Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2000 AND 2001

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 689

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the State Department authorization and the Sarbanes amendment, numbered 689.

Mr. HELMS. That is before modification; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not yet been modified.

Mr. HELMS. Let me inquire, is the modification that I understand has been agreed to—do both sides agree to it? I know our side does, but I would not want to do anything against the wish of Senator SARBANES.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. 689, AS MODIFIED

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I send to the desk a modification of amendment No. 689 and ask it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], for Mr. SARBANES, proposes an amendment numbered 689, as modified:

On page 39, line 11, insert after ''action'' the following: ''that includes a suspension of more than five days''.

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

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, the majority leader desires, and I want to accommodate him in this, that this amendment be the rollcalled amendment at 5:30.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent there be no further amendment to the pending amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I just discussed this with the Senator. I need to know, if he will advise me, how long he intends to speak at this time.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, in response to the Senator from North Carolina, I am going to introduce a bill. That will take about 4 or 5 minutes. Then I want to make a brief statement, perhaps 5 minutes or 7 minutes or so, on the test ban treaty. My intention would be probably no more than 10 or 12 minutes.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, if the Senator will conclude in 7 minutes, I have no objection at all, but I want to keep the time available for Senators who will talk on the bill.

I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DORGAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1252 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I appreciate the Senator from North Carolina allowing me to speak. We are on a very important piece of legislation, and he is managing it. These are all very important issues. I wish my colleagues well as they work through their bill in the next day or so.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, for the record, I will offer a progress report on where we stand on the State Department reauthorization bill.

Since we began last Friday and over the weekend, the staff has worked together with other staff, and as we now stand, there remain just three amendments yet to be offered by Senators WELLSTONE, FEINGOLD, and SARBANES. The Sarbanes amendment is in addition to the one that is scheduled for a vote at 5:30 this afternoon. I encourage all three Senators to utilize this time so we can put this bill to bed and send it over to the House.

I believe the Senator from Minnesota desires some time.

Madam President, how much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. GRAMS. Madam President, 5 minutes.

Mr. HELMS. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAMS. I thank the Chair. Madam President, I thank the chairman for recognizing me.

As the subcommittee chairman with jurisdiction over the State Department authorization bill, I compliment our chairman for all the work he has put into this bill to move it quickly to the floor.

As he said, I hope we can get these amendments addressed and send this bill to the House and hopefully have it signed by the President in the very near future.

I worked closely and diligently with Members on both sides of the aisle and the administration to craft legislation which will strengthen America's leadership role in the international arena. This package enhances the security of our embassies abroad, establishes benchmarks for the payment of U.N. arrears, and prioritizes our international affairs expenditures.

I am pleased this authorization bill contains the provisions of a bill I introduced, the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999. In the aftermath of the embassy bombings in August of 1998, the State Department Accountability Review Boards chaired by Admiral Crowe concluded that we have devoted inadequate resources and placed too low a priority on security concerns. Those findings echoed those of the Inman Commission, which issued an extensive embassy security report that raised these same points 14 years ago.

We seek to remedy that situation by establishing an Embassy Security and Construction Account so funds designated for embassy security will not be used for other purposes. In addition to authorizing $600 million a year for the next 5 years, this bill provides security requirements for U.S. diplomatic facilities and requires the Secretary of State to certify that the funds are being used to meet security objectives. It also establishes requirements for threat assessments and also emergency procedures. Working abroad will never be risk free. But we can take a number of measures, like these, to make sure that safety is increased for U.S. Government employees overseas. We can also put forward requirements to ensure we have an effective emergency response network in place to respond to a crisis should one arise.

I am also pleased that the U.N. Secretary General and the administration have endorsed our U.N. reform package which provides $819 million in arrears and another $107 million debt relief in exchange for reforms. This is a positive step towards shaping a U.N. that is a viable organization in the 21st century. Because any organization burdened with a bloated bureaucracy and no mechanisms to control spending will collapse under its own weight of inefficiency. We must reform the United Nations now, and the United States has the responsibility to play a major role. If we do nothing, and the United Nations collapses under its own weight in a few decades, then we will have only ourselves to blame.

I believe that the U.N. needs the discipline of actual benchmarks tied to

the arrears to provide the impetus for fundamental reform; because given the power of an entrenched U.N. bureaucracy, true reform will only occur when there are tangible incentives to change. We have seen how difficult it is to streamline our own bureaucracy here in Washington. It is even more difficult to streamline an international organization where each member is involved in these decisions. But I want to underscore that these reforms are achievable. These reforms include having Inspectors General in the specialized agencies; promoting merit-based employment; and establishing a code of conduct for personnel with an anti-nepotism provision. Congress' message is simple and it is straightforward. The U.S. can help make the United Nations a more effective, more efficient and financially sounder organization, but only if the U.N. and other member states, in return, are willing to finally become accountable to the American taxpayers.

