

Most banks do not make loans for less than \$1,000, he said, and pawnning is embarrassing.

Borrowers like a payday loan, Mr. Rochford said, because "it is private," adding: "It is quick. And they do not need a lot of documentation." The fees cover loans that turn sour, he said, and the cost of employees to process loans.

Kokomo, about 50 miles north of Indianapolis, may be a case in point. A steel and asphalt city of immense new Daimler-Chrysler and Delphi-Delco automobile component factories, Kokomo is fertile terrain for payday lending.

Strapped by bad credit and unmanageable or unexpected expenses, people here used to go to pawn shops for loans. But of three pawn shops here two years ago, one has closed, and another, Bob's, passed up renewing its license this month. Now people go to the city's new payday lenders.

Unemployment, which has exceeded 20 percent in Kokomo in recessions, was just 1.4 percent in March, according to the latest survey by the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University. About 20,000 people, roughly 40 percent of the area work force, is employed by automotive companies. They earn \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year and are the new lenders' biggest customers.

The payday lenders here approve most loans within 10 minutes. "No Credit Check, Instant Approval," Easy Money's flier promises. "The fastest way to payday," read the banners on the walls of Check 'n Go.

For this service, some states specify a maximum fee of \$15 on a one- or two-week loan of \$100 or \$200. In Indiana the limit is \$33. At \$33, the annual rate on a two-week \$100 loan is 858 percent.

And as borrowers amass loans, taking new ones to pay the fees on the others, the fastest way to payday becomes a fast way, too, to garnished wages and bankruptcy.

Kathy Jo King, 41, earns almost \$60,000 a year as an assembly-line worker at the Daimler-Chrysler transmission plant. But she has no savings, in part because she is paying creditors \$113 a week to work her way out of a bankruptcy that followed a serious automobile accident and left her husband partly disabled and both with high medical bills.

Then early last year, Ms. King and her husband and their boys, 18 and 11, had to move, incurring \$1,500 in unexpected expenses.

"I've got kids to feed," she said. "I had to go do something." With her credit in ruins, she could not go to a bank for a loan, so she went to payday lenders.

"We did several payday loans all at once," Ms. King said. "They make you feel real at ease about it." She started paying off the loans bit by bit but became saddled with \$200 in fees alone every two weeks and could not keep up.

So one lender tried to redeem her last \$330 check covering a loan of \$300 and a fee of \$30. She did not have money in the bank to cover the check and it bounced. The bank and the lender then charged her \$80 in fees for a bad check.

Next, the lender sued, and Ms. King lost. The court awarded the lender triple damages—\$990, or three times the amount of the check, plus \$150 in lawyer fees and \$60 for court costs. With the \$80 for bouncing the check, Ms. King owes \$1,280 on her original loan of \$330.

Currently, about 100 payday lenders suits against borrowers are on file in the Howard County Superior Court in Kokomo. Lenders here also send out letters threatening their customers with imprisonment for bouncing a loan check, although none is known to have tested the state penal code provision that they invoke in making the threat. Some lenders start taking legal action within a

month to obtain unpaid loans; others try to work longer with customers to avoid a lawsuit.

David Hannum, coordinator of the Consumer Credit Counseling Service, said borrowers kept paying the fees, digging themselves deeper into debt, out of fear that lenders would otherwise try to redeem their checks when they did not have money in the bank to cover them, further tainting their credit ratings.

To tap into this market, Carol Brenner, 36, opened Quick Cash here in September. Ms. Brenner now has 350 clients, most of whom return every week or two to have their loans renewed or to pay them off, but then they often take another a few days later. She charges less than most lenders: \$20 for a two-week \$100 loan, for an annual percentage rate of 521 percent, and \$30 for \$200, or 391 percent.

Unlike some lenders, Ms. Brenner lets her clients pay off portions of their loans as they extend them and in that way work them down. And to avert probable trips to small-claims court, she says she will not lend to people who already have more than two loans from other payday lenders.

The biggest borrowers, many lenders say, are not Kokomo's low-wage service workers, but auto industry employees who earn more than \$20 an hour.

"Most of my customers are from Chrysler and Delco," said Marc Sutherland, manager of the Kokomo office of Nationwide Budget Finance.

Shari Harris, 39, who earns around \$25,000 a year as an information security analyst, was managing money well enough until the father of her two children, 10 and 4, stopped paying \$1,200 a month in child support.

"And then," Ms. Harris said, "I learned about the payday loan places."

She qualified immediately for a two-week \$150 loan at Check Into Cash, handing it a check for \$183 to include the \$33 fee. "I started maneuvering my way around until I was with seven of them," she said.

In six months, she owed \$1,900 and was paying fees at a rate of \$6,006 a year. "That's the sickness of it," Ms. Harris said. "I was in the hole worse than when I started. I had to figure a way to get out of it."

So she asked her employer to stop paying her wages into her checking account, emptying it, and putting her checks into a savings account. She stopped paying the bi-weekly fees to extend the loans, so the lenders tried to redeem her checks. "I let them all bounce," she said.

She took a second job, working in a department store, and turned to the Consumer Credit Counseling Service, which worked out a plan under which she is paying \$440 a month to work down the loans.

Jean Ann Fox, director of consumer protection at the Consumer Federation of America and a prominent critic of payday lending, said, "There's nothing wrong with small loans at reasonable interest rates, reasonable terms and reasonable collection practices.

