

Because the House of Representatives did not do this, one of the two Chambers must take up the other one's bill, pass it, and ask for a conference. This presents numerous opportunities for procedural mischief and delay by those who would rather not see any bill pass than one containing modest gun safety provisions, such as the Senate bill.

Mr. President, I am very disturbed by this delay in taking the next step to pass this important legislation.

Our nation was rocked 2 months ago by the tragic shootings at Columbine High School in Colorado, coming as it did in the wake of earlier school shootings in Jonesboro, Arkansas; West Paducah, Kentucky; Springfield, Oregon; and elsewhere. We cannot tolerate or evade this shocking school violence. We should not let our children start a new school year without passing this important legislation to address youth violence.

The Senate bill is a wide, sweeping measure, which will help us to confront the problem of juvenile crime. It includes a number of provisions which I authored and which I have worked on for several years, including:

A ban on importing high capacity ammunition magazines;

A ban on juvenile possession of assault weapons and high capacity ammunition magazines;

A comprehensive package of measures to fight criminal gangs;

Limits on bombmaking information;

The James Guelff Body Armor Act, which contains reforms to take body armor out of the hands of criminals and put it into the hands of police; and

Crime prevention programs.

It also contains other modest reforms to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and children, including: Requiring the same background checks at gun shows which gun dealers have to preform; and requiring the sale of child safety locks with handguns.

The Senate bill also establishes a new \$700 million juvenile justice block grant program for states and localities, representing a significant increase in federal aid to the states for juvenile crime control programs, including:

Additional law enforcement and juvenile court personnel;

Juvenile detention facilities; and

Prevention programs to keep juveniles out of trouble to begin with.

Our bill encourages increased accountability for juveniles, through the implementation of graduated sanctions to ensure that subsequent offenses are treated with increasing severity.

It reforms juvenile record systems, through improved record keeping and increased access to juvenile records by police, courts, and schools, so that a court or school dealing with a juvenile in California can know if he has committed violent offenses in Arizona; and extends federal sentences for juveniles who commit serious violent felonies.

Let us not delay further in enacting these important measures. I join my colleagues in urging the majority to

proceed to conference and appoint conferees, so that we can enact this vital legislation.

I thank the Chair, and yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it has been 71 days—71 days—since the tragic shooting at Columbine High School. There are 69 days left before school children in Massachusetts and other states go back to school. It is time for Congress to finish the job we began last month and pass juvenile justice legislation. Communities across America are waiting for our answer.

We need to provide communities with the assistance they need to reduce youth violence.

We need to help parents struggling to raise their children from birth through adolescence.

We need to help teachers and school officials recognize the early warning signals and act before violence occurs.

We need to assist law enforcement officers in keeping guns away from children.

We need to close the gun show loophole.

We need to require the sale of safety locks with all firearms.

The Senate passed such legislation with overwhelming support last month. The House of Representatives passed its own version of this legislation earlier this month. It is time to appoint House and Senate conferees to write the final bill and send it to the President, so that effective legislation is in place as soon as possible.

Everyday we delay, this critical problem continues to fester. Children are under assault from violence and neglect—from the break-up of families—from the temptations of alcohol, tobacco, and drug abuse—from violence in the media. These are not new problems, but they have become increasingly serious problems, and Congress cannot look the other way and continue to ignore them.

We must support youth, parents, educators, law enforcement authorities, and communities. The public overwhelmingly supports more effective steps to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and juveniles. We cannot accept "no" for an answer from the National Rifle Association. It is long past time for Congress to face up to this challenge. The tragedy at Columbine High School is an urgent call to action to every member of Congress. Will we finally do what it takes to keep children safe, or will we continue to sleepwalk through this worsening crisis of gun violence in our schools and our society.

We have a national crisis, and common sense approaches are urgently needed. If we are serious about dealing with youth violence, the time to act is now. There is no reason why this Congress can not pass a comprehensive juvenile justice bill before the August recess. The citizens of this country deserve better than what Congress has given them so far.