That being said, I want to emphasize that the U.N. does excel in certain areas. The U.N. Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture gives financial aid to organizations that help torture survivors, like the Center for Victims of Torture in Minnesota. Assisting treatment centers for victims of torture is an effective method to lessen the incidence of torture by providing irrefutable medical and psychological evidence that torture is actually still occurring. These centers also serve a strategic purpose of restoring faith in the principles of human rights and democracy. That is why I am leading the effort to increase the U.S. contribution to $5 million a year.

I urge my colleagues to support the entire bipartisan package and, especially, to understand how difficult it was to arrive at an agreement on the arrears. Again, I commend the chairman and also the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee for their diligence and also their perseverance in effecting this compromise bill. This agreement is in America's best interest, and the best interest of the entire international community.

I compliment the chairman for all his fine work in getting this bill to the floor. Again, I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Thank you very much, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KERREY. Madam President, I rise today in support of S. 886, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman HELMS and Senator BIDEN for their leadership in crafting this bipartisan bill.

Simply put, the bill before us is a piece of national security legislation. I know we don't often think about the authorization of the State Department in these terms, but the truth is our first line of national defense is diplomacy. We in Congress have spent far too little of our time and resources on ensuring we have a strong, well-financed diplomatic corps. As a consequence we have failed to convince the American public of the importance of our foreign policy institution in maintaining U.S. national security.

I recognize that it's much easier to explain to our constituents the importance of the Defense Authorization Bill to their safety and security. The tangible results of the Defense Authorization Bill—a well trained and well-equipped military force—is easily translatable into a sense of greater national security. Rather than tanks and fighter aircraft, this bill authorizes our diplomats and overseas embassies. It authorizes funding for U.S. participation in international organizations and foreign language broadcasting. It is much less obvious to the American people how these types of activities help protect America. Mr. President, they do.

One of the most important lessons of the post-Communist era is the increasing importance of diplomacy. A failure of diplomacy in today's world is more likely to result in the need for the use of force. As one thinks about the instances in which the United States has been compelled to use military force in the last decade—from the Persian Gulf to Kosovo—each conflict was preceded by a breakdown of diplomacy, or at least an inability of diplomacy to solve the problem. During the Cold War, we relied on our military might to deter Soviet aggression. Today's threats are more diverse and must be countered, not only with military strength, but with strong intelligence and diplomatic capabilities.

I intend to vote for this bill because I believe it is a positive step in strengthening our diplomatic capabilities. To begin, this bill would fully authorize the President's request for Diplomatic and Consular Programs. Just as we strive to have the best-trained and best-equipped military force in the world, we should do everything in our ability to create a diplomatic corps with unparalleled insights into how the world works. A key component of this is creating a State Department that is responsive, efficient, and capable. In my opinion, the integration of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) and the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) into the State Department has improved coordination of U.S. policy and led to greater effectiveness.

For our diplomats to be successful, they must be reasonably safe. The bill contains a five-year authorization for a $3 billion program for embassy construction and upgrading U.S. diplomatic facilities overseas. The bombings of the U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania taught us the painful lesson that too many of our diplomatic posts remain too vulnerable to terrorist attack. We can never guarantee absolute security, but this bill will make an immediate downpayment of $600 million to upgrade security and establish a process to identify those facilities most vulnerable and most in need of improvements.

This bill further promotes U.S. national security by authorizing such programs as Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and the National Endowment for Democracy (NED). Each of these are vital tools in our effort to promote democracy and provide hope to those people seeking to end totalitarian rule. The surest way to foster U.S. national security is to extend the benefits of democracy and the rule of law to people in places like Iraq and Cuba.

Perhaps the most important component of S. 886 is the authorization to begin repayment of U.S. arrears to the United Nations. It may be surprising to many Americans that, due to our failure to meet our international financial obligations, the United States is perilously close to losing its vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations. Any member country with arrears equal to two years of its annual assessment automatically loses its right to vote in the General Assembly. Our failure to act on this issue by the end of the year will put the United States in such illustrious company as Afghanistan, Iraq, and Yugoslavia—each of which have also lost their voting rights.