"But these practices are designed to keep you in perpetual debt."

WHAT IT COSTS

An Expensive \$100—A payday loan is a short-term cash advance, for a fee, to be paid off with a check that will be cashed on the borrower's next payday. But with fees like \$30 for a two-week loan of \$100, they are far more expensive than even credit cards:

Payday loan: \$60 a month—A \$30 fee for a two-week \$100 loan, renewed for two more weeks; \$100 cash loan—\$60 \$100 cash advance—\$5.

Credit card: About \$5 a month—A card available to people with poor credit might have a 3 percent fee for a cash advance, plus

an annual interest rate of 19.8 percent, or about \$2 a month on \$100.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2000 AND 2001

The Senate continued the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I know it must appear to the Chair and others that this is sort of a disjointed way to begin consideration of a major bill, but we are trying to work out time agreements. Senators are being very cooperative. I think we are approaching some reconciliation on it; I am not sure.

In the meantime, Senator SARBANES needs to get away for an important appointment. How much time will the Senator need?

Mr. SARBANES. This is the amendment I indicated I could do in 40 minutes. Once the amendment is explained, I hope that the committee will accept it. I would be prepared to offer it now. I have another amendment which will take longer.

I am prepared to go ahead and offer it now if the chairman wishes.

Mr. HELMS. Why don't we do that.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from North Carolina, we are working on a unanimous consent request. Would the Senator allow us to interrupt his statement if necessary?

Mr. SARBANES. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if I may interrupt for a moment on a matter of procedure, I recognize the difficulty the leader has in trying to orchestrate things in the body. I know he is working very diligently to try to come up with time agreements and the possibility of stacking votes and holding them over until Monday. I remember that former Senator Jake Garn sort of had an affinity for a family-friendly process, and I want to commend the leadership for trying to follow that.

I want to point out that I happen, by coincidence, to live very far away. For me to make a Monday vote, I have to leave Sunday night and fly all night to get here. If I leave on the very first flight from Fairbanks, AK, on Monday and leave at 8 o'clock, I get arrive in Washington in the evening. Ordinarily, I don't go back to my State on a weekend; I stay here. But Father's Day and Mother's Day are fairly important, so I intend to go to Alaska today.

Unfortunately, I will miss the stacked votes that are proposed on Monday. I was inclined to object to the unanimous-consent agreement, but in

the spirit of cordiality, which I have pretty much maintained around here in the last 19 years, I will defer to the leadership. I wanted to explain this uniqueness to those who live in Chicago or for those who can take the train next door. I wish I could. It is a little different set of circumstances.

I have made my concerns known. As we plan events, I think we should recognize there are a couple of special days, and Father's Day is one of them. I have 11 grandchildren who are coming, so sayonara.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I certainly wish the Senator from Alaska a wonderful trip. I know how important his family is to him. I also want to thank him for his magnanimous decision not to object to the stacked votes. I know it is important to him to be here and participate in recorded votes. I also know his family is very important and Father's Day is very important. He could have objected, but he decided not to. I hope other Senators will follow that example. I try very hard to accommodate every Senator on both sides of the aisle.

I fear that the problem in the Senate now is that I have been too accommodating, because we try to work votes around every Senator's schedule, and it is absolutely out of control. I have Senators come in here and say: Oh, please, please, please, don't have another vote after 9:30 on Friday. And other Senators say: You mean we are going to vote Monday afternoon?

I realize voting is a problem, but it is required to move bills along. So I ask my colleagues to not get mad at me for trying to get our work done.

This week has been unusually productive. With this bill, if we could have finished it today, we would have completed seven bills this week. Senator REID and Senator DASCHLE share my frustration at what we go through. You would not believe the kinds of requests we get from Senators not to have votes during the middle of the day on Tuesday, or in the morning on Wednesday, or on Thursday afternoon. My colleagues, it is just out of control.

We try to say on Mondays or Fridays, for good and valid reasons, we will not have votes on occasion. We try to tell Members in advance. Because of a number of problems, we have notified both sides of the aisle that there won't be votes next Friday, the 25th. But there is a limit as to how much we can do. I was always used to working Monday through Friday. I realize that when we go home, we are still working. When we tell Senators we are not going to have votes before 5 on Monday or after 12 on Friday, we still have difficulty.

I thank Senator MURKOWSKI for his attitude. I must say to all the Senators that we just have to be prepared to be here and vote.

Here is another thing. Senators have now gotten to where, when there is a death in the family, they don't even want to miss a vote. That is a terrible and difficult time, but your constitu-

ents will understand. You can't ask 99 Senators not to have a recorded vote because you have had a death in the family. Sometimes it is an in-law. People understand if you can't be here. Meanwhile, back in the jungle, we have to get our work done. So I ask for your indulgence.

I yield to Senator MURKOWSKI.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. My only frustration, I share with the leader, is that the assumption today was that we were going to have some votes. As a consequence, I made my plans accordingly for a 2 o'clock airplane. I could have gotten a 10:30 airplane. After 2 o'clock, there are no more airplanes. I share the frustration of the leader who, obviously, is today accommodating a number of Senators who want to get out of here early, even though the leader said today we are going to vote in the morning at least. We did vote in the morning. It works both ways, Mr. President. When the leader says so, the consistency of that statement, I think, should be followed through, if I can make an appropriate suggestion.