The lack of action is appalling and inexcusable. We cannot continue to whistle past the graveyards of Littleton and the many other communities scarred by juvenile gun violence in recent years. Each new tragedy is a fresh indictment of our failure to act responsibly.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, all the amendments to this bill have now been filed. I, at this point, will consult with Senator LEAHY about how we proceed, but in all likelihood we should be able to finish this bill by mid to late afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1119

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I wanted to address the body on several of the discussion points that were raised today regarding an amendment I filed. I inquire first of the President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is the McConnell amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Then I will not have to ask the pending business be set aside. We are still on that.

I wanted to address several of the issues my colleagues have raised, that the negotiations between Armenia and Azerbaijan that are taking place in the so-called Minsk Group are at a very delicate time period and the repeal of section 907, as addressed in the McConnell-Abraham amendment, would upset the delicate negotiations at this point in time.

Frankly, it is just not true that these negotiations are at a delicate point in time now and this amendment would do that. The present conflict has been going on since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and a cease-fire has been in effect since 1994. The U.S. Government is one of the peace group co-chairs, along with Russia and France, and they all—the U.S. Government, the Clinton administration—favor repeal or waiver of section 907.

The amendment I put forward prevents our Government from being an honest broker in the peace process. We have letters from Secretary Albright and the administration on this.

Russia is involved, and not in a helpful way. Their handiwork in retaining influences in the Caucasus is only slightly less obvious than their efforts to help out in Kosovo—in some situations where they were not helpful at all. Russian military troops are still based in Armenia and were providing military support and munitions supplies to Armenia during the war with Azerbaijan.

The argument in support of the status quo has nothing to do with the sensitivities of the ongoing peace talks. The last real peace initiative where there was a real push was in 1997, calling for Armenia's withdrawal from the occupied territories in exchange for normalization of trade with Azerbaijan. This was rejected by Armenia.

The continued status quo in Armenia's favor is nothing less than the Armenian Government's attempt to influence U.S. foreign policy and preserve an undue advantage. It really is that simple. Azerbaijan is the only country in the former Soviet Union that has unilateral sanctions from the United States. Again, we do not lift them; we just provide waiver authority for section 907.

So those arguments being raised by my colleagues are simply not accurate. Also, they talk about the issue of the blockade: Somehow Azerbaijan is blockading Armenia. I want to show a map on this point so people can get a look, again, at the region and what this so-called blockade is about.

Here is Azerbaijan. Here is Armenia. Here is the area in dispute. Armenia is occupying 20 percent of the landmass of Azerbaijan. The United Nations has condemned this action by Armenia. OSCE, the group much involved in negotiation, condemns the action by Armenia.

You can see Armenia has outlets they can use through Iran or through Georgia, which is up here. So there is not a blockade on Armenia. What the so-called blockade is, and has been for a long period of time, is a mutual border closing caused by Armenia's continued illegal occupation of Azerbaijan.

I hope my colleagues will look at the map, look at the situation, read the U.N. resolutions, the OSCE resolutions about Armenia occupying 20 percent of Azerbaijan, and quickly and clearly conclude that this blockade is really a mutual border closing caused by Armenia and its illegal occupation of Azerbaijan. That, plus the difficulties caused by Armenia's mining of some of the overland routes through the buffer zone surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh, are probably some of the most serious logistical obstacles in the blockade.

So I point these out to my colleagues, those who are saying this is a sensitive time. We had a cease-fire for 5 years. It is not that the government is involved in trying to negotiate a true peace and wants 907 to be repealed so the United States can be an honest broker in this peace process and not one-sided on it. The Clinton administration, and Bush administration prior to that, opposed section 907. And the blockade is really not a blockade at all.

Mr. President, I ask at this time to set aside the pending amendment, Senator McCONNELL's amendment, so I can call up an amendment.

