

would take care of us: we would have the things we do not have."

Nakaweesi's plight has become a familiar one in Africa, where AIDS has left millions of children without parents and has afflicted thousands of others who contracted the AIDS virus through their mothers.

Statistics on the impact of AIDS among African children are sketchy but nonetheless grim. UNICEF predicts that by 1999, up to 5 million African children will have lost their mothers to AIDS. Of the 9.5 million people in sub-Saharan Africa who either have the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)—which causes AIDS—or the disease itself, an estimated 1.3 million are children.

AIDS has ravaged the continent in part because of cultural mores that assent to men having simultaneous sexual partnerships with more than one woman. Researchers also have found that a high rate of nonfatal sexually transmitted diseases among both genders has made Africans more vulnerable to HIV.

AIDS specialists fear that the impact of the disease on children will slash school enrollments, roll back gains in infant mortality rates and further tax family structures already shattered by political and economic crises in many African countries.

Uganda's AIDS crisis is among the most urgent in Africa, as 1.5 million of the nation's population of 17 million are HIV-positive. An estimated 519,000 Ugandan children have lost at least one parent to AIDS, and the government reports that by 1998 about 150,000 children will have died of it and another 300,000 will be infected.

"What we have seen is staggering," said Omwony Ojwok, director of the Uganda AIDS Commission. "The families in particular are simply at a breaking point. You have some adults with 10 orphans in their house, plus their own children. Eventually, you run out of adults to take care of the children."

The town of Kakuuto, three hours west of Kampala, has been hit especially hard. An estimated 30 percent of its 70,000 residents are either HIV-positive or have AIDS. Relief workers estimate that there are 17,000 orphans. Some are left on their own, but many more live with grandparents who often are too old to provide the economic and emotional security of a mother and father.

Alandrena Nakabiito, 62, was left with six orphans, ages 5 to 13, when two relatives died of AIDS in the early 1990s. Nakabiito, who reared four of her own children, said that she never expected to be cast in this role.

"I never thought of it," she said, waving her arms in her dark, narrow, two-room hut. "I built this small house for myself." Now eight people, including Nakabiito's 72-year-old sister, live there.

Nakabiito said she makes about \$60 a year, adding that she would work harder on her acre of land but age has drained her strength. She digs only in the morning, resting in the afternoon. The slight woman, whose hands bear scars of a hard farm life, said she is especially sad that she cannot help Lucky Nakkazi, the 13-year-old, with her studies. Lucy can go to school only because the World Vision relief organization pays fees for her and about 2,500 other orphans in Kakuuto.

"I would try to help, but I have poor sight at night," Nakabiito said, referring to Lucy's school work.

Lucy attends Kakuuto Central Primary School, where headmaster Kyeyune Gelazius said that 220 of his 450 students have lost parents to AIDS. He predicts that within five years, 75 percent of his students will be orphans. He said that generally their attendance is sporadic and their behavior disruptive and that they lag academically.

"They don't get the attention they need at home," said Gelazius, who has seen 11 relatives die of AIDS. "Their grandparents are usually too old, and the children don't respect them."

A study in neighboring Tanzania found that children who have lost their mothers to AIDS "have markedly lower enrollment rates and, once enrolled, spend fewer hours in school" than youngsters with two parents, the World Bank Research Observer reported. The same study concluded that by 2020 the AIDS death rate among children in Tanzania will have cut primary and secondary-school enrollments by 14 and 22 percent, respectively.

Doctors also fear that AIDS will wipe out improvements in infant mortality rates over the past decade. For now, the rate remains stable, but a 1994 World Bank report on AIDS in Uganda warned: "Because of the large numbers of women carrying the virus, there are increasing numbers of infants and children infected. This together with the loss of mothers due to AIDS will increase infant and child mortality significantly." At the Kakuuto offices of Doctors of the World, a medical relief group, AIDS program coordinator Fred Sekyewa said babies born to mothers with AIDS have a 25 to 50 percent chance of being infected and that one in three pregnant women examined here tests HIV-positive.

Sekyewa added that many women with AIDS have babies because of cultural pressures. "In African societies it is an abomination for a woman to die without a child," he said. "A woman in her twenties who has AIDS will say, 'I must have a child now because I may die before I get the opportunity.'"

