a collapse in the price of wheat. This is a picture of hunger. This picture is all too typical in some parts of the world. Starvation, deprivation, desperate hunger, hundreds of millions of people go to bed with an ache in their belly because they didn't have enough to eat. Millions and millions of children don't have enough to eat. Every eight seconds, one child dies because of hunger and hunger-related causes. Yet a fam-

ily farmer who plows the ground in the spring and tends to the crop, and is lucky enough to get a crop off in the fall, takes that load of wheat to the elevator only to be told by the grain trade: The food you have produced doesn't have value.

Farmers wonder if so many people in the world are so hungry, if so many live in starvation, and suffer from deprivation, and go to bed hungry, why is it that the food we produce in such abundant quantity in this country has no value?

As we talk about this disconnection—indeed, it is a disconnection of what we produce and what the world so desperately needs and the hunger that exists around the rest of the world, and then for our producers to be told that what they have produced doesn't have value—we have a policy in the United States that says: There are certain countries in this world whose behavior is such that we want to impose an economic embargo. Included in that embargo, we, as a country, want to prohibit the sale of food and medicine to those other countries. That is current policy. In fact, almost 11 percent of the wheat export market in the world has been off limits to our family farmers because of sanctions that we have applied against other countries.

North Korea, Iran, Cuba, and others have been told, the United States of America will not move grain and medicine to these countries because they are behaving outside the norm of international behavior and therefore, we impose sanctions. Those sanctions include food and medicine. That is wrong-headed public policy, and it should never have happened in the first place. It is a bipartisan mistake by administrations over the years that have included food and medicine in the economic sanctions. We should never include food and medicine in sanctions we impose against other governments. We should never use food as a weapon. We should never include medicine as a part of a sanction—to use medicine as a weapon. We ought to decide now that we are going to change that policy.

A bipartisan group of us, myself in the Appropriations Committee, joined by Senator SLADE GORTON from the State of Washington, with the support of Senator ASHCROFT, Senator DODD, and a group of others, have offered an amendment in the Appropriations Committee to say: No more; let us abolish all sanctions on food and medicine shipments everywhere in the world. It passed. It is in the Agriculture appropriations bill that will come to the floor of the Senate.

That is not new. We passed it last year as well, by 70 votes in the Senate. Because of one issue, it got hijacked by some legislative leaders and did not become law. They are planning to hijack it again.

The issue is Cuba. We have legislative leaders who say Cuba is a different story. We must maintain sanctions against the shipment of food and medi-

cine to Cuba. They want to retain the entire embargo with Cuba. But the 40 years of embargo has failed.

The question is—when you have an experiment, a laboratory experiment, and this is a real experiment, a real laboratory, for 40 years you have an embargo against Cuba and it doesn't work—who will be the first to stand up and say: This does not work; maybe we ought to do something else?

We are not talking about the entire embargo with respect to Cuba. We are just talking about the issue of food and medicine and the sanctions that now apply to shipments of food and medicine to Cuba. The legislative leaders are intending to hijack this position once again. Our intent to repeal that sanction is going to be hijacked once again, unless we find a way to stop it.

The Washington Post today wrote an editorial, "Food for Cuba." They make the point that there is no justification for having sanctions on food and medicine for Cuba, and there is no justification. It is interesting that the debate over normal trade relations with China produces all these folks who come to the floor of the House and Senate and say: We must engage with China. Engaging with a Communist nation will inevitably move that nation in a more constructive direction. More trade and more direction towards open markets will inevitably improve things in a country such as China.

If that is the case, why is it not the case with Cuba, also a Communist country? Why is it the case that engagement with China is productive in moving them towards better human rights and towards a more constructive direction, but it is not the case in Cuba? The answer is the current embargo that exists with Cuba makes no sense at all. Sanctions against the shipments of food and medicine, not only to Cuba but to the other sanctioned countries in the world, is not moral policy. It is not moral for this country, in my judgment, to use food and medicine as part of sanctions. It is wrong.

I started by talking about farmers. Yes. I have an interest to try to make sure farmers have the opportunity to serve markets. Those who support Freedom to Farm. I don't; I don't think it has worked. We need to ask the same question with respect to markets. If you say the Freedom to Farm approach is something that is important for farmers, what about the freedom to sell? Freedom to Farm—what about the freedom to sell? Farmers are told they have the freedom to farm. What about the freedom to sell their products to Cuba, or the freedom to sell their wheat to Iran, or the freedom to sell their wheat to Libya?

