transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment Program; Contract Rent Annual Adjustment Factors, Fiscal Year 2000 (Notice of Revised Contract Rent Annual Adjustment Factors)" (FR–4528–N–01), received October 19, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5722. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fair Market Rents for the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program for Fiscal Year 2000 (Notice of Final Fiscal Year 2000 Fair Market Rents (FMRs))" (FR–4196–N–02), received October 19, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5723. A communication from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Administrator of National Banks, Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extended Examination Cycle for U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks" (KINS064–AC15), received October 19, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:
S. 1250. A bill to amend title 36 of the United States Code to establish the American Indian Education Foundation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–197).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:
S. 624. A bill to authorize construction of the Fort Peck Reservoir Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–188).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:
David J. Hayes, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

(The above nomination was reported favorably with the recommendation that he be confirmed, subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):
S. 1752. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Coastal Barrier Resources Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):
S. 1754. A bill entitled the "Denying Safe Havens to International War Criminals Act of 1999"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself and Mrs. SMITH):
S. 1755. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to regulate interstate commerce in the use of mobile telephones; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mrs. SMITH):
S. 1756. A bill to enhance the ability of the National Laboratories to meet Department of Energy missions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COCHRAN:
S. 1757. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to rural health care providers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DeWINE and Mr. GRASSLEY:
S. 1758. A bill to authorize urgent support for Colombia and front line states to secure peace and the rule of law, to enhance the effectiveness of anti-drug efforts that are essential to impeding the flow of deadly cocaine and heroin to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CHAFEE (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):
S. 1752. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Coastal Barrier Resources Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am here today to introduce a bill to reauthorize the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA). Most people do not realize that coastal barriers are the first line of defense protecting the mainland from major storms and hurricanes, and this extremely vulnerable area is under increasing developmental pressure.

From 1960 to 1990, the population of coastal areas increased from 80 to 110 million and is projected to reach over 160 million by 2015. Continued coastal development to the power of three decades of relative calm, safety factors of continuing to develop coastal barrier regions must also be considered.

In 2001, the population of coastal areas areas increased from 80 to 110 million and is projected to reach over 160 million by 2015. Continued development on and around coastal barriers place people, property, and the environment at risk.

To address this problem Congress passed CBRA in 1982. This extremely important legislation prohibits the Federal government from subsidizing flood insurance, and providing other financial assistance such as beach replenishment within the Coastal Barrier Resources System. Nothing in CBRA prohibits development on coastal barriers, it just gets the Federal government out of the business of subsidizing risky development.

The law proved to be successful in that we expanded the Coastal Barrier System in 1990 with the support of the National Taxpayers Union, the American Red Cross, Coast Alliance and Tax Payers for Common Sense, to name just a few. The 1990 Act doubled the size of the System to include coastal barriers in Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, the Great Lakes and additional areas along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. We also allowed the inclusion of areas that are already protected for other purposes such as parks and refuges. Currently the System is comprised of 3 million acres and 2,500 shoreline miles.

Development of these areas decreases their ability to absorb the force of storms and buffer the mainland. The devastating floods of Hurricane Floyd and other recent storms remind us of the importance of coastal development to the power of nature. The Federal Emergency Management Agency reports that 10 major disaster declarations were issued for this hurricane, more than for any other single hurricane or natural disaster. In fact, 1999 sets a record for major disaster declarations—a total of 14 in this year alone. As the number of disaster declarations has crept up steadily since 1980, so has taxpayer expenditures. Congress has approved on average $3.7 billion a year in supplemental disaster aid in the 1990’s, compared to less than $1 billion a year in the decade prior.

Homeowners know the risk of building in these highly threatened areas. Despite this taxpayers are continually being asked to rebuild homes and businesses in flood-prone areas. The National Wildlife Federation came out with a study that found that over forty percent of the damage payments from the National Flood Insurance Program go to people who have had at least one previous claim. A New Jersey auto repair shop made 31 damage claims in 15 years.

At a time when climatologists believe that Floyd and other major hurricanes signal the beginning of a period of turbulent hurricane activity after three decades of relative calm, safety factors of continuing to develop coastal barrier regions must also be considered.

Depleting our Nation’s coastal resources.

Beyond the economic and safety issues, another compelling reason to support the Coastal Barrier Resources Act is that it contributes to the protection of our Nation’s coastal resources. Coastal barriers protect and maintain the wetlands and estuaries essential to the survival of innumerable species of fish and wildlife. Large populations of waterfowl and other migratory birds depend on the habitat protected by coastal barriers for wintering areas. Undeveloped coastal barriers also provide unique recreational opportunities, and are an essential protection for present and future public enjoyment.

The legislation which I am introducing today would reauthorize the Act for eight years and make some necessary changes to improve implementation. A new provision would establish
a set of criteria for determining whether a coastal barrier is developed. Codifying the criteria will make it easier for homeowners, Congress and the Fish and Wildlife Service to determine if an area qualifies as an undeveloped coastal area. The legislation would require the Secretary of the Interior to complete a pilot project to determine the feasibility of creating digital versions of the coastal barrier system maps. Digital maps would improve the accuracy of the older coastal barrier maps and it easier for the Department of Interior and homeowners to determine where a structure is located. Eventually, we hope that the entire system can be accessed by the Internet.

I believe that Congress should make every effort to conserve barrier islands and beaches. This legislation offers an opportunity to increase protection of coastal barriers, and at the same time, saves taxpayers money. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. Hatch (for himself, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Leahy, and Mr. Kennedy):

S. 1753. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that an adopted alien who is less than 18 years of age may be considered a child under such Act if adopted with or after a sibling who is a child under such Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

KEEPING IMMIGRANT SIBLINGS TOGETHER

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill corresponding to one introduced by Congressman Horn of California and passed the House of Representatives this week. The intent of this bill is to allow immigrant orphan siblings to stay together when being adopted by U.S. citizens.

Under current law, a U.S. citizen may bring an immigrant child they have adopted to the United States if the child is under the age of 16. This bill would allow U.S. citizens to adopt immigrant children ages 16-17 if the adoption would keep a group of siblings together.

Mr. President, I agree with Mr. Horn’s conclusion that family unity is a frequently cited goal of our immigration policy, and this proposal would promote that goal. Under current law, if children are adopted by U.S. citizens and one child is 16 or older the oldest sibling cannot come to the United States with his or her brothers and sisters under current law. It seems clear to me that siblings of these young ages ought not to be separated.

Further, foreign adoption authorities in some cases do not allow the separation of siblings. In such cases, if a U.S. citizen wanted to adopt a group of siblings and one of them is 16 or older, the citizen would lose the opportunity to adopt any of the other children under current law.

As Mr. Horn’s analysis of the consequences of this bill confirms, this bill is unlikely to cause a significant increase in immigration levels overall. During fiscal year 1996, a total of 351 immigrant orphans older than age 9 were adopted by U.S. citizens, out of 11,316 immigrant orphans adopted by U.S. citizens overall that year.

I thank Congressman Horn for his leadership in proposing this legislation. I certainly hope that we can act on this measure before we adjourn.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1753

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PROVIDING THAT AN ADOPTED ALIEN WHO IS LESS THAN 18 YEARS OF AGE MAY BE CONSIDERED A CHILD UNDER THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IF ADOPTED WITH OR AFTER A SIBLING WHO IS A CHILD UNDER SUCH ACT.