I will call up amendment No. 1170. This is an amendment I talked about previously on Sudan. I would like to

have that considered. I ask unanimous consent that we set aside the pending amendment so I can call up amendment No. 1170.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1170

(Purpose: To make available international disaster assistance, humanitarian assistance, and development assistance in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] proposes an amendment numbered 1170.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

**SEC. — INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR OPPOSITION-CONTROLLED AREAS OF SUDAN.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds made available under chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to international disaster assistance) for fiscal year 2000, up to \$4,000,000 should be made available for rehabilitation and economic recovery in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan. Such funds are to be used to improve economic governance, primary education, agriculture, and other locally-determined priorities. Such funds are to be programmed and implemented jointly by the United States Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture, and may be utilized for activities which can be implemented for a period of up to two years.

**SEC. — HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR SUDANESE INDIGENOUS GROUPS.**

The President, acting through the appropriate Federal agencies, is authorized to provide humanitarian assistance, including food, directly to the National Democratic Alliance participants and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement operating outside of the Operation Lifeline Sudan structure.

**SEC. — DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR OPPOSITION-CONTROLLED AREAS OF SUDAN.**

(a) **INCREASE IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.**—The President, acting through the United States Agency for International Development, is authorized to increase substantially the amount of development assistance for capacity building, democracy promotion, civil administration, judiciary, and infrastructure support in opposition-controlled areas of Sudan.

(b) **QUARTERLY REPORT.**—The President shall submit a report on a quarterly basis to the Congress on progress made in carrying out subsection (a).

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, this is an amendment we have been negotiating back and forth. I indicated briefly that we wanted to bring it up if we could not get a negotiated agreement. We are proceeding later on in the day. I know the people in charge of the bill want to move this amendment, so I called this amendment up to get it as

the pending business so people can discuss it.

I have discussed this earlier. I do not seek to take up an extraordinary amount of time to discuss it. It would make available international disaster assistance, humanitarian assistance, and development assistance in the opposition-controlled areas of the Sudan.

I recently led a congressional delegation to the region. The government in Khartoum is a terrorist regime. That is according to the U.S. State Department. They have in their country the worst humanitarian situation in the world. That is according to Brian Atwood, head of USAID—the worst in the world. There were nearly 2 million people killed in 10 years, over 4 million internally displaced. This is through forced, manmade famine and starvation. This is by bombing, indiscriminate civilian bombing by the government in Khartoum.

It is exporting terrorism. It has housed Osama bin Laden until 1997. They house a number of terrorist groups in Khartoum. They are supporting terrorism and spreading throughout the region a sort of militant terrorism—in the Congo, Eritrea, Uganda, and other places. They seem to seek to be the African edge of the militant terrorism. The people attempting to kill President Mubarak in Egypt were given housing and aid and abetting in Sudan by this government. This is a bad regime. This amendment simply seeks to provide humanitarian assistance to those opposition-controlled areas and the opposition groups.

Here, again, is the list of items the government in Khartoum, the Sudan Government, is doing today. I have talked about these. Most recently, last year, 100,000 people, according to the U.S. Committee on Refugees, were killed by a man-induced famine, induced by the Khartoum government. They would not let our disaster relief planes fly into the region. They said no.

It is time we allowed aid to go to the resistance groups that are fighting just for dignity and for their own lives. This is a simple amendment. It is a modification to the one we previously called up. I do not know of any objection to this, and as soon as the manager of the amendment can perhaps come to the floor, I would simply like to ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment and have us vote on it because I think it is a worthwhile amendment. While that is being taken care of, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HELMS be added as a cosponsor to this amendment.

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I have discussed this with Senator FRIST, who chairs the subcommittee, who also has traveled to Sudan and knows of the situation taking place in that region. That is why this is an important issue for us to take up now. This is the appropriate vehicle. It is

providing aid to the southern resistance movement. Actually now it is not just southern, it is all over the country.

We can move the vote to a later point, but I ask for the yeas and nays on amendment No. 1170.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second at this time.

Mr. BROWNBACK. At the appropriate time, when we can get a sufficient second, I will be asking for the yeas and nays on this amendment so we can have a vote on this amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. THOMAS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1305 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Brownback amendment No. 1170.

