

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Nebraska for sponsoring this legislation. My own experience in combat in Vietnam, having had over 100 of my men wounded and over 20 killed, seeing directly the impact of landmines and booby traps, I know exactly the kind of devastation they can inflict. In my travels around the world where landmines are a principal impediment to farming and other civilian activities in areas where combat had been previously conducted, I have seen its hideous effects, the maiming of many, many individuals. I am pleased to join Senator LEAHY and Senator HAGEL in this bipartisan effort to eventually eliminate antipersonnel landmines.

This legislation reflects a principled first step on our part to halt the spread of these dangerous weapons. If an international consensus is to be achieved ultimately banning their manufacture and deployment, the United States will have to lead by example and restrict its own activities in this area. During peacetime, most Americans reasonably assume that military weapons are safely stored away. That is not the case, regrettably, with landmines. Many countries, particularly developing countries, continue to actively lay mines with tragic consequences. These devices indiscriminately kill or maim an average of 70 individuals a week, or some 26,000 civilians annually. In Bosnia alone, over 250 soldiers of various countries have been injured by landmines.

Mr. President, two-thirds of the Senate is formally on record supporting a moratorium on our use of landmines. While this does not get to the heart of the issue, in my mind, beginning the process of demining an estimated 100 or more million mines scattered across the world today, and cutting off funds for new deployments, will sharpen the debate on the utility derived from placing landmines, compared to the damage they inflict.

I recognize this is a debate underway for expedited consideration of a comprehensive ban treaty this year through what is known as the Ottawa conference, or embracing the United Nations approach of negotiating a multilateral agreement over a longer period of time. This legislation steers clear of the controversy by formally endorsing neither, but noting each in hortatory language. Moreover, given the belief of some that landmines continue to function as a useful deterrent on the Korean Peninsula, the legislation creates a national security exception for that particular situation.

We have a long way to go before we rid ourselves of these insidious devices. Someday I look forward to considering a permanent and international treaty banning the production, stockpiling, sale, and use of these weapons. For now, the legislation proposed by Senator LEAHY and Senator HAGEL is a modest proposal, eliminating funding for new deployments and, in my judg-

ment, it heads us in the right direction and it has my full support.

With that, I yield the floor. I yield any time I may have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I yield as much time as necessary to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, at the outset, let me say this is a serious matter and one in which I heartily concur with Senators LEAHY and HAGEL over the issue before us. In the recorded history of humankind, there were many instances of conflict leading to wars of devastation and great loss. Most people believe those wars come to an end, and with the end of the war there is at least some finality and some peace. Those who have been injured, of course, carry those scars for a lifetime. Those who lost their lives are remembered. Those who served look back with sometimes horror, sometimes fondness, to the experience.

We in the United States think at the end of the great wars, and after the tickertape parades, the finality is finally evidenced by something as significant as a memorial. But what we are speaking of today is a legacy of war that does not end. After the decisions are made, the foreign policy decisions which go awry and lead to a war or a conflict, those decisions end up creating situations which live on forever. In this case, we are dealing with a specific challenge and a specific issue of landmines.

In a visit to Central America about 7 years ago, I went to Costa Rica, to a clinic which was being sustained by contributions from the United States. It was an orthopedic clinic where, primarily children, but adults as well, were brought in to be fitted for orthopedic devices. These are young men, children, young women who walked the streets and the dusty roads in Honduras, El Salvador, and Nicaragua, and innocently stepped on a landmine and lost one of their limbs.

These were not combatants or soldiers, these were ordinary people. The wars were over. Yet, for them, the war continued. Each and every day they faced hostilities, hidden hostilities in these landmines. We rallied, in the United States, as we do so often, to provide medical assistance, as we should.

The decisions of foreign policy that led to those conflicts meant nothing to these people, nothing whatsoever. The important thing is that they had been maimed and had lost a limb because of that war and because of its legacy. Many of us think of someone losing a leg or a foot and, of course, in the United States, assume they will go through rehabilitation, they will be fitted with some type of orthopedic device, and life will go on. But in a developing country, a poor country, that

kind of injury can be devastating for a lifetime. People who once had great potential can find themselves at that point relegated to impoverishment, relegated to always being a "cripple." We take for granted that they will receive help, and many times they do not.

There are now 110 million landmines in 64 countries around the world. The conflicts which led to the planting of those landmines may have been long forgotten, but they still sit there, waiting for an innocent civilian or passerby to come through and become a victim. The Leahy-Hagel proposal is a good one, to put an end to this devastation and an end to this legacy of war.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The period of morning business is closed.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING ACT OF 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 903. There will be a vote, under the previous order, scheduled for 12 noon. The time between now and then will be equally divided between the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. HELMS, and the Senator from Delaware, Mr. BIDEN, and the Senator from Indiana, Mr. LUGAR.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 903) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and to provide for reform of the United Nations, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Lugar amendment No. 382, relating to the payment of United Nations arrearages without conditions.

DeWine/Graham Amendment No. 383, to deny entry to the United States to Haitians who have been credibly alleged to have ordered, carried out, or sought to conceal extrajudicial killings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no amendments be in order to either the pending DeWine amendment, No. 383, or the Lugar amendment, No. 382.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 382

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, Members who have followed this debate will recall that yesterday afternoon I offered

an amendment to the division C of this bill, that portion dealing with the United Nations. Essentially, the task before the Senate, and before our Government as a whole, is how do we relate the United Nations as an organization we have supported, and one important to our foreign policy. It is an international organization that has been under attack in this country. And, we have not paid our bills.

As I pointed out yesterday, the legislation before us attempts to remedy the situation over a 3-year period of time with 18 pages of very substantial conditions that must be met by the United Nations in order for the United States debt repayment money to flow to that body.

Mr. President, my amendment is very straightforward. It substitutes for the 18 pages of conditions in the bill my amendment which says there are no conditions for our payment and we will, in fact, make the payment of \$819 million in two installments in 2-years' time. The \$819 million has been a sum the administration and the Foreign Relations Committee has agreed that we owe. In addition, we would be receiving approximately \$107 million back from the United Nations for peacekeeping services we have offered.

The two ideas before the Senate are important because this is a turning point of some significance in our foreign policy. In order to understand the amendment today and the bill that it amends, I think it is necessary to go back to square one and ask, why are we in such a predicament? How could the United States fail to pay the United Nations over \$1 billion over the course of several years?

I think the answer, quite frankly, is that there has been a pervasive feeling in the U.S. Senate which we, as Senators, thought were reflecting the country's antipathy to the United Nations, antipathy to bureaucracies and organizational inefficiencies. Many Americans have been told, at least in our Senate debates, that the United Nations preys upon the United States and that we are not in control. But, of course, the leadership the United States has exerted to obtain control of that body is certainly suspect.

Mr. President, to set the record straight at the outset, a number of national polls have been taken that reflect a 2-to-1 majority of Americans believing the United Nations is very important and that we ought to pay our bills. The polling data goes for many years, but I found especially instructive a poll that indicated on the question: "Do you believe that U.N. member states should always pay their full dues to the U.N. on schedule, or should a state hold back its dues to pressure other members to agree to changes it believes are needed?", Americans, in a Wirthlin Group poll in 1989 conducted for the United Nations Association, 60% of Americans responded that we should always pay the United Nations, pay other countries, whoever. Only 14 percent said you ought to hold back.

In April 1996 jumping about 7 years ahead, 78 percent of Americans believe that a nation should always pay; 13 percent believe you ought to be able to hold back.

The American public understands what is fair. They understand what a contract is, what our obligations are as a nation.

Furthermore, Mr. President, they understand the work the United Nations does, and by an overwhelming majority, the public believes we should not only stay in the United Nations but, as a matter of fact, in a polling item of a Times Mirror poll, the question was, "Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The United States should cooperate fully with the United Nations?," 65 percent of Americans agree, 29 percent disagree—well over two-thirds.

I make that point because I believe we have come to this particular pass because public servants believe somehow it is popular to withhold money from the United Nations; to, in essence, say to the United Nations, "Reform, repent or we will not pay our dues."

This is understandable, and the amount of reform needed by the United Nations is sizable. The new Secretary General Kofi Annan, who has supported the United States, who has come to visit with our own Foreign Relations Committee, has not only pledged to make reforms, he is doing that job. Our Ambassador, Mr. Richardson, will have a full-time job working with him to make certain that occurs.

There are 184 nations involved. We are one of them, ostensibly the most powerful of those nations. Essentially, we are going to have to work with that bureaucracy to pare it down, to pare the budget down. The signs of progress are promising.

Let me make a major point I hope Members will follow. Of the more than \$1 billion the United States agrees that we owe, only 5 percent has anything to do with the bureaucracy, the Secretariat of the United Nations, only 5 percent, some \$54 million.

Now, if Members ask, "Well, then, what is the argument about?" The argument is about \$650 million or so of peacekeeping expenses that were assumed by our allies for which the United Nations is simply a passthrough for money that we, the United States of America, said we would pay and now we owe to friendly countries.

Let me cite, so it is not obscure, who we owe money to. We owe money to France, \$60.1 million; we owe Great Britain \$41 million; the Netherlands \$21.3 million; Pakistan \$20.1 million; Germany \$18.3 million we owe; Belgium \$17.3 million; Italy \$17.2 million; India \$16.1 million; Canada our near neighbor, \$14.2 million. This is money we owe to them, not to Kofi Annan, the Secretary General, or the U.N. Secretariat or the organization so frequently criticized on the floor of this body. We owe more than \$650 million to other

countries who sent their troops out to do work that we wanted them to do. We voted for the peacekeeping resolutions. We said we would send money if they would send men and if they would take on the fighting obligations, or at least the dangers that were involved in often hazardous duty that went beyond simple peacekeeping. That is the money, Mr. President, that is at risk.