(a) In General.—Section 101(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) by inserting ‘‘(i)’’ after ‘‘(E);’’ and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(ii) subject to the same proviso as in clause (i), a child who (I) is a natural sibling of a child described in clause (i) or subparagraph (F)(i); (II) was adopted by the adoptive parent or parents of the sibling described in such clause or subparagraph; and (III) is otherwise described in clause (i), except that the child was adopted while under the age of eighteen years; or;’’; and

(2) in subparagraph (F)—

(A) by inserting ‘‘(i)’’ after ‘‘(F);’’

(B) by striking ‘‘period at the end and inserting ‘‘; or’’; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(ii) subject to the same proviso as in clause (i), a child who (I) is a natural sibling of a child described in clause (i) or subparagraph (E); (II) was adopted by the adoptive parent or parents of the sibling described in such clause or subparagraph; and (III) is otherwise described in clause (i), except that the child was adopted while under the age of eighteen years; or’’;

(b) Conforming Amendments Relating to Naturalization.—

(1) Definition of Child.—Section 101(c)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(c)(1)) is amended by striking ‘‘sixteen years,’’ and inserting ‘‘sixteen years (except to the extent that the child is described in subparagraph (E) or (F) of section 101(b)(1));’’ and

(2) Certificate of Citizenship.—Section 322(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1432(a)(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking ‘‘sixteen years’’ and inserting ‘‘sixteen years (except to the extent that the child is described in subparagraph (E) or (F) of section 101(b)(1));’’ and

(B) by striking ‘‘subparagraph (E) or (F) of section 101(b)(1);’’ and inserting ‘‘either of such subparagraphs.’’;

By Mr. Hatch (for himself and Mr. Leahy):

S. 1754. A bill entitled ‘‘Denying Safe Havens to International and War Criminals Act of 1999’’; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DENYING SAFE HAVENS TO INTERNATIONAL AND WAR CRIMINALS ACT OF 1999

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President. I rise today to introduce, along with Senator Leahy of Vermont, a bill entitled ‘‘Denying Safe Havens to International and War Criminals Act of 1999.’’ This is an important measure that I hope can move promptly through the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate. The provisions contained in this bill are crucial to efforts made internationally. I believe that it will give law enforcement critical tools in more effectively pursuing fugitives and war criminals.

I thank my ranking member for his work on this matter. This bill incorporates in title III, his own bill dealing with war criminals and it is an important component of this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to include the text of the bill in the Record.

[Data not available at time of printing.

Mr. Leahy. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today with Senator Hatch a bill to give United States law enforcement authorities important tools to help them combat international crime. The ‘‘Denying Safe Haven to International and War Criminals Act of 1999’’ contains a number of provisions that I have long supported.

Unfortunately, criminals, including terrorist directed at Americans and American interests abroad are part of our modern reality. Furthermore, organized criminal activity does not recognize national boundaries. With improvements in technology, criminals now can move about the world with ease. They can transfer funds with the push of a button, or use computers and credit card numbers to steal from American citizens and businesses from any spot on the globe. They can strike at Americans here and abroad. They can commit crimes abroad and flee quickly to another jurisdiction or country. The playing field keeps changing, and we need to be sure our laws can keep pace.

This bill would help make needed modifications in our laws, not with sweeping changes but with thoughtful provisions carefully targeted at specific problems faced by law enforcement. We cannot stop international crime without international cooperation, and this bill gives additional tools to investigators and prosecutors to promote such cooperation, while narrowing the room for maneuver that international criminals in terrorists now enjoy.

I initially introduced title I, section 4 of this bill, regarding fugitive dissemination, on April 30, 1998, in the ‘‘War on Drugs, Laundering Money and Combating Drugs in Prisons Act of 1998,’’ S. 211, with Senators Daschle, Kohl, Feinstein and Cleland. Again, on July 14, 1998, I introduced with Senator Biden, on behalf of the Administration, the ‘‘International Crime Control Act of 1998,’’ S. 2303, which contains most of the provisions set forth in this bill. Virtually all of the provisions in the bill were also included in

We have drawn from these more comprehensive bills a set of discrete improvements that enjoy bipartisan support so that important provisions may be enacted promptly. Each of these provisions has been a law enforcement priority.

Title I sets forth important proposals for combating international crime and denying safe havens to international criminals. In particular, section 3 would provide for extradition under certain circumstances for offenses not covered in a treaty or absent a treaty. Treaties negotiated many years ago specified the crimes for which extradition was provided. Developments in criminal activity, however, have outpaced the ability of countries to renegotiate treaties to include newly developing criminal activity. Under the bill, extradition would nevertheless proceed if the person was charged under legislation enacted in the United States or if the crime was particularly serious. Section 2 outlines procedures for the temporary transfer of incarcerated witnesses. Specifically, the bill would permit the United States, as a matter of reciprocity, to send persons in custody in the United States to a foreign country to stand trial where the Attorney General determines that such transfer would be made in conjunction with the Secretary of State.

Title II of the bill is designed to promote global cooperation in the fight against international crime. Specifically, section 1 would permit United States courts involved in multi-district litigation to enforce mutual legal assistance treaties and other agreements to execute foreign requests for assistance in criminal matters in all districts involved.

Section 2 outlines procedures for the temporary transfer of incarcerated witnesses. Specifically, the bill would permit the United States, as a matter of reciprocity, to send persons in custody in the United States to a foreign country to stand trial where the Attorney General determines that such transfer would be made in conjunction with the Secretary of State.

Section 3 would give the Attorney General authority to transfer a person in custody in the United States to a foreign country to stand trial where the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that such transfer would be consistent with the international obligations of the United States. The section also authorizes a transfer of a person in state custody in the United States to a foreign country to stand trial after a similar determination by the Attorney General and the consent of the State authorities. Similarly, the Attorney General is authorized to request the temporary transfer of a person in custody in a foreign country to face prosecution in a federal or state proceeding.

Section 4 is designed to stop drug kingpins, terrorists and other international fugitives from using our courts to fight to keep the proceeds of the very crimes for which they are wanted. Criminals should not be able to use our courts at the same time they are evading our laws.

Section 5 would permit the transfer of prisoners to their home country to serve their sentences, on a case-by-case basis, where such transfer is provided by treaty. Under this provision, the prisoner must consent to the transfer.

Section 6 would provide a statutory basis for holding and transferring prisoners who are sent from one foreign country to another through United States airports to prevent them from claiming asylum while they are temporarily in the United States.

Title II of the bill is designed to promote global cooperation in the fight against international crime. Specifically, section 1 would permit United States courts involved in multi-district litigation to enforce mutual legal assistance treaties and other agreements to execute foreign requests for assistance in criminal matters in all districts involved.

Section 2 outlines procedures for the temporary transfer of incarcerated witnesses. Specifically, the bill would permit the United States, as a matter of reciprocity, to send persons in custody in the United States to a foreign country to stand trial where the Attorney General determines that such transfer would be made in conjunction with the Secretary of State.

Section 3 would give the Attorney General authority to transfer a person in custody in the United States to a foreign country to stand trial where the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that such transfer would be consistent with the international obligations of the United States. The section also authorizes a transfer of a person in state custody in the United States to a foreign country to stand trial after a similar determination by the Attorney General and the consent of the State authorities. Similarly, the Attorney General is authorized to request the temporary transfer of a person in custody in a foreign country to face prosecution in a federal or state proceeding.

Section 4 is designed to stop drug kingpins, terrorists and other international fugitives from using our courts to fight to keep the proceeds of the very crimes for which they are wanted. Criminals should not be able to use our courts at the same time they are evading our laws.

Section 5 would permit the transfer of prisoners to their home country to serve their sentences, on a case-by-case basis, where such transfer is provided by treaty. Under this provision, the prisoner must consent to the transfer.

Section 6 would provide a statutory basis for holding and transferring prisoners who are sent from one foreign country to another through United States airports to prevent them from claiming asylum while they are temporarily in the United States.

Title II of the bill is designed to promote global cooperation in the fight against international crime. Specifically, section 1 would permit United States courts involved in multi-district litigation to enforce mutual legal assistance treaties and other agreements to execute foreign requests for assistance in criminal matters in all districts involved.

Section 2 outlines procedures for the temporary transfer of incarcerated witnesses. Specifically, the bill would permit the United States, as a matter of reciprocity, to send persons in custody in the United States to a foreign country to stand trial where the Attorney General determines that such transfer would be made in conjunction with the Secretary of State.

Section 3 would give the Attorney General authority to transfer a person in custody in the United States to a foreign country to stand trial where the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that such transfer would be consistent with the international obligations of the United States. The section also authorizes a transfer of a person in state custody in the United States to a foreign country to stand trial after a similar determination by the Attorney General and the consent of the State authorities. Similarly, the Attorney General is authorized to request the temporary transfer of a person in custody in a foreign country to face prosecution in a federal or state proceeding.

Section 4 is designed to stop drug kingpins, terrorists and other international fugitives from using our courts to fight to keep the proceeds of the very crimes for which they are wanted. Criminals should not be able to use our courts at the same time they are evading our laws.

Section 5 would permit the transfer of prisoners to their home country to serve their sentences, on a case-by-case basis, where such transfer is provided by treaty. Under this provision, the prisoner must consent to the transfer.

Section 6 would provide a statutory basis for holding and transferring prisoners who are sent from one foreign country to another through United States airports to prevent them from claiming asylum while they are temporarily in the United States.

