

I join in the expressions of my colleagues in expressing my profound sadness and regret at the fate that has befallen our colleague and members of his and the Bessette family.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—Continued

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I will also make some comments about the reorganization of the Department of Energy with regard to its nuclear activities.

I heard my colleagues speaking earlier on this subject. I think it is one of those great times in the Senate where Members from both sides of the aisle can come together and try to get something done for the benefit of the country and for the benefit of our safety in a troubled world. It is a historic opportunity.

Perhaps to lend a little bit of a different perspective or additional perspective, I should say, with regard to some of the work we do in the Governmental Affairs Committee, it has to do generally with the operation of Government. We continually face instances where the Government is not performing the way it should. The taxpayers are not getting their money's worth. We continually see instances of waste, fraud, and abuse. We have what is known as the high risk list; that is, those Departments and agencies which are most prone to waste, fraud, and abuse. We see the same agencies year in and year out. We have reports year in and year out about these kinds of problems. It is affecting the way our people look at their own Government, which I think is probably the most important underlying problem that we have in this country. This lack of faith and trust in Government has become a recurring theme in recent nonpartisan and bipartisan surveys of public opinion toward Government. This trend is definitely in the wrong direction.

A poll released by the Counsel for Excellence in Government last week found that just 29 percent of Americans say that they trust the Government in Washington to do what's right most of the time. This is down even from last year's poll, which found only a 38 percent level of trust. The National Academy of Public Administration recently released a national election study poll this June that pegged the percentage of Americans who trust Government at a meager 32 percent. According to the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, it is poor Government performance that is the leading indicator, the leading factor, in Americans' distrust of the Federal Government. An overwhelming majority of the public—74 percent—say that the Government does only a fair or poor job in managing its programs and providing services. The National Academy of Public Administration reports that survey respondents complain about Government failures, stating that Government be-

comes part of the problem, is too big, serving others, doing nothing, and wasting money. So we have seen that over a period of years.

Time and time and again, we have had reports bringing this to our attention. All too often, we wind up talking about it and doing very little about it. But now we find that we are faced with a different kind of lack of performance as far as our Government is concerned. Maybe we can afford certain breakdowns. Maybe we can afford certain fraud, inefficiencies, and waste, but we are facing a different kind now, and that has to do with our national security. Time and time again, we see instances where the right hand within a department does not know what the left hand is doing.

We recently received the inspector general's report from the Department of Justice which demonstrated that we on the Governmental Affairs Committee did not receive evidence and did not receive materials showing people with strong ties to the Chinese government at the same time they were making political contributions in this country. Six inspectors general gave us a report recently regarding how our export control system was working. We found out that it is not working very well at all. We don't know very much, sometimes, about who is doing the exporting. We don't know much about who the end users are and what they are doing with these dual-use technologies we are sending them, some of which can be used for military purposes. The law requires that we train our licensing officers. But we are not following that law. We have no training programs with regard to our licensing officers. We are supposed to be checking up on our foreign visitors there and making sure that when they visit the labs, they are not coming away with information that they should not be having. We are not doing a good job there.

The law requires that we keep up with the cumulative effect of the exports we are sending to these other countries, but we are not doing that either. We found out recently that, with regard to trying to get materials regarding someone who is a suspect, actual espionage activities broke down interdepartmentally between the Department of Energy and the Department of Justice because of a lack of communication. We were trying to get a search warrant there; it never came about. If we had the correct information and had been really talking to each other and had a system whereby we could exchange information after asking the right questions, we would not even have needed that search warrant. These are all instances where the Government is not performing in the way the Government should be performing. And now we see a systematic breakdown with regard to the security at our national laboratories.

This is bad enough in and of itself at any time. But I think it is especially

disturbing now that we understand more and more that we are living in a different world than we have been living in in times past. I think that after the end of the Cold War, when we didn't have the big Soviet Union threat anymore, we let our guard down in this country. We thought that we could place less emphasis on preparedness, readiness, national security, and things of that nature. The Chinese were in no position to pose a direct threat to us, and we felt the Soviet Union certainly was not. Yet as we look around the world, we see that new threats are developing. We got the Rumsfeld report, and we understand now that rogue nations around this world are rapidly developing biological, nuclear, and chemical capabilities that pose a threat to this country. Then we have the Cox report, which tells us what we have lost with regard to our own national laboratories, in terms of nuclear technology and perhaps even nuclear materials. The President's own Federal foreign intelligence advisory committee, led by Senator Rudman, now points out the difficulties that we are having in that regard.