Some may question the need for U.S. participation in the United Nations. The simple fact is the multilateral nature of the U.N. improves our ability to confront global challenges. Our participation in the United Nations has helped to reduce the threat of Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction program. Our participation in the United Nations has forced Libya to turn over the suspects from the Lockerbie bombing so that they may face justice. Just recently we sought support in the United Nations to strengthen our hand in Kosovo and provide multilateral support for the ongoing peace implementation effort. It's naive to believe that being the largest debtor nation at the U.N. will not have an increasingly negative impact on our ability to lead. Therefore, it is critically important that we pass this bill and set ourselves on the path to paying our debts.

There is one group of my constituents that consistently understand the importance of U.S. foreign policy. Nebraska farmers and food processors know maintaining good diplomatic relations is essential to maintaining good markets for their products. They also understand that international conflict and instability can affect not only their prosperity, but their safety as well. I intend to vote for this bill because I believe it will increase the safety of the American people by strengthening our foreign policy institutions and improving our ability to avoid conflict.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, we will be voting, as I understand it, on the amendment which I offered on Friday. The chairman at that time asked if I could go ahead, and I indicated I could to try to move the bill along.

We have worked over the weekend. Staff has worked on this amendment and some modification was made in it which was earlier sent to the desk by the chairman of the committee. I thank the chairman and his staff and the ranking member and his staff for working on this.

Actually, the chairman and his people were reasonably trying to get at a problem. We have made an adjustment that makes it work. If a Foreign Service officer receives a suspension of more than 5 days, that fact will stay in his or her file until they next come up for promotion and for tenure. There would still be a minimum period when any suspension will be in the file, but beyond that period, the minor suspensions will drop out of the file. Any one that has been for more than 5 days will remain in the file. That is to get at a problem.

Staff said to me, on occasion we get reports on these people, and when we look into it, we discover there was a major suspension but this suspension dropped out of the person's record before they came up before a promotion board. People believe, in a case of something of more than 5 days, which obviously would be of some consequence, that it ought to remain in and not be excised from the record. We have made that adjustment. I thank the chairman and his people for their responsiveness.

The other amendment I believe was agreeable on Friday. That was on a grievance, where we took it back up from 1 year to 2 years. The committee had dropped it from 3 to 1 in terms of the period when an employee has to file a grievance. One year is tough, particularly if that person is overseas, because they do not get home leave except every 18 months. We took it back up to 2 years and made some other minor changes, and that is acceptable to the committee. I very much appreciate that.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Senator. How much time remains before the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, as I understand it now, with these changes the chairman has suggested, the amendment is acceptable to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is acceptable to the offerer with the changes that have been made.

Mr. HELMS. This amendment, as modified, preserves one of the key Foreign Service reforms in the bill. The bill currently requires that any disciplinary action taken against a member of the Foreign Service be included in a Foreign Service member's file for at least one successful tenure or promotion. Current practice requires that such actions remain in a personnel file for only 2 years.

The current requirement has enabled some Foreign Service members to game the system and receive a promotion once the disciplinary action has been removed from the file. For example, the committee was recently asked to review the promotion of an individual who had failed to attain promotion by two review boards while the disciplinary action remained a part of his file. After 2 years, when the action was removed from his file, he immediately received promotion.

The Foreign Service, like the military, is intended to be an up or out system. In the military, disciplinary actions stay with an officer's file for his entire career. The current provision in the bill seems to me to be a reasonable reform that would ensure a Foreign Service promotion board can make an informed decision. I accept the reasonable compromise offered by Senator SARBANES that ensures this requirement applies only to more severe disciplinary actions.

Madam President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, they have.

Mr. HELMS. I suggest we vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 689, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 177 Leg.]

YEAS—88

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

NOT VOTING—12

Baucus	Kennedy	Murkowski
Chafee	Lautenberg	Nickles
Dodd	Leahy	Santorum
Inhofe	McCain	Thomas

The amendment (No. 689), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, we are within striking distance of a final disposition of this bill tomorrow. We hope to get an agreement for the Feingold and Sarbanes amendment and a vote on final passage tomorrow morning.

In the meantime, after the majority leader has his report to us, we will begin debate on the amendment by the distinguished Senator, Mr. FEINGOLD.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. 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. 692

(Purpose: To limit the percentage of noncompetitively awarded grants made to the core grantees of the National Endowment for Democracy)

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will offer today an amendment to make a simple reform to the grants process for the National Endowment for Democracy, the funding of which is authorized in the State Department authorization bill which we are debating.