AMENDMENT NO. 1165

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding assistance provided to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside and that amendment No. 1165 be called up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. CLELAND, proposes an amendment numbered 1165.

The amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA.

It is the sense of the Senate that nothing in this Act, or Senate Report No. 106-81, re-

lating to assistance provided to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the Foreign Military Financing Program, should be interpreted as expressing the will of the Senate to accelerate membership of those nations into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this sense-of-the-Senate amendment is being offered on behalf of myself, Senator ROBERTS, Senator BOB SMITH, and Senator MAX CLELAND as well.

It is, I believe, an important amendment. It is also an amendment that will be accepted. That is my expectation. We don't have a final decision on that, but we hope that is the result.

This year's foreign operations appropriations bill designates \$20 million in foreign military financing grant assistance to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, the Baltic States. I am not concerned about the fact that we are designating funds for those states. I am concerned about the provision because of the intent that appears to lie behind the funding.

Let me quote from the committee report. It says in the committee report:

The assistance accelerates Baltic states integration into NATO and supports these democracies as they enhance military capabilities and adopt NATO standards.

This amendment I have offered, with the help of the three other Senators I mentioned, would state that nothing in this bill concerning the foreign military financing intended to support the legitimate security needs of the Baltic States should be interpreted as also expressing the intent of the Senate to accelerate the membership of those countries into NATO.

We recently observed the 50th anniversary of NATO, welcomed three new members into the alliance: the Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary. I voted for the admission of those three into the alliance on this historic occasion. No other nations were admitted to the alliance, nor was there a commitment made to extend an invitation to any particular nation to join in the future.

The language contained in the Senate report accompanying the bill suggests that the military financing authorized in the bill would be for the express purpose of accelerating the integration of those states into NATO. I believe that language is premature. I believe it is ill-advised at this time. Let me try to give a few indications as to why.

Many of my colleagues share the concern, which we have heard on the floor, about the future of the NATO alliance. We, obviously, value NATO and its contributions to peace. We fervently intend that it continue to be a force for peace in the future.

Recent events within the alliance have raised some concern. Despite the recent military victory in Kosovo, there is some evidence that the alliance may not be totally healthy at this stage.

While the bombing campaign continued in Yugoslavia, for example, there were divisions among NATO members. Those were worked through.

In addition, there is a major debate now underway concerning the equity of the burdens that different members of NATO have, both financial burdens and military burdens.

I am not suggesting we debate the future of NATO today, although I do believe the Senate should soon review the Strategic Concept that is being proposed to guide future NATO potential military involvements.

I am suggesting, however, that legislative provisions, such as the one I have called attention to today in this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, could prematurely complicate the very difficult problems the alliance is facing. I don't believe anybody here would deny that a debate concerning the membership of the Baltic nations in NATO is likely to be a spirited one. This bill is not the appropriate venue for that debate to take place.

I have reviewed, by the way, the Baltic charter that was signed in January 1998 to determine if I missed something with respect to the membership of the Baltic nations in NATO. There are many affirming words in the charter about cooperation between NATO and the Baltic nations, and there are several encouraging references with respect to possible future membership of those countries in the alliance. But there are no words that commit NATO to offering membership or to accelerating their integration of those nations into the alliance.

The provision in the bill that would provide military assistance to the Baltic nations for that specific purpose is not grounded in a policy that I believe we should embrace at this time.

The sense-of-the-Senate amendment I offer would permit foreign military financing to meet the security needs of the Baltic nations, but it does not commit the Senate, as a result of that assistance, to commit itself to approval or acceleration of the membership of the Baltic nations into NATO.

I hope my colleagues will support the amendment. I believe it is in our national interest and in the security interests of Europe as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the bill before us includes increased Foreign Military Financing funding to help Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania improve their militaries. The Baltic countries need to improve their military posture whether or not they join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). But the fact is that they do aspire to join NATO, and all three countries will be working to meet goals in NATO's Membership Action Plans for each country.