If we have in the coming weeks the kind of chicanery that went on last year to hijack this policy, to hijack those Republicans and Democrats who say we must end these sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine to all countries—and, yes, including Cuba—if

they intend to hijack that again through legislative chicanery, they are going to have a whole load on their hands, because they did it last year and they were successful, but they are not going to do it twice.

If there is an up-or-down vote on this to eliminate the sanctions on food and medicine with respect to all of these countries, including Cuba—there were 70 votes in the Senate last year, and there was a majority in the House. By an overwhelming margin Republicans and Democrats in the Congress believed that we ought to eliminate sanctions on food and medicine shipments. The only conceivable way they can detour our effort is to prevent a vote in the House and to try to strip out the provision that the Senate Appropriations Committee put in when that bill comes to the floor of the Senate.

I serve notice to all who think about these issues that it is not going to happen the way it happened last year. You might have the muscle and you might have the cards up your sleeve to try to derail this once again. But it is going to cost in terms of the way this place works.

We have a clear, large majority in the House and the Senate on the side of the American farmer, who believe they ought to have the freedom to sell in these markets; on the side of those who say this policy of using food as a weapon is fundamentally immoral; on the side of doing the right thing with Cuba and yes, other countries; consistent with what we described and talked about with respect to China. We have a large majority in the House and the Senate to do the sensible thing this year.

I am not prepared to step aside and quietly go away on this issue. If leaders do to us what they are suggesting in the papers, they will try to do to us what they did last year successfully through legislative slight of hand.

Our farmers deserve better than that. Hungry people around the world deserve to look at this country and understand that this country will never, never ever impose sanctions on food and medicine.

This country in its zeal and desire to take aim at a dictator hits hungry people, hits poor people, and hits sick people. We are not hurting dictators. Does anybody here believe that Fidel Castro has ever missed a meal because we have an embargo or sanction on food and medicine? Does anybody here ever think that Saddam Hussein has missed dinner because we have not sent food to Iraq? We haven't hurt dictators. All we have done is hurt sick people, poor people, and hungry people around the world with this foolish policy. And, at the same time, we have hurt our farmers here at home.

This must stop. It must stop this year. And it must not be a halfhearted notion of putting on the brakes halfway and saying we will eliminate the sanctions with respect to these couple of countries but we can't do it with re-

spect to Cuba. Nonsense. It must be done across the board, and it must be done this year.

Those, as I have said, who think they are going to hijack this policy are in for a long, hot summer.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: No. 451, and Nos. 528 through 543, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Foreign Service. I ask the clerk to report Calendar No. 536.

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward William Gnehm, Jr., of Georgia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Douglas A. Dworkin, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

#### BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Edward E. Kaufman, of Delaware, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2000.

Alberto J. Mora, of Florida, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2000.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

David N. Greenlee, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Paraguay.

Susan S. Jacobs, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Papua New Guinea, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Solomon Islands, and as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vanuatu.

John F. Tefft, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Ex-

traordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lithuania.

John R. Dinger, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mongolia.

Donna Jean Hrinak, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Venezuela.

John Martin O'Keefe, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kyrgyz Republic.

Edward William Gnehm, Jr., of Georgia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Daniel A. Johnson, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Suriname.

V. Manuel Rocha, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Bolivia.

Rose M. Likins, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of El Salvador.

W. Robert Pearson, of Tennessee, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey.

Marc Grossman, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Director General of the Foreign Service.

Anne Woods Patterson, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Colombia.

James Donald Walsh, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

#### FOREIGN SERVICE

Foreign Service nominations beginning Craig B. Allen, and ending Daniel E. Harris, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, 2000.

Foreign Service nominations beginning C. Franklin Foster, Jr., and ending Michael Patrick Glover, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, 2000.

Foreign Service nominations beginning Leslie O'Connor, and ending David P. Lambert, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 11, 2000.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume the legislative session.

NOMINATION OF EDWARD GNEHM,  
JR.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank all of my colleagues for the action that was just taken.

This is truly one of the highlights of my Senate career. The nomination that was read individually was my college roommate. I roomed with him for 3 years at George Washington University where he was striving to become a career Ambassador for the United States of America. I watched him work and struggle and exceed all expectations. He is extremely brilliant and has been able to get the kind of career that he wanted.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming, who is presiding, for the rapid action that he took to have the hearing held on this nomination.