I want to make this very clear. I am not here to cut or eliminate NED funding by even one penny. This doesn't cut the program at all. Rather, my amendment simply requires the money given by the American taxpayers to NED each year be distributed fairly and effectively. The amendment, therefore,

reforms the NED's grant-making procedures, procedures about which it can fairly be said, as of today, ''The fix is in.''

Here is how the grant process at NED works today. Currently, 65 percent of NED grant money goes automatically to four so-called core grantees, and these are the Solidarity Center, an arm of the AFL–CIO; the Center for International Private Enterprise or CIPE, an arm of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and two groups tied to America's major political parties, the International Republican Institute and the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs.

My amendment simply would require that the grant process of NED become competitive. The amount of grant funds provided automatically to the NED's four core grantees would be reduced incrementally over the next 5 years, so all NED grant funds would be awarded competitively on the merits by the time we get to the end of that 5-year period.

I hope we can all agree that more competition among applicants for grant funds is a good thing and that it is the fairest way to apportion the tax dollars NED distributes to help promote democracy. As it stands now, the four grantees are hardly subject to any real scrutiny. That is why I say the fix is in for these very well connected organizations.

The NED is a private, nonprofit organization created by the U.S. Government during the cold war in 1983. The idea was a good one. The idea was to strengthen democratic institutions around the world through nongovernmental efforts. The NED is governed by an independent, nonpartisan board of directors and operates with an annual congressional appropriation, so strictly speaking, it is not really an endowment. NED receives 97 percent of its funding from the taxpayers. Until it has significant private sources of funding, it does not make any sense to me to guarantee most of its grants to four private groups.

The NED provides some direct grants, conducts analyses of the theory and practice of democratic development worldwide, and serves as a clearinghouse for information on that development. The NED makes hundreds of grants each year to support prodemocracy groups in Africa, Asia, Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America, the Middle East and the former Soviet Union. The Endowment supports projects that promote political and economic freedom, a strong civil society, independent media, human rights and the rule of law.

There are also programs in the areas of labor, business, and political party development which are funded mostly through the four grantees, although other applicants are prepared to conduct programs in each of these areas.

Obviously, I believe in the value of democracy and the imperative of the United States to support democratic development, human rights, and the rule of law abroad. So I do not take lightly at all the admirable aims of the National Endowment for Democracy and do believe these goals are in the national interest of the United States.

Nevertheless, I continue to have concerns about this bizarre structure of the endowment ''family.'' As I mentioned, more than 50 percent of the NED's budget, and some 65 percent of the grants it makes, goes to these so-called core grantees—NDI, IRI, CIPE and the Solidarity Center.

Why do these core grantees get that funding year after year? Because at NED's inception, they had the political clout to get permanently ''wired in.'' Whatever the goals of the originators of this strange arrangement, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the core groups necessarily offer programs of such superior quality that they should get this annual bonanza while other independent organizations must vie for funding from the NED's small remaining discretionary fund.

Sure—I am quick to say this—the core grantees have conducted some excellent programs and many of them certainly serve important U.S. national interests. I am sure they deserve to get some funding. But why is it they are automatically given 65 percent of grant funds? I have to believe there are other organizations out there that can do the job better on some projects, but they are not even allowed to compete for this majority of the money.

In fact, I have the list of some 250 organizations that have satisfied those individuals who review the remaining amounts of funds to the point where these organizations have been granted funds.

I must say in fairness, considerable progress has been made over the years in addressing many of the most pressing concerns about the selection and monitoring of NED grants. As the result of several studies conducted by the GAO, the Endowment has addressed many issues and has tightened up its project selection and performance monitoring procedures. I certainly recognize that the NED has made a little bit of progress in reducing the percentage of its grants that are slated for these four grantees. It used to be as high as 80 percent of the total NED budget.

The NED has seen its funding attacked in this Chamber in recent years, but each time the Senate has made a clear and sometimes overwhelming decision to preserve that funding. I understand that an appropriations bill which was filed last week zeros out funding for the NED, but I am absolutely confident those funds will be restored because there is no other federally funded organization in America that is, frankly, better connected on Capitol Hill than the National Endowment for Democracy.

Today, I am certainly being realistic and trying to be positive and helpful and trying to improve the program. I am not attempting to shut down the NED. Let me repeat, my amendment does not seek to kill the National Endowment for Democracy, nor does it cut the program funding even by one dime. Rather, I seek to reform the strange and unique grantmaking structure that has evolved at NED.