In Nairobi, Kenya, hundreds of HIV-positive children die in hospitals annually after being abandoned by their mothers. Three years ago, the Rev. Angelo D'Agostino, a Jesuit priest, founded a home in Nairobi for such children. A surgeon and psychiatrist who taught at George Washington University for 14 years, D'Agostino said he gets calls from hospitals and social workers seeking homes for 100 AIDS babies every month. D'Agostino, 69, has taken in about 80 children. He said that some have become healthy after receiving a steady diet of nutritious meals and attention.

"They were born with their mother's HIV antibodies, so they initially tested positive. But they never got infected," D'Agostino said. "So after a while, they're fine. But usually these kids die of malnutrition or something else in a hospital; because they once tested positive, everybody gives up on them."

The priest said that his children, most of whom are under 5, often show the strains of losing their parents. They cry for hours. They have nightmares. They stare into space.

"They talk about seeing their parents die," D'Agostino said. "They talk about being alone with their 10- or 12-year-old sibling."

Elizabeth Nakaweesi understands their pain. The teenager said she quit school in the sixth grade to care for her young siblings after her parents' deaths because "there was nobody else to do it."

Elizabeth's father, who died at 51, had collected taxes at the local market. Her mother, who was 39, had cultivated their plot of bananas, sweet potatoes and cassavas.

Sometimes, when crops are poor and her straw mats are not selling, Nakaweesi must beg neighbors for help. She said that without assistance from neighbors and World Vision—which pays school fees, bought her a bicycle and provides other necessities—she and brothers and sisters would not survive.

Elizabeth works hard to foster a spirit of family teamwork. After her siblings return from school, everyone works in the field before dinner. At supper time, one child fetches water. Another finds firewood. Another picks bananas. Another puts out bowls and eating utensils. Another does the cooking.

But the teenager knows that she cannot replace her parents. When she tries to speak of them, tears will in her eyes. She turns her face to the wall.

"They must be mother and father now," said Grace Mayanja, a staff worker with World Vision, referring to children in Kakuuto left to raise siblings. "But in their hearts, they're still little girls."

#### STOP HIDDEN KILLERS: THE GLOBAL LANDMINE CRISIS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, over the years, I have spoken often about the problem of landmines. I have done so on this floor and as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, where I addressed the Disarmament Committee of the United Nations. I have been urging the U.S. Government and the United Nations to do whatever they can to stop the proliferation and use of antipersonnel landmines.

Sometimes when we think of landmines, we think of these huge floating mines in a shipping lane, but in fact, what we usually mean is a weapon about the size of a can of shoe polish. Antipersonnel landmines are tiny, and in some of them the only metal part is about the size of a thumb tack, so it is virtually impossible to detect. They cost about \$2 or \$3, and can be concealed beneath the surface of the ground. They are strewn by the thousands and they explode when somebody steps on them, no matter whether that person is a civilian or combatant. They kill an estimated 70 people each day. In the 2 hours since the Senate opened session this morning, at least eight people have been killed or maimed in the world from landmines. We are talking about 70 people each day, 26,000 people each year. There are an estimated 85 to 110 million landmines in 60 to 65 countries waiting to explode.

To give you some idea of this, parts of the Netherlands, and Denmark, are still too dangerous to go into, because of landmines left from World War II. But the vast majority of these hidden killers have been spread in just the past few years. In fact, even though the Russians followed our lead and declared that it would stop exporting antipersonnel landmines, that policy apparently does not apply to Chechnya. The Russians have been spreading landmines in Chechnya and doing it in such a way that nobody is ever going to know where they are—they are being dropped by the thousands out of airplanes—and there will be people, years from now, still dying and being maimed from them.

This January, at a press conference attended by representatives of some 40 countries, Secretary of State Christopher announced the release of the State Department's report "Hidden Killers: The Global Landmine Crisis."

It tells the gruesome story of the carnage caused by landmines.

Last year alone, on top of that 100 million or so unexploded landmines, we now have another several million that were laid, mostly in the former Yugoslavia. Estimates of the cost to locate and remove them are in the tens of billions of dollars. That does not even count the millions of mines that will be laid in the future.