Title II of the bill is designed to promote global cooperation in the fight against international crime. Specifically, section 1 would permit United States courts involved in multi-district litigation to enforce mutual legal assistance treaties and other agreements to execute foreign requests for assistance in criminal matters in all districts involved.

Section 2 outlines procedures for the temporary transfer of incarcerated witnesses. Specifically, the bill would permit the United States, as a matter of reciprocity, to send persons in custody in the United States to a foreign country to stand trial where the Attorney General determines that such transfer would be made in conjunction with the Secretary of State.
Section 2. Establishment of the Office of Special Investigations

Title III—Anti-Atrocity Alien Deportation

Section 1. Inadmissibility and Removability of Aliens Who Have Committed Acts of Torture or Punishment

Section 6. Transit of Fugitives for Incarcerated Witnesses

Section 5. Transfer of Foreign Person to a Foreign Country

The Mobile Telecommunications Sourcing Act of 1999. This legislation is the product of more than a year’s worth of negotiations between the Governors, cities, State tax and local tax authorities, and the wireless industry.

The legislation represents an historic agreement between State and local governments and the wireless industry to bring sanity to the manner in which wireless telecommunications services are taxed.

For as long as we have had wireless telecommunications in this country, we have had a taxation system that is incredibly complex for carriers and costly for consumers. Today, there are several different methodologies that determine whether a taxing jurisdiction may tax a wireless call.

If a call originates at a cell site located in a jurisdiction, it may impose a tax. If a call originates at a switch in the jurisdiction, no tax may be imposed. If the billing address is in the jurisdiction, a tax can be imposed.

As a result, many different taxing authorities can tax the same wireless call. The farther you travel during a call, the greater the number of taxes that can be imposed upon it.

This system is simply not sustainable as wireless calls represent an increasing portion of the total number of calls made throughout the United States. To reduce the cost of making wireless calls, Senator DORGAN and I are introducing this legislation.

The legislation would create a nationwide, uniform system for the taxation of wireless calls. The only jurisdictions that would have the authority to tax mobile calls would be the taxing authorities of the customer’s place of primary use, which would essentially be the customer’s home or office.

By creating this uniform system, Congress would greatly simplify the taxation of wireless calls. The wireless industry would not have to keep track of countless tax laws for each wireless transaction.

State and local taxing authorities would be relieved of burdensome audit and oversight responsibilities without losing the authority to tax wireless calls. And, most importantly, consumers would see reduced wireless rates and fewer bills sent through the mail.

The Mobile Telecommunications Sourcing Act is a win-win-win. It’s a win for industry, a win for government, and a win for consumers. I thank Senator DORGAN and my colleagues for their efforts in crafting this bill. And, most of all, I thank government and industry for coming together and reaching agreement on this important issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

[Data not available at time of printing.]

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today my colleague Senator BROWNBACK and I are introducing legislation that is designed to address a highly complex issue with respect to taxation of mobile telecommunications service. Although the issue is complex, the solution is a simple, practical, reliable and uniform method of taxation on wireless telecommunications services that works best for consumers.

Currently, the mobility of wireless telecommunications services makes the taxing by state and local jurisdictions a complicated and expensive task for carriers and consumers because questions arise as to whether the tax is levied in the location in which the call is placed or where the consumer resides. Because this situation is difficult to monitor, state and local jurisdictions the prospects of non-compliance and double taxation are also of concern. For example, a person driving between Baltimore, Maryland and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania can pass through 12 separate state and local taxing jurisdictions.

In the two hours it would take someone to make that 100 mile drive, several phone calls could be made under a cloud of uncertainty that works for no one, not the consumer, not the carrier, and not the taxing jurisdictions.

This scenario presents us with a challenge to the traditional method of taxation in the face of the growing popularity of mobile communications systems. It is a case that needs to be changed.

The Mobile Telecommunications Sourcing Act is, in itself, an achievement. This legislation was developed through 3 years of dedicated, good faith negotiations between the industry and state and local government organizations. Rather than allow an unworkable situation to continue unresolved and rather than ignite a polemical political battle, we are introducing legislation that works for no one, not the consumer, not the carrier, and not the taxing jurisdictions.

This scenario presents us with challenge to the traditional method of taxation in the face of the growing popularity of mobile communications systems. It is a case that needs to be changed.
Under this legislation, a consumer’s primary place of residence would be designated as the taxing jurisdiction for the purposes of taxing roaming and other charges that are subject to state and local taxation. This legislation does not as easily to collaborate with the national labs as it should be, nor are collaborations as common as they need to be to keep our labs on the cutting edge of science and technology. This legislation takes the next steps in that direction.

There are three fundamental ideas running through this bill. The first is that scientific and technical collaboration with the national labs is good for our economy and essential to the fulfillment of our national missions. The second idea is that the bulk of cutting edge technology is today. Consider the following: Real federal spending on R&D peaked in 1987, but from 1987 to 1997, national R&D grew by 20%. The federal government was responsible for none of that growth, and now accounts for only a quarter of national R&D spending. In the same period, industrial R&D grew by over 20% of the growth in national R&D. As Nobel laureate Dr. Burt Richter stated during his testimony on DOE’s reorganization, “All of the science needed for stockpile stewardship is not done in government labs.” That’s why I was so concerned with the ability of the labs to collaborate during the reorganization debate.

I emphasize how collaboration helps the labs because it’s a point that’s often missed in our discussions of tech transfer, CRADAs, and other such things. When legislation makes it easier to work with the labs was passed in 1989, we were in the midst of a “competitiveness crisis” and looking for ways to use technology to improve our economic performance. After all, innovation is responsible for 50% or more of our long term economic growth. With these roots, people usually focus on how collaborating with the labs helps the industry achieve access to a treasure trove of technology and expertise. For example, over a 100 new companies were started around DOE technology in the last four years. And, the fact that industry has been collaborating with the labs and recently paying for a greater share of those partnerships is good evidence that its getting something of value. The economic benefits from these collaborations are real and a primary reason I’ve pushed them for many years. But the benefits to the labs are real too. A recent letter from Los Alamos to me stated, “Working with industry has validated our ability to predict . . . changes in materials . . . improved our ability to manufacture . . . replacement parts with greater precision and lower cost, and enhanced our ability to assure the safety and reliability of the stockpile without testing.”

As an example, Sandia’s collaboration with Goodyear Tire has helped Goodyear produce computer simulations of tires—an extremely complex problem—and helped Sandia improve its modeling and production of neutron generators, a critical component of nuclear weapons. Technical collaborations with our labs that have a clear mission focus by the lab and a clear business focus by the company are good for our economy and good for the labs’ missions.

The second fundamental idea flows from the first. If collaborations with the labs are beneficial, we should keep working to make them better, faster, and more flexible—much like the collaborations we see throughout the private sector. Hence, this bill includes provisions to:

- Establish a small business advocate at the labs chartered with increasing small business participation in lab procurement and collaborative research.
- Establish a technology partnership ombudsman at the labs to ensure that the labs are known as good faith partners in their technical relationships.

Significantly streamline the CRADA approval process for government-owned, contractor operated laboratories like Sandia, allowing the labs to handle more of the routine CRADAs themselves and allowing more flexibility in the negotiation of intellectual property rights—all to make CRADA’s more attractive to industry.

The third fundamental idea that runs through this bill is that if collaboration is important to our economy and to the success of the labs, then the local technical institutions near the lab—the universities and companies that might work with the lab—matter a great deal. We know that the environment inside an institution, how it’s managed, will help determine how innovative it is. Managing innovation is more art than science, and that’s why people are always visiting places like 3M.

Well, just as the internal environment affects how innovative an organization is, its external environment, the organizations near it that might collaborate with it, also help determine how innovative it is. When the technical institutions in a region form a high quality, dynamic network, they can meld into what’s been called a “technology cluster” that dramatically boosts innovation and economic growth throughout the region. We see this most famously in places like Silicon Valley, or Route 128, or Austin, TX. In most of these places, there is a large research university that serves as the anchor innovator the cluster.

With that phenomena in mind, this bill seeks to harness the power of technology clusters for the benefit of the labs’ missions and the labs’ communities, with the labs as the anchor innovator. The bill authorizes the labs to...
work with their local communities to foster commercially oriented technology clusters that will help them do their job. Projects under this “Regional Technology Infrastructure Program” would be cost shared partnerships between a lab and nearby organizations with the potential to help the lab achieve its mission, leverage commercial technology, and commercialize lab technology. This is not about outsourcing a lab’s functions, but about promoting technical capabilities that are commercially viable and useful to the lab. Thus, the lab gets highly competent collaborators nearby and the region gets high tech economic growth.