Mr. LOTT. I must say, if I may respond, it was our intent to have more votes, but obstructionists can quite often prevail in the Senate. If somebody objects, it is pretty hard to force a vote. On Monday, I could call up Executive Calendar items. I can force votes, but I prefer not to do that. I have never liked the so-called "bed check" votes. I try to have votes on substance. That is the problem. Today, we had a blowup here at 9:45, and all kinds of efforts to be reasonable and get agreements came apart. I believe maybe by 11 o'clock, if enough people are gone, we can get this thing worked out.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I appreciate the frustrations the majority leader has to work under. But he has just had a very productive week. We passed half a dozen bills of consequence here in the Senate this week. So I guess I would better understand this reaction if we hadn't done anything all week. I thought we had a productive week. I am right next door here, so it is easy for me. Sometimes you get more with a carrot than you do with a stick.

Mr. LOTT. I don't believe there has been a majority leader since Mansfield who has used a carrot as much as this majority leader. We don't go late on Mondays or Fridays.

Mr. SARBANES. I acknowledge that the majority leader worked hard to try to make the calendar more family friendly.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you for doing that.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to the majority leader and the others assembled here, not only have we done a good job this week on those things we voted upon—major appropriations bills—but also there are a lot of things that have gotten a lot of attention that are com-

pleted and passed in this body, not the least of which is the resolution sponsored by the four leaders and everybody else in the Senate, and basically a vast majority here, dealing with commanding the troops and all those who were involved in the Kosovo war. That took some work between the two sides, and we worked that out. It is a beautiful resolution. It is passed. If we had more time today, we would talk about that.

Lots of things occurred here. There, of course, is some question as to whether there are other things we would like to do. We have talked about the Patients' Bill of Rights. But we have to say that we have accomplished a great deal this week, and I think we should feel good about that.

Having served in the other body and this body, I think every Senator who has served here for a matter of years appreciates the work of the leader in making this body one where we have certainty as to our schedule. That has been a big help.

We had a vote this morning. We didn't have as many people as we thought, but we had a vote. Our time wasn't wasted this morning. The progress made on this State Department bill, I think, is terrific. I have been involved in this bill when we have taken more than a week to deal with this bill. We will resolve this in a matter of a few hours.

I appreciate the anxiety and frustration of the leader, but we want to work with the leader and make sure we get more done. I speak for everyone on this side.

Mr. LOTT. I will use leader time to respond briefly. I thank Senator REID for his comments. I note the fact he was willing to work with us. We had the resolution worked out over a period of several days, commanding our troops and commanding the President and others for their work in Kosovo. That could have been difficult, could have caused amendments, and there could have been requests for recorded votes.

That was one of several things we have done this week. I note the Senator from Nevada in his new role as the whip on the Democratic side has really made a difference. We appreciate his cooperation. Quite often, it takes a lot of time to work through the pending amendments. He has been very helpful.

I am glad we had a good week. I am hoping every week will be similar to this week. I will keep working in that effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 689

(Purpose: To revise the deadlines with respect to the retention of records of disciplinary actions and the filing of grievances within the Foreign Service)

Mr. SARBANES. I have an amendment at the desk which I ask be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] proposes an amendment numbered 689.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 39, strike lines 14 and 15 and insert the following: "for a period commensurate with the seriousness of the offense, as determined by Director General of the Foreign Service, except that the personnel records shall retain any record with respect to a reprimand for not less than one year and any record with respect to a suspension for not less than two years."

On page 41, line 16, strike "one year" and all that follows through the end of line 22 and insert the following: "two years after the occurrence giving rise to the grievance or, in the case of a grievance with respect to the grievant's rater or reviewer, one year after the date on which the grievant ceased to be subject to rating or review by that person, but in no case less than two years after the occurrence giving rise to the grievance."

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I hope the committee will find it possible to accept this amendment. I will very briefly describe it.

This amendment seeks to address two provisions in the bill which affect the rights of those who serve in the Foreign Service. The first problem deals with the time period given in order to file a grievance. Under the current system, employees have a period of 3 years to file a grievance; that is the current law, 3 years. The bill does two things: It reduces that period to 1 year. It will take away the employee's right, which was upheld by a 1989 decision by the Foreign Service Labor Relations Board, to challenge an old evaluation that has been used against them.

It does two things. The amendment addresses those issues. It extends the period for filing a grievance to 2 years. In other words, the committee bill brings it down from 3 years to 1 year. We put it back up to 2 years.

Let me explain why I think this is important. Members of the Foreign Service have limited access to lawyers and personnel files while they are overseas. This amendment, moving the period back up to 2 years, gives them time to return to the United States on home leave, which they are entitled to only after they have been at their post for 18 months. They can come back on home leave in order to research and file their case.

If the grievance is against an employee's supervisor, the employee would have 1 year after he or she ceased to be supervised by that individual to file the grievance. I think the fairness of that is obvious on its face.

In addition—and this is a complicated, but I think important point—the amendment deletes the sentence that would preclude employees from grieving old evaluations used against

them. Currently, promotion panels can reinterpret old reports to select out Foreign Service personnel using report statements which did not seem and were not intended at the time to be negative. The promotion panels can go back to these old reports and reinterpret them.

The bill, as it is written, eliminates the ability to challenge an old evaluation on the part of the employee. Civil service employees have this protection now. They can contest all bases cited for their termination, regardless of when the matter occurred. A Foreign Service employee should have the same due process rights.