I am not certain Senators understand that we are, in essence, saying to our allies, we will not pay you unless you change the dues structure for us, for the United States. In essence, we not only have failed to pay our allies, but we have said, as a matter of fact, we are not going to pay you. This bill says we won't pay you unless you reduce our U.N. dues to only 20 percent of the budget, as opposed to 25 percent, and unless you reduce our peacekeeping dues to 25 percent as opposed to around 31 percent. Unilaterally, arbitrarily, take it or leave it. That is what is proposed in the legislation in front of us.

In addition, the legislation, Members will note if they read through the 18 pages of agate type, has at least 38 conditions and hoops other countries and the United Nations must go through in order for us to pay our debts.

Mr. President, it is strange that we came to this situation through, I think, a misperception of who ought to be paid. Most Americans who understand we owe Great Britain, France, Canada, and Italy, will say, "Why haven't we paid?" And most Americans would understand that our failure to pay will have consequences because we are dealing with these same nations in NATO reform and NATO expansion in trying to determine what the fair shares will be. We are dealing with most of these countries every day in terms of agricultural exports which are very difficult bread-and-butter issues for America. Yet, we take an arbitrary position with regard to the United Nations that we simply will not pay until they go through the hoops of implementing the reforms we insist upon in this bill.

Mr. BIDEN. Excuse me. Will the Senator yield for a question on one point on my time?

Mr. LUGAR. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BIDEN. The Senator's amendment calls for the payment of \$819 million over 2 years; is that correct?

Mr. LUGAR. That's correct.

Mr. BIDEN. How would the Senator's amendment pay our allies any more money than our mark, than this legislation does?

Mr. LUGAR. I respond to the distinguished Senator by pointing out, I have doubts under the bill we are about to pass that very much money get through the United Nations to our allies. The money will most certainly get to our allies through my amendment. I suspect, if the other conditions that are in title XXII are imposed, the odds are slim that the money will get through.

Mr. BIDEN. If the Senator will yield, Mr. President, I am sorry, I didn't phrase the question well and clearly enough. Even if the money gets through, as the Senator is suggesting his amendment would accommodate, how would the Senator's amendment fully fund and pay the arrearages the Senator believes we owe our allies? Is there enough money in the Senator's amendment to fully pay the money the Senator believes that we owe our allies through the United Nations as it relates to the United Nations peacekeeping?

Mr. LUGAR. I will respond to the Senator by saying the money paid to our allies is our assumption of how much we owe. It is based upon the \$1.021 billion that the administration and the Foreign Relations Committee has agreed is the sum we owe. Many of our allies believe we owe a lot more.

Mr. BIDEN. If the Senator will yield again, but the Senator's amendment only provides \$819 million, not \$1.021 billion. What I am confused about is, how does the Senator's amendment in this regard differ from the bill that the chairman and I have brought before the Senate?

We have \$819 million in our bill, which you don't like, nor do I, and the fact that we make the United Nations meet benchmarks before it is released. But assuming it was released, how does the Senator's amendment provide any more money to pay the arrearages that the Senator believes that we owe?

Mr. LUGAR. My amendment would not provide more money. It simply provides certainty that payment is received at all. Let me just continue—

Mr. BIDEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUGAR. The distinguished Senator from Delaware yesterday, in responding to a similar argument that I have made today, made the point that, all things considered, he agrees that we ought to pay our debts, that we ought to respond to our contractual obligations, that, in the best of all worlds, this is a principled stand, as I recall his description of it. But the Senator from Delaware said the trail that I am following leads to no payment.

Now, if I were to ask with some incredulity why a fairly straightforward amendment adopted by the Senate—obviously the House must act and the President must sign the bill—why my course will lead to zero, as the Senator from Delaware characterized it. It is because, as the Senator from Delaware pointed out, he has been negotiating with the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the committee has said, in essence, we are not going anywhere without accommodation of these conditions—at least that was the characterization. Essentially, he was saying that we have gone nowhere for several years, and that we have accumulated debts and will continue to accumulate debts.

In short, the distinguished Senator from Delaware said, and he described, very candidly, the negotiations that he

came to the chairman suggesting a sum of money the administration felt we owed, and the chairman took a very adverse view to that. The Senator from Delaware has been negotiating for quite a long while in trying to get that figure up.

The Senator from Delaware finally comes to the body yesterday and says essentially, "This is the best I can do. In essence, hopefully, these conditions will be met. Countries, in fact, will meet them and the money will flow, \$100 million in the first year fairly easily," as the Senator characterized, "and it gets tougher in the second and third years. But, nevertheless, somehow this is going to occur." That is the judgment Senators have to make.

I will just say very frankly, Mr. President, that we ought to face the situation in a much more straightforward way, because this debate has not occurred in private, nor have our failures to pay our debts occurred in private. It is a very public embarrassment in which the United States of America is stiff-arming our friends, quite apart from whatever damage we are doing to the United Nations. If, in fact, we want to get out of the United Nations, withdraw from it, saying essentially this is a group of people constantly preying upon us and we are tired of that, that is one basic decision Senators might want to make. I am suggesting, Mr. President, this bill veers very close to making that decision for us.

What if the rest of the world, 183 nations, decides that our arbitrary decision here in the Senate is not really where they want to go? What if the United Nations goes bankrupt? What if our allies no longer trust us with regard to peacekeeping, fearing they will not be paid any more than they have been in the past? What if, as a matter of fact, other nations begin to doubt our word and our ability to follow through on contractual obligations we undertake? There is a lot at stake, Mr. President.

It could very well be that there are some Senators who would say, "We ought to take advantage of our size and weight in the world now. There's no point in worrying about the sensitivities of other nations. We're paying 25 percent of the dues. Our share of the world's wealth right now is about 27 percent, but we don't want to pay that, we want to pay 20 percent. We're not going to take any fuss from any other nation about that."

We're going to pay 20 percent of the U.N. dues arbitrarily. Not only that, we are going to take our peacekeeping from 31 percent to 25 percent of the budget. It is too high to begin with. We are tired of paying that. We will pay that, take it or leave it. In essence there are two "take it or leave it's," Mr. President, as the Senator from Delaware characterized the debate yesterday. In essence he has said to the Senate that we either take it or leave it or there will not be any payment at all. The chairman will not agree to it.

Second, after we get through this process, we say to the rest of the world, "Take it or leave it, because there won't be any payment unless you take our word for what we want to pay and under the conditions that we want to pay it."

In essence, Mr. President, this is not very good foreign policy. It is not really a very good stance for the United States at all. I will simply say, what will be the predicaments if we get our way and arbitrarily reduce our dues, and countries either get their moneys or they don't. I predict, Mr. President, the ramifications of this are likely to be very expensive for the United States.

Not only is it the right thing to do to pay our debts, it is in fact the most effective way of being persuasive at the United Nations to bring about reforms that we want there.

Mr. President, I appreciate that not all Senators have followed all of the debate as extensively as those who have been debating this yesterday and today. But let me say already there is some doubt as to precisely what this bill has to say.

For example, the Washington Post of Saturday, June 14, 1997, suggested that Ambassador Richardson and our own colleague, Senator GRAMS of Minnesota, went to the United Nations on Saturday, after our markup on Thursday, and, according to John Goshko of the Post: They denied that Congress wants to "micromanage the United Nations," and they insisted that the plan is "not a take-it-or-leave-it proposition." Instead, they said it is a set of "suggestions" aimed at helping the United Nations become, as GRAMS said, "the best United Nations it can be". . .

The two officials' assertions that the conditions or so-called benchmarks in the plan are only suggestions ran counter, according to the article, and also according to remarks by Chairman HELMS on Thursday.

Quoting Senator HELMS:

This bill will prohibit the payment by the American taxpayers of any so-called U.N. arrears until these congressionally mandated benchmarks have been met by the U.N.

Then another quote from Senator HELMS:

The message to the U.N. is simple but clear: no reform, no American taxpayer money for arrears.

Now, Mr. President, in the Washington Times, Senator GRAMS is quoted as saying:

"These are broad suggestions," said Sen. Rod Grams, Minnesota Republican, architect of the reform package and U.S. delegate to the United Nations. "We're not going to micromanage the U.N. by any means."

At a press conference yesterday, both [Ambassador Richardson and Mr. Grams] took pains to soften the edges of a bill most here see as an imperious "take it or leave it" offer. Mr. Grams plans to spend time at the United Nations this summer, selling the package to foreign envoys [according to the Washington Times of June 14, 1997].

So already, Mr. President, while we are debating the bill, our Ambassador

and a distinguished colleague are at the United Nations saying we are making some helpful suggestions that we do not want to micromanage. But back here at the Congress, the word is no reform, and according to the 18 pages of conditions in this legislation, no money.

Senators will have to make up their minds. The suggestion has been two "take it or leave it," in my own view. This is the reason I presented the amendment. We have obligations. In a straightforward way we ought to meet them.

As the Senator from Delaware suggested in his question this morning, the amounts of money in this bill are clearly in dispute. But I accept the fact that the U.S. Government, both in its legislative and administrative branches, estimates we owe \$1.021 billion. After various deductions, \$819 million is on the table to be disbursed in both the Foreign Relations Committee bill and in my amendment.

But there is a large difference in how the dispersal occurs, a very large difference in our attitude to other countries, our friends in the rest of the world, and a very large difference in our presumptions about the United Nations and its usefulness to us.

Finally, Mr. President, word came yesterday in a debate that the United States of America has loaned countries a lot of money. We have spent a lot of money helping them defend themselves. And indeed we have. Our foreign policy frequently—frequently—tries to make sure the frontiers of conflict are as far away from our country as possible. We have given a lot of military aid to others who we hoped would fight our battles as our allies or as front lines for us. And that was prudent for us to do.