Let me give an example. Imagine a lab that does research in optics that has optics companies nearby. The lab and the companies discover they both need better training for their machinists and skilled workers. So they agree to set up and share the cost of an advanced training program for their workers at the local community college. This is good for the workers, good for the companies, good for the lab. Other types of projects this program might fund include:

- Local economic surveys and strategic planning efforts;
- Technology roadmaps for local industry;
- Personnel exchanges among local universities, firms, and the lab;
- Lab based small business incubators or research parks; and
- Joint research programs between a group of local firms and the lab.

We have some real life examples of this kind of thinking in the research parks Sandia and Los Alamos are setting up to collaborate with industry and promote economic growth. And Argonne, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, and Sandia have programs to link their technology with industry, to get it into the marketplace, which can only help advance the lab’s mission. This bill will encourage the labs to systematically experiment with more projects like those.

Now, some might think that the Internet will make proximity irrelevant to collaboration. But that’s not the case, as simple observation of Silicon Valley shows; it’s not been dis-\

Mr. President, for many years I’ve worked on this issue. Projects under this “Regional Technology Infrastructure Program” would be cost shared partnerships between a lab and nearby organizations with the potential to help the lab achieve its mission, leverage commercial technology, and commercialize lab technology. This is not about outsourcing a lab’s functions, but about promoting technical capabilities that are commercially viable and useful to the lab. Thus, the lab gets highly competent collaborators nearby and the region gets high tech economic growth.

Let me give an example. Imagine a lab that does research in optics that has optics companies nearby. The lab and the companies discover they both need better training for their machinists and skilled workers. So they agree to set up and share the cost of an advanced training program for their workers at the local community college. This is good for the workers, good for the companies, good for the lab. Other types of projects this program might fund include:

- Local economic surveys and strategic planning efforts;
- Technology roadmaps for local industry;
- Personnel exchanges among local universities, firms, and the lab;
- Lab based small business incubators or research parks; and
- Joint research programs between a group of local firms and the lab.

We have some real life examples of this kind of thinking in the research parks Sandia and Los Alamos are setting up to collaborate with industry and promote economic growth. And Argonne, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, and Sandia have programs to link their technology with industry, to get it into the marketplace, which can only help advance the lab’s mission. This bill will encourage the labs to systematically experiment with more projects like those.

Now, some might think that the Internet will make proximity irrelevant to collaboration. But that’s not the case, as simple observation of Silicon Valley shows; it’s not been dis-
simply handled by a GOIC by eliminating extra steps now required for CRADA with them.

**Technology Industries Association of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, October 13, 1999.**

Hon. Jeff Bingaman,
U.S. Senator, Hart Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Bingaman: On behalf of the board of directors of the Technology Industries Association of New Mexico (TIA), I am sending this letter to express our support of legislation you are introducing, the National Laboratories Partnership Improvement Act of 1999.

Members of our organization are well aware of the benefits that already have occurred via the "technology transfer" process begun with the Stevenson-Wydler Act of 1980 and continuing since with various improvements and changes to the original measure. Although most of the member companies in TIA do not engage in direct sales to or contracting with the Federal government or military a number of these companies have benefited due to the technology transfer process.

At least one of our TIA members was created as a spin-off of Sandia National Laboratories. Some of the larger multinational companies in New Mexico have benefited via CRADA arrangements. And some of our other smaller member companies have been greatly aided through the simple but effective mechanism of the technology assistance program run by Sandia.

After reviewing draft versions of your proposed legislation, we particularly like two features:

The provision that the national laboratories can link with private companies, rather than the other way around. We think this is important, because as much as private companies can and have been aided via access to the vast R&D capabilities of the national labs, it is also important that the government institutions learn from private companies those skills necessary to succeed in the intensely competitive international free-market economies.

The section which promotes the development of technology clusters in the local economies where national laboratories are located. This strategic approach to economic development is beginning to emerge in central New Mexico with the help of your office and others. We think this is important, because much of our national economic development lies within reach, but a lot of our expertise remains behind the laboratory gates.

TIA thanks you for your effort and is hopeful the legislation will be enacted.

Sincerely,

John P. Jekowski,
President.

City of Albuquerque,
Albuquerque, NM, October 13, 1999.

Jeff Bingaman,
U.S. Senator, Hart Building,
Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Bingaman: On behalf of the citizens of Albuquerque, I want to state my strong support of your proposed legislation, "The National Laboratories Partnership Improvement Act of 1999." For the past 50 years the synergy among our scientific, civic, and educational communities and the Department of Energy’s national laboratories has helped to build and enhance our modern city. While we welcome these working partnerships, we recognize that stronger technical relationships between laboratories, private businesses, and other nearby institutions are needed to leverage additional resources, both public and private, and promote high tech economic growth at the local, regional, and national levels.

Your leadership in the past and your thorough understanding of the complex issues involving technology transfer has deeply benefited Albuquerque’s economic diversification, job growth, and stability. The legislation provides an important and timely framework for the future, and we look forward to working with you and your staff in whatever way necessary to implement it. To that end, we would hope that monies generated by the legislation might come directly to the community, and not go to existing or proposed lab tech transfer programs. This will enable our business, institutional and civic leadership to develop the infrastructure required by this well-crafted, thoughtful, and far-reaching proposal.

Sincerely,

Jim Baca,
Mayor.

By Mr. Coverdell (for himself, Mr. Dewine, and Mr. Grassley).

S. 1758. A bill to authorize urgent support for Colombia and front line states to secure peace and the rule of law, to enhance the effectiveness of anti-drug efforts that are essential to impeding the flow of deadly cocaine and heroin from Colombia to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DeWine, Mr. President, the current situation in Colombia is a nightmare. Embroiled in a bloody, complex civil war, the Colombian state is spiraling toward collapse. Since the early 1990s, more than 35,000 Colombians have lost their lives at the hands of two well-financed, heavily-armed guerrilla insurgency groups, along with a competing band of ruthless paramilitary operatives, hell bent on crushing the group of leftist guerrillas. Sadly, many of those killed so far have been innocent civilians caught in the constant cross-fire.

The American habit is at the core of the Colombian crisis, with drug users and pushers in this country subsidizing the anti-democratic leftists. Americans want drugs. The drug traffickers want money. To ensure their prosperity and to maintain a profitable industry, the traffickers essentially hire the guerrillas and, increasingly, the paramilitary groups to protect their livelihoods. Violence and instability reign. Democracy is crumbling.

That's why, Mr. President, today, along with my colleague Senator Coverdell, we are introducing the Anti-Drug Alliance with Colombia and the Andean Region Act of 1999. This comprehensive bill is designed to promote peace and stability in Colombia and the Latin American region. Our colleague, Senator Grassley also joins us as a co-sponsor. We believe it is time that our government work in conjunction with the government and the people of Colombia to help lessen the growing crisis.

The problems in Colombia run deep. There are no easy "overnight" solutions. If we are to assist in creating and sustaining long-term stability in Colombia, we must commit the resources to achieving that end. It is in our national interest to support Colombia in its effort to thwart further destabilization. Without a strong Colombian government, drug traffickers will flourish, an abundant and steady flow of illicit drugs will head for the United States, one of our largest export markets in the western hemisphere will continue to falter, and a democratic government will further erode.

Just a couple of weeks ago, I met with Colombian President Pastrana during his visit to Washington. We discussed how our two countries can work together—in cooperation—to eliminate drugs from our hemisphere and to begin restoring democracy and the rule of law in Colombia.

For more than three decades, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, otherwise known as the FARC, and the National Liberation Army (ELN) have waged the longest-running guerrilla insurgency in Latin America. Both rebel groups have a combined strength of between 15,000 and 20,000 full-time guerrillas. These armed terrorists control or influence up to 60% of rural Colombia. At present, the Colombian military does not appear to have the strength and resources to counter these menacing forces.

Well over a decade ago, the biggest threat to stability from within our hemisphere was communism—Soviet and Cuban communists pushing their anti-democratic movement in Central America. We overcame that threat. Under the Reagan and Bush Administrations, Democracy prevailed. Today, in our hemisphere, the communists have been replaced by drug traffickers and the rebels they hire to protect their lucrative industry. These drug traffickers also are financing the roughly 5,000 armed paramilitary combatants, whose self-appointed mission is to counter the strength of the leftist guerrillas. If we hope to have any impact at all in eliminating the drugs in our cities, in our schools, and in our homes, we need to attack drug trafficking head on—here and abroad. This is how we can help both the people of Colombia and the people of our own country.

