

S. RES. 128

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 128, a resolution designating March 2000, as "Arts Education Month."

S. RES. 237

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 237, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations should hold hearings and the Senate should act on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 82—CONDEMNING THE ASSASSINATION OF FERNANDO BUESA AND JORGE DÍEZ ELORZA, SPANISH NATIONALS, BY THE BASQUE SEPARATIST GROUP, ETA, AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT VIOLENT ACTIONS BY ETA CEASE**

Mr. DODD submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 82

Whereas on February 22, 2000, the Basque terrorist group ETA killed Fernando Buesa, the leader of the Basque Socialist Party, and Jorge Diez Elorza, a member of his escort, in a cowardly bomb attack;

Whereas this heinous crime displays absolute contempt for human rights and the right to life by those individuals who practice terrorism and threaten freedom, peace, liberty, and the peaceful coexistence of the Basque people and the people of Spain; and

Whereas Spain is a democracy where the rule of law is enforced and terrorist acts are not tolerated: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—*

(1) strongly condemns and denounces those responsible for the cowardly bombing that killed Fernando Buesa and Jorge Diez Elorza;

(2) strongly shares the determination of the Spanish people that the perpetrators of this vile act will be brought swiftly to justice so that Spain may demonstrate its opposition to acts of terror;

(3) calls again on ETA and those responsible for this act to renounce violence and terrorism which have taken so many lives; and

(4) continues to cherish the strong friendship between Spain and the United States.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I know I will be joined by every Member of the Senate as I express my deepest condolences to the families of Fernando Buesa and Jorge Diez Elorza, who were tragically killed in Tuesday's bombing attack by the Spanish terrorist group ETA in Vitoria, Spain. I point out Fernando Buesa was the head of the So-

cialist Party in the Basque Assembly, so he was a political leader of some note and a highly respected leader in his own country. In the aftermath of this attack on human rights and peaceful coexistence, I also offer my thoughts and prayers to the people of Spain and the Spanish community around the world.

Reports of terrorist violence in Spain are becoming far too common. It was only one month ago that an ETA car bomb in central Madrid killed one man and injured innocent children on their way to school. This cowardly type of terrorist expression must be stopped.

Over a year ago, I was pleased when I heard reports of the historic ETA cease-fire. Under this cease-fire, Spain remained free of terrorist violence for 14 months and enjoyed the increase in tourism that peace affords. Unfortunately, in December of 1999, ETA renounced its cease-fire, once again plunging Spain into the horrific terrorist violence that marked its past.

I believe that a majority of the people in Spain, both Basque and Spanish, are tired of this endless violence. It is time for ETA to renew its cease-fire and negotiate a peace agreement with the Spanish government. Only then can the senseless violence that threatens to destroy Spain's booming economy be stopped.

Last night, at a White House dinner I attended in honor of King Juan Carlos and Queen Sofia of Spain, after-dinner dancing was suspended in memory of the killed. In this vein, I ask that we as a body reaffirm our commitment to human rights by condemning this most recent attack in Spain.

Today, I submit a resolution that denounces the terrorist activities that killed Fernando Buesa and Jorge Diez Elorza, calls again on ETA to renounce the use of violence and terrorism which have taken so many lives, and pledges continued alliance between Spain and the United States, and ask it to be referred to the appropriate committee. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 83—COMMENDING THE PEOPLE OF IRAN FOR THEIR COMMITMENT TO THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS AND POSITIVE POLITICAL REFORM ON THE OCCASION OF IRAN'S PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS**

Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself and Mr. WELLSTONE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to.

S. CON. RES. 83

Whereas the Islamic Republic of Iran held parliamentary elections on February 18, 2000; Whereas more than 75 percent of the approximately 39,000,000 eligible voters cast ballots in the elections;

Whereas preliminary results indicate that reformers have won a parliamentary majority, freeing Iran's parliament, the Majlis, of hard-line domination for the first time since the 1979 Iranian revolution;

Whereas reformers won elections despite concerted efforts by hard-line Iranian clergy to ban reformist forces from the ballot; and

Whereas the elections show a clear preference by a majority of Iranian voters for democracy, rule of law, and improved relations with Western nations: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—*

(1) commends the people of Iran for their commitment to the democratic process;

(2) congratulates reformist parliamentarians on their recent electoral victory;

(3) reaffirms the desire of the United States to see free, democratic political development, the restoration of the rule of law, and full civil and political rights for all Iranians; and

(4) calls on the Government of Iran to rejoin the community of nations and renounce terrorism, opposition to the Middle East peace process, and the development and acquisition of weapons of mass destruction.