But now we come to a situation, Mr. President, in which the United States said we do not want to be involved in these front line activities, or certain peacekeeping chores that were controversial, but which we think ought to be done. We voted for them. We sent others forward. We said we would pay. And now we have not paid nor will we pay unless the United Nations and the members in it reduce our dues, and unless they go through the hoops of even such suggestions that international conferences of the United Nations could be held in only four cities. We even dictate the cities in which the conference might occur.

Members will be astonished, as they read through all the conditions, what is involved. But Members should read soon because we will have a vote shortly this afternoon on this amendment. I believe it is a critical vote for American foreign policy. I hope the Senators will support my amendment.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield 2 minutes?

Mr. LUGAR. I am happy to yield such time as I have.

Mr. SARBANES. How much time does the Senator have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes 40 seconds left under his time.

Mr. SARBANES. If the Senator will yield me 2 minutes.

Mr. LUGAR. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. I rise in very strong support of this amendment. The Senator from Indiana stated the arguments in a very cogent and, I think, persuasive fashion.

Mr. President, we just celebrated 50 years of the Marshall Plan. A couple of years ago we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations. If you read that history, what is clear is the marked contrast between the United States' attitude at the end of World War II, at which time we demonstrated strong leadership, and the attitude that is reflected in this legislation.

This legislation imposes a host of arbitrary and burdensome conditions on the United Nations. If the United Nations fails to achieve them, I am sure the argument will be made, "It's too bad they didn't accede to the conditions we were imposing, and therefore it's their fault that we're not paying these arrears." Yet, I remind my colleagues, these are arrears which we clearly owe and which we have built up over the years.

This approach goes directly contrary to the one that was reflected in the exercise of American leadership in both the United Nations and the Marshall plan—an approach which I think ought to characterize our policy toward the United Nations today.

I think the able Senator from Indiana has rendered a distinct service by focusing the attention of the Senate on this issue. I very much hope my colleagues will support his amendment. It relates solely to payment of arrears, to dues we already owe. We agreed to pay them under the Charter of the United Nations. Now we are saying, "Well, if you want us to pay our past dues, you've got to agree to reduce our future dues."

Now, I support an effort to reduce our future dues, but I do not think it ought to simply be imposed through this unilateral action on the part of the United States.

The United Nations serves important interests of ours. I think it is critical for the United States to help sustain and preserve a strong United Nations. I very much hope that the amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be adopted.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. I yield myself as much time as I am able to consume. I think I have about 20, 25 minutes left, in that range.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-two minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, to state the obvious, there are no two Senators of whom I have higher regard than the

two Senators who are proposing this amendment. We use those kinds of phrases around here, but I know they both know that I mean it.

Now, I have a little difficulty with their approach here, not the principle that they are proposing, because, as I said from the outset and as the chairman will tell you repeatedly, and I suspect the Senator from New Hampshire, who is on the floor, may tell you, and I know our new colleague from Nebraska will tell you, I am not one who thinks we should be attaching conditions. I am a minority in that view, along with my two colleagues, but I am not one who thinks we should be attaching conditions. So I agree with them on that.

But I do think they overplay the point a bit in making it appear as though the Senator from North Carolina has in effect co-opted the Senator from Delaware into signing on to these conditions and that this is something totally new. Let me remind people of a few historical facts about conditions.

I have here—and I will ask in a moment that I be able to submit this for the RECORD—the number of occasions on which the U.S. Congress or Republican or Democratic Presidents have withheld the payment of moneys to the United Nations that were duly owed because of policy decisions made by our Government, notwithstanding the fact that we owed it, that we would not pay our dues unless the United Nations changed their view—conditions, conditions.

I will just list them all. The PLO and Palestinian-related condition that we withheld funds of \$16,556,000 because we voted on this floor—I do not know how my colleagues voted, but I bet they voted the same way—we voted on this floor to say that as long as the PLO was getting a special kind of treatment in the United Nations, which we viewed to be unfairly against the interest of our ally Israel, we were going to withhold funds. That is \$16.556 million. SWAPO. Remember old SWAPO? Well, we had that. You know, that was the debate relating to Southern Africa, Angola, South Africa, et cetera. We withheld \$68 million. The Law of the Seas preconference, another policy dispute, we withheld \$7.56 million. The South African-Israel conference, we withheld \$200,000. The Kasten amendment, we withheld \$1,300,000. The appropriations shortfall of fiscal years 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1996 accounts for \$168.64 million, there was those—anyway I will go back over this. The deficit-reduction plan withheld \$12,860,000. The Kassebaum-Solomon amendment withheld \$42 million. And it goes on.

Guess what? We withheld, based on conditions that this body or Republican or Democratic Presidents placed on the United Nations, \$164,111,000. So of the arrears, this body was complicit in over \$100 million of those arrears. Now, all of a sudden they look at the Senator from North Carolina and me and say, "Oh, my lord,

what are you doing? You're attaching conditions?" *Mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa.*

I did not think we should attach conditions then or now. But this is not anything new. And so of the money that we say is owed—our administration says we owe \$1.021 billion, and the United Nations says we owe \$1.361 billion. Of that, \$1.021 billion, \$164 million of it is previously attached conditions.

Now, I would like my colleagues who think we should not attach conditions to look at this list, stand on the floor and acknowledge why we should not have done any of this, and how they voted on it. I do not know how they voted on it. I do not even know how I voted on every one.

So, I am a little bit surprised at the manner in which this argument is being presented as if oh, my lord, we are about to do this awful thing we have never done before, and the United Nations is going to crumble when we do it. That is No. 1.

No. 2, how did I arrive at \$819 million, to badger my friend from North Carolina to say I would not sign on to this unless it got to \$819 million? The way I arrived at that number—there is nothing original on my part—I asked the administration, what do we need to pay our friends, and what do we need to meet our obligations?

Let me tell you, and this gives my friend some "agitato" here, as they say in the Italian communities in my State, let me tell you what I understand the facts to be. Let me point out that my friend from Maryland and my friend who is the leader of this effort, Senator LUGAR from Indiana, are not providing one more penny than I am providing. So this is all about principle. You ought to come and ask for all the money because you are doing the same thing I am doing, trying to get the best deal you can—not that either one of them have suggested that what I am doing is unprincipled, I just point out that their approach is no more or less principled than what I am suggesting. We are trying to get a job done. They do not provide one more penny.

Now, how did they arrive at my \$819 million? Why did they not arrive at \$1.021 billion like they say we need? Because they know what I know, that \$819 million will pay our allies. Now, let's go back and talk about how it is owed and what is owed. Peacekeeping arrears—that we acknowledge, the President acknowledges, and even if we paid more money, the President would not pay any more of it—peacekeeping arrears amounts to \$658 million; regular budget arrears amounts to \$54 million; arrearages in specialized agencies amounts to \$254 million; and arrears to international organizations amount to \$55 million. Let me repeat that now: Peacekeeping \$658 million; regular budget, \$54 million; specialized agencies, \$254 million; and international organizations, \$55 million.

Now, I share the same concern my friend from Indiana does. However, if

we appropriate \$819 million the way the Senator from North Carolina and I are proposing, there are relatively easy conditions that have to be met the first 2 years. Let me make sure everybody remembers. The first year, we get about \$100 million, and the second year we are up to \$475 million. The United Nations owes us \$107 million, and the United Nations will pay the United States from a tax equalization fund, \$27 million. Now, you got that? I do not want to turn this into a math class but I want to be simple—these numbers are real important. Mr. President, \$100 million goes out the first fiscal year this takes effect; \$475 million the second year; the United Nations owes us, we say, \$107 million for peacekeeping; and \$27 million for the tax equalization. You add up all that money and it pays virtually every single penny that we owe to all of our allies for peacekeeping and the only thing it does not do in the first 2 years is it does not pay what we are said to owe to an international organization called UNIDO, the U.N. Industrial Development Organization, from which we have formally withdrawn. The Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Indiana, the Senator from Delaware, and the Senator from New Hampshire did not say you had to withdraw from it. The President withdrew. Ambassador Richardson delivered the papers and said, "We're out." That is the only organization we do not have the money to pay but we are already out of it.

So, come on. Come on. I do not like doing it this way either, but it doesn't come out the way you all are saying it comes out. Our allies have nothing to fear. They reason they are not squawking, the reason there are not yelling out there, the reason neither the United Nations nor the Secretary-General is holding a protest and jumping up and down and screaming, is because they know and we know and the administration knows that the money in year 1 and year 2 combined with the money owed us will pay the deal, will meet our obligations.

Now, the last point I will raise, and I will not use all my time because others wish to speak, the last point I will raise are these conditions. Let me just tick off what the conditions are that the chairman has graciously agreed will be the ones required in the first 2 years to allow all of the money I just mentioned to be released. I may lose his vote if I keep pointing this out, but these are the facts.

First, a very difficult condition in the first year, the United Nations has to acknowledge, we have to acknowledge, the President has to acknowledge that our sovereignty will not be diminished by membership in the United Nations. That is a very difficult condition to meet. Come on. Come on. That is the first condition for the first year. Then we have to get the United Nations to reduce—and they say they can do this—our regular budget assessment from 25 to 22 percent, 25 to 22 percent

in year 2, not year 1, year 2. So, we have 2 years to get that done. I might add, it was Ambassador Richardson testifying before our committee that said it should be 20 percent, Madeleine Albright said it should be 20 percent, the President has said it should be 20 percent. We did not pick 20 percent out of the air. Granted, I would rather it not be a mandate, but this is not something we are making up out of whole cloth. This is what this administration thinks is a fair assessment. They do not want us to mandate it, but they acknowledge it is fair. Now, roughly \$709 million in the first 2 years would be available.

Another condition met which we already have unilaterally done and our allies have acknowledged is that we have been assessed 30 percent for peacekeeping. We do a whole heck of a lot of peacekeeping around the world and no one else chips in on it at all. We say that is too high, it should be 25 percent. The administration says that is not a problem, we can get it down there. So that is another condition. We only pay 25 percent, not from this point on, but from 2 years out. From that point on, 25 percent for peacekeeping.