With the help of my colleagues, Senators Paul Coverdell, Bob Graham and Charles Grassley, last year we passed the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, which was a much-needed step toward attacking the drug problem at its core. This Act is a $2.7 billion, three-year investment, to rebuild our drug fighting capability outside our borders. This law is about reclaiming the federal government's exclusive responsibility to prevent drugs from ever reaching our borders. This law is about building a hemisphere free from the violent and decaying influence of drug traffickers. This is a law that stops drugs before they ever reach our kids in Ohio.

This bill was necessary because the Clinton Administration, since coming...
into office, has slashed funding levels for international counter-narcotics efforts. By turning its back for the better part of this decade on the fight against drugs abroad, this Administration has contributed inadvertedly to the growth of drug-trafficking organizations, as well as the narco-terrorists in the region.

If one principle has guided American foreign policy consistently since the dawn of our nation, it is this: The peace and stability of our own hemisphere must come first. That certainly has been the case throughout the last century. The Spanish-American War, the Cuban Missile Crisis, the democratization of Latin America in the 1980s, and the North American Free Trade Agreement in the 1990s—all of these key events were approached with the same premise: A strong, free, and prosperous hemisphere means a strong, free, and prosperous United States.

Consistent with that principle, the United States must take an active role in seeking a peaceful, democratic Colombia. That is why Senator COVERDELL, who just came back from Colombia, and I have developed a comprehensive assistance plan for Colombia. The Alliance Act of 1999 would authorize $1.6 billion over three years to support:

1. Alternative crop and economic development; 2. Drug interdiction programs; 3. Human rights and rule of law programs; and 4. Military and police counter-narcotics operations.

Our plan also contains provisions for counter-narcotics assistance and crop alternative development programs for other Latin American countries, including Brazil, Bolivia, Peru, Panama, Venezuela, and Ecuador.

Our plan not only provides the means to eradicate and interdict illicit drugs, but it is the beginning of a process that would enable our country to help itself.

Our plan would monitor the assistance to the Colombian security forces, so we can be sure that this assistance is used effectively for its intended purpose and does not fall into the hands of those who engage in gross violations of human rights and drug trafficking.

We urge the Colombian government to take the current situation against the often over-looked paramilitaries. They are a growing part of the problem in Colombia and should not be ignored.

Our plan is comprehensive. Our plan is balanced. It is our commitment to assisting the Government of Colombia and our interest in working together to bring peace and security to the hemisphere.

Mr. President, this is not an "America Knows Best" plan. We consulted with those who are on the front-lines in Colombia—those who know best what Colombia needs right now. We have talked with the Colombian government, including President Pastrana, to inquire about Colombia's specific needs. We also have consulted with U.S. government officials, who have confirmed our belief that a plan for Colombia must be balanced if we hope to address the complex and dangerous elements of the current situation.

Frankly, Mr. President, it is my hope that the Administration will proactively work with Congress—and most importantly, Colombia—to turn the tide against those seeking to undermine democracy in the region. We must act now—too much is at risk to wait any longer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1758

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Alliance with Colombia and the Andean Region (ALIANZA) Act of 1999".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Purposes.
Sec. 3. Findings.
Sec. 4. Definitions.

TITLE I—UNITED STATES POLICY AND PERSONNEL

Sec. 101. Statement of policy regarding support for democracy, peace, the rule of law, and human rights in Colombia.
Sec. 102. Requirement for a comprehensive regional strategy to support Colombia and the front line states.
Sec. 103. Availability of funds conditioned upon the implementation of strategic plans and application of congressional notification procedures.
Sec. 104. Limitation on availability of funds.
Sec. 105. Sense of Congress on unimpeded access by Colombian law enforcement officials to all areas of the national territory of Colombia.
Sec. 106. Extradition of narcotics traffickers.
Sec. 107. Additional personnel requirements for the United States mission in Colombia.
Sec. 108. Sense of Congress on a special coordinator on Colombia.
Sec. 110. Sense of Congress on members of Colombian security forces and members of Colombian irregular forces.

TITLE II—ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED

Subtitle A—Democracy, Peace, the Rule of Law, and Human Rights in Colombia

Sec. 201. Support for democracy, peace, the rule of law, and human rights in Colombia.
Sec. 202. United States emergency humanitarian assistance fund for internally displaced population in Colombia.
Sec. 203. Investigation by Colombian Attorney General of drug trafficking and human rights abuses by irregular forces and security forces.
Sec. 204. Report on Colombian military justice.
Sec. 205. Denial of visas to and inadmissibility of aliens who have been involved in drug trafficking and human rights violations in Colombia.

Subtitle B—Eradication of Drug Production and Interdiction of Drug Trafficking

Sec. 211. Targeting new illicit cultivation and mobilizing the Colombian security forces against the narcotics trafficking threat.
Sec. 212. Reinvigoration of efforts to interdict illicit narcotics in Colombia.
Sec. 213. Enhancement of Colombian police and navy law enforcement activities nationwide.
Sec. 214. Targeting illicit assets of irregular forces.
Sec. 215. Enhancement of regional interdiction of illicit drugs.
Sec. 216. Revised authorities for provision of additional support for counter-drug activities of Colombia and Peru.
Sec. 217. Sense of Congress on assistance to Brazil.
Sec. 218. Monitoring of assistance for Colombian security forces.
Sec. 219. Development of alternatives to the illicit drug trade.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to prescribe broad measures to confront the threat to United States interests of continued instability in Colombia;
(2) to defend constitutional order, the rule of law, and human rights, which will benefit all persons;
(3) to support the democratically elected Government of the Republic of Colombia to secure a firm and lasting end to the armed conflict and lawlessness within its territory, which now costs countless lives, threatens regional security, and undermines effective anti-drug efforts;
(4) to require the President to design and implement an urgent, comprehensive, and adequately funded plan of support for Colombia and its neighbors;
(5) to authorize adequate funds to implement an urgent and comprehensive plan of economic development and anti-drug support for Colombia and the front line states;
(6) to authorize indispensable material, technical, and logistical support to enhance the effectiveness of anti-drug efforts that are essential to impeding the deadly cocaine and heroin from Colombia to the United States; and
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(7) to bolster the capacity of the front line states to confront the current destabilizing effects of the Colombia conflict and to resist illicit narcotics trafficking activities that may serve to erode the enhanced law enforcement efforts in Colombia.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Adult and youthful lawlessness in Colombia present a clear and present danger to the security of the front line states, to law enforcement efforts intended to stem the flow of cocaine and heroin, and, therefore, to the well-being of the people of the United States.

(2) Colombia is a democratic country fighting mainly against the Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), paramilitary organizations, and international narcotics trafficking kingpins.

(3) With 34 percent of world terrorist acts committed there, Colombia is the world's third most dangerous country in terms of political violence.

(4) Colombia is the world's kidnapping capital of the world with 2,609 kidnappings reported in 1996 and 513 reported in the first three months of 1999.

(5) In 1998 alone, 308,000 Colombians were internally displaced in Colombia. During the last decade, 350,000 Colombians have been killed.

(6) The FARC and the ELN are the two main guerrilla groups that have waged the longest-running anti-government insurgency in Latin America.

(7) The FARC and the ELN engage in systematic extortion through the abductions of United States citizens, have murdered United States citizens, profit from the illegal drug trade, and engage in systematic and indiscriminate crimes, including kidnapping, torture, murder, and against Colombian civil and security forces.

(8) The FARC and the ELN have targeted United States Government personnel, private United States citizens, and United States business interests.

(9) In March 1999, the FARC murdered three kidnapped United States human rights workers near the international border between Colombia and Venezuela.

(10) The Colombian rebels are estimated to have a strength of 10,000 to 20,000 full-time guerrillas, and they have initiated armed action in nearly 70% of the country's 1,050 municipalities and control or influence roughly 60% of rural combat.

(11) The Government of Colombia has recovered 5,000 new AK-47s from guerrilla caches. The FARC has plotted to use $3,000,000 in funds earned from drug trafficking to buy 30,000 AK-47s.

(12) Although the Colombian Army has 220,000 troops, there are no more than 40,000 soldiers available for offensive combat operations.

(13) Colombia faces the threat of an estimated 100,000 paramilitary organizations, which engage in lawless acts and undermine the peace process.

