

1990's. It was the blunder of the decade, and Japan is mounting a huge debt as it tries to spend its way out of seven-year recession.

"These are difficult projections to make for even the next year or two," Mr. Sinai said today, "And even more difficult for beyond that," and the risk is accentuated because most of the paydown of the debt is to occur between 2010 and 2015, allowing plenty of time for economic and political miscalculation or happenstance.

On the other hand, the Government is closer to paying off the debts that really matter than even Mr. Clinton indicated today. While the debt clock reads \$5.6 trillion, the figure that kicks around the United States Treasury is less than half that: \$2.77 trillion, when the amount of debt held by the Federal and state governments and the Federal Reserve is subtracted. Under the President's projections, that debt will be paid off around 2011.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 1123, AS MODIFIED

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will shortly send a modified amendment to the desk. In the time I have, let me speak on a topic I think is related to this bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield? I have been advised by Senator MCCONNELL's staff this has been cleared, the modification has been cleared. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to send it to the desk we can have it accepted.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I send my modified amendment No. 1123 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is modified.

The amendment (No. 1123), as modified, is as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new title:

TITLE—INTERNATIONAL TRAFFICKING OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN VICTIM PROTECTION

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "International Trafficking of Women and Children Victim Reporting Act of 1999".

SEC. 02. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The worldwide trafficking of persons has a disproportionate impact on women and girls and has been and continues to be condemned by the international community as a violation of fundamental human rights.

(2) The fastest growing international trafficking business is the trade in women, whereby women and girls seeking a better life, a good marriage, or a lucrative job abroad, unexpectedly find themselves in situations of forced prostitution, sweatshop labor, exploitative domestic servitude, or battering and extreme cruelty.

(3) Trafficked women and children, girls and boys, are often subjected to rape and other forms of sexual abuse by their traffickers and often held as virtual prisoners by their exploiters, made to work in slavery-like conditions, in debt bondage without pay and against their will.

(4) The President, the First Lady, the Secretary of State, the President's Interagency Council on Women, and the Agency for International Development have all identified trafficking in women as a significant problem.

(5) The Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing Conference) called on all governments to take measures, including legislative measures, to provide better protection of the rights of women and girls in trafficking, to address the root factors that put women and girls at risk to traffickers, and to take measures to dismantle the national, regional, and international networks on trafficking.

(6) The United Nations General Assembly, noting its concern about the increasing number of women and girls who are being victimized by traffickers, passed a resolution in 1998 calling upon all governments to criminalize trafficking in women and girls in all its forms and to penalize all those offenders involved, while ensuring that the victims of these practices are not penalized.

(7) Numerous treaties to which the United States is a party address government obligations to combat trafficking, including such treaties as the 1956 Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, which calls for the complete abolition of debt bondage and servile forms of marriage, and the 1957 Abolition of Forced Labor Convention, which undertakes to suppress and requires signatories not to make use of any forced or compulsory labor.

SEC. 03. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are to condemn and combat the international crime of trafficking in women and children and to assist the victims of this crime by authorizing an annual report of its findings to include the identification of foreign governments that tolerate or participate in trafficking and fail to cooperate with international efforts to prosecute perpetrators;

SEC. 04. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **TRAFFICKING.**—The term "trafficking" means the use of deception, coercion, debt bondage, the threat of force, or the abuse of authority to recruit, transport within or across borders, purchase, sell, transfer, receive, or harbor a person for the purpose of placing or holding such person, whether for pay or not, in involuntary servitude, or slavery or slavery-like conditions, or in forced, bonded, or coerced labor.

(2) **VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING.**—The term "victim of trafficking" means any person subjected to the treatment described in paragraph (2).

SEC. 05. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than March 1, 2000, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to Congress describing the status of international trafficking, including—

(1) a list of foreign states where trafficking originates, passes through, or is a destination; and

(2) an assessment of the efforts by the governments described in paragraph (1) to combat trafficking. Such an assessment shall address—

(A) whether governmental authorities tolerate or are involved in trafficking activities;

(B) which governmental authorities are involved in anti-trafficking activities;

(C) what steps the government has taken toward ending the participation of its officials in trafficking;

(D) what steps the government has taken to prosecute and investigate those officials found to be involved in trafficking;

(E) what steps the government has taken to prohibit other individuals from participating in trafficking, including the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of individuals involved in trafficking, the criminal and civil penalties for trafficking, and the efficacy of those penalties on reducing or ending trafficking;

(F) what steps the government has taken to assist trafficking victims, including ef-

orts to prevent victims from being further victimized by police, traffickers, or others, grants of stays of deportation, and provision of humanitarian relief, including provision of mental and physical health care and shelter;

(G) whether the government is cooperating with governments of other countries to extradite traffickers when requested;

(H) whether the government is assisting in international investigations of transnational trafficking networks; and

(I) whether the government—

(i) refrains from prosecuting trafficking victims or refrains from other discriminatory treatment towards trafficking victims due to such victims having been trafficked, or the nature of their work, or their having left the country illegally; and

(ii) recognizes the rights of victims and ensures their access to justice.