The administration says in testimony that these are easy conditions to meet. This is not something we are asking them to jump through some hoop they cannot meet. Now, when the condition of sovereignty, which is restating the obvious, when the condition of 22 percent for our annual dues, and when the condition of 25 percent for peacekeeping are met, and they have 2 years in which to meet that, all the money needed to pay all our allies, all the money we owe them will be released.

So what is the deal here? Neither of my colleagues said this, but some have written that somehow I have made this pact with the ultimate enemy of the United Nations to undermine the United Nations and we are just going to rip its throat out and so on and so forth, and we compromised. And isn't that a horrible thing? Look, anybody who comes over here looking to be bathed in the waters of legislative purity, Senator LUGAR's amendment does not help you a bit, because he jumps right into that swamp with the rest of us. He is not asking for the \$1.3 billion that the United Nations says we owe. He is not asking for \$1.021 billion, the amount the administration says we owe. He is asking for the same amount of money that the chairman of the committee and I are asking for. So much for the notion of paying everything they say we owe.

Now, there is a distinction, you should be aware of when you vote. The distinction is that there are mandates in there, all of which can be met, and, in my view, reasonably can be met and should be met. I would rather not mandate them. That is the matter of principal distinction between the Senator and I. I would rather not mandate

them, but they are mandated. Now, understand what the Senator from North Carolina has done here, and again I'm not being facetious when I say this, and maybe it is not helpful to point out what he has done, he has been eminently reasonable. In the first distribution scheme we had for this \$819 million, in the first distribution scheme we had, the way it was laid down is there would be \$100 million, there would have been \$419 million, and then the remainder in the third year. I went to him and said, look, I need \$475 million in that second year, and he said OK, as the final element of compromise. The reason I needed \$475 million was to do just what I just laid out for you. So there is a distinction.

The Senator from Indiana says it all gets paid out of the \$819 million and paid out in 2 years and he is worried about our allies. I am saying we pay out the \$710 million if they meet the conditions in the first 2 years and all our ally obligations are met. This is a distinction without a gigantic difference here. There is, as they might say, much ado about something, but it ain't much.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIDEN. I am delighted to yield.

I want to save 4 minutes for my friend from Virginia. I have how much time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4½ minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Where does the Senator get the \$710 million?

Mr. BIDEN. In three places. I get \$100 million the first year, \$475 million the second year on the arrearages.

Mr. SARBANES. The Senator said we would have—

Mr. BIDEN. I am going to explain that, I will tell you where I get the rest.

I get \$107 million from the money the United Nations acknowledges they owe the United States for peacekeeping, and I get \$27 million for money that the United Nations owes the United States for tax equalization.

That is how I get it. It is not out of the \$819.

Mr. SARBANES. Where do I find this in the bill?

Mr. BIDEN. You find it in acknowledgments. It does not have to be in the bill. They owe us \$107 million for peacekeeping and \$27 million for tax equalization. That is money the administration has to use to meet its obligations.

Mr. SARBANES. So these figures that are in the bill on page 180—\$100 million, \$475 million, and \$244 million—are correct?

Mr. BIDEN. Absolutely correct, but I was making the point in response to the question will there be enough money to pay our allies in the first 2 years? And the answer is yes because of the \$575 million out of this bill and roughly \$134 million that is owed to us.

Mr. SARBANES. Well, how does that enable them to pay our allies?

Mr. BIDEN. It's very simple.

Mr. SARBANES. They are operating on a deficit now. So if we forgive their debt to us, how does that give them money to pay our allies?

Mr. BIDEN. The reason is because, just like when the bank owes you money, they owe you money—the question is how much we owe them. You are saying we owe them \$1.370 billion. My time is running out. Maybe later the Senator from North Carolina might yield me a few minutes.

I reserve the remainder of my time for my friend from Virginia, Senator ROBB. I am out of time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS. How much time is remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. HELMS. I have three Senators on the floor wishing to speak. I ask them to stay as close as they can to 5 minutes. If they need to go a little over that, fine. First, Senator HAGEL of Nebraska, then Senator GREGG of New Hampshire, and Senator GRAMS of Minnesota, all three of whom have been so helpful in the creation and production of this bill.

I yield to Senator HAGEL and then automatically the floor is yielded to the other two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. I will be brief, Mr. President. I know there are others who want to speak on this issue. There is an old North Carolina adage that goes like this: Don't make the perfect the enemy of the good.

The Senator has heard that, I know. I think that is what we are talking about this morning. This is rather remarkable. What has been pieced together over 5 months of very diligent effort, leadership, and hard work, making something work based on a bipartisan foreign policy effort and a commitment made by Chairman HELMS, Senator BIDEN, Secretary of State Albright, and the administration, who all have worked very hard on this. When you add to that Senator GRAMS from Minnesota, as the subcommittee chairman, who has put his imprimatur and worked hard and given his leadership to this effort, this is a remarkable effort.

Mr. President, I don't know about you or other Senators in this body, but for years and years, as a private citizen, as a taxpayer, and as a businessman, I would hear constantly, and I have heard over the last 2 years during my campaign: What about the United Nations? What are we doing? The United Nations says we owe money. Do we owe money? How much? What about the peacekeeping efforts? Are our peacekeeping dollars counted? How do we account for that? Isn't it true that we put American men and women in harm's way and we paid the bill and we are in Bosnia and all over the globe?

So what is the correct way to assess our dues, our commitment to this very important organization? The debate,

ladies and gentlemen—don't be mistaken here—is not whether the United Nations is good, bad, or whether we want to be in it or not. Of course it is good. The world is better because of the United Nations. But we need to get this issue cleared up. We need to take the negotiations that have been held by the leaders in this and hold negotiations. I think it was rather evident in our committee hearings and the subsequent markup of this bill last week, when it was reported out 14 to 4. It said to me that, in fact, bipartisanship is in effect and, in fact, the commitment made by the administration and Senators BIDEN, HELMS, and others, will make this work. We need to get this behind us and we need to address this issue. I think it is a fair resolution to the issue. We can then work on the bigger issues that this country and the world must face as we move into a bold, new century.

Big issues. We have trade issues. We have treaty issues. I, for one, am not one Senator who wants to go back and replay this. I say this with the greatest respect for Senator LUGAR and others who have been involved in this. Hardly an individual in this body is as aware and provided as much leadership on foreign relations as Senator LUGAR. But I think the time is now to make what we came up with—the good effort of bipartisan leadership—the bill that we move forward with and, therefore, allowing this body, the committee, and all those responsible for policy in this country, as we move into the next century, the freedom to focus on that. I rise today in strong support of the Helms-Biden bill. I hope my colleagues will take what I and my colleagues have said this morning into consideration as they vote today.

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Minnesota in endorsing this really excellent effort that has been developed through a great deal of negotiation between the Senators from North Carolina and Delaware, the Secretary of State, the Ambassador to the United Nations, the Senator from Minnesota, and the majority leader.

This effort was not easy. There were a lot of disagreements as to how we should address the U.N. arrearages issue. I am speaking from the perspective of the Appropriations Committee, where I chair the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the funding of the United Nations. From my viewpoint, I and I think many of my colleagues were not really willing to simply give carte blanche to the United Nations again.

The fact is that the United Nations has, regrettably, been fiscally mismanaged. That mismanagement has meant that American tax dollars have

been wasted. That is not right. We as a Senate have an obligation to make sure that the tax dollars that are sent to us out of the hard earnings of our constituents are effectively spent. This proposal includes in it conditions that will require the United Nations to finally straighten out its fiscal house. Today, you really can't tell where a dollar goes that is sent to the United Nations. More importantly, there is a distinct sense that when a dollar goes to the United Nations today, a great deal is misspent on patronage, on promised services that are not delivered, on programs that don't work, and on agencies which have an excessive amount of personnel.

So we are requiring, under this proposal, that the United Nations put in very basic accounting procedures, that they actually be able to tell us where the dollars go, that they have a personnel policy that is accountable, a system of accounting for the programmatic activity they undertake.

More importantly, we are requiring and putting in conditions that allow us to determine that their procedures and structures work well, from a GAO auditing of their procedures.

In addition, we have seen the other conditions outlined by the Senator from Delaware and, I am sure, will be outlined by other Senators here, which will make the United Nations fee system, or payment system, or dues system more reflective of the burdens of other nations, as well as the United States. We pay a disproportionate amount of the cost for peacekeeping and for the fees at the United Nations and the dues of the United Nations. We are not talking about dramatic reduction in either our commitment to the United Nations, in peacekeeping, or in our commitment to the area of dues. But we are talking about bringing it more in line with the fact that other nations, since the initiation of the United Nations, have risen in their economic capability to bear some of this burden. That is reflective in this amendment.

So this is a good amendment. It is an amendment that brought together the various parties. And, believe me, when we started the negotiations, we were a long way apart. There wasn't much expectation that an agreement would be reached. But through the good counsel of the Senator from North Carolina, the Senator from Minnesota, the majority leader, and through the hard effort of the Secretary of State and the Ambassador to the United Nations, we have reached an accommodation and agreement. It is a positive one, one that will help the United Nations be a stronger institution that people can have confidence in, especially as to how and where it spends the dollars sent to it.

So it is a positive step forward to have these conditions in this bill. I, as an appropriator, would have a lot of problems passing any appropriation that didn't follow the outline set forth

by this committee and set forth in the work of Senator HELMS and Senator BIDEN.

I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, as the subcommittee chairman with jurisdiction over the bill before us today, I worked diligently with members on both sides of the aisle, and with the administration, to craft legislation which will strengthen America's leadership role in the international arena. This package reorganizes our foreign relations bureaucracy, establishes benchmarks for the payment of U.N. arrears, and prioritizes our international affairs expenditures. We need a more effective foreign affairs apparatus, both at home and at the United Nations, in order to confront the challenges to peace and security in the future.

