

Today, there are millions and millions, like men, who do, and we recognize the need to protect them better than they have been by providing the most effective—the most effective—crime prevention tool there is: lighting. It provides for more rape crisis centers. It sets up a national hotline that battered women can call around the clock to get advice and counseling.

I am working on the ability for them when they call to also be able to get a lawyer who will handle their case pro bono—for free—and help guide them through the system. They were getting rape education efforts going with our young people so we can break the cycle of violence that begets violence.

I might note parenthetically, one of the reasons I wrote this legislation initially, the Violence Against Women Act, is that I came across an incredible study, a poll done in the State of Rhode Island, of, I think, seventh, eighth and ninth graders. I am not certain, to be honest, I think seventh, eighth and ninth graders.

It asks, in the poll conducted, the survey, "If a man spends \$10 on a woman, is he entitled to force sex on her if she refuses?" An astounding 30-some percent of the young men answering the question said, "Yes." But do you know what astounded me more? Mr. President, 25 percent of the young girls said "yes" as well. We have a cultural problem here that crosses lines of race, religion, ethnicity, and income. We just do not take seriously enough the battering of our women—our women, is the way our friends like to say it—of women in this country. This is especially true when it comes to victims who know their assailants. For too long we have been quick to call these private misfortunes rather than public disgraces.

The Violence Against Women Act also meant to do something else beyond the concrete measures that I mentioned. It also sent a clarion call across the land that crimes against women will no longer be treated as second-class crimes. For too long the victims of these crimes have been seen, not as innocent targets of brutality, but as participants who somehow bear some shame or even some responsibility for the violence inflicted upon them.

As I said, this is especially true when it comes to victims who know their assailants. For too long we have been quick to call theirs a private misfortune rather than a public disgrace. We viewed the crime as less than criminal, the abuser less than culpable, and the victim as less than worthy of justice.

In my own State of Delaware, until recently, if a man raped a woman he did not know, he was eligible, if he brutally did it, to be convicted of first-degree rape. But do you know what? We had a provision in our law, and many States had similar provisions, that said if the woman knew the man, if the woman was the social companion of the man, then he could only be tried for

second-degree rape, the inference being that somehow she must have invited something because she knew him, she went out with him.

It seems to me we have to remain ever vigilant in our efforts to make our streets and our neighborhoods and our homes safer for all people, but in this case particularly for women. We need to make sure right now that no judge ever misreads the carjacking statute again and undermines the overwhelming purpose of my legislation in the first place, which was to change the psyche of this Nation about how we are to deal with the brutal act of rape. It is not a sex crime, it is an act of violence, a violent act.

Now, one of the most respected courts in the Nation has come down and said it does not constitute serious bodily injury. So, Mr. President, we need to make sure right now that no judge ever misreads the carjacking statute again. We need to tell them what we intend, what we always intended, that the words "serious bodily injury" mean rape, no ifs, ands, or buts. The legislation, a bill to be introduced by myself and Senator HATCH and others, does just that. It says, and I will read from one section:

Section 2119(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "including any conduct that, if the conduct occurred in the special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the United States, would violate section 2241 or 2242 of this title" after "(as defined in section 1365 of this title)".

Translated into everyday English it means, serious bodily injury means rape. No judge will be able to, no matter how—I should not editorialize. No judge in the future, once we pass this legislation, will be able ever again to say that serious bodily injury does not include rape.

I thank Senator HATCH, and I would like to particularly thank Demetra Lambros, who is sitting behind me, a woman lawyer on my staff who worked with Representative CONYERS' staff to write this legislation, for the effort she has made and for calling this to my attention. I also thank Senator HATCH, who has always been supportive and very involved in this, and his staff, and Congressman CONYERS, the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee.

I am confident if every Member—this is presumptuous for me to say, Mr. President—but as every Member of the Senate becomes aware of what this does, I cannot imagine there is anyone here or anyone in the House who will not support it.