It is a different world. So we must ask ourselves: If not now, when? If we can't, at long last, after all these reports—and Senator Rudman pointed out that there had been over a hundred reports over the years pointing out the problems that we were having at our national labs. Yet very little was done. So it takes a tremendous amount. We have seen in these nonmilitary matters, non-national security matters, how difficult it is. The Government has gotten too big and complex, with layer upon layer of assistants and deputy assistants in these departments, and we are having less and less accountability and more and more complexity, more and more of the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing.

So now, at long last, when we have someone, such as the President's own commission, report to us that within the Department of Energy there is no accountability, that it is dysfunctional, that it is saturated with cynicism and disregard for authority, that it is incapable of reforming itself, that it will do whatever is necessary, apparently, to delay reform, certainly this must get our attention.

I believe from listening to my colleagues and the way this thing is developing, perhaps maybe at long last our attention has been gotten. And what is being proposed now in terms of reorganization is a very straightforward approach. It is not nearly as radical as some people would like to go. Many people would like to take matters of nuclear safety, our laboratories and nuclear materials totally outside the Department of Energy and set up a totally different entity to deal with them. This bill doesn't do that. It keeps it within the Department of Energy. The Secretary of Energy continues to set the policy for the department. And the newly created Under

Secretary for Nuclear Stewardship reports to the Secretary and is under the supervision of the Secretary. So you still have direct lines of reporting. You have more accountability. You have a simplified reporting system. You would not have any more of this Rube Goldberg-type of organization chart that we see within the Department of Energy, under which you could not tell who is responsible for what.

At long last, as difficult as it is to reform Government, as difficult as it is to stop waste, fraud, and abuse, when we are told about it every year, told about it all the time, now that we know we have this significant problem with regard to the most significant matter that can plague a country, dealing with national security, surely we can take the necessary steps in order to turn this thing around.

I know there will be amendments proposed. I have never seen a piece of legislation that perhaps could not stand a bit of improvement. I do not really know the thrust of the amendments that will be proposed. But I urge my colleagues that, as we go along in considering these amendments, ask the question: Does this enhance or does this defuse accountability?

We need accountability more and more throughout Government. We can very seldom place responsibility anywhere anymore for mishaps in Government. But here we must have it. We certainly must have it with regard to the Department of Energy and our nuclear stewardship. I am delighted with the way this has progressed. The changes are not a draconian, and it is a revolutionary approach. It is an approach that will enhance accountability. It gives us an opportunity not only to do something with regard to national security in this country but perhaps to take some first steps toward restoring the American public's faith in their own Government.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. I ask unanimous consent that the pending Kyl amendment be temporarily set aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1259

(Purpose: To block assets of narcotics traffickers who pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States)

Mr. COVERDELL. 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 Georgia [Mr. Coverdell], for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LOTT, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 1259.

Mr. COVERDELL. 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 end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE —BLOCKING ASSETS OF MAJOR NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS

SEC. 01. FINDING AND POLICY.

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

(1) Presidential Decision Directive 42, issued on October 21, 1995, ordered agencies of the executive branch of the United States Government to, inter alia, increase the priority and resources devoted to the direct and immediate threat international crime presents to national security, work more closely with other governments to develop a global response to this threat, and use aggressively and creatively all legal means available to combat international crime.

(2) Executive Order No. 12978 of October 21, 1995, provides for the use of the authorities in the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) to target and sanction four specially designated narcotics traffickers and their organizations which operate from Colombia.

(b) POLICY.—It should be the policy of the United States to impose economic and other financial sanctions against foreign international narcotics traffickers and their organizations worldwide.

SEC. 02. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to provide for the use of the authorities in the International Emergency Economic Powers Act to sanction additional specially designated narcotics traffickers operating worldwide.

SEC. 03. DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN FOREIGN INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS.

(a) PREPARATION OF LIST OF NAMES.—Not later than January 1, 2000 and not later than January 1 of each year thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General, Director of Central Intelligence, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of State, shall transmit to the President and to the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy a list of those individuals who play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking as of that date.