(14) Paramilitary organizations profit from the illegal drug trade and engage in systematic and indiscriminate crimes, including extortion, kidnapping, torture, and murder, against Colombian civilians.

(15) The conflict in Colombia is creating instability along its borders with neighboring countries, Ecuador, Panama, Peru, and Venezuela, several of which have deployed forces to their border with Colombia.

(16) Coca production has increased 28 percent in Colombia since 1998, and already 75 percent of the coca and 75 percent of the heroin seized in the northeast United States is of Colombian origin.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Except as provided in section 218, the term ‘‘appropriate congressional committees’’ means—

(A) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

(2) FRONT LINE STATES.—The term ‘‘front line states’’ means Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela.

(3) ILLEGAL DRUG TRAFFICKING.—The term ‘‘illicit drug trafficking’’ means illicit trafficking in narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances, and other controlled substances (as defined in section 802(6) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(6))), as such activities are described by any international narcotics control agreement to which the United States is a party, the domestic law of the country in whose territory or airspace the interdiction is occurring.

(4) IRREGULAR FORCES.—The term ‘‘irregular forces’’ means irregular armed groups engaged in illegal activities, including the Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), and paramilitary organizations.

(5) TITLES.—The title ‘‘United States Policy and Personnel’’ shall only be made available—

Title 1—United States Policy and Personnel

SEC. 101. STATEMENT OF POLICY REGARDING SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRACY, PEACE, THE RULE OF LAW, AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN COLOMBIA.

It shall be the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the democratically elected Government of the Republic of Colombia in its efforts to secure a firm and lasting end to the armed conflict and lawlessness within its territory, which now costs countless lives, threatens regional security, and undermines effective anti-drug efforts.

(2) to insist that the Government of Colombia complete urgent reform measures intended to open its economy fully to foreign investors and competition in the petroleum industry, as a path toward economic recovery and self-sufficiency;

(3) to promote the protection of human rights in Colombia by conditioning assistance to security forces on respect for all internationally recognized human rights;

(4) to support Colombian authorities in strengthening judicial and investigative capabilities to bring to justice any person against whom there exists credible evidence of gross violations of human rights;

(5) to expose the lawlessness and gross human rights violations committed by irregular forces in Colombia; and

(6) to mobilize international support for the democratically elected Government of the Republic of Colombia so that the Government can resist making unilateral concessions that undermine the credibility of their peace process.

SEC. 102. REQUIREMENT FOR A COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL STRATEGY TO SUPPORT COLOMBIA AND THE FRONT LINE STATES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and the Caucus on International Narcotics Control of the Senate a report on the current United States policy and strategy regarding United States counternarcotics assistance for Colombia and the front line states.

(b) REPORT ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) The primary and second priorities of the United States in its relations with Colombia and the front line states that are the source of most of the illicit narcotics entering the United States.

(2) The actions required of the United States to support and promote such priorities.

(3) A schedule for implementing actions in order of their strategic importance.

(4) The role of the United States in the efforts of the Government of Colombia to deal with illegal drug production in Colombia.

(5) The role of the United States in the efforts of the Government of Colombia to deal with the insurgency in Colombia.

(6) The role of the United States in the efforts of the Government of Colombia to deal with irregular forces in Colombia.

(7) How the strategy with respect to Colombia relates to the United States strategy for the front line states.

(8) How the strategy with respect to Colombia relates to the United States strategy for fulfilling global counternarcotics goals.

(9) Strategy and funding for providing urgent material, technical, and logistical support to Colombia and the front line states in order to defend the rule of law and to more effectively impede the cultivation, production, transit, and sale of illicit narcotics.

SEC. 103. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS CONDITIONED ON SUBMISSION OF STRATEGIC PLAN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES.

Funds made available to carry out this Act shall only be made available—

(1) upon submission to Congress by the President of the plan required by section 102; and

(2) in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications.
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Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I would like to make a statement on the debate on the Colombia Plan, which is on the floor as an amendment to the Senate resolution 48. The responsibility of the United States Congress is to provide strong and effective leadership in the battle against drug abuse and the spread of international crime. The United States has a special responsibility as Colombia’s principal trading partner, as an ally in the hemispheric drug war, and as a key investor in the Colombian economy. We should build on our success, not lose momentum. We should support, not undermine, Colombia’s fight. The House has already passed this resolution. The Senate is now considering a different resolution. We need a comprehensive strategy, not piecemeal measures. We need political commitment, not political bash in the United States. Last year, the Administration asked for $455 million in counternarcotics assistance to Colombia. Last year, the Senate Appropriations Committee recommended $482 million. This year, the bill is $350 million. I think we have the strategy right. I want to thank President Salinas for listening and responding to our requests. I am very pleased with the Colombian strategy, and we need to fully fund it, not try to amend it. The Congressional Budget Office has said that this aid is cost-effective. This aid is a fungible investment, not a blank check. I want to thank the Administra-

SEC. 104. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

(a) INELIGIBILITY OF UNITS OF SECURITY FORCES FOR ASSISTANCE.—The same restrictions contained in section 566 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(d) of division A of Public Law 105-277) and section 8130 of Public Law 105-262 that apply to the availability of funds under those Acts shall apply to the availability of funds under this Act.

(b) ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS.—In addition to the restrictions prescribed in subsection (a), those restrictions shall apply with respect to the availability of funds for aid to units of the security forces of Colombia if the Secretary of State reports to Congress that credible evidence exists that a member of that unit has provided material support to irregular forces in Colombia or to any criminal narcotics trafficking syndicates that operate in Colombia. The Secretary of State may detail such evidence in a classified annex to any such report, if necessary.

SEC. 105. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON UNIMPEDED ACCESS BY COLOMBIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS TO ALL AREAS OF THE NATIONAL TERRITORY OF COLOMBIA.

It is the sense of Congress that the effectiveness of United States anti-drug assistance to Colombia depends on the ability of law enforcement officials of that country having access to all areas of the national territory of Colombia for the purposes of carrying out the interdiction of illegal narcotics and the eradication of illicit crops.

SEC. 106. EXTRACTION OF NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the governments of Colombia and the governments of the front line states shall take effective steps to prevent the creation of a safe haven for narcotics traffickers by ensuring that narcotics traffickers indicted in the United States are promptly arrested, prosecuted, and sentenced to the maximum extent of the law and, upon the request of the United States Government, extradited to the United States for trial for their egregious offenses against the security and well-being of the people of the United States.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every six months thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report setting forth—

(1) a list of the persons whose extradition has been requested from Colombia or the front line states, indicating those persons who—

(A) have been surrendered to the custody of United States authorities;

(B) have been detained by authorities of Colombia or any state that is not under United States control and who are being processed for extradition;

(C) have been detained by the authorities of Colombia or a front line state and who are not yet determined inadmissible for extradition; or

(D) are at large;

(2) a determination whether or not authorities of Colombia and the front line states are taking all possible steps to facilitate the prompt extradition of each of the persons sought by United States authorities; and

(3) an analysis of—

(A) any legal obstacles in the laws of Colombia and of the front line states to the prompt extradition of persons sought by United States authorities; and

(B) the steps taken by authorities of the United States and the authorities of each such state to remove such obstacles.

SEC. 107. ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE UNITED STATES MISSION IN COLOMBIA.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing an examination of the options available to address the needs of the internally displaced population of Colombia, to monitor compliance with any international obligations, and to assist the return of the forcibly displaced to their homes only when the safety of civilians is fully assured and they return voluntarily.

(b) FUNDING.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing an examination of the options available to address the needs of the internally displaced population of Colombia, to monitor compliance with any international obligations, and to assist the return of the forcibly displaced to their homes only when the safety of civilians is fully assured and they return voluntarily.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Government should provide assistance to forcibly displaced persons in Colombia; and

(2) the Government of Colombia should support the return of the forcibly displaced to their homes only when the safety of civilians is fully assured and they return voluntarily.

(c) AUTHORIZATION TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—The President is authorized—

(1) to provide assistance to the internally displaced population of Colombia; and

(2) to assist in the temporary resettlement of the internally displaced Colombians.

(d) FUNDING.—Amounts authorized under section 101(b) of the Act shall be available to the President for purposes of activities under subsection (c).

SEC. 108. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON A SPECIAL COORDINATOR ON COLOMBIA.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should designate a special coordinator on Colombia with sufficient authority—

(1) to coordinate interagency efforts to prepare and implement a comprehensive regional strategy to support Colombia and the front line states;

(2) to advocate within the executive branch adequate funding for and urgent delivery of assistance authorized by this Act; and

(3) to coordinate diplomatic efforts to maximize international political and financial support for Colombia and the front line states.