In fact, following this 1989 decision to which I referred, the Foreign Service Association and the five foreign affairs agencies in the Government reached an agreement under which employees may contest records to the extent they are used as a basis for grievable actions taken against them.

Denying employees the ability to do that, among other things, would lead to filing unnecessary preemptive grievances for fear they would be used against them in the future. In other words, if you are going to say these old evaluations can't be "grievanced," then it will serve as an incentive to contest more evaluations earlier.

This amendment restores the limited right, if an old evaluation is used to challenge it, and it would preclude the need for such preemptive grievances.

That is the first part of the amendment. It seems to me to make eminent good sense to do this. I have tried to take into account some of what the committee was seeking to accomplish. As I have indicated, we accept bringing the 3 years down, but we think it should come down to 2. I think taking it to 1 is going too far. The employees overseas would have a difficult time because they don't get the home leave for 18 months.

The second part of the amendment relates to the length of time a disciplinary action stays in an employee's personnel file. Under the current system, a reprimand stays in the employee's file for 1 year and a suspension for 2 years. The bill would extend that period in all cases until the employee is tenured as a career member of the service or next promoted. In effect, you may significantly lengthen the time in which these disciplinary actions stay in the employee's file.

There is a balancing to be done because under the current system disciplinary records are removed from the file after 1 or 2 years, no matter how serious. Therefore, they are not always available to reviewers when a Foreign Service employee is considered for promotion. That is something we need to look at. I understand the committee was focused on that.

The bill attempts to rectify this problem by requiring all records of disciplinary action to remain in the employee's file until the employee is tenured or next promoted. The pro-

posed change makes no distinction between a suspension of 1 day or 1 month, between a minor infraction or a major violation. By failing to differentiate between minor and major violations, this change could have the unintended effect either of extending the length of punishment beyond a reasonable time period or reducing the likelihood that appropriate disciplinary actions will be imposed in the first place. The disciplining authorities may forego imposing these actions in the more minor cases because they know these things will remain in the file perhaps for a long period—until tenure or the next promotion.

This part of the amendment requires the Director General of the Foreign Service to decide when taking a disciplinary action what length of time it should remain in the employee's record based on the seriousness of the violation. In no case, however, would the letter remain in the file less than 1 year for a reprimand or 2 years for a suspension.

So we set, as it were, a minimum requirement of 1 year for a reprimand and 2 years for a suspension. Beyond that, the Director General, at the time of the disciplinary action, could indicate the additional length of time, as it were, that the disciplinary action would remain in the employee's file. I think this accomplishes the purpose of distinguishing between major and minor infractions, in a sense. It does not put the minor infractions in there indefinitely or until tenure or promotion is reached, but it does permit the Director General, on the major infractions, to extend them beyond the minimum of 1 year for a reprimand or 2 years for a suspension.

In both instances here I have tried to take into account what I have perceived to be the concerns of the committee in including these provisions. Neither proposal, in effect, eliminates the committee provisions. It only seeks to modify them or to adjust them, and I think would make for a more equitable system. I very much hope the committee will find it possible to accept this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I had a very brief discussion with the chairman of the committee about the second part of the Senator's amendment, which I happen to support fully; that is, instead of going from 3 years down to 1 year. All the reasons the Senator stated seem valid to me. A 2-year time period, it seems to me, is more reasonable. I suspect the chairman may be inclined to agree with that.

With regard to the first part of the amendment of the Senator relating to this issue of the seriousness of the offense, right now it is 1 year and 2 years. This would allow the State Department to make an independent judgment as to whether or not a reprimand or suspension should stay in the file beyond the time period here.

I raise the question whether or not we may be able to work something out. I have not had a chance to talk to the chairman about this to see whether it makes sense to him, but it seems to me the greatest difficulty with the first part of the amendment of the Senator, as it relates to the reforms we are trying to implement, is leaving open-ended this notion of who determines the seriousness of the offense. Having the Director General of the Foreign Service determine the seriousness of the offense without us, the committee, knowing how he or she will go about making that determination, in effect leaves a hole wide enough to eliminate the reform. I am not asking my colleague from North Carolina to respond to this yet.

I raised a moment ago in private with the Senator from Maryland whether or not he would be agreeable to amend the first part of his amendment to suggest the Director General had to submit to the Congress and the committee a set of regulations about how he or she would determine what constitutes the seriousness of the offense; in other words, how that would be determined. We would put the burden on them to come back to us to tell us, so we had some faith it would not be an ad hoc way of approaching this and we would have some sense of how to proceed.

I do not know whether or not that is amenable. It obviously needs to be fleshed out more than I have just outlined it, whether or not that is amenable to the chairman. But I suggest there is a possibility that the Senator, if he is willing, could work with us to see if we could work out some procedure that may enable the chairman to agree, for his part, to accept the amendment. Is the Senator amenable to that approach, I ask the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. SARBANES. Let me say to my distinguished colleague, I think we could work something out. I am not trying to create a situation in which the Director General can simply end up retaining the current system. Because, as I understand it, the committee's concern was that these disciplinary records were taken out of the file after 1 or 2 years, no matter how serious, and therefore they were not always available for review when a Foreign Service employee was considered for promotion. So the committee said, all right, we are going to keep it in the record until you are tenured or you are next promoted.