I thank the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. HELMS, for the expeditious work that he did with the full committee to get this name brought before the Senate.

We have a truly dedicated career officer who will be serving us in Australia. I know him very well. I canoed with him in the swamps of Georgia.

I watched his career and his travels. Most of my travels around the world have been through his eyes, as he has been located in different positions beginning with Katmandu, Nepal.

I think we owe a lot of thanks not only to him but to his family, and his wife Peggy, who has gone with him on these travels. They served well as ambassadors for our country.

When he had a break, he came back to the United States and served in the State Department. I was often able to see him in Washington. I watched him as he was liaison for the Defense Department, liaison for the State Department with Senator KENNEDY, and in a number of other positions.

He and I have daughters who are the same age. We have sons who are the same age. His son, Ed, is married to the daughter of the couple who introduced my wife and I. How did a Wyoming girl meet somebody out here? They met at my swearing-in ceremony. The two dads were part of my wedding. And I was there to see their children's marriages in Wyoming.

Skip is a fraternity brother of mine and is actually the only brother that I have.

With this action taken today, the United States will be well served in Australia. This is the correct action, the best action, and this is the best representation we can get.

I thank all of my colleagues for their support in getting this important nomination approved.

AUTHORIZATION OF TESTIMONY  
BY SENATE EMPLOYEE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 320, submitted earlier by Senator LOTT and Senator DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 320) to authorize testimony by a Senate employee in a State administrative proceeding.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, a caseworker employed in the state office of Senator WILLIAM V. ROTH, Jr. has been subpoenaed to testify at an unemployment compensation benefits hearing before the Delaware Department of Labor.

The testimony concerns contacts that the caseworker had with the claimant in the course of assisting the claimant's employing business with casework matters.

In accordance with the rules of the Senate, this resolution would enable the caseworker to testify in response to the subpoena.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 320) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 320

Whereas, in the Inquiry Relative to the Claim for Benefits of Yolanda Nock, pending before the Department of Labor, in the County of Sussex, State of Delaware, a subpoena for testimony has been issued to Elinor Hughes, an employee of the Senate on the staff of Senator William V. Roth, Jr.;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That Elinor Hughes is authorized to testify in the Inquiry Relative to the Claim for Benefits of Yolanda Nock, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

CONGRATULATING REPRESENTATIVE  
STEPHEN S.F. CHEN

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 121, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Con. Res. 121) congratulating Representative Stephen S.F. Chen on the occasion of his retirement from the diplomatic service of Taiwan, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, a motion to consider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 121) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 121

Whereas Representative Stephen S. F. Chen has been a member of Taiwan's diplomatic service for forty-seven years;

Whereas Representative Chen has represented Taiwan's interests in such countries as the Philippines, Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, and the United States;

Whereas Representative Chen has held a number of important positions in his government at home, including those of Vice Foreign Minister and Deputy Secretary-General to President Lee Teng-hui;

Whereas Representative Chen's many years of service in the United States include appointments as Taiwan's Consul-General in Atlanta from 1973 to 1979 and as Director of the Coordination Council for North American Affairs in Chicago from 1980 to 1982 and Los Angeles from 1988 to 1989;

Whereas Representative Chen has served with distinction as Taiwan's senior diplomat in the United States since 1997, when he became the Representative of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas Representative Chen has been a friend of the United States and earned the respect and genuine affection of many Members of the Senate and House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Representative Stephen Chen is to be congratulated for his many years of distinguished service to Taiwan and for his friendship to the United States; and

(2) the best wishes of Congress are to be extended to Representative Chen and his family on the occasion of his retirement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

40 YEARS TOO LONG—THE CUBAN  
EMBARGO

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, when President Kennedy announced a trade embargo on Cuba in 1961, the consensus in Washington was that stifling the Cuban economy would lead to internal unrest and ultimately depose the anti-American president, Fidel Castro. Since that time, Congress has tightened the screws on Cuba to include food and medicine in the embargo and to put pressure on other countries not to trade with Cuba. We have made it more difficult to lift the embargo by requiring a two-thirds vote by Congress and we have passed a law that says no government involving Fidel Castro or his brother will be acceptable to the U.S., even if they were chosen in Democratic elections. Through it all, our

main nemesis, Fidel Castro, has survived. In fact, he is strong as ever. To gain a better understanding of this issue, I recently led a group of Arkansas farmers to Havana to see firsthand the impact of our policy and the potential opportunities that exist should this policy be changed. I entered Havana focused on Cuba's potential as a new trade market for Arkansas agriculture producers. I left Havana with a new understanding of the embargo's effects on the people of Cuba. I returned from Cuba more confident than ever that the U.S. embargo on Cuba must be lifted. The three most compelling reasons for my stance on this issue are: (1) the fact that we should engage countries, not isolate them in order to move them forward and help them to gain potential; (2) the overall effect on the American economy that losing the trade with Cuba has had; and (3) the humanitarian impact on the Cuban people.