I thank the Chair. I realize the hour is late. I thank the Chair for indulging me. Tomorrow, hopefully, we will be in a position to bring this legislation up and pass it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, for our distinguished majority leader, I

make the following request. I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

MARITIME SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have always been a strong supporter of the U.S.-flag merchant marine, and America's maritime industry. That is why, last year I introduced the Maritime Security Act of 1995. This bill is the product of nearly a decade of bipartisan and bicameral effort. It will reform, streamline, and reduce Federal support for the U.S.-flag merchant marine, while at the same time revitalizing our U.S.-flag fleet.

The starting point for the Maritime Security Program is the simple and valid premise that America's merchant marine is a vital component of our military sealift capability.

Thus, in order to protect our military presence overseas, we must have a modern, efficient, and reliable sealift. On this point, the assessment of our Nation's top military leaders is unequivocal. Our military needs a U.S.-flag merchant marine to carry supplies to our troops overseas. We cannot, in fact, we must not, rely on foreign ships and foreign crews to deliver supplies into hostile areas.

Just recently I receive a letter from Adm. Thomas Moorer, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Rear Adm. Robert Spiro, a former Under Secretary of the Army. They both enthusiastically endorsed the legislation. I have added this letter to a stack of letters sitting on my desk from many other distinguished military leaders who also have strongly backed the Maritime Security Act.

Not long ago, I also received endorsements of the Maritime Security Act from the Honorable John P. White, the current Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the Honorable John W. Douglass, the current Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition.

I also have received numerous letters from members of the Navy League of the United States.

Clearly, there is visible support from both the active and retired military community for the recognized value of this program.

The Maritime Security Act will ensure that our Nation will continue to have access to both a fleet of militarily useful U.S.-flag commercial vessels, and a cadre of trained and loyal U.S.-citizen crews. What's more, under this bill our military planners will gain access to the onshore logistical and intermodal capabilities of these U.S.-flag vessel operators. Instead of just getting a ship, our military gets access to port facilities worldwide, state-of-the-art computer tracking systems, intermodal loading and transfer equipment,

and so on. And our Nation get these benefits for less than half the cost of the current program.

This is both a fiscal and national security bargain.

Let me make this point clear. This is not a blanket handout to the maritime industry. To participate in the Maritime Security Program, each vessel must be approved by the Secretary of Defense. And participation is limited to vessels actively engaged in the international maritime trades.

Make no mistake about it—without it the American maritime flag will disappear from the high seas. The U.S.-flag merchant marine that has helped to sustain this country in peace and has served with bravery and honor in wartime will be gone.

I don't believe that any American wants that day to come.

Provisions of this bill have been considered and discussed in nearly 50 public hearings in either the House or the Senate. These hearings were full and open. All interested parties, both for and against this approach, have had notice and opportunity to make comments, criticisms and corrections. In 9 years, this inclusive process has insured the incorporation of all valid provisions into a balanced and responsible public policy which advances and revitalizes an integral segment of America's economy and culture. This inclusive process is reflected in the deep respect and support for this legislation across a wide political and social spectrum.

The House passed the bill in December on a voice vote, with overwhelming and loud bipartisan support. I have been told that the President intends to sign this bill promptly after its final passage here in the Senate.

Mr. President, the Senate has a responsibility to provide for the Nation's defense. And this bill represents the most cost-effective way to make sure that our military has the sealift capabilities it needs to protect our interests around the world. It marks a dramatic departure from our previous maritime programs. The entitlements are gone, and they have been replaced by a vigorous fiscal discipline and dynamic marketplace.

Mr. President, I urge all of my colleagues to stand with me in support of this legislation when it comes to the floor.

Mr. President, this is a bill we must pass before this Congress goes into recess for this fall's elections. It is my hope that the Senate will consider the Maritime Security Act on the floor in September.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I am pleased and honored to offer an amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for assistance to Ukraine. Ukraine's achievement this year in the areas of ethnic stability, human rights

and constitutional reform are significant, and fully justify the substantial earmark of aid being proposed. My proposal will not change the total amount of the appropriation, but it will provide assurance that appropriated funds will be used in the interest of both the United States and Ukraine.

I believe that the best forms of foreign aid are those which strengthen the recipient from within and lead toward self sufficiency and, ultimately, independence from any assistance from the United States or other foreign sources.