My colleagues Senators BINGAMAN, ROBERTS, BOB SMITH, and CLELAND have offered an amendment that says that nothing in the bill "should be interpreted as expressing the will of the Senate to accelerate membership of those nations into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)." However, the Senate can do nothing to invite the Baltic countries or any other

aspiring country to join NATO. Only NATO can invite countries to join. When they are ready to join, and if they are invited to join, the Senate would have to vote to approve amending the NATO treaty to accept further NATO expansion.

The Foreign Military Financing funding can serve to accelerate the Baltic countries' efforts to meet NATO criteria, but the decision to invite them to join NATO remains a political one that will be made by NATO's nineteen member states. The Baltic states could do nothing to become NATO ready and be invited—or they could become modern-day Spartas and still not be asked to join NATO; that decision is up to NATO.

The Senate has already expressed its opinion in Section 2703 of the European Security Act of 1998 that was included in last year's Omnibus Appropriations bill that "It is the sense of Congress that Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria . . . (C) upon complete satisfaction of all relevant criteria should be invited to become full NATO members at the earliest possible date." In other words, the Senate and House of Representatives have already said that when the Baltic countries are ready to join NATO, they should be invited to join.

Thus I fail to see the usefulness of the amendment offered by my colleagues today. I particularly regret that the amendment has singled out Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia when in fact there are many NATO aspirants, including Romania, Bulgaria, Slovenia, Slovakia, Albania, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The Baltic countries have made enormous strides in transforming themselves into free market democracies. They have embraced civilian control of their militaries, have participated in international peacekeeping, and have demonstrated their ability to operate with the military forces of NATO countries under NATO standards, spending precious resources to do so. I believe we must follow through and do all we can to convince our NATO allies that the Baltic states should be invited.

The United States' position on further expansion is that NATO should have an open door policy and that geography should be no barrier to membership. Russia need not feel threatened by the NATO membership of the three tiny Baltic states—they can do nothing to threaten the enormous and powerful Russian Federation. And right now Russia has no hostile intent toward them. But should Russia turn away from democracy, and if an expansionist autocrat were to come to power once again, NATO membership for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia would make a powerful statement that the United States and Europe will never again accept buffer-state subjugation of the Baltic states.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am greatly dismayed by and strongly opposed to the amendment introduced by

Senator BINGAMAN that seeks to express the Sense of the Senate that the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania should not receive accelerated consideration for membership in NATO. This amendment most assuredly does not reflect the views of this Senator, and I am certain that of many more of my colleagues.

I fail to comprehend the purpose in singling-out these independent nations in this manner. It appears to this Senator, after reviewing both the Foreign Appropriations bill and accompanying report, that there is nothing contained in either document that should provoke the offering of this amendment.

It is my firm belief that the NATO alliance can benefit from the inclusion of new Central and East European nations, including the three Baltic states. The Baltic peoples have asked for and deserve protection from foreign invasion, and are willing to join the NATO security alliance to protect other European nations in need of help.

Future NATO membership for Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania is essential to their safety and prosperity. Security concerns will take precedence over continued democratic and economic reforms if the Baltics continue to exist, unprotected, in the shadow of an increasingly nationalistic Russia.

The United States should and must be vigilant in our efforts to extend NATO's reach to all democratic nations in Europe who cannot protect themselves. If we leave these nations exposed to the risk of foreign invasion and influence, the gains made in expanding democracy and freedom around the world will be vulnerable to erosion. The United States must continue to set an example for the world as a promoter and protector of democratic freedom. As victors in the Cold War, we have never had a greater opportunity than this to show democracy's enemies that we have the courage and the will to stand firm against them. NATO expansion is of vital importance to the future of democracy.