This was my first trip to Cuba and it was extremely worthwhile. I found the country and its people impressive and possessing great potential. The architecture in downtown Havana was charming, however, it struck me that someone had turned the lights out 40 years ago and no one has thought to flip the switch back on. The gorgeous architecture was crumbling along with the people. The physical decay of the cities, buildings, and infrastructure is readily apparent. This obvious economic and physical decline has not, however, led to an uprising of Cuban citizens demanding for a more democratic government based on capitalistic principles. It has been four decades since the embargo was enforced for political reasons. Times have clearly changed. The Soviet Union no longer aids Cuban efforts to challenge U.S. interests in Central America and elsewhere. The Soviet Union does not even exist.

The Cold War has been over for 10 years and the U.S. has normal trade relations with all of the countries of the former Eastern bloc. Yet we continue to ostracize Cuba. U.S. defense analysts even maintain that Cuba does not pose a security threat to our country at the turn of the century. Is Cuba an ideal nation? Absolutely not. But there are other countries that we trade with and maintain normal diplomatic relations with whose governments are not democratically elected; where full respect for internationally recognized human rights is lacking; where there is little or no tolerance for political dissent; or where private enterprise is largely illegal.

The first of these countries that comes to mind is China. Prior to the Memorial Day recess the House of Representatives voted to grant Permanent Normal Relations (PNTR) status to the Republic of China. The Senate will likely vote on this matter soon. On this separate but related issue let me be clear. I look forward to the China PNTR debate and urge my colleagues

to join me in support of expanding our trading opportunities. I hope that we can pass PNTR with China as quickly as possible with no amendments so that President Clinton can sign this landmark legislation into law. As I have watched the China PNTR debate rage in Washington during recent weeks, I am struck by the common theme that we, as a nation, can influence a country's actions much more by engaging them in trade and communication than we ever could by ignoring and isolating them.

I've held to this belief for quite some time in regard to China as well as Cuba. China is the largest Communist country in the world. The U.S. has annually granted China its most-favored-nation status and will likely approve Permanent Normal Trade Relations in the coming months. Our treatment of Cuba should be no different. It is true that China has made various overtures and taken some positive steps as their acceptance into the WTO is being considered. China has allowed for a limited amount of private enterprise to exist. And recently, China purchased goods from the U.S. as a good faith gesture that they will live up to the commitments negotiated in the WTO accession agreement. Many who oppose trade with Cuba ask, "Why are we not holding Cuba to the same standard? Why don't we require them to privatize certain business entities or purchase some commodities as a good faith gesture?" The option to purchase U.S. goods is not available to Cuba, as it is to China, due to laws that we have passed in this very institution. Their hands are tied.

Yet Cuba is taking steps on its own regarding private industry. Recent progress has been made in the form of joint ventures to facilitate the tourism industry in Cuba. For instance, the hotel we stayed in was a joint venture with the Dutch. Of course the government is still participating, but it is an example of private capital coming in from another source and affecting the people's way of life. The people working at those hotels receive tips from tourists that put them way above the daily wage of average Cubans. Steps made in these directions can only foster and plant positive seeds for change. We can also expect the rapidly advancing technology of the Internet to help open doors to Cuba. Just as Chinese dissidents communicate today over the Internet in spite of attempts by the Communists to stop them, I can anticipate a day when the Cuban people do the same thing.

The farmers of Cuba are incapable of producing enough to sustain the 11 million inhabitants of the Caribbean island. Therefore, food must be imported. Our allies are already meeting that need and trading with Cuba. Rice is coming into Cuba from Asia, soybeans from Brazil, while our farmers endure some of the worst prices they have seen in decades.