(C) **REPORTING STANDARDS AND INVESTIGATIONS.**

(1) **RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.**—The Secretary of State shall ensure that United States missions abroad maintain a consistent reporting standard and thoroughly investigate reports of trafficking.

(2) **CONTACTS WITH NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—In compiling data and assessing trafficking for the Human Rights Report and the Annual Report, United States mission personnel shall seek out and maintain contacts with human rights and other nongovernmental organizations, including receiving reports and updates from such organizations, and, when appropriate, investigating such reports.

SEC. 06. PROTECTION OF TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1123), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent it be in order the Senator from Rhode Island be recognized for the 5 minutes prior to my recognition.

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

The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1118

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his graciousness in allowing me to speak. I rise today to express my opposition to the Brownback amendment which would implement the Silk Road Strategy Act of 1999. I urge my colleagues to support the second-degree amendment offered by Senators MCCONNELL, ABRAHAM, and SARBAKES. I am also a cosponsor of the second-degree amendment.

The purpose of Senator BROWNBACK's amendment is appropriate, in the sense

he wants to provide assistance to integrate the Caucasus, provide more cooperation and collaboration between these countries. But what we have seen over the last several decades, really, has been the resistance, particularly by the Government of Azerbaijan and the Government of Turkey, to a cooperative and collaborative relationship with the Government of Armenia. That is a polite way of saying they have been blockading Armenia for many years.

In response to that blockade, we have passed, I think wisely, legislation in this Congress and preceding Congresses to prevent our cooperation with these countries unless they lift the blockade. It has been the only real way we have been able to put leverage upon the governments of Turkey and Azerbaijan to recognize that a dialog, cooperation, collaboration, and regional harmony is necessary.

The interesting and ironic point at this juncture is that our strategy seems to be working because for the first time, in the context of the NATO meetings here in Washington just a few weeks ago, the President of Armenia and the President of Azerbaijan had face-to-face meetings.

Up until that time, the Azeris refused to even recognize, really, the Government of Yerevan to have a constructive dialog. Now at the point where we are making progress, where we have a dialog initiated by the Azeris and the Armenians, we are attempting to undercut that progress with this amendment which will essentially take all the pressure off both the Azeris and the Turks in terms of their relationship with Armenia and, in particular, the region of Nagorno-Karabakh.

Nagorno-Karabakh has been for generations an area of concentrated Armenian population but under the control of Azerbaijan. In 1988, Nagorno-Karabakh seceded from Azerbaijan. There was warfare. Mercifully, the warfare has ceased, but this is still a festering point among the three countries—Nagorno-Karabakh, Armenia, and Azerbaijan.

Again, if we are to make progress on this very critical issue, the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh, the issue of the general relationship among Armenia and its neighbors, Azerbaijan and Turkey, now is not the time to take off the one piece of leverage, section 907, which is giving the Azeris an incentive to go to the table, sit down, and talk and collaborate.

I have had the privilege and the opportunity to travel to Armenia and to Nagorno-Karabakh. There is a sincere willingness to seek an understanding, to seek a cooperative arrangement with the Azeris, with the Turks. But that cannot happen unless there is a dialog.

The dialog has started, but my fear is that if we adopt this measure, proposed with every good intention by the Senator from Kansas, we will undercut the progress we have made. We will send a

strong message to the Azeris that they do not have to do anything, they do not have to talk to the Armenians, they do not have to do anything, because they now are unrestricted in terms of their type of diplomatic initiatives.

It will be terribly unfortunate, and it will essentially undercut the motivation which I believe is compelling and moving this underlying amendment of the Senator from Kansas forward: the notion of regional dialog, regional cooperation, regional collaboration.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky, because that is the only way we are going to keep both the Azeris and the Armenians at the table. We know from a long sweep of history, if two nations are talking, then there is hope. Once the dialog is over—and it will end if section 907 is repealed—we are going to see a much more hostile and threatening environment in the Caucasus, one which will not only impact our relationship but also will be a threat to the stability of that region.