The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico can only have a negative effect on the United States's efforts to expand and protect democratic development in Central and Eastern Europe. To punitively single-out these three nations as they strive to protect their right to independence and freedom, following decades of Soviet domination, is neither constructive, nor in the interests of the United States. It is my sincere hope that this language will not be included in the final Foreign Operations Appropriations bill passed by Congress for Fiscal Year 2000.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, is there an amendment pending now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. LEAHY. Which amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 1165, submitted by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending

amendment be laid aside temporarily so that I may introduce this amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1179

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 1179.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

SELF-DETERMINATION IN EAST TIMOR

SEC. . (a) The President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Treasury (acting through United States executive directors to international financial institutions) should immediately intensify their efforts to prevail upon the Indonesian Government and military to—

(1) disarm and disband anti-independence militias in East timor;

(2) grant full access to East Timor by international human rights monitors, humanitarian organizations, and the press;

(3) allow Timorese who have been living in exile to return to East Timor to campaign for and participate in the ballot; and

(4) release all political prisoners.

(b) The President shall submit a report to Congress not later than 15 days after passage of this Act, containing a description of the Administration's efforts and his assessment of efforts made by the Indonesian Government and military to fulfill the steps described in paragraph (a).

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall direct the United States executive directors to international financial institutions to take into account the extent of efforts made by the Indonesian Government and military to fulfill the steps described in paragraph (a), in determining their vote on any loan or financial assistance to Indonesia.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to express strong support for a peaceful process of self-determination in East Timor.

The Indonesian Government has a historic opportunity to resolve a conflict that has been the cause of suffering and instability for 23 years.

It has made a commitment to vote on August 21st on East Timor's future, and has recognized its responsibility to ensure that the vote is free and fair.

On May 5, when I introduced a similar resolution, I remarked on Indonesia's accomplishments in the past year: President Suharto relinquished power; the Indonesian Government endorsed a vote on autonomy; and the United Nations, Portugal and Indonesia signed agreed on the procedures for that vote.

There has been more progress in the past month. Democratic elections have

been held, the first members of an international observer mission and police force arrived in East Timor, and Nobel laureate Jose Ramos Horta was invited to return to Jakarta for the first time in 24 years.

A year ago few people would have predicted that a settlement of East Timor's future would be in sight. However, there is deep concern that August 21st is quickly approaching, and the violence in East Timor will make a free and fair vote impossible.

In fact, the vote, initially scheduled for August 8th, was postponed by the United Nations until August 21st because of the violence.

Hundreds of civilians have been killed, injured, or disappeared in ongoing violence by anti-independence militias armed by members of the Indonesian military who want to sabotage the vote.

Human rights monitors and humanitarian organizations continue to face problems gaining access to the island, and members of the press have been threatened.

This amendment calls on the administration to immediately intensify its efforts to prevail upon the Indonesian Government to disarm and disband the anti-independence militias, grant full access to humanitarian organizations, and allow Timorese who have been living in exile to return home.

It directs the United States executive directors to international financial institutions to use their influence to encourage the Indonesian Government and military to create a stable and secure environment for the vote.

We should use all the resources at our disposal to convince the Indonesians to stop the violence. This is not only their responsibility, it is in their interests. If the Indonesian military succeeds in sabotaging the vote, Indonesia will face international condemnation.

On June 11th, I and other Members of Congress wrote to World Bank President James Wolfensohn about the need for the World Bank to use its leverage with the Indonesian Government.

Mr. President, the world community has recognized the urgency of this situation. An international monitoring and police presence throughout East Timor is critical to creating a secure environment.

The administration is already helping to pay the costs of the U.N. monitors and police, and they have made some progress in stemming the violence.

But far more needs to be done. It is time for the Indonesian Government and military to do their part—to act decisively to ensure that a free and fair vote can occur.

This amendment reinforces what others have said and what the Indonesian Government has already committed to do. It should be unanimously supported.

Mr. President, yesterday more than 100 anti-independence militiamen sur-

rounded a newly opened United Nations' office in the East Timorese town of Maliana. Hurling rocks, the mob injured a diplomat from South Africa and at least a dozen Timorese who sought refuge inside the office. The U.N. building also sustained considerable damage.

In recent months I have spoken out about the escalating violence in East Timor on numerous occasions. I am offering an amendment today about the situation there.