Three years ago, almost nobody was paying attention to what has aptly been called a "weapon of mass destruction in slow motion." Far more civilians have died and been injured by landmines than by nuclear weapons.

They are a weapon of mass destruction, they just claim their victims slowly. Then the Senate passed, by 100-0, an amendment I sponsored to halt U.S. exports of antipersonnel landmines. That is the only time I know of when the U.S. Senate acted with unanimity on an issue of this kind.

The purpose of that amendment was to focus attention of the landmine crisis and to urge other countries to join us in trying to solve it. Because the Senate acted with such unanimity—Republicans and Democrats, across the political spectrum—and spurred on by the President of the United States, Secretary of State Christopher, and U.N. Ambassador Madeleine Albright, 18 other countries have declared export moratoria. Last September, at the United Nations, President Clinton announced a U.S. goal of the eventual elimination of antipersonnel landmines. On December 15, 1994, the U.N. General Assembly adopted a U.S. resolution calling on all countries to stop exports, and for further efforts toward the goal of the eventual elimination of antipersonnel landmines.

This is the first time, Mr. President, in recent history, since the banning of chemical weapons, that the world community has singled out a type of weapon for total elimination. It reflects a growing consensus that these weapons are unacceptable because they are indiscriminate, and because they are used routinely to terrorize civilian populations.

Imagine if the area from the Capitol Building to the Washington Monument were seeded with antipersonnel landmines, each one buried in the ground and waiting to explode. Who is going to go there? What if all of New England, or all of California, were strewn with mines? That is the reality for dozens of countries where millions of people go about their daily lives in fear of losing a leg or an arm, or their children's lives, from landmines.

I remember being in Uganda several years ago. From legislation of mine, we started a program to make artificial arms and legs for people who have lost limbs from landmines. My wife, who is a registered nurse, was with me and she saw a young boy, 10 or 12 years old, hopelessly crippled from polio. She could not believe that there was someone who was crippled from polio, when there are such low-cost vaccines.

It turned out that UNICEF had sent polio vaccine to Uganda, but that little boy had not got the vaccine. The medical personnel could not go to his part of Uganda, to his village, because of the landmines strewn around there. So in a country where to survive it is necessary to be able to move, this little boy is hopelessly crippled.

Here is a photograph of a young boy in Mozambique, Mr. President. Look at him from the waist down. There is nothing there. Those are two wooden legs. Artificial legs in a very poor country, a growing boy who will outgrow them and probably did outgrow them months after this picture was taken.

Look at this Kurdish boy. Can anyone, as human beings, as parents, look at this and not be horrified? I think of my children, when they were this age. One badly damaged leg. An arm missing at the shoulder. The other leg torn off at the knee. And these children are considered the lucky ones because they were close enough to medical care to get help. They did not die, as many do, just from the loss of blood.

These are not combatants, but these are typical of what I have seen every place I have gone in the world where they have landmines. I am told that you cannot walk down the street of Phnom-Penh without seeing people an arm or leg gone. They say that in Cambodia they are clearing the landmines an arm and a leg at a time.

Not only do these weapons endanger civilians most of all—and that is why they are terrorist weapons—but they kill and maim American soldiers, whether in combat or peacekeeping missions. They threaten our Peace Corps volunteers and other Americans who are involved in humanitarian work.

Ken Rutherford of Colorado testified here last year. He told about being in Somalia driving in his jeep, while he was working for the International Rescue Committee. He heard the blast and the bang, and the next thing he knew he was sitting in shock, holding his foot in his hand trying to reattach it to his shattered leg. Of course, that could never be. Ken has courageously gone through painful surgery after surgery, to be able to walk again.

Hidden killers is an indictment of a weapon that even Civil War General Sherman, who is not remembered as a great humanitarian, called a violation of civilized warfare over a century ago. A violation of civilized warfare. That is when a tiny number of them were used. Now there are millions.

During the month of January, officials of governments, including the United States, met in Geneva to discuss proposals for strengthening the Conventional Weapons Convention, the one existing international agreement covering the use of landmines. Signed in 1980, the Senate finally ratified it last Friday.

I want to praise the distinguished majority leader, Senator DOLE, the dis-

tinguished Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, and others, Senator HELMS, Senator PELL, and Senator LUGAR, for bringing the convention before the Senate for ratification.