I think that is reasonable to do for serious violations, but I think we need to create a differentiation between serious violations and what would be minor infractions. But I think if we require regulations be proposed that would define that difference and that would be submitted to the committee, it seems to me maybe that would work it out in a way that is amenable to everyone.

Mr. BIDEN. I say to my friend from Maryland, I appreciate his willingness

to try to work this out. I think we can work out the issue of the nature of the seriousness of the offense through regs being submitted.

I am told there is one other concern that is being suggested now. Right now there is a floor of 2 years for suspension.

Mr. SARBANES. We keep that floor.
Mr. BIDEN. Pardon me?

Mr. SARBANES. We keep that floor.

Mr. BIDEN. I understand it, but rather than do this negotiation, probably on the floor, that is another part Senator HELMS wants to take a look at.

What I suggest is I think we are very close to being able to work this out. I commit to the Senator we will attempt to do that. Obviously, if we do not, he is entitled to a vote on this, but I am inclined to believe we can do this and accept it to his satisfaction in the managers' amendment. But we will have between now and Monday evening to try to work that out, if he is willing to do that?

Mr. SARBANES. Yes. I will be happy to work with the committee members. I am trying to recognize the committee's concerns and, in a sense, simply fine-tune the language. I am not contending in either instance that there is no validity in the committee concerns. I concede the validity of the committee concerns. But I am trying to fine-tune this thing so I think it works in a better fashion.

Does the Senator want me to request it be temporarily laid aside so others can offer amendments?

Mr. BIDEN. I suggest that, if the Senator is willing to do that.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent this amendment be temporarily set aside, thereby opening the way for other Members to offer amendments.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today we begin consideration of the State Department Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000 and 2001, which was reported out of the committee 17-1.

Mr. President, as I said, today the Senate begins consideration of the State Department Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001. The bill was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations on April 21 by an overwhelming vote of 17 to 1.

The bill contains several titles, which Chairman HELMS has just summarize. Let me just take a few minutes to highlight the major provisions of the bill.

First the bill revives the so-called Helms-Biden legislation on paying our overdue bills to the United Nations.

This proposal, I remind my colleagues, was approved by the Senate in June 1997 by a 90 to 5 vote. Unfortunately, it was ultimately sidetracked by the other body in the last Congress.

The version in this bill contains several changes from the bill approved in

1997—changes that were made to reflect the time that has passed since the deal was devised in the 105th Congress.

This package meets the central objective that I have—to pay back most of our back dues, or arrears—to the United Nations. It provides for the payment of \$926 million in arrears, nearly all that we owe to the United Nations, over the course of three years, with the amount of funding released in each year contingent on the achievement of specific reforms in the United Nations.

Significant changes have been made to the final plan that we passed in the last Congress:

First, the bill provides a waiver for the two toughest provisions in the package—the requirement to achieve a reduction to 20 percent in our regular budget assessment rate, and a requirement to establish a "contested arrears" account for those arrears that are in dispute between the United States and the United Nations.

Second, the bill provides more money upfront. A provision permitting the President to waive \$107 million in reimbursements owed by the United Nations to the United States has been moved from "year three" to "year two" of the bill. This will allow \$682 million to be paid to the United Nations as soon as the "year one" and "year two" conditions are met.

That is enough to cover most of our \$712 million debt to the regular and peacekeeping budgets, which together constitute the bulk of our arrears. I should emphasize here that a significant amount of this funding—\$575 million—has already been appropriated in the last two fiscal years.

I expect that the third year of funding will be appropriated this year—because this money is exempt from the limits imposed by the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. So once we pass this bill, and the Secretary of State makes the necessary certifications, the money can begin to flow.

This package is the product of lengthy negotiations that began over two years ago.

The final details of this revised package were negotiated earlier this year between the chairman, the Secretary of State, and me. It is supported by the Clinton administration.

I think we have a good deal here. It is not everything that I wanted. It is not everything that the Secretary of State wanted. And it is not everything the chairman wanted. That is the essence of compromise. And this is a solid compromise that I hope our colleagues will support.

Let me briefly discuss a few other provisions in the bill.

First, we fully funded the President's budget request for most of the bill, including the operating accounts of the Department of State, international and cultural exchanges, and international broadcasting operations such as the Voice of America.

Second, we developed bipartisan legislation to improve security at our embassies. The tragic bombings of our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania last August underscored the vulnerability of our diplomatic posts. Some 80 percent of our embassies do not meet government security standards for setback from the street.

An official review chaired by retired Admiral William Crowe concluded that there had been a "collective failure" in the U.S. Government in failing to address security at our embassies overseas, and called on the government to devote \$1.4 billion a year over each of the next ten years to strengthen security.

The bill before the Senate authorizes \$3 billion over the next five years for construction of more secure facilities.

This meets the President's requested funding level, and accelerates it by a year. Even though it is the amount that the President sought, we must recognize that it is just the beginning of what must be a sustained program of enhancing security.

Working overseas is dangerous. We can never make our embassies bomb-proof or risk-free. But we owe it to our dedicated employees who work overseas to provide the resources necessary to minimize known risks.

Third, the bill provides for the establishment of a new Assistant Secretary of State for Verification and Compliance, which will carry out a function that was handled at an equivalent level in the former Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The verification function has long been headed by a Senate-confirmed official, and for good reason. Once a treaty is signed, we don't want its enforcement to be lost in the bureaucratic shuffle. Moreover, the existence this office will be of considerable importance in obtaining Senate approval of future arms control treaties.