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NAMING OF AIRCRAFT CARRIER CVN-77, THE LAST VESSEL OF THE HISTORIC "NIMITZ" CLASS OF AIRCRAFT CARRIERS, AS THE U.S.S. "LEXINGTON"**

Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. INOUE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. CON. RES. 84

Whereas over the last three decades Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for a total of 10 "NIMITZ" class aircraft carriers;

Whereas the last vessel in the "NIMITZ" class of aircraft carriers, CVN-77, is currently under construction and will be delivered in 2008;

Whereas the first nine vessels in this class proudly bear the following names:

- (1) U.S.S. Nimitz (CVN-68).
- (2) U.S.S. Dwight D. Eisenhower (CVN-69).
- (3) U.S.S. Carl Vinson (CVN-70).
- (4) U.S.S. Theodore Roosevelt (CVN-71).
- (5) U.S.S. Abraham Lincoln (CVN-72).
- (6) U.S.S. George Washington (CVN-73).
- (7) U.S.S. John C. Stennis (CVN-74).
- (8) U.S.S. Harry S. Truman (CVN-75).
- (9) U.S.S. Ronald Reagan (CVN-76).

Whereas it is now time to recommend to the President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, an appropriate name for the final vessel in the "NIMITZ" class of aircraft carriers;

Whereas over the last 25 years the vessels in the "NIMITZ" class of aircraft carriers have served as one of the principal means of United States diplomacy and as one of the principal means for the defense of the United States and our allies around the world;

Whereas the name bestowed upon aircraft carrier CVN-77 should embody the American spirit and provide a lasting symbol of the American commitment to freedom;

Whereas for the citizens of the United States, the name "Lexington" has been synonymous with defense of freedom from the very first battle of the War of the American Revolution and is taught to American schoolchildren as the place of the "shot heard round the world", at which our forebears mustered the courage to gain independence;

Whereas the name "Lexington" has been associated with naval aviation from its origins in the 1920s, when President Harding bestowed the name "Lexington" on the second aircraft carrier in United States history;

Whereas that vessel, the U.S.S. Lexington (CV-2), also known as the "Fighting Lady", saw active service from 1927 until lost in 1942 during the historic Battle of the Coral Sea;

Whereas immediately after that loss, President Franklin D. Roosevelt saw fit to bestow the name "Lexington" on a successor aircraft carrier in order to carry on the fighting spirit to preserve freedom;

Whereas that successor aircraft carrier, the U.S.S. Lexington (CV-16), joined the fleet in 1943 and earned 11 battle stars during the Pacific campaigns of World War II as she helped carry the fight to the enemy;

Whereas the U.S.S. Lexington (CV-16) continued her service to the United States after World War II, conducting numerous deployments during the Cold War and completing her 48 years of service as a training aircraft carrier for student aviators; and

Whereas upon the completion of her service and in keeping with the traditions of the Navy, the U.S.S. Lexington (CV-16) was stricken from the Navy Vessel Register on November 30, 1991: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That it is the sense of Congress that the aircraft carrier CVN-77 should be named the U.S.S. Lexington—

(1) in order to honor the men and women who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II, and the incalculable number of United States citizens on the home front during that war, who mobilized in the name of freedom, and who are today respectfully referred to as the "Greatest Generation"; and

(2) as a special tribute to the 16,000,000 veterans of the Armed Forces who served on land, sea, and air during World War II, of whom less than 6,000,000 remain alive today, and serve as a lasting symbol of commitment to freedom as they pass on and proudly take their place in history.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 259—URGING THE DECOMMISSIONING OF ARMS AND EXPLOSIVES IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Oregon) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 259

Whereas the Good Friday Agreement was signed on April 10, 1998, to bring about a peaceful settlement to the conflict in Northern Ireland;

Whereas in a referendum on May 22, 1998, the people of Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland voted overwhelmingly in favor of the Good Friday Agreement;

Whereas the Good Friday Agreement provides for the devolution of government from the United Kingdom to local institutions in Northern Ireland and the establishment of a North/South Ministerial Council and a British-Irish Council, and consists of provisions on decommissioning, human rights, policing, and prisoners;

Whereas much progress has been made in the establishment of both the indigenous Northern Ireland institutions and the North/South and British-Irish bodies, hundreds of prisoners from both communities have been released, and a plan for the restructuring of the police force has been put forth;

Whereas the Independent International Commission on Decommissioning (the Commission), led by General John de Chastelain, was established to facilitate the process of decommissioning of paramilitary arms as called for in the Good Friday Agreement;

Whereas the two principal loyalist paramilitary organizations, the Ulster Volunteer