SEC. 109. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DEATH OF THREE UNITED STATES CITIZENS IN COLOMBIA IN MARCH 1999.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should designate a special coordinator on Colombia with sufficient authority—

(a) to coordinate interagency efforts to prepare and implement a comprehensive regional strategy to support Colombia and the front line states;

(b) to advocate within the executive branch adequate funding for and urgent delivery of assistance authorized by this Act; and

(c) to coordinate diplomatic efforts to maximize international political and financial support for Colombia and the front line states.

SEC. 110. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MEMBERS OF COLOMBIAN SECURITY FORCES AND MEMBERS OF COLOMBIAN IRREGULAR FORCES.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) any links between members of Colombian irregular forces and members of Colombian security forces are deeply troubling and clearly counterproductive to the effort to combat drug trafficking and the prevention of human rights violations; and

(2) the involvement of Colombian irregular forces in drug trafficking and in systematic human rights abuses, especially in the cases of perpetrators who are members of the Colombian military and police, is deplorable and contrary to United States interests and policy.

TITLE II—ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED

Subtitle A—Democracy, Peace, the Rule of Law, and Human Rights in Colombia

SEC. 201. SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRACY, PEACE, THE RULE OF LAW, AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN COLOMBIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to support programs and activities to advance democracy, peace, the rule of law, and human rights in Colombia, including—

(1) the deployment of international observers, upon the request of the Congress of Colombia, to monitor compliance with any peace initiative of the Government of Colombia;

(2) support for credible, internationally recognized, independent human rights organizations working in Colombia;

(3) support for the Human Rights Unit of the Attorney General of Colombia;

(4) to enhance the rule of law through training of judges, prosecutors, and other judicial officials and through a witness protection program;

(5) to improve police investigative training and facilities and related civilian police activities; and

(6) to strengthen a credible military justice system, including technical support by the United States Judge Advocate General, and strengthen existing human rights monitors within the ranks of the military.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purpose, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President $100,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 1999, and ending September 30, 2002, to carry out subsection (a).

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) are authorized to remain available until expended.

(c) AUTHORIZATION TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—The President is authorized—

(1) to provide assistance to the internally displaced population of Colombia; and

(2) to assist in the temporary resettlement of the internally displaced Colombians.

(d) FUNDING.—Amounts authorized under section 201(b) of the Act shall be available to the President for purposes of activities under subsection (c).

SEC. 202. UNITED STATES EMERGENCY HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR INTERNALLY FORCED DISPLACED POPULATION IN COLOMBIA.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Government should provide assistance to forcibly displaced persons in Colombia; and

(2) the Government of Colombia should support the return of the forcibly displaced to their homes only when the safety of civilians is fully assured and they return voluntarily.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing an examination of the options available to address the needs of the internally displaced population of Colombia, to monitor compliance with any international obligations, and to assist the return of the forcibly displaced to their homes only when the safety of civilians is fully assured and they return voluntarily.

(c) AUTHORIZATION TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—The President is authorized—

(1) to provide assistance to the internally displaced population of Colombia; and

(2) to assist in the temporary resettlement of the internally displaced Colombians.

(d) FUNDING.—Amounts authorized under section 202(b) of the Act shall be available to the President for purposes of activities under subsection (c).

SEC. 203. INVESTIGATING COLOMBIAN ATTORNEY GENERAL OF DRUG TRAFFICKING AND HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES BY IRREGULAR FORCES AND SECURITY FORCES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to support efforts by the Attorney General of Colombia to—

(1) investigate and prosecute members of Colombian irregular forces involved in the production or trafficking in illicit drugs; and

(2) investigate and prosecute members of Colombian security forces involved in the production or trafficking in illicit drugs.

(b) FUNDING.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 203(a) shall be available to the President for purposes of activities under subsection (c).

SEC. 204. UNITED STATES EMERGENCY HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR INTERNALLY FORCED DISPLACED POPULATION IN COLOMBIA.
(b) FUNDING.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 201(b) shall be available to the President for purposes of activities under subsection (a).

SEC. 204. REPORT ON COLOMBIAN MILITARY JUSTICE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report examining the efforts to strengthen and reform the criminal justice system of Colombia and making recommendations for directing assistance authorized by this Act for that purpose.

(b) REPORT ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall contain the following:

(1) A review of the laws, regulations, directives, policies, and practices of the military justice system of Colombia, including specific military reform measures being considered and implemented.

(2) An assessment of the extent to which the laws, regulations, directives, policies, practices, and reforms relating to the military justice system have been effective in preventing and punishing human rights violations, irregular forces, and narcotics trafficking.

(3) Recommendations for the measures necessary to strengthen and improve the effectiveness and enhance the credibility of the military justice system of Colombia.

SEC. 205. DEAL OF VISA TO AND INADMISSIBILITY OF ALIENS WHO HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN DRUG TRAFFICKING AND HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN COLOMBIA.

(a) GROUNDS FOR DENIAL OF VISAS AND IN-ADMISSIBILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Attorney General shall not admit to the United States any alien who the Secretary of State has credible evidence is a person who—

(1) is or was an illicit trafficker in any controlled substance or has knowingly aided,abetted, counseled, or colluded with others in the illicit trafficking in any controlled substance in Colombia or (2) ordered, carried out, or materially assisted in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights in Colombia.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.

(1) Persons for Exception.—Subsection (a) does not apply in any case in which—

(A) the Secretary of State finds, on a case-by-case basis, that the entry into the United States of the person who would otherwise be denied a visa or not admitted under this section is necessary for medical reasons; or

(B) the alien has cooperated fully with the investigation of human rights violations; or

(2) the Attorney General, on a case-by-case basis, that admission of the alien to the United States is necessary for law enforcement purposes.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Whenever an alien described in subsection (a) is issued a visa pursuant to paragraph (1) or admitted to the United States pursuant to paragraph (2), the Secretary of State or the Attorney General, as appropriate, shall notify in writing the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives of such action.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) LIST OF THE UNITED STATES CHIEF OF MISSION.—Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Secretary of State a list of those individuals who have been credibly alleged to have committed drug trafficking and human rights violations described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

(2) TRANSMITTAL BY SECRETARY OF STATE.—Not later than three months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit the list prepared under paragraph (1) to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

(3) DEFINITION.—In this section:

(1) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE.—The term “controlled substance” has the meaning given in section 102(6) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(6)).


Subtitle B—Eradication of Drug Production and Interdiction of Drug Trafficking

SEC. 211. TARGETING NEW ILICIT CULTIVATION AND MODERNIZING THE COLOMBIAN SECURITY FORCES AGAINST THE NARCOTRAFFICKING THREAT.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to support programs and activities by the Government of Colombia, including its security forces, to target eradication and law enforcement activities in areas of new cultivation of coca and opium poppy, including—

(1) material support and technical assistance to aid the training, outfitting, deployment, and operational support of forces other than three counternarcotics battalions of the Army of Colombia;

(2) to support the acquisition of up to 15 UH-60 helicopters or comparable transport helicopters, including spare parts, maintenance services and training, or aircraft upgrade kits for Colombia;

(3) communications and intelligence training and equipment for the Army and Navy of Colombia;

(4) additional aircraft for the National Police of Colombia to enhance its eradication efforts and to support its joint operations with the military of Colombia; and

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purpose, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President $200,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 1999, and ending September 30, 2002, to carry out subsection (a).

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) are authorized to remain available until expended.

SEC. 212. REINVIGORATION OF EFFORTS TO ERADICATE ILLICIT DRUGS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to support programs and activities by the Government of Colombia to enhance eradication and law enforcement activities by the National Police and Navy of Colombia nationwide, including—

(1) acquisition of transport aircraft, spare engines, and other parts, additional UH-1H upgrade kits, forward-looking infrared systems, and other equipment for the National Police of Colombia;

(2) training and operation of specialized netted units of the National Police of Colombia;

(3) construction of additional bases for the National Police of Colombia near its national territorial borders; and

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purpose, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President $200,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 1999, and ending September 30, 2002, to carry out subsection (a).

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) are authorized to remain available until expended.