This bipartisan agreement is the result of a good-faith effort to accommodate conflicting perspectives on how we, as a nation, should mobilize our resources. There were tough, lengthy negotiations on this package. We had to reconcile competing interests, and as a result, nobody is completely satisfied with the final product. I will be the first to say that this bill is not perfect. I would have preferred much more in the way of reforms and budget discipline. But this is a good agreement; and in this case, we should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. I want to reassure my colleagues that I am open to oversight hearings that would address their concerns and closely examine the implementation of the changes we have made.

In order to effectively safeguard the national interest, we must reorganize our foreign policy apparatus. This nation is saddled with an unwieldy Cold War foreign policy bureaucracy in which many of the functions of AID, ACDA, USIA and the International Development Cooperation Agency could be better handled by the State Department. This legislation does not go as far as I would like in consolidating our foreign relations bureaucracy. But for now, this package has a major advantage over a more complete consolidation—this package is achievable. It is a solid first step. Hopefully, these reforms will lead to further streamlining in the future—the American people want our Government to not only reflect their wishes abroad, but they want it to do so coherently. We are more likely to achieve our goals if we have a single voice representing the administration's position in the conduct of foreign relations, rather than a number of competing fiefdoms which undercut the authority of the Secretary of State.

For example, under the new structure, we no longer should be stymied by a good-cop, bad-cop approach to foreign policy, whereby the entities who hand out U.S. foreign aid maintain good relations with client nations,

while the Department of State essentially holds the line in protecting U.S. interests. We should not be handing out foreign aid to a country at a time when that very country is clearly acting against our interests. When we distribute foreign aid, it should be with an understanding that the United States entity asking for cooperation from a country in one arena is coordinating with the United States entity that will be delivering assistance to that country. Under this plan, the different parts of our foreign policy apparatus have a structural imperative to act in concert.

Granted, the United States is not alone in the need to downsize its bureaucracy and eliminate waste. The United Nations must do the same. My visits to the United Nations as the United States Congressional Delegate to the U.N. General Assembly served to reinforce my commitment to salvage this organization. In this age, any organization burdened with a bloated bureaucracy and no mechanisms to control spending, will collapse under the weight of its own inefficiency. Most United Nations officials recognize the need for reform, and have started to work to achieve some of them. Indeed, in her former position as Ambassador to the United Nations, Secretary Albright was an outspoken critic of waste, fraud, and abuse and was instrumental in initiating an oversight process. However, most of her efforts were stymied by an entrenched bureaucracy. True reform will only occur when there are tangible incentives to change. I believe that the United Nations needs the discipline of actual benchmarks tied to the arrears to provide the impetus for fundamental change. We have seen how difficult it is to streamline our own bureaucracy. It is even more difficult to streamline an international organization where each member is involved in these decisions. We are not seeking to micro-manage U.N. reforms. We want to work with our fellow U.N. members to make the organization the best it can be.

This bill provides a 3-year payment of \$819 million in arrears to the United Nations in conjunction with the achievement of specific benchmarks that will help us enhance the vitality of the United Nations. I joined Ambassador Richardson at the United Nations late last week to brief Secretary General Kofi Annan and the Permanent Representatives of many of our allies' delegations on the details of this package. I was repeatedly asked whether the \$819 million was a firm number. I indicated that it is a carefully negotiated figure that I believe will remain firm. I would like to remind my colleagues that the House bill contains no provision at all for the payment of arrears. The U.N. officials also wanted to know whether the benchmarks were conditions or suggestions. The benchmarks are what I call, somewhat tongue-in-check, "mandatory suggestions." They are suggestions in the sense that the United Nations can

choose whether or not to adopt them, and mandatory in the sense that if the U.N. wants the money it will have to implement the reforms.

If the United Nations ignores the need for reform, than the United Nations will have to forgo the \$819 million.

I regret that a statement I made in New York last week was misinterpreted to suggest that somehow benchmarks were negotiable or optional.

My intent was to indicate that the details regarding the implementation of certain conditions could be worked out with our fellow U.N. members—as long as the benchmark goals are achieved.

You know, there is a difference here. Many of the benchmarks establish broad parameters on the direction we believe the United Nations should be going. The final small details and the micromanaging of how those are accomplished and reached will be the work of negotiations between member states. We are setting out a macropackage of reforms that I believe most members at the United Nations recognize need to be made. These reforms are heading the United Nations in the direction that it needs to go in order to become a very efficient organization.

There is significant interest in the Congress to withhold the payment of arrears until there is tangible evidence that reform has occurred. After all, this is not the U.S. Government's money, it is the taxpayers money. Americans should be able to ensure that their hard earned money will not be squandered.

I was greatly encouraged that the Secretary General remains committed to reforms and will work with us to achieve them.

I strongly believe that the United Nations is an important forum for debate between member states and a vehicle for joint action when warranted. It is not a world government.

However, the United Nations must endorse reforms that provide transparency and accountability so it is embraced as the former, instead of feared as the latter. I firmly believe that this package will improve the United Nations to the point where the United Nations can win back public support which has eroded over the years.

These reforms are critical to ensure the United Nations is effective and relevant.

I urge my colleagues to support the entire bipartisan package and, especially, to understand how difficult it was to arrive at an agreement on the arrears.

I commend the chairman and the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee for their diligence and perseverance in effecting this compromise, an effort which took many months. I am pleased that the Administration has agreed, albeit reluctantly, to this agreement.

I look forward to the implementation of the measures which will enhance America's ability to exert leadership in the international arena through the

consolidation of our foreign relations apparatus.

I am hopeful that the United Nations will accept the reforms and in doing so, will increase its ability to perform its mission. This agreement is in America's best interest, and the best interest of the entire international community.

Thank you, very much. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, just for the Record, I think I should emphasize that JUDD GREGG from whom we just heard, the chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, has worked with us every step of the way in crafting this U.N. reform provision.

Senator GRAMS, from whom we just heard, is chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, and is our congressional delegate to the United Nations. He has been so instrumental in negotiating the provisions on U.N. reform.

I believe that Senator ROBB is prepared to speak. If he needs an extra couple of minutes, I will yield them to him.

Mr. ROBB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBB. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, it's hard to argue with the spirit of Senator LUGAR's amendment. And indeed I don't argue with its spirit. We owe the United Nations hundreds of millions of dollars. Our deadbeat status is an embarrassment for the country and undermines our standing and the vital work of this international organization.

That said, the political reality of the situation we find ourselves in is that a majority of this body is prepared only to pay our debts conditioned on comprehensive reforms being implemented at the United Nations. And I certainly don't disagree with reforming the United Nations, and making it more efficient and effective. Still, we are holding hostage money already owed to changes being invoked that suit our unilateral demands.

But the will of the majority is clear. While I may disagree with my friend the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee on the unilateral means which he has chosen to affect reform at the United Nations, the negotiated package providing \$819 million over 3 years I believe is the best we can hope for. Half a loaf is better than no loaf at all. And that is the alternative. This is a classic example of a situation where the perfect can become the enemy of the good.

Mr. President, I would favor an approach that pays our arrearages in full, not in the 2 years proposed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana or the 3 years sought by our distinguished chairman while conditioning future

payments on reform. But that strategy fails the political litmus test laid down by the majority. I understand that reality, and I want an authorization bill that can become law. Hence, the circumstances persuade me that the only approach that can accomplish that objective, even though I may substantively disagree with part of it—is the one negotiated between and offered by Senator HELMS and Senator BIDEN.

It represents a compromise in good faith on both sides to achieve an objective that we have not achieved in this body in some period of time. And for that reason, I support the bill and I oppose with regret the amendment that is offered by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Indiana.

With that, Mr. President, I yield back any time remaining.

Again, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for yielding me an additional minute.

Mr. HELMS. The Senator is quite welcome.

Mr. President, I am very pleased with the progress that we are making today.

Mr. President, just for the record, in 1985 a very distinguished Senator named Nancy Kassebaum, and Mr. SOLOMON on the House side, offered legislation using this very same approach. And it was in enacted into law for the State Department Authorization Act for fiscal years 1986 and 1987. Who do you reckon was the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at that time? It was my very good friend, Senator LUGAR of Indiana. If my memory serves me correctly, he supported Nancy Kassebaum, I, and all the rest of us who were interested in the same thing.

The Clinton administration never requested some of the larger amounts of money involved in the so-called arrearage. Through a normal process of budgeting, the Congress overlooked paying this enormous sum for peacekeeping, principally to our allies in Europe. In fact, the nonpayment of U.N. peacekeeping expenditures in Bosnia was an explicit rebuff by the Congress to a policy, and any suggestion to the contrary is simply not so. But the Clinton administration never requested most of the funds in that budget. It never received congressional approval. The Congress to the contrary explicitly opposed these peacekeeping expenditures. But through a flawed mechanism at the United Nations the Clinton administration at that time could vote for the peacekeeping mission and then after the fact demand the Congress meet the so-called United States obligation to pay.

So it is a confusing set of circumstances. But the argument that we are somehow being less than honorable in applying some demands is just not reasonable.

Let's look at another thing. Do we really want to start down the path of

who has spent how much on Bosnia? This is an argument which our allies are not going to win. Less than 2 years ago two Cabinet-level officials from the Clinton administration told the Foreign Relations Committee, of which Senator LUGAR is a member, and I believe he was present at that time, that the cost incurred for the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia is "going to be in excess of \$1 billion, probably \$1.5 billion." Just for the record, the United States has to date spent—guess how much on Bosnia? Mr. President, \$6.5 billion. Who is going to reimburse our military and our taxpayers for this expenditure? So where does anybody get off saying we are doing something dishonorable, or unwise, or unreasonable if we are protesting a lot of this stuff that is going on at the United Nations?