Force (UVF) and the Ulster Freedom Fighters (UFF), informed the Commission that they are prepared to move on decommissioning if the Irish Republican Army (IRA) makes clear that the war is over and it will also decommission;

Whereas the Commission's January 31, 2000, report on decommissioning states that though the IRA emphasized that it poses no threat to the peace process, it has not provided any information as to when decommissioning will begin;

Whereas the leader of the Social Democratic and Labor Party, John Hume, has called upon the IRA to "demonstrate for all to see its patriotism and desire to move the situation forward by strengthening the peace process through beginning voluntarily the process of decommissioning";

Whereas on February 11, 2000, due to the decommissioning impasse, the British Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Peter Mandelson, suspended the Northern Ireland Executive and resumed direct control over the province;

Whereas on February 11, 2000, the Commission issued a report noting the "IRA's recognition that the issue of arms needs to be dealt with in an acceptable way and that this is a necessary objective of a genuine peace process"; and

Whereas recent polls indicate that the overwhelming majority of the people in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland support decommissioning by all paramilitary organizations: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That the Senate—*

(1) stresses the importance of decommissioning of weapons held by paramilitaries on all sides without conditions to the success of the peace process in Northern Ireland;

(2) calls upon the Irish Republican Army to make a firm commitment and offer a specific timetable as to when decommissioning of all of their arms and explosives will begin; and

(3) urges the loyalist paramilitary organizations to respond to such an IRA proposal by immediately beginning the process of decommissioning all of their weapons.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am certainly not alone in my disappointment at the recent turn of events in Northern Ireland. It is a disheartening development. With the signing of the Good Friday Agreement in April 1998 and the overwhelming desire for peaceful resolution of the conflict—in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland—the prospects for peace in that troubled region had never seemed better.

The Good Friday Agreement, like all negotiated peace settlements, offers incentives to all parties but it also requires compromises—compromises that most people are willing to make, and have made, in order for peace. I do not pretend to speak for any side in Northern Ireland, but I can imagine that it was difficult for many in the Unionist community to see convicted IRA bombers walk free from prison.

And it was certainly difficult for many in the nationalist community to accept the principal of continued British sovereignty over Northern Ireland. But David Trimble, John Hume, and other honorable men and women have fulfilled their obligations under the Good Friday Agreement in order to give peace the opportunity to take root in Northern Ireland.

The current crisis stems from the refusal of one organization—the Irish Re-

publican Army—to begin the process of decommissioning of their weapons and explosives. The IRA claims it has done enough by keeping its guns silent, by not setting off bombs, by adhering to a cease-fire. But, Mr. President, what kind of democratic system exists when one organization maintains a massive arsenal for potential use in the event that it is dissatisfied with the political process? Is that considered a genuine peace? I maintain that it is not, and it should not be accepted by people in this country.

Let me clear, the IRA's political wing, Sinn Fein, signed onto decommissioning in the Good Friday Agreement. As the Agreement states: "all participants accordingly reaffirm their commitment to the total disarmament of all paramilitary organizations" and to "use any influence they may have, to achieve the decommissioning of all paramilitary arms within two years", which is May 22 of this year.

Now, Sinn Fein's leader Gerry Adams has said that his organization "has no further room to move", which I find quite interesting, considering that members of his party were allowed to participate in the local governing structures established by the Good Friday Agreement (but do not seem to be willing to convince the IRA it must fulfill its obligations as well).

I suggest that Mr. Adams be advised that he cannot have it both ways. And to those whose excuse is that the deadline for decommissioning is still three months off (May 22, 2000), I would remind them that there is an established body designed to manage this process and that the IRA refused to make any commitment or offer any timetable for decommissioning to this institution. It is difficult to believe that on May 21, 2000, the IRA would have, in any event, turned over its hundreds of guns, its tons of Semtex, which it maintains as a veto on peace.

We are at a critical point: due to lack of commitment by the IRA on decommissioning, the British government had no choice but to suspend the indigenous institutions of Northern Ireland. Why? Let me merely recite the obvious: Why should Sinn Fein be allowed to participate in legitimate, elected governing bodies when the IRA refuses to disarm? How can we expect the unionist community to deal with Sinn Fein officials in this capacity when the IRA has turned its back on this crucial part of the peace process?

Sinn Fein and the IRA continue to raise the bar; after demanding that the Northern Ireland Executive and Northern Ireland Assembly be established before beginning decommissioning, they now state that if the British withdraw their troops from bases in Northern Ireland, they might consider handing in their weapons. I would remind them that there is an agreement, there is a process that they have signed onto—from which they have benefitted. Their prisoners have been released. Plans for a drastic overhaul of the Royal Ulster