Let me describe this amendment one more time. This chart shows, again, the situation before our amendment and under current law. The distribution, the very small portion in green is available to everybody else after these four grantees are guaranteed 65 percent of the grant money. My amendment will decrease the amount in blue gradually over 5 years by a small amount each year to 52 percent in fiscal year 2001, 39 percent in fiscal year 2002, so on until 2004 when there would be no noncompetitive funds made available and the funds would go to the applicants who offer the best proposals. A novel idea: All the money goes to the best applicants. That is a pretty good use of taxpayers' dollars, in my view.

Mr. HELMS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I will be happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. HELMS. Will the Senator be willing to send his amendment to the desk and count the time he has used against it?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, it was my intention to offer the amendment at the conclusion of my remarks. I certainly anticipated the time I used would go against my time.

Mr. HELMS. I am not trying to direct the Senator. I just want the clock to start running.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the time I have already consumed be counted against my time that I was allotted under the agreement.

Mr. HELMS. That sounds fair.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the chairman.

I will conclude my remarks, and at the conclusion of those remarks, I will, in fact, send the amendment to the desk. This does not necessarily mean any of the four core grantees will have to cut their budgets, but it will mean they will have to actually make their case to NED that their proposals are the best use of taxpayers' dollars. As it now stands, these four grantees know the fix is in, so there is less incentive to make sure every single program is as efficient and well planned as it possibly can be.

My amendment will phase out this fix over a 5-year period and compel each of the four grantees to work a little harder to earn their grants, as hard as everybody else, so they can be in this big green pie of the best applicants, not just the guaranteed applicants.

Again, this is not an amendment to kill or even cut funding for the NED. It is an amendment to use old-fashioned American competition to ensure that

the best use of taxpayers' dollars in the funding of democracy programs happens abroad. My colleagues who believe in fairness and competition and the efficient use of the taxpayers' money should vote aye.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of 250 organizations which received NED funds in calendar year 1998 be printed in the RECORD.