(b) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN PERSONS FROM LIST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the list described in subsection (a) shall not include the name of any individual if the Director of Central Intelligence determines that the disclosure of that person's role in international narcotics trafficking could compromise United States intelligence sources or methods. The Director of Central Intelligence shall advise the President when a determination is made to withhold an individual's identity under this subsection.

(2) REPORTS.—In each case in which the Director of Central Intelligence has made a determination under paragraph (1), the President shall submit a report in classified form to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives setting forth the reasons for the determination.

(d) DESIGNATION OF INDIVIDUALS AS THREATS TO THE UNITED STATES.—The President shall determine not later than March 1 of each year whether or not to designate persons on the list transmitted to the President that year as persons constituting an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. The President shall notify the

Secretary of the Treasury of any person designated under this subsection. If the President determines not to designate any person on such list as such a threat, the President shall submit a report to Congress setting forth the reasons therefore.

(e) CHANGES IN DESIGNATIONS OF INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) ADDITIONAL INDIVIDUALS DESIGNATED.—If at any time after March 1 of a year, but prior to January 1 of the following year, the President determines that a person is playing a significant role in international narcotics trafficking and has not been designated under subsection (d) as a person constituting an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, the President may so designate the person. The President shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of any person designated under this paragraph.

(2) REMOVAL OF DESIGNATIONS OF INDIVIDUALS.—Whenever the President determines that a person designated under subsection (d) or paragraph (1) of this subsection no longer poses an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, the person shall no longer be considered as designated under that subsection.

(f) REFERENCES.—Any person designated under subsection (d) or (e) may be referred to in this Act as a "specially designated narcotics trafficker".

SEC. 04. BLOCKING ASSETS.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that a national emergency exists with respect to any individual who is a specially designated narcotics trafficker.

(b) BLOCKING OF ASSETS.—Except to the extent provided in section 203(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)) and in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may be issued pursuant to this Act, and notwithstanding any contract entered into or any license or permit granted prior to the date of designation of a person as a specially designated narcotics trafficker, there are hereby blocked all property and interests in property that are, or after that date come, within the United States, or that are, or after that date come, within the possession or control of any United States person, of—

(1) any specially designated narcotics trafficker;

(2) any person who materially and knowingly assists in, provides financial or technological support for, or provides goods or services in support of, the narcotics trafficking activities of a specially designated narcotics trafficker; and

(3) any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General, Director of Central Intelligence, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of State, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, a specially designated narcotics trafficker.

(c) PROHIBITED ACTS.—Except to the extent provided in section 203(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act or in any regulation, order, directive, or license that may be issued pursuant to this Act, and notwithstanding any contract entered into or any license or permit granted prior to the effective date, the following acts are prohibited:

(1) Any transaction or dealing by a United States person, or within the United States, in property or interests in property of any specially designated narcotics trafficker.

(2) Any transaction or dealing by a United States person, or within the United States, that evades or avoids, has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, subsection (b).

(d) LAW ENFORCEMENT AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section is intended to prohibit or otherwise limit the authorized law enforcement or intelligence activities of the United States, or the law enforcement activities of any State or subdivision thereof.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General, Director of Central Intelligence, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of State, is authorized to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act as may be necessary to carry out this section. The Secretary of the Treasury may redelegate any of these functions to any other officer or agency of the United States Government. Each agency of the United States shall take all appropriate measures within its authority to carry out this section.

(f) ENFORCEMENT.—Violations of licenses, orders, or regulations under this Act shall be subject to the same civil or criminal penalties as are provided by section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) for violations of licenses, orders, and regulations under that Act.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ENTITY.—The term "entity" means a partnership, association, corporation, or other organization, group or subgroup.

(2) NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING.—The term "narcotics trafficking" means any activity undertaken illicitly to cultivate, produce, manufacture, distribute, sell, finance, or transport, or otherwise assist, abet, conspire, or collude with others in illicit activities relating to, narcotic drugs, including, but not limited to, heroin, methamphetamine and cocaine.

(3) PERSON.—The term "person" means an individual or entity.

(4) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term "United States person" means any United States citizen or national, permanent resident alien, entity organized under the laws of the United States (including foreign branches), or any person in the United States.

SEC. 05. DENIAL OF VISAS TO AND INADMISSION OF SPECIALLY DESIGNATED NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Attorney General may not admit to the United States—

(1) any specially designated narcotics trafficker; or

(2) any alien who the consular officer or the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe—

(A) is a spouse or minor child of a specially designated narcotics trafficker; or

(B) is a person described in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 04(b).