The Indonesian Government and military have pledged to establish a safe and secure environment prior to the August 21st ballot on East Timor's political status. This alarming incident is a clear example that the Indonesian Government and military are not living up to their obligations. It is a clear example that their failure to act is having and will continue to have international consequences.

This latest attack suggests that despite the May 5th tripartite agreement, the presence of an international observer mission and police force and recent negotiations between the opposing factions about how to stem the violence, the situation is continuing to deteriorate. It could jeopardize the entire peace process.

The East Timorese have endured over 20 years of violence and repression. The international community has committed its resources to helping ensure that a free and fair ballot can be conducted. The United Nations has firmly stated that it has a job to do in East Timor and it will not be chased off by intimidation and harassment.

Mr. President, it is my hope that this violent attack will sound the alarm to the Indonesian government and military that they have an historic opportunity to finally establish peace in East Timor and that they must act immediately or it will be lost.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I will soon send two amendments to the desk, one by the occupant of the chair, Senator VOINOVICH, related to designation of Serbia as a terrorist state, and the other by Senator BIDEN, both of which have been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1180 AND 1181

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] proposes amendments numbered 1180 and 1181.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1180

To SEC. 525.—Designation of Serbia as a Terrorist State add:

(C) This section would become null and void should the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (other than Montenegro and Kosova) complete a democratic reform process that brings about a newly elected government that respects the rights of ethnic minorities, is committed to the rule of law and respects the sovereignty of its neighbor states.

AMENDMENT NO. 1181

(Purpose: To allocate funds for the Iraq Foundation)

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

**SEC. . ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR THE IRAQ FOUNDATION.**

Of the funds made available by this Act for activities of Iraqi opposition groups designated under the Iraqi Liberation Act (Public Law 103-338), \$250,000 shall be made available for the Iraq Foundation.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two amendments be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 1180 and 1181) were agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1179

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, are we now back on the Leahy amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). That is correct.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to join my distinguished colleague from Vermont, Senator LEAHY, to offer this amendment to encourage a peaceful process of self-determination in East Timor. This amendment closely mirrors what he and I and several other Senators expressed in Senate Resolution 96, and in a similar amendment to the State Department authorization bill. We are offering this amendment today to again highlight the significance of the process underway in East Timor that will once and for all determine its political status.

I want to commend the members of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee for including language relating to East Timor in the committee report accompanying this bill. I believe it is important that the Senate go on record regarding its support for the forthcoming ballot and in condemnation of the violence surrounding this historic vote.

As we all know, Indonesian President Habibie announced on January 27 that the Government of Indonesia was finally willing to seek to learn and respect the wishes of the people in that territory. On May 5, the Governments of Indonesia and Portugal signed an

agreement to hold a United Nations-supervised “consultation” on August 8 to determine East Timor’s future political status. This ballot has since been postponed to an as yet undetermined date in late August.

Despite the positive step forward that the ballot represents, excitement and tension over the possibility of gaining independence have in recent months led to a gross deterioration of the security situation. Militias, comprised of individuals determined to intimidate the East Timorese people into support for continued integration with Indonesia and widely believed to be supported by the Indonesian military, are responsible for a sharp increase in violence.

Just this week, members of a pro-Jakarta civilian militia attacked a United Nations regional headquarters in the Maliana township in East Timor. Several people, including a U.N. election officer, were wounded. This is latest in a string of violent incidents that have been linked to pro-Jakarta militias. Mr. President, this kind of violence and intimidation cannot be tolerated, especially at this crucial time.

In the May 5 agreement, the Government of Indonesia agreed to take responsibility for ensuring that the ballot is carried out in a fair and peaceful way. Unfortunately, it is unclear that they are implementing this aspect of the agreement. Quite the opposite. Whether Indonesian troops have actually participated in some of these incidents or not, the authorities certainly most accept the blame for allowing, and in some cases encouraging, the bloody tactics of the pro-integration militias. The continuation of this violence is a threat to the very sanctity and legitimacy of the process that is underway. Thus, the Leahy-Feingold amendment specifically calls on Jakarta to do all it can to seek a peaceful process and a fair resolution to the situation in East Timor.