We have put ourselves in a position where we are hurting our own economy

and the backbone of our nation, the America farmer. By denying our farmers access to additional markets, like Cuba, we are ignoring a pledge that was made with the passage of the 1996 Farm Bill to open markets, the necessary markets our farmers need. Promises regarding enhanced trading opportunities and the free market abounded with passage of the so-called Freedom to Farm Act. Yet, the recently passed Caribbean/Africa Trade bill was the first trade bill Congress has passed in six years. We have failed to grant the President Fast Track Authority and essentially guaranteed the failure of our nation's farmers by granting them the ability to produce as much as they are capable while denying them access to sufficient markets to move their goods. For the American farmer the combination of this nation's Ag and foreign trade policies is a no-win situation.

For soybeans alone, opening up trade with Cuba could mean a \$60 million market. In Arkansas, we could ship 400,000 tons of rice right down the Mississippi River, through the Gulf of Mexico to the Cuban people. Food products would be a phone call and a couple of days away. Instead, the Cuban people are left paying higher prices for a lower quality product that takes weeks, sometimes months, to arrive in their ports.

Rice is a staple of the Cuban diet and we know how to grow it in Arkansas. Arkansas is consistently the top U.S. producer of rice. Exports are extremely important to the rice industry. Last year, the rice industry exported to more than 100 countries. Trade and trade policy, therefore, are critical to the continued success of the industry.

At the time that the U.S. Government imposed sanctions on trade with Cuba, it was not only our largest export market for rice, but it took more than one-half of our total rice exports. Cubans know good American rice, and they want it. The embargo dealt a major blow to the rice industry, particularly growers in the South who grow long grain rice, which is the rice of preference in Cuba. The only impact the embargo has had on Cuba is on its middle- to low-income citizens. We are hurting the Cuban people much more than the Cuban government or Cuban elite. Due to the high prices the government is forced to pay, less food is available for distribution. U.S. humanitarian organizations are prevented from providing food to starving children due solely to the existence of the embargo.

While in Cuba, I met with opponents of the Castro regime who have been persecuted for attempting to highlight the disparate human rights treatment in Cuba. These dissidents believe that the embargo gives the Cuban government an excuse for what is wrong with the country. Our embargo provides Cuban officials with an excuse for the sorry state of the economy and the challenges the country faces. If we lift

the embargo, we expose the Cuban people to many of the problems of their own government. Right now the Cuban people are only getting one side of the story, and they are not blaming their government or Fidel Castro for their troubles, because Fidel Castro is using the U.S. Government as the excuse for those problems.

I understand there are colleagues in this body whom I deeply respect who also disagree with me on this issue. I agree that should the U.S. lift its embargo on Cuba, Fidel Castro will probably declare victory over what he calls his imperialist oppressor to his north. But the real truth which is undeniably is that under current policy absolutely no one wins.

As a farmer's daughter, I am not so concerned about the short-term implications of who can claim victory after 40 years of economic isolation. I believe that the long-term benefits of engagement with Cuba offer economic benefit to Americans; opportunities for democratic influences inside Cuba and better living conditions for the Cuban people. Each of these goals strike me as fundamental principles of our unique, American democracy. Lifting the 40-year embargo on Cuba is the right thing to do. I hope we do it sooner than later.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,  
JUNE 12, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate, under the previous order, will stand adjourned until the hour of 12 noon on Monday, June 12, 2000.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:54 a.m., adjourned until Monday, June 12, 2000, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DOUGLAS A. DWORKIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

EDWARD E. KAUFMAN, OF DELAWARE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2000.

ALBERTO J. MORA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID N. GREENLEE, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY.

SUSAN S. JACOBS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO PAPUA NEW GUINEA, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO SOLOMAN ISLANDS, AND AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF VANUATU.

JOHN F. TEFFT, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA.

JOHN R. DINGER, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO MONGOLIA.

DONNA JEAN HRINAK, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA.

JOHN MARTIN O'KEEFE, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC.

EDWARD WILLIAM GNEHM, JR., OF GEORGIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO AUSTRALIA.

DANIEL A. JOHNSON, OF FLORIDA, CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SURINAME.

V. MANUEL ROCHA, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF BOLIVIA.

ROSE M. LIKINS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR.

W. ROBERT PEARSON, OF TENNESSEE, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY.

MARC GROSSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE.

ANNE WOODS PATTERSON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA.

JAMES DONALD WALSH, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ARGENTINA.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING CRAIG B. ALLEN, AND ENDING DANIEL E. HARRIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 7, 2000.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING C. FRANKLIN FOSTER JR., AND ENDING MICHAEL PATRICK GLOVER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 7, 2000.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING LESLIE O'CONNOR, AND ENDING DAVID P. LAMBERT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 11, 2000.