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply—

(1) where the Secretary of State finds, on a case-by-case basis, that the entry into the United States of the person is necessary for medical reasons;

(2) upon the request of the Attorney General, Director of Central Intelligence, Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary of Defense; or

(3) for purposes of the prosecution of a specially designated narcotics trafficker.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask for 20 minutes to be equally divided between myself and Senator FEINSTEIN.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, the amendment just sent to the desk, it is my understanding, has now been

agreed to by both sides, which Senator FEINSTEIN and I are most happy about.

This piece of legislation evolved earlier in the year. Senator FEINSTEIN will speak for herself, but she and I have been engaged in the issue of narcotics trafficking in our hemisphere and in the world and have become deeply worried about its effect on the United States and have envisioned this as a new tool for our Government.

To give you a bit of a background, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act is a follow on to the former Trading With The Enemy Act. Its purpose is to stop all economic activity, commerce, trade, and finance with rogue nations, such as Libya and North Korea, that are national security threats to the United States.

In 1995, President Clinton expanded this act through an executive order to include specially designated narcotics traffickers. As issued, the President's executive order applies to four drug traffickers affiliated with the Colombian Cali cartel. The goal was and remains to completely isolate the targeted drug traffickers. The executive order that the President issued in 1995 blocks any financial, commercial and/or business dealings with any entity associated with the four named drug traffickers, to include criminal associates, associated family members, related businesses and financial accounts.

What would this amendment accomplish? It takes the President's 1995 Executive order and codifies it in the law and expands it to include other foreign narcotic traffickers deemed as a threat to our national security.

It freezes the assets of drug traffickers under U.S. jurisdiction and cuts off their ability to do business in the United States.

There is the arrow pointed at the problem. It begins to isolate these nefarious forces and their effect on the United States.

As under the President's Executive order, the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control would develop a list of specially designated narcotics traffickers in consultation with the Department of Justice and the Department of State. Anyone who appears on the list is prohibited from conducting any economic activity with the United States.

American firms or individuals who violate this prohibition will be subject to significant financial penalty and potential prison terms. The Treasury Office of Foreign Assets would enforce the sanctions, which carry criminal penalties of up to \$500,000 per violation for corporations, and \$250,000 for individuals, as well as up to 10 years in prison.

The goal is to provide another weapon in the war on drugs by completely isolating targeted drug traffickers.

Taking legitimate U.S. dollars out of drug dealers' pockets is a vital step in destroying their ability to traffic narcotics across our borders. This is a bold

but necessary tool to fight the war on drugs.

Let me say before I turn to the distinguished Senator from California, as early as 1 hour ago I was in communication with representatives of the Treasury Department and the administration of a willingness to continue as this legislation works its way through the Congress to work with them to perfect the legislation. It is an important new tool. It is premised on an action this President has already emboldened and taken and simply expands it.

We must confront the growing strength of impunity of drug cartels. Several months ago former DEA Administrator, Tom Constantine, testified about Mexican drug cartels. He said:

Organized crime groups from Mexico continue to pose a grave threat to the citizens of the United States. In my lifetime, I have never witnessed any group of criminals who have had such a terrible impact on so many individuals and communities in our Nation.

Of course, this is not Mexico-specific. This is a broad tool to deal with narcotics and their activities anywhere in the world. With drugs continuing to pour across our border, there is no other way to think about drug trafficking than as a fundamental threat to our national security.

Several years ago, in a meeting with the President of Mexico, President Zedillo, he said—and he has said such publicly since—that there is no threat as dangerous to the security of the Republic of Mexico as the narcotics traffickers.

We must use every weapon in our arsenal to strike at the heart of this scourge—those who traffic these drugs. By expanding the use of the President's international emergency economic powers to target drug kingpins and their empires, we can work year-round to help drive these traffickers out of business—no matter where they exist.

I thank my colleague, the Senator from California, not only for her work in perfecting this amendment but for her ongoing work and concern about the effects of narcotics on the stability of the democracies in this hemisphere, and, of course, its effect—its dramatic effect—on the citizens of the United States.