The fact that the talks are going on in preparation for a U.N. conference next September to strengthen the 1980 convention is important by itself. The convention is universally regarded as woefully inadequate, and John Molander, the Swedish chairman of the talks, deserves credit for his efforts.

But these negotiations have shown how reluctant governments are to turn rhetoric into reality. I mentioned that Russia had said it had stopped exports of landmines. I praise President Yeltsin for that. I had talked to him about it personally, as I did Foreign Minister Kozyrev. Russia is obviously a country that has one of the largest stockpiles of landmines and they have the ability to manufacture them.

But now we see that they have no reluctance to sow them from airplanes over Chechnya. What army is being deterred by that? What army? It is the armies of old women and old men going out to find firewood to make a fire so they do not die from the cold. What army? It is an army of little children trying to go to school. Those are the armies that are terrified and maimed and killed by the indiscriminate use of landmines.

It is a blight, Mr. President, it is a blight. It is a moral blight. It is an evil blight. They should be treated the same way as we treat poison gas and chemical warfare. They do not distinguish between civilians and combatants. And yet we there are some who would have us give a Good Housekeeping seal of approval to a certain types of landmines.

Balderdash. What difference does it make? A landmine is a landmine. Cheap, deadly, long-life mines can blow the leg off the best trained, best equipped American soldier. If we treat some antipersonnel mines as acceptable, we run the risk of making the goal of eliminating them more elusive. Thousands of innocent people will continue to die. Every 15 minutes of every day of every year someone—usually an innocent civilian, often a child, or civilian—loses a leg or an arm.

Large areas of countries like Bosnia, Angola, and Cambodia have been contaminated with mines. The people cannot return to their fields to grow food, collect water, or firewood without risking their lives. Their children are being blown to pieces when they play outside or walk to school.

Refugees cannot go home. The Pakistani Ambassador to the United Nations tells me that over 1 million Afghan refugees are stranded in his country. Why? They cannot go home to Afghanistan; it is littered with landmines. And so they are in an area where they are devastating the forest, causing all kinds of problems and they

are an enormous drain on Pakistan because they cannot go back to Afghanistan.

It is a global catastrophe. People everywhere are calling for an end to this madness. Three weeks ago the Belgium Parliament voted a 5-year total ban on antipersonnel mines. Mexico, Sweden, Ireland, Estonia, Colombia, and Cambodia have already announced a total ban.

Only a year or two ago that seemed inconceivable. The United States has led the way, and we should continue to lead. We are the only superpower, and we can afford to set an example. We do not need these weapons for our security. What army is going to march against the United States? We have the most secure borders in the world.

Mr. President, we are blessed as no democracy in history has been blessed, not only with the resources of our own land and the resource of our own people, but with the security we have as a nation. But let us think what happens when we set foot outside of our country, when we send humanitarian missions, or send the men and women from our military to help in peacekeeping. We find this terrorist weapon used against us. And we are only the tip of the iceberg, because it is a terrorist weapon used most often against those who are most defenseless.

We should treat antipersonnel landmines with the same stigma as poison gas and other indiscriminate, inhumane weapons. Only when the price of using them is to be branded a war criminal and an international pariah will this mayhem stop. There are always going to be Saddam Husseins, who would commit any outrage against their own people. But they will become more and more the exception.

Last week we did take the next step. We ratified the Conventional Weapons Convention, including the landmine protocol. The United States can now participate fully in the conference to amend the convention this September. I intend to go to that conference. I think it is an important opportunity to try to give the convention the teeth it currently lacks. Between now and then I will be speaking with the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and others, about ways to strengthen it.

Mr. President, there are some weapons that are so inhumane that they do not belong on this Earth. They do not fit in our natural law right of self-preservation and defense. Even within that natural law, and even with our right of self-defense, we do not have the right to use any kind of weapon under any circumstances. Antipersonnel landmines are so inhumane that they fall into that category. They have ruined far too many innocent lives already.