SEC. 213. ENHANCEMENT OF COLOMBIAN POLICE AND NAVY LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to support programs and activities by the Government of Colombia, including its security forces, to support anti-drug law enforcement activities by the National Police and Navy of Colombia nationwide, including—

(1) acquisition of transport aircraft, spare engines, and other parts, additional UH-1H upgrade kits, forward-looking infrared systems, and other equipment for the National Police of Colombia;

(2) training and operation of specialized netted units of the National Police of Colombia;

(3) construction of additional bases for the National Police of Colombia near its national territorial borders; and

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purpose, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President $200,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 1999, and ending September 30, 2002, to carry out subsection (a).

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) are authorized to remain available until expended.

SEC. 214. TARGETING ILLEGITIMATE ASSETS OF IRREGULAR FORCES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF TASK FORCE.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Attorney General, Secretary of State, and Director of Central Intelligence, shall establish a task force to identify assets of irregular forces that operate in Colombia for the purpose of imposing restrictions on assets as defined by such President’s authority under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701).

(b) REPORT ON ASSETS OF IRREGULAR FORCES.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress a report on measures taken in compliance with this section and recommend measures to target the unlawfully obtained assets of irregular forces that operate in Colombia.

SEC. 215. ENHANCEMENT OF REGIONAL INTERDICTION OF ILLICIT DRUGS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to support programs and activities by the United States Government, the Government of Colombia, and the governments of the front line states to enhance interdiction of illicit drugs in that region.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purpose, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President $100,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 1999, and ending September 30, 2002, on account of this Act.
(B) not less than $40,000,000 shall be available
for regional intelligence activities; and
(C) not less than $30,000,000 for the acqui-
sition of surveillance and reconnaissance air-
craft for the United States Southern Command
primarily for detection and monitoring in sup-
port of the interdiction of illicit drugs; and
(2) not less than $85,000,000 shall be available
for the governments of the front line states to
increase the effectiveness of regional inter-
diction efforts.
(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts ap-
propriated pursuant to subsection (b) are au-
thorized to remain available until expended.
(3) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funds made available to carry out
this section may be made available to a front
line state only after the President deter-
mines and certifies to the appropriate Con-
gressional committees that such state is co-
operating fully with regional and bilateral
aerial and maritime narcotics efforts or is
taking extraordinary and effective measures
on its own to impede suspicious aircraft or
maritime vessels through its territory. A de-
termination and certification with respect to
a front line state under this subsection shall be
effective for not more than 12 months.

SEC. 216. AUTHORIZATION FOR PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL SUPPORT
FOR COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES OF CO-
PÉR.
Section 1033 of the National Defense Au-
thorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public
Law 105-65) is amended—
(1) in the sequence of subsection (a), by inserting before the period at the end the
following: “, including but not limited to
riverine counter-drug activities”;
(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the
following:
“(4) The operating costs of equipment of
the government that is used for counter-drug
activities are authorized.
(3) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “any of
the fiscal years 1999 through 2002” and in-
serting “the fiscal year 1999 and may not ex-
ceed $76,000,000 during the fiscal years 2000
through 2002”.

SEC. 217. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ASSISTANCE
TO BRAZIL.
It is the sense of Congress that the Presi-
dent should—
(1) review the nature of the cooperation be-
tween the United States and Brazil in coun-
ternarcotics activities;
(2) recognize the extraordinary threat that
narcotics trafficking poses to the national
security of Brazil and to the national secu-
ritv of the United States;
(3) support the efforts of the Government
of Brazil to control drug trafficking in and
through the Amazon River basin;
(4) share information with Brazil on nar-
cotics interdiction in accordance with sec-
tion 1012 of the National Defense Authori-
zation Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (22 U.S.C. 2291-
4) in light of the enactment of legislation by
the Congress of Brazil that—
(A) authorizes appropriate personnel to
damage, under inoperative, or destroy air-
craft within Brazil territory that are reason-
ably suspected to be engaged primarily in
trafficking in narcotics or narcotic par-
aphernalia;
(B) contains measures to protect against
the loss of innocent life during activities re-
ferred to in subparagraph (A), including an
affected measure to identify and warn air-
craft before the use of force; and
(5) issue a determination outlining the
matters referred to in paragraphs (1) through
(4) in the case of any incident in the provi-
sion by the United States of critical opera-
tional, logistical, technical, adminis-
trative, and intelligence assistance to Brazil.

SEC. 218. MONITORING AND SUPPORT FOR CO-
LOMBIAN SECURITY FORCES.
(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts
otherwise available for such purpose, there is
authorized to be appropriated for the Depart-
ment of Defense and the Department of State
for fiscal years 2001, and 2002 an amount not to exceed the amount
equal to one percent of the total security as-
sistance for the Colombian armed forces for
such fiscal year, for training and assistance of the use of United States assistance by the
Colombian armed forces, including monitor-

ing to ensure compliance with the provi-
sions of this Act and the provisions of sec-
tion 568 of the Foreign Operations, Export
Financing, and Related Programs Appropria-
tions Act, 1999 (as contained in Public Law
105-277; 112 Stat. 2335).
(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts ap-
propriated pursuant to paragraph (1) are au-
thorized to remain available until expended.
(b) REPORTS.—Not later than six months
after the date of the enactment of this Act,
and every six months thereafter, the Sec-
retary of Defense and the Secretary of State
shall jointly submit to the appropriate Con-
gressional committees a report on the extent
of assistance provided under this section.
(c) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN USE OF ALTER-
NATIVES TO THE ILLICIT DRUG TRADE.
(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of
Congress—
(1) to recognize the importance of well-con-
structed programs for the development of
economic alternatives to the illicit drug
trade in order to encourage growers to cease
illicit crop cultivation; and
(2) to stress the need to link enforcement
efforts with development in order to
ensure that assistance under such programs
does not become a form of income supple-
tation to the growers of illicit crops.
(b) SUPPORT OF DEVELOPMENT OF ECO-
NOMIC ALTERNATIVES.—The President is au-
thorized to support programs and activities
by the United States Government to enhance the develop-
ment of economic alternatives to the illicit
drug trade.
(c) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN USE OF AL-
TERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.—No funds
available under this Act for the development of economic alternatives to the illicit drug
trade may be used to encourage assistance
for the eradication of illicit drug crops.
(d) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds
authorized to be appropriated by subsection
(e) may only be made available to Colombia
or a front line state after—
(1) such state has provided to the United
States agency responsible for the adminis-
tration of this section a report on the realistic
objectives to ensure the ultimate eradication of
illicit crops.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts
otherwise available for such purpose, there is
authorized to be appropriated $800,000,000 for
the period beginning October 1, 1999, and end-
ing September 30, 2002, to carry out sub-
section (b), including up to $50,000,000 for Co-
lombia, up to $90,000,000 for Bolivia, and up to
$100,000 for Peru.
(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts ap-
propriated pursuant to paragraph (1) are au-
thorized to remain available until expended.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS
S. 165
At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the
name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr.
LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S.
185, a bill to establish a Chief Agricul-
tural Negotiator in the Office of the
United States Trade Representative.
S. 620
At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the
name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr.
BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.
620, a bill to grant a Federal charter
to Korean War Veterans Association,
Incorporated, for other purposes.
S. 720
At the request of Mr. HELMS, the
name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr.
ROTH) was added as a cosponsor of S.
720, a bill to promote the develop-
ment of a government in the Federal
Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and
Montenegro) based on democratic prin-
ciples and the rule of law, and that re-
spects internationally recognized human rights, to assist the victims of
Serbian oppression, to apply measures
against the Federal Republic of Yugos-
la, and for other purposes.
S. 758
At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the
name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs.
HUTCHISON) and the Senator from Missis-
nippi (Mr. LOTT) were added as cos-
ponsors of S. 758, a bill to establish
legal standards and procedures for the
fair, prompt, inexpensive, and efficient
resolution of personal injury claims arising out of asbestos exposure, and
for other purposes.
S. 1130
At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the
name of the Senator from Michigan
(Mr. ABRAHAM) was added as a cospon-
sor of S. 1130, a bill to amend title 49,
United States Code, with respect to li-
ability of motor vehicle rental or leasing
companies for the negligent oper-
ation of rented or leased motor vehi-
cles.
S. 1144
At the request of Mr. VONSTEIN, the
names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr.
ROTH) and the Senator from Missis-
nippi (Mr. LOTT) were added as cos-
ponsors of S. 1144, a bill to provide in-
creased flexibility in use of highway
funding, and for other purposes.
S. 1242
At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the
names of the Senator from South Da-
sota (Mr. DASCHLE) and the Senator
from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were
added as cosponsors of S. 1242, a bill to