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

ORGANIZATIONS THAT RECEIVED NED DISCRETIONARY GRANTS IN CALENDAR YEAR 1998

Afghanistan Information Center
Afghanistan Study Center
African Centre for Democratic Governance
African Leadership Forum
Al-Urdun Al-Jadid Research Center
Albanian Center for Human Rights
American Assistance for Cambodia
American Federal of Teachers Educational Foundation
American Foreign Policy Council
Andean Commission of Jurists
Arab Media Institute
Asia Plus News Agency
Assistance Center for Nonprofit Organizations
Associates to Develop Democratic Burma
Association for Civic Education
Association for Independent Electronic Media
Association in Support of Local Democracy
Association of Liberian Professional Organizations
Association of Vietnamese Overseas
Association of Women with University Education
Associaton of Young Leaders
Azerbaijan Foundation for the Development of Democracy
Balkan Forum Civil Association
Belapan Information Agency
Belgrade Center for Human Rights
BETA News Agency
Bureau d'Etudes, de Rechereche et de Consulting International
Burma Information Group
Burma Lawyers' Council
Burmese Women's Union
Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies
Cambodian Human Rights Task Force
Campaign for Democracy
Center for a Free Cuba
Center for Anti-War Action
Center for Civil Education Poland-Belarus
Center for Cooperation-Livno
Center for Free Speech
Center for Justice and International Law
Center for Law Enforcement Education
Center for Law and Human Rights
Center for Modern China
Center for Palestinian Research and Studies
Center for Research and Popular Education
Center for Strategic and International Studies
Center for the Services of Popular Action
Center of Social Projecting ''Vozrozhdeniye''
Centre Chretien pour le Developpement des Paysans en Milieu Rural
Centre des Droits de l'Homme et du Droit Humanitaire
Chad Non-Violence
Channels Television
Children of Chernobyl Gomel NGO Resource Center
China News Digest International
Chinese VIP Reference
Citizen's Movement for Democracy
Citizen's Presence
Civic Association Justice First
Civil Association for Social Development—New Dawn
Civil Liberties Organization
Collectif d'Actions pour le Developpement des Droits de l'Homme
Colombian Commission of Jurists
Comite d'Action pour les Droits des L'Enfant et de la Femme
Committee for the Defense of Human Rights
Committee for the Defense of Human Rights in Tartarstan
Coordinating Child Center for International Development of Tajikistan
Council for the Defense of Human Rights and Freedoms
Cuban Committee for Human Rights
CubaNet
Danas (Today)
Democracy Center Foundation
Democratic Association of Moroccan Women
Democratic China
Democratic Voice of Burma
Development through Education Fund
Dialogue Turkmen Youth Leadership Center
Disadente Universal de Puerto Rico
Dr. Ismail Juma'le Human Rights Organization
Educational Choices Heightened Opportunity
Educational Society of Malpolska
Egyptian Center for Women's Rights
Egyptian Organization for Human Rights
Ethiopian Human Rights Council
European Center for Common Ground
Express Chronicle
Femmes et Enfants pour les Droits de l'Homme
Foundation for China in the 21st Century
Foundation for Defense of Human Rights
Foundation for Democracy in Zimbabwe
Foundation for Education for Democracy
Foundation for Human Rights Institute
Free Iraq Foundation
Freedom Channel
Fund for Peace
Gender Equity: Citizenship, Work and Family
Glastnost Defense Foundation
Glastnost Public Foundation
Gomel Civic Initiatives Association
Grand Vision pour la Defense des Droits de l'Homme
Group d'Etudes et de Recherche sur la Democratie et le Developpement Economique et Sociale
Group for Democratic Development
Groupe Justice et Liberation
Helsinki Citizens Assembly—Tuzla
Helsinki Citizens Assembly—Banja Luka
Helsinki Citizens Assembly—Turkey
Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Republika Srpska
Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Serbia
Hong Kong Human Rights Monitor
Human Rights Africa
Human Rights in China
Human Rights Documentation Unit
Human Rights Foundation of Monland
Human Rights Foundation for Civil Society
Human Rights Monitor
Human Rights Publishers
Humanitarian Law Center
HUNDEE
Huri-Laws
Ibn Khaldoun Center for Development
Ilim Educational Complex
Information and Research Centre for Civic Education
Information Bureau of the Human Rights Movement in Cuba
Institute for Democracy in Eastern Europe
Institute for Democracy in Eastern Europe/Warsaw
Institute for Far Eastern Studies, Kyungnam University
Institute for Regional Studies
Institute for Southeastern Studies
Institute for Sustainable Development Education
Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law
Institute of Political and Strategic Studies
International Campaign for Tibet
International Crisis Group
International Forum for Islamic Dialogue
International Human Rights Law Group
Jan Hus Educational Foundation
Karen Information Center
KARTA (Charter) Center Foundation
Kaunas Municipal Training Center
Kharkiv's Center for Women's Studies
Kharkiv Human Rights Protection Group
Khmer Students Association
Koha Ditore
Krygyz Committee for Human Rights
Lahu National Development Organization
Laogai Research Foundation
Lawyers' Association for the Defense of Human Rights
League of Democratic Women
Lebanese Foundation for Permanent Civil Peace
Leagal Defense Institute
Les Amis de Nelson Mandela pour la Defense des Droits de l'Homme
Liberal Women's Brain Pool
Liberian Human Rights Chapter
Ligue des Electeurs
Liuboslavkii Charitable Foundation for the Defense of Human Rights
Media Rights Agenda
''Meeting of Cuban Culture'' Magazine
Mexican Commission for the Defense and Protection of Human Rights
Milan Simecka Foundation
Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights
Moscow Helsinki Group
Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni People
Museum of Political Repression and Totalitarianism
Mutawinat Benevolent Company
Mwelekeo wa NGO
Myrna Mack Foundation
Nadacia Pre Obciansku Spolocnost
National Coalition for Democracy
National Democratic Coalition
National Health and Education Committee
National Human Rights Monitor, Inc.
National League for Free and Fair Elections
Nework for Communal Justice and Conflict Mediation
Network Recherche Action
The New Era Journal
Niger Delta Human Rights and Environmental Rescue Organisation
Nizhnii Tagil Human Rights Library
Nonviolence International
NTV Zetel
Obrumankoma, Odapagyan and Oson Traditionals
Organization of Indigenous Women of the Peruvian Amazon
Organization to Improve the Quality of Life
Panorama
Panorama Center for the Dissemination of Alternative Information
Partners for Democratic Change
Peace and Development Committee
People in Need Foundation
People's Action for Free and Fair Elections
Permanent Committee of the Civil Institute
Philanthropic Amlieh Association
Polish-Czech-Slovak Solidarity Foundation
Presov Civic Foundation
Press and Society Institute
Press Freedom Guardian
Press Union of Liberia
Princeton China Initiative
Pro Democracy Association
Prologues
Promotion de la Femme Rurale
Public Research Center
Radio Anfani
Radio Drina
Radio Zid
Rally for Youth Action
''Ratusha'' Civic Association
Region Association