In this spirit, I propose this earmark in the amount of \$25 million for the purpose of helping to create a complete, modern system of commercial law in Ukraine, including not only substantive laws which are compatible with international standards but also training and equipping of an independent judiciary and legal profession, which as we know are the cornerstones of law-based economy.

Such a fundamental transformation—from a totalitarian command economy to a self-sustaining free market—cannot be achieved without substantial technical assistance. Until now, assistance for comprehensive commercial law reform has been provided to Ukraine largely through pro bono publico, through a commendable program of donated aid known as the Commercial Law Project for Ukraine. These private efforts, no matter how praiseworthy, are inadequate to bring about the fundamental reforms which are so urgently needed, the earmark which I propose would fill that need and bring the goal of economic self-sufficiency for Ukraine closer to a reality.

The philosopher John Locke wrote, "Where law ends, tyranny begins." It is also true that, where law begins, tyranny ends. In this spirit, I propose an earmark for legal and commercial law restructuring in Ukraine.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three letters in support of this amendment from Yuri Shcherbak, Ambassador of Ukraine, Orest A. Jejna, President of the Ukrainian American Bar Association, Askold Lozynskyj, President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMBASSY OF UKRAINE,
Washington, DC, July 5, 1996.

Re foreign assistance appropriations for fiscal year 1997—sub-earmark for legal reform-commercial law restructuring.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: Thank you very much for your successful sponsorship of a foreign aid earmark for Ukraine in the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. Please call on me or my staff at any time if we can assist you in the coming weeks to win Congressional approval of the earmark.

I am writing at this time to indicate my support for the addition of a sub-earmark for legal reform and commercial law restructuring as recently proposed by the Ukrainian

American Bar Association. I respectfully request that you support the addition of such a sub-earmark, which will help to assure that U.S. assistance will promote the establishment of the rule of law in Ukraine.

This sub-earmark would be especially encouraging for my country in respect to the adoption of the New Constitution of Ukraine and preparation of a great number of legislative acts following the Constitution.

Ukraine wants from the U.S. only that assistance which will make her self-sufficient and independent of all foreign aid. Proposals such as that by the Ukrainian American Bar Association help to bring the goal of self-sufficiency closer to realization.

Thank you once again for your support for our common cause of revitalization of Ukraine.

With warmest regards, I remain,
Respectfully,

YURI SHCHERBAK,
Ambassador of Ukraine to the USA.

UKRAINIAN AMERICAN
BAR ASSOCIATION,
Phoenix, AZ, July 2, 1996.

Senator MITCH MCCONNELL,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: Thank you for your sponsorship of an earmark of aid to Ukraine. Your courageous advocacy has promoted vital U.S. interests while bringing freedom to the people of Ukraine.

I want to add my voice to those who are requesting inclusion of an additional sub-earmark for legal reform and commercial law restructuring as necessary to support a decentralized, market-oriented economy. The funds granted to date by the U.S. government for comprehensive commercial law reform in Ukraine have been woefully inadequate to provide Ukraine with the necessary foundation for a functioning private sector.

I believe it is incumbent upon Congress to support assistance projects which will promote Ukraine's self-sufficiency and eventual independence from U.S. foreign aid. Commercial law reform and other fundamental legal reforms are among the most important priorities in achieving self-sufficiency for Ukraine.

If it is feasible at this juncture, I urge Congress to adopt an additional sub-earmark for legal reform in Ukraine as follows:

"\$25,000,000.00 for legal restructuring necessary to support a decentralized market-oriented economic system, including the creation of all necessary substantive commercial law, all reforms necessary to establish an independent judiciary and bar, legal education for judges, attorneys and law students, and public education designed to promote understanding of a law-based economy."

If you wish any additional information on the position of the Ukrainian American Bar Association, do not hesitate to contact me at (602) 254-3872. Thank you for your consideration of this subject of vital concern.

Respectfully,
OREST A. JEJNA,
President.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS,
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
New York, NY, June 11, 1996.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Dear Senator McConnell: On behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. (UCCA), the representative organization of the Ukrainian-American community, please allow me to once again thank you for your leadership in the passage of the \$225