I am reminded—as we talked during several debates about things that are so critically important to us—and we might be reminded that 14,000 people a year die of the narcotic impact, not to mention 100,000 crack babies. The list goes on and on.

There is no segment of public policy that is any more important. There are some that are as important but none any more important with regard to the safety of the people of the United States—and, for that matter, this hemisphere—than our work on narcotics and the peripheral issues that deal with it.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

I want to begin by thanking the Senator from Georgia. We have been at this for a few years now. I want him to know it has been a great pleasure for me to work with him, and I thank him for the leadership and the spirit he has shown on this issue.

It has been very heartening for me to work across that center divide and hopefully see this amendment finally enacted today, and hopefully after going to the House in conference, come back here, and then be signed by the President.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the Senator.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, as the Senator from Georgia so well stated, this legislation is patterned after the President's Executive order that he issued in 1995 which targeted the assets of the powerful Colombian drug kingpins.

That order expanded the International Emergency Economic Powers Act to include "specially designated narcotics traffickers." As issued, the President's Executive order applied to four drug traffickers affiliated with the Colombian Cali cartel. The goal is to completely isolate those targeted drug traffickers.

The Executive order blocks any financial, commercial, and/or business dealings with any entity associated with those named traffickers—to include criminal associates, associated family members, related businesses, and financial accounts.

The way this amendment would work is the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control would develop a list of specially designated narcotics traffickers worldwide in consultation with the Department of Justice, the CIA, and the Department of State.

The President could amend the list, and he would officially sign off on the list. Then that Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control would enforce sanctions with criminal penalties of up to \$500,000 per violation for corporations, and \$250,000 for individuals, as well as up to 10 years in prison.

It is a meaningful sanction.

By focusing on the financial relationship between drug cartels and their associated business relationships, the Executive order—and now this amendment—is directed toward those entities that created the drug problem in our country. And those entities can be located anywhere in the world. They are major drug traffickers.

This order has proven successful in quelling the Colombian Cali cartel. This amendment expands it worldwide. Under this Executive order, more than 400 Colombian and other companies and individuals affiliated with drug trafficking have been targeted by the Treasury Department. These entities are denied access to banking services in the United States and Colombia. Existing bank accounts have actually been shut down. As a result, more than

400 Colombian accounts have been closed. That has affected over 200 companies and individuals engaged in drug trafficking.

By February 1998, through the President's Executive order, over 40 of these companies with estimated combined annual sales of over \$200 million have been forced out of business.

The Rodriguez Orejuela business of the Cali cartel has been particularly damaged by their lack of access to banks in the United States and Colombia. These companies have been forced to operate largely on a cash basis because most banks now refuse to provide them services.

One of the cartel's holdings, Laboratorios Kressfor, eventually went through liquidation because of blocking actions by the U.S. banks. Other business accounts were closed because of the sanctions it incurred as a result of doing business with drug traffickers. This company, too, is now in liquidation.

Drug cartels today are more powerful, more violent, and have a far greater reach than traditional organized crime organizations ever had in the past, and they kill more people.

I believe they pose a most significant threat to the national security of this country.

We have seen that destructive power over and over again. In Colombia, Mexico, Burma, Cambodia, Nigeria, and elsewhere drug traffickers have used violent means to pursue their deadly trade. They are the common enemy of all civilized nations. We need to work together to meet this common threat.

The United States is not immune from the devastating effects of global drug trade. Measured in dollar values, at least four-fifths of all illicit drugs consumed in the United States are of foreign origin. Four-fifths of drugs consumed in the United States are of foreign origin, including virtually all of the cocaine and heroin.

These cartels have now made strong inroads in major cities including Los Angeles, Phoenix, Dallas, San Francisco, and San Diego. They are enlisting and have enlisted street gangs as distributors. They are spreading their operations throughout our Nation and arrests are taking place in less likely places—Des Moines, IA; Greensboro, NC; Yakima, WA; New Rochelle, NY.

The President's 1995 Executive order targeting the Cali cartel in Colombia was an effective means of isolating the cartel and its affiliated businesses. It choked off vital revenue streams and helped the Colombian Government take down the cartel.

With the authority to reach countries beyond Colombia, the President can now work, if this amendment is passed, to isolate other major criminal drug syndicates around the world and impose upon them and their associates a similar fate to that of the Cali cartel. It is my hope that with a new emphasis on this expanded authority and with the concerted intelligence effort to de-

velop sufficient data about the cartels and their associates in this country and abroad, the United States will be able to work with our allies to expose, isolate, and cut off the major drug-trafficking syndicates that pose a threat to all of our societies.