I thank and commend the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from Maryland, Mr. SARBANES, Senator ABRAHAM from Michigan, and those who are standing up and saying, now that we are making progress, now that we finally have a dialog between the President of Azerbaijan and the President of Armenia, do not take away the motivation for that dialog; let's continue to talk; let's continue to work for peace in this area.

I yield back any time to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his comments. We appreciate his support on this most important amendment. We certainly hope the Senate will approve the second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 1123, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senator from Minnesota to further modify his amendment, which was adopted just a few minutes ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I send the modification to the desk. I thank both Senator LEAHY and Senator MCCONNELL for their support. This is the first time we are going to have such a report. It is going to be very important to the human rights community and the law enforcement community. It will have a stigmatizing effect on countries involved in this, and it is going to make a huge difference from the point of human rights.

The amendment (No. 1123), as further modified, is as follows:

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new title:

TITLE—INTERNATIONAL TRAFFICKING OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN VICTIM PROTECTION

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “International Trafficking of Women and Children Victim Reporting Act of 1999”.

SEC. 02. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are to condemn and combat the international crime of trafficking in women and children and to assist the victims of this crime by requiring an annual report including the identification of foreign governments that tolerate or participate in trafficking and fail to cooperate with international efforts to prosecute perpetrators.

SEC. 03. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **TRAFFICKING.**—The term “trafficking” means the use of deception, coercion, debt bondage, the threat of force, or the abuse of authority to recruit, transport within or across borders, purchase, sell, transfer, receive, or harbor a person for the purpose of placing or holding such person, whether for pay or not, in involuntary servitude, or slavery or slavery-like conditions, or in forced, bonded, or coerced labor.

(2) **VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING.**—The term “victim of trafficking” means any person subjected to the treatment described in paragraph (2).

SEC. 04. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) Not later than March 1, 2000, the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to Congress describing the status of international trafficking, including—

(1) a list of foreign states where trafficking originates, passes through, or is a destination; and

(2) an assessment of the efforts by the governments described in paragraph (1) to combat trafficking. Such an assessment shall address—

(A) whether governmental authorities tolerate or are involved in trafficking activities;

(B) which governmental authorities are involved in anti-trafficking activities;

(C) what steps the government has taken toward ending the participation of its officials in trafficking;

(D) what steps the government has taken to prosecute and investigate those officials found to be involved in trafficking;

(E) what steps the government has taken to prohibit other individuals from participating in trafficking, including the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of individuals involved in trafficking, the criminal and civil penalties for trafficking, and the efficacy of those penalties on reducing or ending trafficking;

(F) what steps the government has taken to assist trafficking victims, including efforts to prevent victims from being further victimized by police, traffickers, or others, grants of stays of deportation, and provision of humanitarian relief, including provision of mental and physical health care and shelter;

(G) whether the government is cooperating with governments of other countries to extradite traffickers when requested;

(H) whether the government is assisting in international investigations of transnational trafficking networks; and

(I) whether the government—

(i) refrains from prosecuting trafficking victims or refrains from other discriminatory treatment towards trafficking victims due to such victims having been trafficked, or the nature of their work, or their having left the country illegally; and

(ii) recognizes the rights of victims and ensures their access to justice.

(b) CONTACTS WITH NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In compiling data and assessing trafficking for the State Departments Annual Human Rights Report and the report referred to in subsection (a), United States mission personnel shall consult with human rights and other appropriate nongovernmental organizations, including receiving reports and updates from such organizations, and, when appropriate, investigating such reports.

SEC. 06. PROTECTION OF TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

JUVENILE JUSTICE BILL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have an adage: Where there is a will, there is a way. Often that seems to embody how legislation is passed by this Congress. Of course the question always is what is the will, and what is the way? We should look no further than the priority being put on two separate pieces of legislation: S. 254, the juvenile justice bill, and H.R. 775, the Y2K bill. If one looks at that, one sees how the will and the way work around here.

The Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill, S. 254, passed the Senate after 2 weeks of open debate, after a number of votes, and after significant improvements on May 20. The Senate passed it by a strong bipartisan vote of 73-25.

On June 17, the other body passed its version of this legislation but chose not to take up the Senate bill and insert its language, which is the standard practice. Nor has the Republican leadership in the House made any effort to seek a House-Senate conference or appoint conferees.

When there are differences in legislation passed by each House, the normal order is for House and Senate conferees to work these differences out in conference, but we cannot do that unless they appoint conferees.

The majority in the other body is taking a break even before our July 4 recess. They are taking no steps to proceed to conference on the juvenile justice bill or toward the appointment of conferees. Indeed, despite statements by the Speaker of the House earlier this week, the House majority leader is now reported to be planning to delay the completion of this bill for months. This delay is costing us valuable time in getting this juvenile justice legislation enacted before school resumes this fall. This is just plain wrong.