Over \$533 million of the so-called United States arrearages for peacekeeping is specifically related to the failed U.N. mission in Bosnia. In support of the amendment, it has been said that the United States did not have troops in Bosnia and, therefore, the United States has an obligation to pay those who did. That argument is not correct either.

During the period of the U.N. effort in Bosnia, the United States maintained an aircraft carrier battle group off the coast of the former Yugoslavia, a substantial commitment of aircraft to police the no-fly zone over Bosnia, and a military hospital unit in Croatia at an estimated cost of at least \$3 billion. Because the Congress prohibited President Clinton from associating our military with the U.N. disaster, the United States did not seek reimbursement for our efforts to contain hostilities in Bosnia.

If we are going to start talking about paying bills for Bosnia and things like that, we can really, really have a strong argument, and I am going to insist that our military and our taxpayers get reimbursed as well.

So, for me the alternative to the payment of these funds with the conditions in the reform package will not be the no strings attached approach advocated by the Lugar amendment. I will instead oppose any amendment for any reimbursement for the failed U.N. peacekeeping effort in Bosnia. And that is a debate, Mr. President, if we have it, that will be worth having.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask that Senators support my amendment because it is the right thing to do. It is the right thing to pay our debts and to meet our contractual obligations in support of the United Nations, a vigorous vehicle for the conduct of our foreign policy.

The dispute that we have today is over two different tacks on which the Senators differ in terms of our effectiveness. I believe that the Lugar amendment is not only the right thing to do but I believe it is the most effective

way to bring about reform, and to bring about cooperation with our allies, not only at the United Nations but in a host of international trade issues, in NATO and NATO-related concerns, and all of the planning that is vital to our foreign policy.

It makes no sense, Mr. President, to deny our allies funds that we owe them and to expect that they are going to be generous or thoughtful in negotiating settlements with us in a range of agreements around the globe.

So in terms of both the principle as well as its practicality, I believe the best course is to pay our debt and to do so promptly in a straightforward way and to negotiate firmly for reform of the United Nations, as we are doing, and as we will continue to do, after recognizing that 183 other countries are involved. There must finally be agreement with them, too.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I commend the Senators from North Carolina and Delaware for bringing this very important piece of legislation to the Senate floor. It has been many years since Congress has passed and the President signed a State Department Authorization bill. U.S. interests will be very well served if we are able to accomplish this very difficult but important task.

I would like to address a key provision within S. 903, that being the U.N. reform plan. I have long had a deep interest in the world body, and this legislation offers the Senate an opportunity to better understand the many complex issues surrounding U.S. membership in the United Nations.

There have been a number of what I consider to be unfortunate misconceptions raised about the United Nations in recent years that, in the context of this legislation, ought to be addressed in a forthright manner. American taxpayers deserve to know what benefits does the United States derive from its participation in the United Nations? A misconception one hears repeatedly is that the United States pays billions of dollars in U.N. dues, but gets little or nothing to show for it in return. I think it is important to rebut this allegation in order to more effectively make a case for full payment of our arrearages.

The United Nations advances U.S. foreign policy goals in a number of ways, including isolation of nations that support terrorism, conflict resolution through diplomacy, the provision of humanitarian aid, and the promotion of democracy and human rights. These many successful ventures are too often overlooked as the more headline-grabbing failures of the U.N. seem to receive more attention by the news media.

For example, U.N. economic sanctions serve to isolate and weaken regimes of nations such as Iraq, Libya, and others that routinely challenge United States interests abroad. Although these outlaw regimes remain in

power, their ability to influence world events and undermine our interests are greatly reduced. I note the now-lifted U.N. sanctions on Serbia, which were instrumental in bringing that nation to the negotiations that eventually resulted in the Dayton peace accords. And we should also recall that Operation Desert Storm was conducted under the authority of a U.N.-passed resolution.

The United Nations has also been instrumental in a number of peace-making endeavors, including the brokering and implementation of peace agreements in the nearby, formerly war-ravaged nations of El Salvador and Guatemala. While I recognize and acknowledge the imperfect record of U.N. peacekeeping missions, particularly in Somalia and Bosnia, there have been successes in a number of lesser known parts of the world that are infrequently publicized. In any event, it should also be understood that the number of troops involved in U.N. peacekeeping operations has been reduced two-thirds over the past 2 years.

What's more, the United Nations has been a forum in which international norms and standards of conduct are debated and established. These standards put the weight of international unity behind efforts to encourage good conduct on the part of all member states, particularly those that seek to do otherwise. During the 51st U.N. General Assembly alone, a number of important resolutions were adopted, with U.S. support, that promoted our national security interests. These resolutions sought to combat international crime, promote respect for human rights, and deplore the conduct of the repressive Burmese Government. I also note the work of the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva, an important organization which, among other things, puts needed pressure on many nations to fully respect the fundamental rights of its citizens.

Mr. President, these are just some examples of how the United Nations and its affiliated organizations serve U.S. national security interests around the world. There are many more. It's vitally important that every Member of Congress understand exactly what we are receiving in return for our substantial investment at the United Nations in order to make the best judgment about how to proceed in addressing our unpaid dues.

Another important misconception about the United Nations is the characterization of it as a bloated, uncontrolled bureaucracy that is unresponsive to calls for restraint. It is true that the United Nations and its administrative activities had seen enormous growth during its first several decades of existence. This growth and associated bureaucracy led to justified calls for reform and reduction.

We must keep in mind that the United Nations has already undergone several reforms in the past decade, often at the urging of the U.S. Congress. Well

before Secretary-General Kofi Annan assumed office, the United Nations had established an inspector general, reduced the number of high level posts, and cut both its peacekeeping and general budgets. And in the relatively short time since Annan has been Secretary-General, he has announced additional far-reaching reforms. On March 17, Annan specified a series of 10 reform benchmarks involving further budget cuts and restructuring. Included among these are a transfer of resources from administration to programs, establishment of a code of conduct for U.N. staff, and streamlining of his own office. Annan has done a great deal with the authority he has, while proposing additional measures that must be negotiated with member states.

So no one should be left with the understanding that the United Nations is somehow immune from accountability and unresponsive to criticism. The world body, especially through its new Secretary-General, has heard the call for reform. Its leadership recognizes that it must be responsive to the concerns of member states, particularly its biggest donor, the United States.

This brings us to today's debate. It has been my longstanding view that the United States absolutely must remain a full and active member of the United Nations. The many constructive activities of the United Nations. I have discussed, and the many U.S. interests that are served by our participation in the world body warrant a continued and strengthened U.S. role. Indeed, the 20th century has seen the tremendous consequences that result when the United States shrinks from its inevitable leading role in world affairs. In fact, I would argue that the increasing complexity of the challenges confronting the United States today make it more important than ever that we remain engaged internationally by, among other things, fully participating in the United Nations.

And we certainly cannot adequately participate in the United Nations by continuing to carry an arrearage of around \$1 billion. Because of this arrearage, our respect and credibility there has diminished, thereby limiting United States ability to influence positively the United Nations' deliberations and activities. As the sole remaining superpower in an increasingly complex world, the United States simply must play a leading and unimpeded role at the United Nations.

While I am extremely pleased about the willingness of the Senator from North Carolina to engage in negotiations to clear up our arrearage, I believe that paying our back dues in full without the onerous conditions of title 22 is the appropriate course of action. It appears unlikely that the United Nations will, in fact, agree to this package as a whole, particularly given the lukewarm initial reaction of its leadership. This reaction is certainly understandable. Could you imagine if every member state made demands such as this in return for full payment of dues?

What would best serve U.S. interests is to pay off our arrearage now and encourage our diplomats to undertake a very serious effort to negotiate further reforms with a Secretary-General who appears strongly committed to genuine change. I am greatly concerned that the substantial progress we have already made in working with Kofi Annan could be jeopardized by enactment of these mandates. It is no surprise that many member states of the U.N. have said that these conditions are a mere starting point for further negotiations. Such an interpretation, if accepted by the body as a whole, would simply put us back at square one with a \$1 billion arrearage.

Rather than debating how best to pay our back dues, we should instead focus on the more fundamental question of whether or not the United States ought to be a member of the United Nations at all. If we do decide that it's in our interests to remain there, then we should simply pay our dues and move on. It is imperative that the United States remain engaged, rather than withdraw, from world affairs and institutions such as the United Nations. I urge my colleagues to support the Lugar/Sarbanes amendment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President I rise to express my strong support for the amendment introduced by Senator LUGAR. The amendment accomplishes a number of things, including funding arrears to the United Nations within 2 years and fully funding fiscal year 1998 U.S. regular and peacekeeping dues to the United Nations. The full funding for fiscal year 1998 is important in that it will help ensure that the United States does not perpetuate U.S. arrears by not meeting current U.S. obligations to the United Nations.

But as commendable and desirable as these provisions are, what I believe is most important is Senator LUGAR's proposal to strip from S. 903 some 38 unilaterally imposed benchmarks or conditions that the United Nations would have to meet before we fully pay the debts we acknowledge we owe the organization. Included in these benchmarks are a permanent cut in our annual dues from 25 percent to 20 percent of the regular U.N. budget and from 31 percent to 25 percent of the peacekeeping budget.

When I first joined the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I was asked by a ranking State Department official what my position was on U.S. arrears to the United Nations. I said my position could be summed up in two-words: "pay up." At the time I had no inkling that the majority of my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee would agree that our decision to finally pay up should be contingent on the U.N. complying with numerous U.S. conditions. And the conditions contained in S. 903 provide for payment of arrears over a 3-year period, with new conditions imposed each of the 3 years—conditions that the United Nations will have to meet in exchange for U.S. pay-

ments. To other nations, including some of our allies, this formula is likely to be viewed as being tantamount to blackmail on the installment plan. Moreover, if implemented there is no question it would greatly weaken the United Nations and undermine our leadership role in the world body.