Mr. President, I believe the United States has a responsibility—an obligation—to put as much pressure as possible on the Indonesian government to help encourage an environment conducive to a free, fair, peaceful ballot process for the people of East Timor. I am pleased that we have taken a leadership role in offering technical, financial, and diplomatic support to the recently authorized U.N. Assistance Mission in East Timor, known as UNAMET.

Mr. President, it is not in our power to guarantee the free, fair exercise of the rights of the people of East Timor to determine their future. It is, however, in our interest to do all that we can to work with the United Nations, other concerned countries, the government of Indonesia and the people of East Timor to create an opportunity for a successful ballot process. We cannot forget that the Timorese have been living with violence and oppression for more than 23 years. These many years have not dulled the desire of the East

Timorese for freedom, or quieted their demands to have a role in the determination of East Timor’s status.

We have to do all we can to support an environment that can produce a fair ballot in East Timor. Now. And throughout the rest of this process.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN) are necessarily absent.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 188 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Enzi	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	McConnell
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Baucus	Frist	Moynihan
Bayh	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Graham	Murray
Biden	Gramm	Nickles
Bingaman	Grams	Reed
Bond	Grassley	Reid
Boxer	Gregg	Robb
Breaux	Hagel	Roberts
Brownback	Harkin	Rockefeller
Bryan	Hatch	Roth
Bunning	Helms	Santorum
Burns	Hollings	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchinson	Schumer
Campbell	Hutchison	Sessions
Chafee	Inhofe	Shelby
Cleland	Inouye	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Collins	Johnson	Snowe
Conrad	Kennedy	Specter
Coverdell	Kerrey	Stevens
Craig	Kerry	Thomas
Crapo	Kohl	Thompson
Daschle	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Voinovich
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Edwards	Lincoln	

NOT VOTING—2

Mack                   McCain

The amendment (No. 1179) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1118

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in very strong opposition to the

amendment offered to this legislation by my colleague from Kansas, Senator BROWNBACK. I am supportive of the amendment offered by the chairman of the subcommittee to the Brownback amendment, the second-degree amendment. But I want to address the Brownback amendment for just a few minutes here. In the course of doing that, I will underscore why I am supportive of the chairman’s amendment and why I oppose the Brownback amendment.

The Brownback amendment is similar to legislation that was considered by the Foreign Relations Committee in May. That bill was reported out on a voice vote, but six members of the committee—six members—joined in submitting minority views in opposition to several of its major provisions. It had been my expectation that if this issue were to come up, it would come up in the course of calling up that bill, which is on the calendar, has been reported out of committee. That is the normal way one would expect to deal with substantive legislation.

What we are confronted with here is an effort to attach this amendment to an appropriations bill. Of course, we all know the problems that are connected with doing that. It slows down the appropriations process. You often engage in major issues of substantive content, which really ought to involve the substantive committees, and, instead, it is shifted into the appropriations context. One would have to be naive not to appreciate that it is done on occasion, but I don’t think it is a good idea.

I must say, my view here on this matter is, in part, influenced by that. In other words, it is not as though the bill that came out of committee, which we considered and debated, on which we had a vote and on which some of us were in the minority, the bill went out, and it has been placed on the calendar. It is not as if that bill is before us—substantive legislation. Instead, what we have now is an amendment that takes most of the content of that bill and seeks to add it as an amendment to the appropriations bill.

This isn’t an amendment that deals with numbers and figures. It is not, in effect, an amendment that falls clearly within the bailiwick of the appropriators. This is an amendment that really deals with a very important substantive issue of national policy. Senator BROWNBACK proposes to change it, to take out of the law a provision that is now in the law. I think it is very important to understand that. In other words, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kansas would make a major alteration in existing law, and it would seek to do it, as I have indicated, in the context of considering the appropriations legislation.

I can remember a time in this body where efforts to do that alone were reason enough to oppose an amendment. It was not too long ago. In other words,