Fourth, the bill reauthorizes Radio Free Asia, which began broadcasting in 1996 pursuant to legislation that I introduced.

Although it has been on the air less than three years, Radio Free Asia already plays an important role in providing news and information to the people living under dictatorial rule in East Asia, particularly the People's Republic of China, where freedom of the press remains a distant dream.

I am pleased that we are giving our stamp of approval to continue the radio at an increased level of funding.

This bill is a solid piece of legislation which enjoyed strong bipartisan support in the Foreign Relations Committee—as was reflected in the strong vote of 17 to 1 in the committee.

I want to join the chairman in putting the Senate on notice in two respects.

First, we will oppose any amendments that address foreign assistance or security assistance. Those measures do not belong on the State Department authorization bill.

Second, we will oppose any measures dealing with "sanctions reform" or imposing new sanctions.

The chairman has scheduled hearings for next month to consider the various bills on sanctions reforms that are pending in the committee; therefore, it would be premature to consider amendments on that subject at this time.

I pay public tribute to the chairman. Quite frankly, his leadership and the consensus which he has built in the committee in the last 18 months has been remarkable. This bill is a product of JESSE HELMS.

There are some serious, significant changes we make—one of which I will speak to in a moment—with the United Nations. That is through the persistence of my friend from North Carolina. As my mom might say, everyone is capable of redemption, and of late, the State Department has finally redeemed itself on this one. I am confident—the Senator is correct—if and when Mr. Holbrooke is confirmed, we will have an advocate for the Senator's position at the United Nations.

This bill contains several titles which the chairman has summarized. I will take a few minutes to highlight the major provisions of the bill from my perspective.

First, the bill revives the so-called Helms-Biden legislation on paying our overdue bills at the United Nations. The Senator from North Carolina and I have always been friends. We have become very close friends, and we suffer from the same problem: Our friends get very angry with us when we compromise.

I am sure the friends of the Senator from North Carolina are very angry that he has worked out a solution to the so-called arrearages to get this moving, and Senator BIDEN's friends, on my side of the aisle, are very angry that I have agreed to it because they think it should be more.

The bottom line is, we have done some good work. The Senate acted on what we did once before. It was the herculean efforts of the Senator from North Carolina, taking on folks on his side of the aisle, which came to naught, and the not so herculean efforts on my part to take on folks on my side of the aisle who did not think this was enough. We are back.

Hopefully, a little reason has permeated the environment and the purists on both sides will understand that what we have done is necessary in the national interest, very much in the interest of the American taxpayers, and is coupled to genuine reforms with which, when one thinks about it, nobody really disagrees.

The argument on my side of the aisle is: We should not make them agree to the reforms by holding dues over their heads and holding arrearages over their heads. Nobody I have spoken with says what Chairman HELMS wants is unreasonable.

I do not hear anybody coming to the floor saying there is no bloated bu-

reaucracy at the United Nations. I do not hear anyone coming to the floor saying that the United States should pay more. Everybody says we should pay less as a percentage. I do not hear anyone arguing about the substance the chairman has been insisting on for years.

We are down to: Are we doing it the right way? It reminds me of an expression—I will probably get myself in trouble with the French Government—which I think is classic. I was meeting with a State Department person, who will remain nameless, in a very significant position, negotiating a very significant agreement with the French relative to NATO. That is as much as I will say about it.

I asked this fellow: Are the French going to agree with this?

He said: Yes, I think they will, but it is kind of difficult.

I said: What do you mean?

He said: My friend's counterpart duly said to me last night, "Yes, yes, yes, this will work in practice, but will it work in principle?"

That is what we are hung up on here. What the Senator has suggested in these reforms is practically what everyone has acknowledged is needed. What we have been hung up on is the principle of whether or not it should be done the way in which we are doing it.

On the other side of the equation, nobody argues that if we do not come up with this \$926 million we are going to badly hurt the United Nations. We are hurting our allies, we are hurting England, we are hurting the Germans, we are hurting others, because over \$700 million of this money is for peace-keeping accounts that we agreed to sign on to with the Brits, with the French, with the Germans, and with our NATO allies.

I think and I hope, I say to the chairman, a little bit of reason is seeping into this debate—I hope.

I guess I am preaching to the choir here, but hopefully some of the congregation on the House side will hear what the choir is saying, because it is very important that we finally settle this issue and put it to bed.

The version in this bill contains several changes from the bill approved in 1997, changes that were made to reflect the time that has passed since the deal we put together—the chairman actually put together—devised in the 105th Congress which made sense. Time has passed. We have had to make some adjustments. I compliment and thank the chairman, as well as the Secretary of State, who was not overwhelmingly enthused about this approach.

We finally, through the leadership of the chairman actually, are all singing from the same hymnal, as they say up my way. The State Department is on the same page now, the Senator is on the same page, I am on the same page, hopefully, the House will get on the same page, and we can go on to the next hymn.

I think this package meets the central objectives that we have, at least

the ones I have—to pay back most of our so-called arrears to the United Nations. It provides for a payment of \$926 million in arrears—nearly all of that we owe to the United Nations—over the course of 3 years, with the amount of funding released in each year contingent on achievement of specific reforms in the United Nations.