What would happen to the United Nations if other member States were to follow suit and impose some of the same provisions contained in this bill as conditions for paying their arrears? Thus, they might refuse to pay their back dues and assessments until the United Nations agreed to make reductions they specify in their assessed rate for the U.N. budget and share of contributions to peacekeeping operations. Or they might condition repayment to specific reductions in the U.N. staff, reduced U.N. job vacancy rates, or even providing their national counterparts to our GAO with access to U.N. financial data so that they may audit the U.N. books.

Is there any doubt that we would be enraged if the national legislature of any other member state were to mandate that the United Nations jump through a series of hoops before that state pays its debts to the United Nations? And we would have a right to be enraged, not only because our own dues and assessments might consequently be increased. But also because U.N. compliance with such a unilateral diktat could well lead to the organization's collapse. No international organization can be viable if its members have the power to unilaterally determine what they owe the organization, the conditions under which repayment should be made, and what their future financial obligations should be.

As Senator LUGAR has pointed out, only 5 percent, some \$54 million, of the \$1.021 billion we acknowledge we owe is actually owed to the United Nations. It is important to note that the single largest portion of our arrears, almost two-thirds, is owed to countries who contributed troops to peacekeeping operations which the U.S. backed in the U.N. Security Council. In most cases these were operations in which the United States refrained from participating with our own forces. The bulk of this peacekeeping debt is owed to our NATO allies, with the United Nations merely serving as a conduit to reimburse those countries who supported peacekeeping operations with troops and equipment.

There is no doubt that international peacekeeping eases our burden because other nations share the costs and risks. In fact, the United States will gain \$107 million in reimbursements for U.N. peacekeeping costs, which we will credit against our U.N. debt obligations.

In effect, by withholding our debt payments and making repayment contingent on a host of conditions, we've imposed a double whammy on some of our closest allies. We have yet to pay

them what we owe for the costs of peacekeeping operations they carried out which we had deemed to be in our national interest. And by unilaterally reducing our own future obligations to the United Nations as a condition of paying our arrears, our NATO allies will wind up paying more for peacekeeping operations and the U.N. budget. To me, this seems like a sure-fire formula for undermining our relations with our NATO partners.

Mr. President, I believe it is important to stress that the Lugar amendment enjoys strong and broad support. Among the backers is the Emergency Coalition for U.S. Financial Support of the United Nations which includes all the former Secretaries of State, and over 100 business, labor, humanitarian, faith-based, and civic organizations. Moreover, the premises of the Lugar amendments are consistent with the views of the American public. For example, a nationwide poll last year found that almost two-thirds of Americans believe the United States "should always pay its full dues to the United Nations on schedule."

Americans have long believed in having "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind." I hope my colleagues will agree with me that imposing unilateral, take-it-or-leave-it conditions on the United Nations hardly reflects "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind." Therefore, I urge my colleagues to strongly back the Lugar amendment.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 383, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to offer a perfecting amendment to Senator DEWINE's amendment No. 383. I offer this amendment on behalf of Senator DODD. It amends the pending amendment to add two additional categories of individuals who may be excluded under this amendment: First, members of the Haitian high command; and, second, members of the paramilitary organization known as FRAPH.

Both of these organizations were responsible for serious human rights abuses during the coup regime from 1991 to 1994.

I ask unanimous consent that the DeWine amendment be so modified to include the amendment which I send to the desk from Senator DODD.

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

The amendment (No. 383), as modified, is as follows:

At the end of title XVI of division B of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES OF ALIENS WHO HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN EXTRAJUDICIAL AND POLITICAL KILLINGS IN HAITI.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) At the time of the enactment of this Act, there have been over eighty extrajudicial and political killing cases as-

signed to the Haitian Special Investigative Unit (SIU) by the Government of Haiti. Furthermore, the government has requested that the SIU investigate on a "priority basis" close to two dozen cases relating to extrajudicial and political killings.

(2) President Jean-Bertrand Aristide lived in exile in the United States after he was overthrown by a military coup on September 30, 1991. During his exile, political and extrajudicial killings occurred in Haiti including Aristide financial supporter Antoine Izmerly, who was killed on September 11, 1993; Guy Malary, Aristide's Minister of Justice, who was killed on October 14, 1993; and Father Jean-Marie Vincent, a supporter of Aristide, was killed on August 28, 1992.

(3) President Aristide returned to Haiti on October 15, 1994, after some 20,000 United States troops, under the code name Operation Uphold Democracy, entered Haiti as the lead force in a multi-national force with the objective of restoring democratic rule.

(4) From June 25, 1995, through October 1995, elections were held where pro-Aristide candidates won a large share of the parliamentary and local government seats.

(5) On March 28, 1995, a leading opposition leader to Aristide, Attorney Mireille Durocher Bertin, and a client, Eugene Baillergeau, were gunned down in Ms. Bertin's car.

(6) On May 22, 1995, Michel Gonzalez, Haitian businessman and Aristide's next door neighbor, was killed in a drive-by shooting after alleged attempts by Aristide to acquire his property.

(7) After Aristide regained power, three former top Army officers were assassinated: Colonel Max Mayard on March 10, 1995; Colonel Michelange Hermann on May 24, 1995; and Brigadier General Romulus Dumarsais was killed on June 27, 1995.

(8) Presidential elections were held on December 17, 1995. Rene Preval, an Aristide supporter, won, with 89 percent of the votes cast, but with a low voter turnout of only 28 percent, and with many parties allegedly boycotting the election. Preval took office on February 7, 1996.

(9) On March 6, 1996, police and ministerial security guards killed at least six men during a raid in Cite Soleil, a Port-au-Prince slum.

(10) On August 20, 1996, two opposition politicians, Jacques Fleurival and Baptist Pastor Antoine Leroy were gunned down outside Fleurival's home.

(11) Other alleged extrajudicial and political killings include the deaths of Claude Yves Marie, Mario Beaubrun, Leslie Grimar, Joseph Chilove, and Jean-Hubert Feuille.

(12) Although the Haitian Government claims to have terminated from employment several suspects in the killings, some whom have received training from United States advisors, there has been no substantial progress made in the investigation that has led to the prosecution of any of the above-referenced extrajudicial and political killings.

(13) The expiration of the mandate of the United Nations Support Mission in Haiti has been extended three times, the last to July 31, 1997. The Administration has indicated that a fourth extension through November 1997, may be necessary to ensure the transition to a democratic government.

(b) GROUNDS FOR EXCLUSION.—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Attorney General shall exclude from the United States, any alien who the Secretary of State has reason to believe is a person who—

(1) has been credibly alleged to have ordered, carried out, or materially assisted, in the extrajudicial and political killings of Antoine Izmerly, Guy Malary, Father Jean-

Marie Vincent, Pastor Antoine Leroy, Jacques Fleurival, Mireille Durocher Bertin, Eugene Baillergeau, Michelange Hermann, Max Mayard, Romulus Dumarsais, Claude Yves Marie, Mario Beaubrun, Leslie Grimar, Joseph Chilove, Michel Gonzalez, and Jean-Hubert Feuille;

(2) has been included in the list presented to former president Jean-Bertrand Aristide by former National Security Council Advisor Anthony Lake in December 1995, and acted upon by President Rene Preval;

(3) was a member of the Haitian presidential security unit who has been credibly alleged to have ordered, carried out, or materially assisted, in the extrajudicial and political killings of Pastor Antoine Leroy and Jacques Fleurival, or who was suspended by President Preval for his involvement in or knowledge of the Leroy and Fleurival killings on August 20, 1996; or

(4) was sought for an interview by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as part of its inquiry into the March 28, 1995, murder of Mireille Durocher Bertin and Eugene Baillergeau, Jr., and were credibly alleged to have ordered, carried out, or materially assisted, in those murders, per a June 28, 1995, letter to the then Minister of Justice of the Government of Haiti, Jean-Joseph Exume.

(5) Any member of the Haitian High Command during the period 1991-1994, who has been credibly alleged to have planned, ordered, or participated with members of the Haitian Armed Forces in the September 1991 coup against the duly elected government of Haiti (and his family members) or the subsequent murders of as many as three thousand Haitians during that period;

(6) Any individual who has been credibly alleged to have been a member of the paramilitary organization known as FRAPH who planned, ordered, or participated in acts of violence against the Haitian people;

(c) EXEMPTION.—This section shall not apply where 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 excluded under this section is necessary for medical reasons, or such person has cooperated fully with the investigation of these political murders. If the Secretary of State exempts such a person, the Secretary shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—(1) The United States chief of mission in Haiti shall provide the Secretary of State a list of those who have been credibly alleged to have ordered or carried out the extrajudicial and political killings mentioned in paragraph (1) of subsection (b).

(2) The Secretary of State shall submit the list provided under paragraph (1) to the appropriate congressional committees not later than three months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of aliens denied visas, and the Attorney General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of aliens refused entry to the United States as a result of this provision.

(4) The Secretary shall submit a report under this subsection not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act and not later than March 1 of each year thereafter as long as the Government of Haiti has not completed the investigation of the extrajudicial and political killings and has not prosecuted those implicated for the killings specified in paragraph (1) of subsection (b).

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and

the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I hope that Senator DEWINE would accept my perfecting amendment that I offer to his amendment. I understand that the managers of the bill are prepared to accept it, if the sponsor of the underlying amendment has no problem, which I understand he does not.

I believe that those who use violence as a political tool should not be rewarded with a United States visa for those actions. While his amendment covers a number of categories of individuals who have been involved in political killings and other illegal acts, there would seem to be two categories of individuals who played a very prominent role in the reign of terror that characterized Haiti between September 1991 and October 1994 when the duly elected government was restored to office with the assistance of the international community. I am of course talking about the High Command of the Haitian Armed Forces and the paramilitary organization known as FRAPH.

