

(1) recognizes and commends the sacrifice, dedication, and commitment of those serving with, and those who have served with, American nongovernmental organizations (NGO's) and private volunteer organizations (PVO's) that provide humanitarian relief to millions of the world's poor and displaced;

(2) urges all Americans to join in commemorating and honoring those serving in, and those who have served in, America's NGO and PVO community for their sacrifice, dedication and commitment; and

(3) calls upon the people of the United States to appreciate and reflect upon the commitment and dedication of relief workers, that they often serve in harm's way with threats to their own health and safety, and their organizations who have responded to recent tragedies in Central America and Kosovo with great care, skill, and speed, and to make appropriate steps to recognize and encourage awareness of the contributions that these relief workers and their organizations have made in helping ease human suffering.

EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER FREEDOM OF PRESS AND ELECTORAL INSTITUTIONS IN PERU

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 378, S. Res. 209.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 209) expressing concern over interference with freedom of the press and independence of judicial and electoral institutions in Peru.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the resolution appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 209) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 209

Whereas the independence of Peru's legislative and judicial branches has been brought into question by the May 29, 1997, dismissal of 3 Constitutional Tribunal magistrates;

Whereas Peru's National Council of Magistrates and the National Election Board have been manipulated by President Alberto Fujimori and his allies so he can seek a third term in office;

Whereas the Department of State's Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1998, dated February 26, 1999, concludes, with respect to Peru, that "government intelligence agents allegedly orchestrated a campaign of spurious attacks by the tabloid press against a handful of publishers and investigative journalists in the strongly pro-proposition daily La Republica and the other print outlets and electronic media";

Whereas the Department of State's Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1997, dated January 30, 1998, states that Channel 2 television station reporters in

Peru "revealed torture by Army Intelligence Service Officers" and "the systematic wire-tapping of journalists, government officials, and opposition politicians";

Whereas on July 13, 1997, Peruvian immigration authorities revoked the Peruvian citizenship of Baruch Ivcher, the Israeli-born owner of the Channel 2 television station; and

Whereas Baruch Ivcher subsequently lost control of Channel 2 under an interpretation of a law that provides that a foreigner may not own a media organization, causing the Department of State's Report on Human Rights Practices for 1998 to report that "threats and harassment continued against Baruch Ivcher and some of his former journalists and administrative staff . . . In September Ivcher and several of his staff involved in his other nonmedia businesses were charged with customs fraud. The Courts sentenced Ivcher in absentia to 12 years imprisonment and his secretary to 3 years in prison. Other persons from his former television station, who resigned in protest in 1997 when the station was taken away, also have had various charges leveled against them and complain of telephone threats and surveillance by persons in unmarked cars": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ANTI-DEMOCRATIC MEASURES BY THE GOVERNMENT OF PERU.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the erosion of the independence of judicial and electoral branches of the Government of Peru and the blatant intimidation of journalists in Peru are matters of serious concern to the United States;

(2) efforts by any person or political movement in Peru to undermine that country's constitutional order for personal or political gain are inconsistent with the standard of representative democracy in the Western Hemisphere;

(3) the Government of the United States supports the effort of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to report on the pattern of threats to democracy, freedom of the press, and judicial independence by the Government of Peru; and

(4) systematic abuse of the rule of law and threats to democracy in Peru could undermine the confidence of foreign investors in, as well as the creditworthiness of, Peru.

SEC. 2. TRANSMITTAL OF RESOLUTION.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State with the request that the Secretary further transmit such copy to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States, the President of the Inter-American Development Bank, and the President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD NATO AND THE EUROPEAN UNION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 377, S. Res. 208.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 208) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States policy toward the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Union, in light of the Alliance's April 1999 Washington Summit and the European Union's June 1999 Cologne Summit.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2776

(Purpose: To make technical amendments)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], for Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 2776.

The amendment is as follows:

In section 1(b), strike paragraph (1) and insert the following:

(1) on matters of trans-Atlantic concern, the European Union should make clear that it would undertake an autonomous mission through the European Security and Defense Identity only after the North Atlantic Treaty Organization had declined to undertake that mission;

In section 1(b)(5), strike "must" and insert "should".

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wish to explain my amendment to S. Res. 208 expressing the sense of the Senate on United States policy toward NATO and the European Union and my own personal view regarding the desirability of our European Allies conducting operations in their own backyard.

My amendment makes three important changes to the language of the resolution as reported out by the Foreign Relations Committee.

First of all, the amendment substitutes "the" for "its" before "European Security and Defense Identity" to make the point that the European Security and Defense Identity, or ESDI, is being developed within, not outside, the NATO Alliance. This simple fact is enshrined in a number of North Atlantic Council communiques and declarations, starting with the Declaration of Heads of State and Government issued at the Council meeting in Brussels on June 11, 1994. This is important because the development of the ESDI within the Alliance means that, as the 1994 Brussels Declaration stated, "NATO will remain the essential forum for consultation among its members and the venue for agreement on policies bearing on security and defense commitments of Allies under the Washington Treaty."