This crucial mission can only be accomplished together. We must work together to see that our governments are properly equipped to carry it out successfully. To that end, this amendment establishes clear procedures through which the Treasury Department, the Justice Department, the CIA, and the Defense Department can gather information, share that information with their counterparts, and make recommendations to the President as to those cartels that represent the greatest risk to our Nation.

Coordinated by the Office of Foreign Assets Control in the Department of Treasury, the expanded program will target new international drug cartels with the same successful financial choke holds that worked so well in Colombia. This will not be an easy process. The results will not be immediate. A great deal depends on intelligence and its availability. It also must be applied universally.

This legislation is a serious effort to hit the world's major traffickers where they live and to put them and their associates out of business.

I thank Senator COVERDELL for working so tirelessly with me on this bill. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting our efforts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The chairman is recognized.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I will take a minute this evening to thank Senator COVERDELL and also Senator FEINSTEIN for having the foresight and initiative to expand and to improve upon what is already a highly successful weapon in our Nation's fight against international narcotics trafficking.

The International Emergency Economic Powers Act was expanded 4 years ago under Executive order to target specific drug trafficking kingpins operating from Colombia.

Our colleagues' legislation expands upon that Executive order by allowing similar actions to be taken against additional kingpins worldwide.

Any future designation of foreign narcotics traffickers under this act would still be made by the President, but recommendations to the President will now come from the entire U.S. counter-narcotics community, to include law enforcement, intelligence, and regulatory officials.

Once designated, those foreign drug kingpins would soon see their access to the U.S. economy completely disappear.

Without the ability to place illicitly derived proceeds into commerce and trade in the United States, these kingpins and their illicit organizations will wither and fade away.

Denying these foreign traffickers the opportunity to participate in the vibrant and growing U.S. economy is truly a decisive weapon in the war on drugs.

I again thank my colleagues for their fine work on this measure. I also state for the RECORD that I fully support and approve incorporating their measure into the Legislation Authorization Act which is before the Senate. I also state that my colleague, the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Senator KERREY, has asked I note for the Senate that he also concurs in this amendment and extends his congratulations.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1259) was agreed to.

Mr. SHELBY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for brief periods.

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

CIVILITY AND DELIBERATION IN THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on July 16, the Robert J. Dole Institute for Public Service and Public Policy at the University of Kansas hosted a discussion of civility and deliberation in the United States Senate.

Long subjects of interest to me, I was heartened to learn of this event. In an age of media and money-driven politics, it is important to remember that what we Senators must truly strive to be about has little to do with either the media or money. Discussions such as this one remind us all of the essential nature of this body in which we are so privileged to serve, and of the responsibility each of us bears to help this great institution, the United States Senate, continue to reflect the Framers' intent.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Honorable Robert J. Dole and the remarks of Mr. Harry C. McPherson, former Special Counsel to President Lyndon B. Johnson, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR BOB DOLE—INTRODUCTION OF HARRY MCPHERSON, THE CAPITOL, JULY 16, 1999

Thanks very much for the kind introduction, and thanks to all of today's participants, many of them friends.

Harry Truman once remarked that he felt anything but comfortable as a newcomer to the Senate. Then, one day, a grizzled veteran of the institution took him aside and offered him the following sage advice: "Harry," he said, "for the first six months you'll wonder how the hell you ever got to be a United States Senator. After that, you'll wonder how in Hell everyone else did."

I guess I'm still in the early stages when it comes to having my name on a school of public policy. A professor has been defined as someone who takes more words than he needs to tell more than he knows. Kind of reminds me of a filibustering senator. President Johnson, Harry's former boss and mentor, liked to tell of the long-winded Texas politician who never began any address without extolling at great length the beautiful piney woods of east Texas. Then he would move on to the bluebonnets and the broad plains, and down through the Hill Country to the White Beaches of the Gulf Coast.

At which point he went back to the piney woods and started in all over again. On one occasion he had just completed a second tour of the lone star state and he was about to launch into a third when a fellow rose up in back of the room and yelled out: "The next time you pass Lubbock, how about letting me off?"