Clearly members of the Haitian High Command violated every norm of accepted international law with respect to their efforts to overthrow a democratically elected government. But more importantly, their treatment of the Haitian people during the coup regime was reprehensible. Surely granting entry to the United States of such individuals would serve no useful private or public purpose.

Similarly, the paramilitary organization which came to be known as FRAPH undertook such heinous acts as kidnaping, rape and murder as a concerted effort to intimidate the Haitian people. Individuals who were members of this organization should also be excluded from entry into the United States.

Mr. President I believe that this amendment adds the necessary balance to the pending amendment and I urge its adoption.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Delaware and I thank Senator DODD for this effective amendment. It is consistent with what we are trying to do and trying to say and are saying in the DeWine amendment. That simply is that the United States should not allow people who have committed political murders in the country of Haiti into the United States and whether these are from the left or the right, whether these occurred after Aristide or before Aristide, we should be consistent.

So I support the amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from North Carolina has 1 minute remaining.

AMENDMENT NO. 382

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, Senator LUGAR has repeatedly said it is the right thing to do, to vote for his

amendment. It is the right thing to do, almost implying that those of us who do not agree with him have, indeed, a character defect. Let me tell you about the Lugar amendment. The effect of the Lugar amendment would be that the United Nations would have absolutely no incentive to reform—none—no incentive to cut the burden on the American taxpayers by reducing our regular budget assessment to 20 percent; no reduction in our peacekeeping assessment; no inspector general in the big three specialized agencies to root out waste, fraud, and corruption; no U.S. seat on the U.N. budgetary committee; no budgetary reductions in the specialized agencies; no sunset provisions for obsolete programs; no GAO access to U.N. financial data; no budgetary reform, and so on and on.

It may be the right thing to do in Senator LUGAR's opinion, but I expect that it is going to be the wrong thing to do, to vote for the Lugar amendment, when the tally is made in just a few minutes.

Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the amendments? I believe we did that last night.

I yield the remainder of my time.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 383

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 383, as modified, offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE].

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] is absent due to a death in the family.

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

The result was announced, yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 101 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Domenici	Kerrey
Akaka	Dorgan	Kerry
Allard	Durbin	Kohl
Ashcroft	Enzi	Kyl
Baucus	Faircloth	Landrieu
Bennett	Feingold	Lautenberg
Biden	Feinstein	Leahy
Bingaman	Ford	Levin
Bond	Frist	Lieberman
Boxer	Glenn	Lott
Breaux	Gorton	Lugar
Brownback	Graham	Mack
Bryan	Gramm	McCain
Bumpers	Grassley	McConnell
Burns	Gregg	Mikulski
Byrd	Hagel	Moseley-Braun
Campbell	Hatch	Moynihan
Chafee	Helms	Murkowski
Cleland	Hollings	Murray
Coats	Hutchinson	Nickles
Cochran	Hutchison	Reed
Collins	Inhofe	Reid
Conrad	Inouye	Robb
Coverdell	Jeffords	Roberts
Craig	Johnson	Rockefeller
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Roth
DeWine	Kennedy	Santorum
Dodd		Sarbanes

Sessions
Shelby
Smith (NH)
Smith (OR)
Snowe

Specter
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond

Torricelli
Warner
Wellstone
Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Daschle

Harkin

The amendment (No. 383), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 382

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes for debate equally divided on the Lugar amendment.

Mr. LUGAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, my amendment calls for payment of our obligations to the United Nations to the extent of \$819 million over 2 years without conditions; \$658 million of that is owed to our friends and our allies for peacekeeping operations and expenses they undertook and for which we voted. We have a contractual obligation to pay.

Our effectiveness in bringing about reforms in dealing with NATO expansion, in dealing with a host of international trade issues depends upon our credibility with our friends. It is not an argument in favor of reform that unilaterally we decide not to pay or send our payments to other nations but insist on some with 38 conditions in 18 pages of agate type before we allocate the money. We have a straightforward vote, Mr. President. I believe it is the right thing to do. I think it is the most effective thing to do in terms of American diplomacy.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield? I very strongly support the Senator from Indiana, and I very much hope our colleagues will vote in favor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has been kind enough to give me the minute to respond.

The Lugar amendment does not have one single penny more in it than this bill. We do pay all of our allies the arrearages that we owe them with the bill in the way it is drawn up. The administration has supported this compromise we have come up with.

This basically is the way to get the job done. But I emphasize, there is not one additional penny in the Lugar amendment. There is no distinction in how we get paid. The principle is, should there be any conditions placed on the United Nations? This bill does place conditions they can meet. The Senator, on principle, says none should

be there. If you wish to put conditions at all, you should vote with us. If you want no conditions, vote with him. But it is the same amount of money.

I urge that you vote "no" on the Lugar amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 382 offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] is absent due to a death in the family.

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

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 73, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 102 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Akaka	Jeffords	Lugar
Bingaman	Kennedy	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Kerrey	Murray
Bumpers	Kerry	Reed
Chafee	Landrieu	Sarbanes
Dodd	Lautenberg	Specter
Durbin	Leahy	Wellstone
Feingold	Levin	
Glenn	Lieberman	

NAYS—73

Abraham	Faircloth	McConnell
Allard	Feinstein	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Ford	Moynihan
Baucus	Frist	Murkowski
Bennett	Gorton	Nickles
Biden	Graham	Reid
Bond	Gramm	Robb
Breaux	Grams	Roberts
Brownback	Grassley	Rockefeller
Bryan	Gregg	Roth
Burns	Hagel	Santorum
Byrd	Hatch	Sessions
Campbell	Helms	Shelby
Cleland	Hollings	Smith (NH)
Coats	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchison	Snowe
Collins	Inhofe	Stevens
Conrad	Inouye	Thomas
Coverdell	Johnson	Thompson
Craig	Kempthorne	Thurmond
D'Amato	Kohl	Torricelli
DeWine	Kyl	Warner
Domenici	Lott	Wyden
Dorgan	Mack	
Enzi	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Daschle	Harkin
---------	--------

The amendment (No. 382) was rejected.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in accordance with paragraph 2 of rule VI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, that I be permitted to be absent from the work of the Senate for this afternoon and all day tomorrow to attend the funeral of Sebastian Daschle, the father of my colleague and good friend from South Dakota, Senate Minority Leader TOM DASCHLE.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for 8 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I do not know if it is appropriate to ask that might be amended so I ask to have an opportunity to speak for 10 minutes after the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri modify his request?

Mr. ASHCROFT. I am happy to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I object. I want to ask a question. I wonder if I might, someplace in this, without waiting to hear the eloquence of both of your remarks, if I might have 2 minutes.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I am happy to defer for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Two minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I look forward to sharing the 10 minutes with the Senator from Illinois, and I have no objection to the Senator from New Mexico speaking for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Missouri's request is agreed to, and the Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI pertaining to the submission of Senate Resolution 100 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES GENTRY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, within a few short days, Charles Gentry will be leaving his post as my administrative assistant after many years of distinguished service in the legislative and executive branches of government and 11 years in the U.S. Army.

Charles has served on my staff twice. First as my legislative director and now as my administrative assistant.

During his first tour of duty on my staff Congress enacted the partial deregulation of natural gas. It was a major undertaking. It was complicated. It was contentious. Charles masters every aspect of this complicated piece of legislation. Looking back, natural gas deregulation proved to the country that our Nation has massive quantities of natural gas and that market forces would work to everyone's advantage.

Then, as now, no matter what the task, Charles has always been a leader. He has always excelled. I could count on him. He knows his substance. He knows his politics, and he knows New Mexico.

During the last 4 years Charles helped me with the critical issues facing New Mexico.

When Kirtland Air Force base was included on the Base Closure Commission preliminary list, Charles rolled up his sleeves, and in typical Gentry analyt-

ical style found out the facts surrounding this recommendation. It didn't take him long to pinpoint the shortcomings in the Commission's evaluation of Kirtland, and to professionally get the facts to the Commission so they could correct their error. Kirtland was saved and the defense readiness of the country benefited from Charles' hard work.

The administration's grazing fee hike proposal threatened the way of life for hundreds of hard working ranchers in New Mexico. Charles worked diligently to educate members of the Senate about the folly of this proposal. I will always remember the warm welcome we received when we visited southeastern New Mexico and the entire region turned out to thank us for delaying the fees.

Charles has a keen mind for complicated issues, and in New Mexico dealing with Sandia and Los Alamos National Laboratories the issues don't get much more complicated. Charles was one of my key advisors on stockpile stewardship, inhalation toxicology, Nunn-Lugar, and Nunn-Lugar-Domenici initiatives to minimize nuclear proliferation. He worked particularly hard on the Industrial Partnership Program intended to provide economic development to Russia. More importantly, this program is designed to keep Russian nuclear experts from moving to Iraq or Libya. This is probably one of the most important defense initiatives since the Berlin wall came down.

He worked on minority contracting issues at Los Alamos and Sandia. When Lockheed Martin took over Sandia and initiated contract reform Charles ensured that small and minority contractors were able to maintain their relations with Sandia.

Two years ago, when I rewrote the energy title of the DOD authorization bill Charles initiated the negotiations with the Armed Services Committee and facilitated the friendly rewrite of more than 60 pages of this important legislation.

Charles has a big heart. New Mexico veterans are developing a beautiful Veterans' Memorial Park. When Charles heard about the effort during a meeting with me and the sponsors of the park, Charles opened his check book and bought the first commemorative tile.

Charles helped me start the Senate oil and gas forum. He is one of the most knowledgeable oil and gas lawyers in the country.

For the past four years, Charles has been my administrative assistant, but our association began many, many years ago. He was raised in Roswell, NM, where he attended the New Mexico Military Institute. While at NMMI, he was an extraordinary student and athlete. Charles was captain of the football team and the New Mexico Golden Gloves heavyweight boxing champion. Before earning his B.A. in science and mathematics at NMMI, he received