This package is a product of very lengthy negotiations begun over 2 years ago. The details of this revised package were negotiated earlier this year between the chairman, the Secretary of State, and me. It is now supported by the Clinton administration. I think we have a good deal. It is not everything I wanted, and it is not everything the Secretary wanted, and it is clearly not everything the chairman wanted, but that is the essence of compromise. This is a solid compromise. I hope our colleagues will support it.

Let me briefly discuss a few other provisions of the bill.

First, we fully funded the President's budget request for most of the bill, including the operations account in the State Department, international and cultural exchanges, and the international broadcasting operations, such as the Voice of America.

Second, we developed a bipartisan legislative approach to improve the security of our embassies. The tragic bombings of our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania last August underscored the vulnerability of our diplomatic posts. Some 80 percent of our embassies do not meet Government security standards for setbacks from the streets, just to state one aspect of the problem.

The official review, chaired by retired Admiral William Crowe, concluded that there had been a "collective failure" in the U.S. Government in failing to address the security of our embassies overseas and called on the Government to devote \$1.4 billion a year over each of the next 10 years to strengthen security.

The bill before the Senate authorizes \$3 billion over the next 5 years for the construction of more secure facilities. This meets the President's requested funding level and accelerates it by a year. Even though it is the amount that the President sought, we must recognize that it is just the beginning of what must be a sustained program of enhancing security.

I know my colleague in the Chair knows better than anybody in this building what it is like to have a Government building vulnerable to and subject to terrorist attacks. No one knows the tragedy that flows from that better than the Presiding Officer.

We are as exposed in our foreign embassies around the world as buildings are in this town. We cannot and we should not become "Fortress America" internally. But we must do the reasonable things that can be done outside of the country in hostile environments or environments where we have less control over the protection of our citizens.

Working overseas is dangerous. We can never make our embassies bomb-proof or risk-free. But we owe it to our dedicated employees who work overseas to provide resources necessary to minimize the known risk.

Third, the bill provides for the establishment of a new Assistant Secretary of State for Verification and Compliance, who will carry out a function that was handled at the equivalent level in the former Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

I might add, all we are doing now is putting in place what the distinguished chairman is the father of, and that is a significant reorganization of the State Department apparatus. When people ask me, why was this so important to Senator HELMS and why did he work so hard to get it done, I analogize it to what our former colleague, Barry Goldwater, did in terms of the reorganization of the Defense Department. It is as consequential, it is as significant, and I believe it will be remembered as successful as Senator Goldwater's initiatives were with regard to the Defense Department.

It basically takes us into the 21st century and recognizes how fundamentally changed the world is. I think he is to be complimented for it. I plan, as long as I am here, that every time we implement a new aspect of his reorganization plan, to remind our colleagues why it is occurring. It is occurring because the Senator from North Carolina was as persistent as he was, and as consistent as he is, in making sure this organization is modernized.

The verification function had long been headed by a Senate confirmed official, and for a good reason. Once a treaty was signed, we did not want its enforcement to be lost in the bureaucratic shuffle. Moreover, the existence of this office will be of considerable importance to obtaining Senate approval of future treaties.

Fourth, the bill reauthorizes Radio Free Asia, which began broadcasting in 1996 pursuant to legislation I introduced.

I must tell you that we all have our pet initiatives that we care a great deal about because we think they have a significant impact on our security and our interests. I have been feroocious, and some suggest too vocal, in my support of the radios.

But I want to again publicly thank the chairman, who maybe disagreed with me in some aspects of this, but was willing to go along with my basic approach on how to deal with the radios. I know, from his many years during the cold war, of his devotion to Radio Free Europe and Voice of America. I appreciate his lending his considerable support and weight to the way in which we are approaching, under the reorganization, the so-called radios.

Although it has been on the air less than 3 years, by the way, Radio Free Asia already plays an important role in providing news and information for people living under the dictatorial rule

in East Asia, particularly the People's Republic of China, where freedom of the press remains a distant dream. I am pleased that we are giving our stamp of approval to continue the radio at increased levels of funding to make it workable.

There is much more to say, but I will stop at this point in the interest of accommodating my colleagues. But this bill is a solid piece of legislation which enjoys strong bipartisan support in the Foreign Relations Committee. Again, I want to remind everybody, this, as the defense authorization bill, usually attracts every contentious issue that is out there. It is because of the leadership of the chairman that we came out of the committee with a 17-1 vote.

My colleagues should understand—it is presumptuous for me to say this—that this is a reflection of the fact that what is in this bill is solid. It is a solid, solid bill. We would not have gotten this kind of consensus out of an ideologically divided committee but a committee where we are totally committed to making sure we have the strongest ability, the greatest ability, to project our foreign policy around the world.

Again, I thank the chairman for his leadership. I still think people are probably scratching their heads: How do BIDEN and HELMS get along so well and produce such bipartisan approaches? Because I think we both respect each other, but also because I understand that the chairman's motivation here is to make this committee's work a product that can pass the bipartisan muster of the Senate and the Congress. I compliment him again for his leadership.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator, the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. BIDEN, is far too generous. Several times in the past year or two, former Secretaries of State, and other past foreign policy officials of this Government, have said that the Foreign Relations Committee is now relevant. I think that is a high compliment to the committee.

But it would not have happened if it had not been for JOE BIDEN. When JOE BIDEN became—by his choice—the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, when I became chairman, we made a pact that we would work together. I have not enjoyed any other of my services in the Senate more than the cooperation with him.