Rene Moawad Foundation
Rural Educational Services
Russian Association for Civic Education
Ryazan Regional Branch of the Memorial Society
Sakharov Foundation
Saratov Legal Reform Project
Search for Common Ground
Sharq Information and Analysis Center
Sisterhood is Global Institute
Smoloskyp
Snezhinsk Human Rights Defense Group
Spiral Foundation
STINA News Agency
Strategic Empowerment and Mediation Agency
Strategy Center
Studio ''N''
Sudan Human Rights Association
Sutizahnik
Synergy
Tashkent Public Education Center
Tibet Fund
Tibet Times
Tibetan Youth Congress
Tsentral'naya Aziya
Tulane University
Tuzla Citizens Forum
Uchitel'skaia gazeta
Ukrainian-American Bureau for Human Rights
Ukrainian Center for Independent Political Research
Ukrainian Congress Committee of America
Ukrainian Memorial Society
Union of Councils for Soviet Jews
Up with Citizenship Association
Urals Foundation for Social Innovation
Vijesti
Vitebsk Foundation for Democratic Reforms
Voice of the Handicapped for Human Rights
Voice of the Voiceless
Vreme
Westbourne Publishers, t/a Dar al-Saqi
Women for Democracy and Leadership
Women Living under Muslim Law
Women in Nigeria—Kaduna
Women's Affairs Technical Committee
Women's Union in Jordan
World Organization Against Torture USA
Yeni Nesil Journalists Association
Youth Alternative
Youth Center for Human Rights and Legal Culture
Youth EcoCenter Young Leaders School
Youth Human Rights Group

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Chair.

I call up amendment No. 692 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD] proposes an amendment numbered 692.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 13, after line 10, add the following new section:

SEC. 106. LIMITATIONS ON NONCOMPETITIVELY AWARDED NED GRANTS.

(a) LIMITATIONS.—Of the total amount of grants made by the National Endowment for Democracy in each of the following fiscal years, not more than the following percentage for each such fiscal year shall be grants that are awarded on a noncompetitive basis to the core grantees of the National Endowment for Democracy:

(1) For fiscal year 2000, 52 percent.
(2) For fiscal year 2001, 39 percent.
(3) For fiscal year 2002, 36 percent.
(4) For fiscal year 2003, 13 percent.
(5) For fiscal year 2004, zero percent.

(b) CORE GRANTEES OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''core grantees of the National Endowment for Democracy'' means the following:

(1) The International Republican Institute (IRI).
(2) The National Democratic Institute (NDI).
(3) The Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE).
(4) The American Center for International Solidarity (also known as the ''Solidarity Center'').

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 8 minutes 44 seconds remaining.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. 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. LUGAR. I thank the Chair.

I rise to oppose the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. He clearly is a strong proponent and advocate of democracy and has stimulated discussion on these issues as a valued member of the Foreign Relations Committee. The National Endowment for Democracy which was founded in 1983 included the so-called four ''core'' groups from the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, Organized Labor, and the Chamber of Commerce.

That foundation was deliberate. It was not a question of a strange arrangement in which four groups in Washington sequestered the funds for their own benefit. Very clearly, President Reagan and a bipartisan majority of the Congress found that the checks and balances inherent in that debate were very important in making certain that the National Endowment for Democracy was not politicized.

Let me mention that to have competition in which as many as 250 groups interested in democracy compete for money, almost guarantees a substantial bureaucracy to vet all of the points of view and applications. Furthermore, under the worst of circumstances, it does not necessarily bring about a strong bipartisan scrutiny of each other's proposals, quite apart from the scrutiny that organized labor might get from the Chamber of Commerce and vice versa. In fact, the system has worked remarkably well.

I have served as a member of the Board of the National Endowment for Democracy during the past 8 years. I have witnessed the process in which the Board—which is not divorced from the debate in Washington—thinks through those areas of the world that need specific emphasis.

Each of the four core groups is charged with finding proposals and finding specific groups, often in countries that are emerging democracies, to bring forward ways in which democracy might be enhanced. Sometimes it is under very arduous and dangerous circumstances. It is only after the core groups make their proposals, having reviewed them thoroughly, that the staff of the National Endowment for Democracy scrutinize them, ask for amendments, suggest changes, delays or rejection.

Specific members of the Board who have particular expertise in various areas of the world spend a great deal of time pro bono taking a very careful look at those proposals. But finally, each one of us, as Board members, must pass on each and every single one of these grant applications.