Anyone who doubts that need only look at these photographs. See what happens. I started speaking 15 minutes ago. During that time this has happened to at least one person on this Earth since I started speaking, possibly

another child like these. When the Senate recesses this noon—and we all in the security of our caucuses and the security of this beautiful building, the symbol of democracy, eat our lunches—a half-dozen more people will be killed and maimed somewhere in the world. And for what? Do these children threaten anybody? These children had a life hard enough already. Now they have one leg or one arm, or, as in this case, no legs. Can you imagine what their lives are like?

I am going to speak again as I have, many, many times before, Mr. President, about this subject. I will continue to speak about it. I applaud and compliment those of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, who have joined me in this crusade.

We should tell the world that we will treat the use of antipersonnel landmines the same way that we treat poison gas and other indiscriminate, inhumane weapons, and ban them altogether.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I understand the pending business is the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; the Harkin amendment numbered 411.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, on Saturday, March 25, an Iraqi court sentenced two Americans, David Daliberti of Jacksonville, FL, and William Barloon of Iowa, to 8 years in prison. Their crime was an innocent and inadvertent crossing into Iraq from Kuwait.

These two men, both of whom were employed by United States contractors working in Kuwait, have been converted from free citizens working in an important area of national responsibility for Kuwait on behalf of United States contractors to prisoners in an Iraqi cell.

David Daliberti and his partner have done nothing to deserve this sentence. As the observers at the trial last Saturday stated, these men are innocent of the charges levied against them. The crossing was an honest mistake. This mistake has been admitted, but it is not a criminal offense.

The Iraqis must understand several things. First, that we will not allow them to utilize this inadvertent crossing of the border for political purposes. They must understand that their outrageous action toward these two men is the equal of the outrageous action that they have taken when they refuse to abide by the international standards that would be necessary for a lifting of

the economic embargo against their country; that their use of these two men for political purposes will in no way lead to a lifting of the embargo or a modification of the U.N. resolutions regarding sanctions.

Mr. President, President Clinton should be commended for the action that he has taken in this regard. He has been steadfast, he has been personally involved and committed to see that the United States takes all efforts within its power and by organizing international forces in order to accomplish the objective of the release of these two men.

I would also like to thank the representatives of the Polish Government who represent United States interests in Baghdad. They have, as they have done in previous cases, performed a great service for this country. They have represented our interests well in the past, and I am confident that they will do so on behalf of these two Americans.

I have written to the United Nations and received assurance from Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali that the United Nations will do everything within its power to ensure the release of these individuals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter dated March 24, from the Secretary General, relative to the commitment of the United Nations, at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, there have been a variety of voices raised on this matter. The most compelling have been those of the voices of the families directly involved. The family of Mr. David Daliberti live in Jacksonville, FL. I have had the opportunity to talk with his mother, father, and last Friday with his wife, Kathy. They are, obviously, extremely distressed and anxious about the future of their son and husband.

We must convey to them that it is the commitment of the United States of America to do everything within its power to gain the safe and expeditious release of their loved ones. The same commitment will be made to the Barloon family who, I am certain, is experiencing the same level of anxiety.

The Iraqis must understand that we will hold them fully responsible for the treatment that they are according these two innocent men; that they will be held accountable in the court of international opinion and law for any adverse actions taken against these two Americans.

There have been a variety of proposals made, Mr. President, as to what we should do, ranging from diplomatic to economic to military. I personally believe that we should not take any option off the table. We should not give to Saddam Hussein the confidence that would come by his knowing what we will not do.

However, affirmatively, I believe that we should place our confidence and place our faith in the individual who has the constitutional responsibility to lead United States efforts in a matter of this type, and that is the President of the United States.

On Friday, I met with the President at the White House, and I was impressed with the degree to which he was personally knowledgeable of the minute details of this issue; that he had been in personal contact with key figures who have the capability of bringing maximum pressure upon the Iraqis, and his commitment to see that these two men are released as expeditiously and in the best possible circumstances.

So, Mr. President, I support the resolution that is before us today. I think it is important that the United States Senate send a strong signal to Baghdad as to our outrage at their action and that their action will not secure any steps which will be beneficial to the country of Iraq.

The irony is that the control of the future of Iraq and its people, the ability to lift the economic sanctions and to begin a process of restoring Iraq to a membership in an international community of law-abiding nations lies totally within the Government of Iraq itself and particularly its leader, Saddam Hussein.