Next, my amendment deletes the references to NATO being "offered the opportunity to undertake the mission" and then that NATO "referred it to the European Union for action." The first point here is that on one has to offer a mission to NATO; the North Atlantic Council is in permanent session so that it can continuously review events that could impact on stability in the Euro-Atlantic area and can react to them, if necessary. Consequently, it doesn't have to be offered an opportunity to undertake a mission; it has that responsibility and the means to effect it on a continuing basis. The next point is that NATO doesn't refer a mission to the European Union; the EU will undoubtedly have been following such an

event on its own and won't need a referral from NATO to do so. And the final and perhaps most important point is that this change removes the connotation that somehow the European Union is subservient to NATO.

The last change is to simply substitute "should" for "must" in the subparagraph relating to the implementation of the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy. This will avoid the connotation that the United States is dictating to an organization of sovereign states.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to express my own personal view concerning the desirability of our European Allies conducting operations in their own backyard. I have long been a supporter of the ESDI and I am a supporter of the U.S.-sponsored Defense Capabilities Initiative that was recently adopted by NATO. NATO's Operation Allied Force demonstrated a capabilities gap between the United States and our NATO Allies. I welcome the stated determination of our European Allies to develop the capability to act on their own. I welcome the fact that they are providing more than 80 percent of the forces participating in the NATO-led Kosovo Force. I would welcome it if our European Allies would handle the next crisis that develops in Europe. I would be happy if the United States' contribution was limited, for instance, to providing such things as command and control, communications, and intelligence support and I would be even more pleased if the United States didn't have to provide any support and our European Allies were capable of handling a crisis on their own.

I have characterized the United States as being a junior partner and the European Allies being the senior partner in the KFOR peacekeeping mission. I know that there are many people, including some within the Administration who don't like that characterization, but I see nothing wrong with it.

Mr. President, the United States Congress for years has urged Europe to play a greater role in its own defense and to bear more of the collective security burden in NATO. I, for one, can take yes for an answer.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, that any statements relating thereto be placed in the RECORD as if read in the appropriate place.

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

The amendment (No. 2776) was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

[The resolution was not available for printing. It will appear in a future edition of the RECORD.]

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1999

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, November 9. I further ask consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume debate on S. 625, the bankruptcy reform bill, under the previous order.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. tomorrow for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will resume consideration of the bankruptcy bill at 9:30 on Tuesday. There will be 1 hour of debate on the pending minimum wage and business cost amendments, with votes scheduled to occur at 10:30 a.m. Further amendments are expected to be offered and debated and therefore votes are expected throughout tomorrow's session of the Senate. Senators can also anticipate votes regarding the appropriations process prior to the Veterans Day recess.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes in morning business.

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

THE SPICE ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the newspapers of the Nation this weekend were filled with stories about the politics of prescription drug coverage for the Nation's elderly. One poll after another said that the question of covering prescription drugs for seniors was one of the top three concerns of millions of Americans—not just seniors, but people of all ages. And then, in addition to all the polls and surveys that were published this weekend, some of our most distinguished political journalists were out across the country interviewing people in America asking

them what they thought about Congress' handling of the prescription drug issue. And one interview after another essentially has seniors and families responding that they could not figure out why the Congress in Washington, DC, could not tackle this issue in a bipartisan way.

I remember one of the interviewees in particular, in effect, saying, "What are they so busy fussing about in Washington, DC, that they can't find the time to deal with an issue so important to millions of older people?" I think that person who got interviewed pretty much summed it up.

I have been coming up to the floor of the Senate over the last 2 or 3 weeks in an effort to try to bring folks' attention, both in the Senate and in our country, that there is bipartisan legislation to cover the question of prescription drugs for older people, and to talk about why it is so important. As part of that effort, as you can see in the poster next to me, I have been urging that seniors send in copies of their prescription drug bills—actually send in copies of their prescription drug bills to those of us in the Senate in Washington, DC. I have been getting a great many of these bills. I have been coming to the floor on a number of occasions and actually reading from these bills because I think it helps to drive home what we saw in the newspapers all across the country this weekend, and that is that we have to come up with a bipartisan plan to meet these needs of vulnerable elderly people.

So tonight I am going to read from some of the letters that I am receiving from older people at home in Oregon. Four letters in particular struck me as particularly compelling in recent days. I have heard from folks in North Bend, Redmond, Roseburg, and Milwaukie in the metropolitan area of our State. All of them essentially make the same kind of case, and that is that so many seniors are walking on an economic tightrope. They are balancing food costs against the fuel costs and the fuel costs against their medical bills. With so many being unable to afford their prescriptions, they are writing and saying they can't afford to wait for another election, the 2000 election, to resolve this issue. They have been reading these articles with Members of Congress saying that it is too complicated to tackle now. It is too difficult to get a consensus. I just don't think that is the case.

There is a bipartisan bill now before the U.S. Senate. It is one that was drafted by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine, OLYMPIA SNOWE, and myself. We got 54 votes for it on the floor of the Senate. A majority of Members of the Senate voted in a specific way to fund the prescription drug benefit for the Nation's older people. So it is just not right to say that there is no consensus, there is no way to bring Senators of both political parties together on this issue. It is just factually wrong. Fifty-four Members of the