Let me assure you all: I have no intention of making more than one pass at Lubbock. As you know, it's customary to insert the word honorable in front of the names of public servants. Sometimes it's even appropriate. The next speaker is just such a case. In fact, he is one of the most honorable men I know. Harry and I came to Washington about the same time. As he writes in his classic memoir, "A Political Education," it was the era of the one party South. Come to think of it, it was the era of the one party Senate as well.

Still, even if Harry and I spent most of our careers on the opposite sides of the political fence, there is much more that unites us than divides us. To begin with, neither one of us have ever confused personal civility with the surrender of principle. One way or another, our generation has paid a heavy price in resistance to all of this century's extremists who didn't want to serve humanity as much as they wanted to remake or oppress it. Life for us has been a series of tests: whether growing up in the Dust Bowl of the 1930s, or fighting a war against Nazi tyranny, or waging a moral offensive against Jim Crow and other hateful barriers to human potential; whether sending a man to stroll on the surface of the moon, or standing up for American values across four decades of Cold War . . . all of these enterprises, vast as they were, enlisted the common energies of a nation that is never better than when tackling the impossible.

Along the way we discovered that there was no Republican or Democratic way to fight polio or even invent the Internet. Almost forty years have passed since I first arrived in this town as the lowest ranking creature in the political food chain—a freshman Congressman. My ideological credentials were validated by a local political boss in west Kansas who told a friend, "Heck, I know he's a conservative—the tires on his car are threadbare." I never claimed to be a visionary. I came to Washington to do the

decent thing by people in need, without bankrupting the Treasury or depriving entrepreneurs of the incentive or capital with which to realize their dreams. I brought from Kansas the conviction that most people are mostly good most of the time. Something I also learned: that an adversary is not the same thing as an enemy.

It may be hard to believe, but those days one politician could challenge another's ideas without questioning his motives or impugning his patriotism. As Harry will attest, we may have had differences over the years, but they were programmatic, not personal. In the words of the late great Ev Dirksen, "I live by my principles, and one of my principles is flexibility."

Of course, in the great defining struggle over civil rights, it was Ev Dirksen's flexibility that enabled him to put aside narrow questions of party advantage and remind colleagues that it was another Illinois Republican, by the name of Abraham Lincoln, who gave the GOP its moral charter as a party dedicated to racial justice. Throughout this century, no issue has done more to call forth the better angels of our nature. Whether it was Teddy Roosevelt inviting Booker T. Washington to dine with him at the White House, or my hero Dwight Eisenhower, summoning federal troops to integrate Central High School in Little Rock, or Harry Truman desegregating the armed forces, or LBJ speaking at a Joint Session in the House and shouting, "we shall overcome," or the bipartisan coalition that I was privileged to lead in making Martin Luther King's birthday a national holiday.

All this, I think, has relevance for today's discussion. The topic is "Civility and Deliberation in the United States Senate." As any C-Span viewer can tell you, we have too little of one and too much of the other. But why should that come as any surprise? We are after all, a representative democracy—a mirror held up to America. In this age when celebrity trumps accomplishment, and notoriety is the surest route to success in a 24 hour news cycle, voters are understandably turned off by a political culture that measures democracy in decibels.

Needless to say, it is pretty hard to listen when all around you, people are screaming at the top of their lungs. It's even harder to hear the voices of those who sent you to Washington in the first place. In a democracy differences are not only unavoidable—if pursued with civility as well as conviction, they are downright healthy. Put another way, I'd much rather deal with honest contention than creeping cynicism. Yet that's exactly what afflicts our system today, when millions of citizens regard all politicians as puppets on a string, dancing to the music of spinmeisters.

Fortunately, there are still men and women in this town and every town across America who disprove that view. They come from diverse backgrounds. They vote for different candidates. They speak various languages; they worship before many alters. But this much they have in common: they are patriots before they are partisans. At the same time they understand the dangers that arise when any leader starts to calculate his chances at the expense of his conscience.

One of the most inspiring stories I have ever read involves the late Senator John Stennis of Mississippi, for over forty years a lawmaker of towering integrity. In 1982 Senator Stennis faced the toughest reelection fight of his career. At one point early in the campaign, the Senator found himself listening to a room full of experts who kept prefacing every sentence with the phrase, "to win, we will have to do this."

Courtesy as ever, Stennis heard everyone out before replying, "there is one thing you