For months, that regime has rejected its opportunity and responsibility to take those actions. Now they are potentially attempting to use these two innocent Americans as a lever to achieve that result.

They shall not succeed. The United States, with our international allies and with the coalition that is being organized by President Clinton, will bring both maximum force, maximum diplomatic, economic and, if necessary, other initiatives in order to achieve the release of these men, while at the same time standing firm behind the sanctions which Iraq imposed upon itself by its lawless activities.

So, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution and send the signals that have the best opportunity to achieve the release of these two men to the regime in Baghdad and to reinforce the leadership which is being provided by our President in Washington.

Thank you, Mr. President.

EXHIBIT 1

MARCH 24, 1995.

Senator BOB GRAHAM,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRAHAM: Thank you for your letter of 23 March 1995 expressing your grave concern for the two United States citizens who have been detained by the Government of Iraq since 13 March after accidentally crossing the border between Kuwait and Iraq. Please be assured that I share your concern.

Since the incident occurred, General Krishna Thapa, the Force Commander of the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM), which is situated along

the international border between the two countries, has been repeatedly in contact with Iraqi authorities to ascertain the whereabouts of the two individuals, obtain assurances of their well-being, and urge the Government to release them immediately.

Mr. Kofi Annan, Under-Secretary-General for Peace-keeping, has also been in touch with the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations to protest the incident and to urge the Government of Iraq to take immediate steps to obtain release of the detainees. Mr. Annan is also keeping the Permanent Representative of the United States informed of any developments in this regard as they occur.

You may be assured that the United Nations will continue to do everything we can to bring about the rapid release of the detainees. Please convey to their families my deep concern, together with my personal wishes that their families will soon be reunited.

Please accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

BOUTROS BOUTROS-GHALI.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Iowa, Senator HARKIN, for his leadership on this issue. The virtual kidnaping of two innocent American businessmen by Iraq is a very serious matter.

Obviously, I will vote for this amendment because it strongly condemns the Government of Iraq for its unjustified action. I also think it empowers the President as he strives to assure the prompt release and safe exit of our two citizens from Iraq.

At the same time, though, I want to explain for the RECORD that in voting for a resolution which urges the President to "take all appropriate action" in this matter, I do not believe that Congress is authorizing any broad use of military action. While the President may initiate an emergency operation to rescue American citizens, any military action beyond that into Iraq would have to be specifically authorized by Congress.

I make this point, Mr. President, because I have seen in the past how sometimes we quickly and quite appropriately pass some foreign policy resolutions to express a sense of the Senate, only to have them reinterpreted as a broad authority for some unforeseen or even unanticipated military action later. I hardly expect that to be the case with this amendment, but I wanted to set the record straight from the outset.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to conduct morning business and request that the Senate stand in recess following my remarks.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mrs. HUTCHISON and Mr. NUNN pertaining to the introduc-

tion of S. 635 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, if I might, to be listed as an original cosponsor of the legislation just introduced by the Senator from Texas and extend my commendations to her for proposing this long-overdue reform in the treatment of our highest national military leadership.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am proud to have the Senator from Florida be an original cosponsor of the bill, and I look forward to working with him to correct this inequity that we have seen occur over the last few years.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate now stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ASHCROFT).

#### REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 411

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on amendment No. 411 offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] would vote "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 116 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Abraham	Craig	Hatfield
Akaka	D'Amato	Heflin
Ashcroft	Daschle	Helms
Baucus	DeWine	Hollings
Bennett	Dodd	Hutchison
Biden	Dole	Inhofe
Bingaman	Domenici	Inouye
Bond	Dorgan	Jeffords
Boxer	Exon	Johnston
Bradley	Faircloth	Kassebaum
Breaux	Feingold	Kempthorne
Brown	Feinstein	Kennedy
Bryan	Ford	Kerrey
Bumpers	Frist	Kerry
Burns	Glenn	Kohl
Byrd	Gorton	Kyl
Campbell	Graham	Lautenberg
Chafee	Gramm	Leahy
Coats	Grams	Levin
Cochran	Grassley	Lieberman
Cohen	Gregg	Lott
Conrad	Harkin	Lugar
Coverdell	Hatch	Mack