I have just been amazed at how much he has learned about foreign policy since we have been on opposite sides of the committee. I have gotten to know JOE BIDEN well. He is a good partner, a good Senator, and an expert on foreign policy. And I compliment him.

Mr. BIDEN. I thank the Senator.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask the chairman to yield so that I may enter this unanimous consent agreement.

I join in that exchange of compliments to each Senator. I commend the chairman of the committee and the ranking member on the Democratic side, Senator BIDEN. Senator HELMS, you have done a great job. I know you have put a lot of time and energy into this particular bill, and we would not be here without your persistence and without the cooperation of Senator BIDEN.

It is an important bill. When you showed up in my office a week or so ago and said we are ready to go, we need to do this, I was determined we would find a place to do it. I think you have now worked through an agreement that will allow us to get it completed and final passage, hopefully, Monday afternoon. I would like to enter into this unanimous consent request and thank both of you for the outstanding work that you are doing.

I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the State Department authorization bill, all amendments must be filed by 11:45 today, with the exception of the managers' amendment and any second-degree amendments.

I further ask that any votes ordered with respect to amendments be stacked at a time to be determined by the majority leader and the Democratic leader, and the following amendments limited to the following times, to be equally divided in the usual form.

The amendments are as follows: Dodd amendment regarding the inspector general, 30 minutes; Sarbanes amendment No. 689; Wellstone amendment regarding child soldiers, 90 minutes; Wellstone-Harkin, ILO convention amendment, 30 minutes; Wellstone, women and children amendment, 90 minutes; Feingold, war crimes in Rwanda, 30 minutes; Sarbanes amendment with regard to the U.N., 2 hours; Feingold amendment regarding NED, 40 minutes; the Leahy amendment regarding East Timor, 20 minutes; the Helms-Biden managers' amendment; the Feinstein arms trafficking amendment, 30 minutes; and a relevant amendment by the majority leader and the Democratic leader.

Before the Chair rules, let me say again, the managers' packet will include the following: Amendments offered by Senators ABRAHAM, ASHCROFT, KENNEDY, DODD, DURBIN, MOYNIHAN, REID of Nevada, BINGAMAN, THOMAS, BIDEN, LUGAR, GRAMS, another one by LUGAR, and others that have been cleared by the two managers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. In light of the agreement, there will be no further votes today, and the next votes will occur at 5:30 on Monday.

REDUCTION IN VOLUME STEEL IMPORTS—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 66, H.R. 975,

the steel quota bill, and send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of The Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 66, H.R. 975, The Steel Import Limitation Bill:

Trent Lott, Rick Santorum, Mike DeWine, Jesse Helms, Ted Stevens, Harry Reid, Byron Dorgan, Orrin Hatch, Jay Rockefeller, Robert C. Byrd, Robert Torricelli, Fritz Hollings, Pat Roberts, Arlen Specter, Richard Shelby, and Craig Thomas.

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, this cloture vote will occur Tuesday, June 22.

Mr. President, before I complete that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, cloture will occur Tuesday, June 22. I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur at 12:15 p.m. on Tuesday, and the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. LOTT. I now withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in conclusion, I want to make it clear that while I am calling up this steel quota bill and signed the cloture motion, it is because I think this is an important issue and because I made commitments to Senators that we would have a vote on this issue.

I do not think cloture should be invoked. I do not think this bill should pass. I think it would be a very large mistake if we pass it. I want to make that clear.

I am not in any way supporting it. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to think about this vote very carefully. We have already had one steel-related issue passed by the Senate. If we start down the trail of imposing quotas, I think it will not be well received in the financial markets, and it is going in a different direction from what we have been trying to do. I want to make sure the record is clear from the beginning.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2000 AND 2001

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD a Congressional Budget Office cost estimate for S. 886, the pending legislation. The estimate was not available at the time the committee report was filed.

I ask unanimous consent that this CBO cost estimate be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 886.—Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001—As reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on April 27, 1999

Summary: The bill would authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for 2000 and 2001. CBO estimates that appropriation of the authorized amounts would result in additional discretionary spending of \$13.6 billion over the 2000–2004 period. Because the legislation would affect direct spending and revenues, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply; the net impact would generally be less than \$500,000 a year.

Section 4 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) excludes from the application of that act any provisions that are necessary for the national security or the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations. CBO has determined that the provisions in title VI of S. 886 either fall within that exclusion or contain no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates. All other titles of the bill contain no private-sector or intergovernmental mandates and would have no significant effects on the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated Cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of S. 886 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget functions 150 (international affairs) and 300 (natural resources and environment).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—					
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION						
Spending Under Current Law ¹ :						
Budget Authority ²	7,488	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	5,747	1,296	1,177	468	145	74
Proposed Changes:						
Administration of Foreign Affairs:						
Authorization Level	0	4,041	4,041	600	600	600
Estimated Outlays	0	2,701	3,224	844	662	617
International Organizations and Conferences:						
Authorization Level	0	1,506	1,155	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	1,230	1,052	375	2	0
Refugee Assistance and Other Programs:						
Authorization Level	0	665	665	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	459	648	193	7	3
International Broadcasting and Exchange:						
Authorization Level	0	723	723	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	512	680	197	39	12
International Commissions:						
Authorization Level	0	50	50	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	39	46	9	5	2
Subtotal of Proposed Changes:						
Authorization Level	0	6,986	6,635	600	600	600