Every parent in this country is concerned this summer about school violence over the last two years and worried about the situation they will confront this fall. Each one of us wants to do something to stop this violence. There is no single cause and no single legislative solution that will cure the ill of youth violence in our schools or in our streets. But we have an opportunity before us to do our part. It is unfortunate that the majority is not moving full speed ahead to seize this opportunity to act on balanced, effective juvenile justice legislation.

We should not repeat the delays that happened in the last Congress on the juvenile justice legislation. In the 105th Congress, the Senate Judiciary Committee reported juvenile justice legislation in July 1997, but it was then left to languish for over a year until the very end of that Congress. In fact, serious efforts to make improvements to this bill did not even occur until the last weeks of that Congress, when it was too late and we ran out of time.

The experience of the last Congress causes me to be wary of this delay in action on the juvenile justice legislation this year. I want to be assured that a House-Senate conference on this legislation is fair, full, and productive.

At the end of the last Congress, the majority staged what appeared to be a procedural ambush to move a one-sided bill forward in a way that precluded full and open debate and amendment. I certainly hope that the current delay in action on this year's juvenile crime bill is not an attempt to concoct another procedure ambush.

We have worked hard in the Senate for a strong bipartisan juvenile justice bill. I will be vigilant in working to maintain this bipartisanship and to press for action on this important legislation. We know if we have the will, there is a way.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. LEAHY. I yield without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the ranking member on the Judiciary Committee. I could not agree more with his remarks. We worked hard on this bill. We deserve for it to be heard. We do not deserve—the American people do not deserve—for it to be shoved under a carpet to pop out sometime unknown perhaps when it cannot be debated.

I ask the Senator this question: Does it seem unreasonable, given his years of experience in the Senate—and I know we worked on criminal justice matters when I was in the House—does it seem unreasonable for us to have a goal, for the American people to sort of set the goal, or agree with us in the goal, that the juvenile justice bill, including provisions such as closing the gun show loophole, which this body passed, be on the President's desk by the day school resumes, by Labor Day of next September? Does that seem to be a reasonable timetable and a reasonable request for people who are interested in debating the issues and seeing that we do something to close the gun show loophole?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I say to my friend from New York, it is reasonable to move forward on it. These are issues the American people care about. They do care about the gun show loopholes on gun sales, certainly after the tragedy of Columbine. They do care about a number of the issues that are in the juvenile justice bill. The Senate reflected that by passing it 73-25. This is a 3-to-1 vote in the Senate.

I say to my friend from New York, when he served in the other body, he

and I were on a number of conference committees together. We knew we would have major criminal justice bills come in one distinct form from the Senate and one distinct form from the House, but we moved quickly in the conferences, sometimes going all night long. In fact, I can remember a couple that went all night long, 2 or 3 nights in a row, to complete our work because we knew we were dealing with criminal justice matters, matters about which the American people have great concern. But we did it.

So I say to my friend from New York, in answer to his question, that this is wrong. This is wrong that we are not moving forward to immediately conference the Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Senator from New York for his concern and his leadership on these matters. He was one of the leaders—in fact, oftentimes on the floor he was the leader—on these issues, including closing gun loopholes. I was looking forward to, and am looking forward to, his expertise and his work when we do get to conference. He and I are ready to go to conference. I am prepared to have him in there to help me in that conference, because these are major issues.

But at some time or another the American people expect us to vote one way or the other. Some Senators will vote against our position. Some House Members will vote against our position. Some will vote for it. I do not ascribe motives to them, but I say, that you either vote for or against something. You do not vote maybe. And the Congress is being forced to vote maybe.

This is a sharp contrast to the pace of action on the Y2K bill. The Y2K bill provides special legal protections to businesses. After earlier action in the House on H.R. 775, the Y2K liability limitations bill passed the Senate on June 15, 1999. That was about 1 month after the Senate passed the Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill.

On June 16, the day after Senate action on the Y2K bill, the Senate asked for a House-Senate conference and appointed conferees. In fact, I am one of them. The House responded by agreeing to the conference and appointed its conferees a few days later, on June 24. Then we immediately went to conference. The conference met that same day, the same day the House appointed its conferees.

After a weekend break for extensive negotiations with the White House, the conference report on the Y2K liability limitations bill was filed yesterday, June 29. I expect the House and Senate will be taking up the conference report almost immediately, and the Y2K liability limitations bill will probably see final passage this week.

It is interesting that this is a business-lobbied-for issue and that thing zips through here; it zips through here at warp speed. I can almost see the legislative clerk saying: We want warp 5,