On occasion we reject a fair number during a meeting, quite apart from whether a quota of grants has been allocated specifically to the four. Each of the four ''cores'' has the ability and the talents to bring forward remarkable proposals for the advancement of democracy. That has been occurring for the past 16 years.

The Foreign Relations committee has not held hearings on this proposal. It comes literally out of the blue. It may have some merit for another organization at another time, but for this organization the genius was in its initial inception—an opportunity to bring forward proposals that were not coming from the U.S. Government, from the State Department, from the White House, or the National Security Council.

It brought forward proposals from well-defined institutions in our society that are broadly based—members of the Democratic and Republican parties, often elected officials, responsible to their constituents, who are well aware of political currents in the country, and the institutions that characterize our national Chamber of Commerce and the AFL–CIO.

As a matter of fact, the Solidarity movement found resonance with the AFL–CIO. It was the labor movement of our country that brought forward one of the most significant sets of proposals and advocacy.

It is a fact that at the recent 50th anniversary NATO celebration, one of the great honors paid in this city was by the National Endowment for Democracy to Lech Walesa. In many ways, Lech Walesa's leadership, courageous as it was at a turning point in history, was a hallmark of the work of the National Endowment. The checks and balances were at work, because other groups took a look at the labor/Solidarity situation in Poland and wondered whether it was appropriate for the United States Government to be appropriating funds that led to the change of government in that country. On balance, our Government appropriated those funds but the National

Endowment did make the decisions. They were outside the bureaucracy of the Federal Government, outside the politicization that occurs when one party or another gains dominance and a particular type of preferential structure.

I make these points because I believe this is an arrangement that works well. If the wagon isn't broke, we should not try to fix it. The situation is clearly one that does not require any fixing.

There may be institutions in our society that wish we had established a different sort of endowment. I suspect that if Members are prepared to vote for this amendment, it will be a very different National Endowment for Democracy. But I caution Members about the dangers of making these changes. Therefore, I ask for careful consideration by Members. I ask, in fact, consideration of the remarkable work that is now being done by the National Endowment for Democracy and the 16 years of very solid achievement by many great Americans who were outside of our Government, but who participated in boosting democracy through this vehicle.

I ask, therefore, for the defeat of the Feingold amendment. I am hopeful that as the votes are counted tomorrow, the National Endowment will receive a vote of endorsement.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight minutes 44 seconds.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I require at this point.

Let me first say how much regard I have for the Senator from Indiana and enormous respect for his role on the Committee on Foreign Relations, his demeanor, and his knowledge. It is a pleasure to work with him. We disagree on this one.

The Senator from Indiana suggests that this point about the National Endowment for Democracy comes from out of the blue. I have been here long enough to know that year after year the former Senator from Arkansas, Mr. BUMPERS, made several attempts to eliminate the program or change the program. It has been a regular subject of scrutiny in this body, as it should be. I think to suggest that it is a surprise that there would be some oversight of NED is not quite accurate.

What the Senator from Indiana is indicating, of course, is the political parties and business and labor are at the heart of a pluralistic democratic society, that they are the fundamental concepts of American political life. I agree with him. I think it is important that as we endeavor to encourage democratization around the world that we try to include all of these elements of our democracy. But I do not think it should be primarily limited or dominantly limited to these four core grantees.

The Senator from Indiana knows far better than I do the origins of the program. I appreciate his comments about what the thinking was in the beginning, how these groups got together, and how the structure was crucial for the program to begin. I do not dispute that. I am sure there is some validity.

But I think after some 15 years, these groups and these organizations have had time enough to develop their programs so they are ready to fly on their own, that they are ready to compete against other applicants for the funding in a free and fair manner.

The fact that the NED's four core grantees are guaranteed to receive a set amount of funds every year seems to me fundamentally unfair and is a contradiction of our democratic principles, especially when you are talking about guaranteeing private groups taxpayer dollars, which is exactly what this does. Every group that conducts democracy programs should have an equal opportunity to pursue Federal funding for its programs, not just the ones that are so powerfully and politically connected. These four well-connected groups are not the only people in America that know something about political parties or business or labor, but it is only these groups that are guaranteed 65 percent of the grant money from this program. That is almost entirely taxpayers' dollars. To me, a much more appropriate system would be a competitive one.

As I understand it, since the Senator fairly raises the concern about whether the original understanding between these groups would be preserved, I am told that the board itself has representatives of both of the major political parties, as well as of business and labor, and that they are the ones that would be making these decisions.

The Senator from Indiana indicates that this is a situation where something isn't broke so do not fix it. The fact is, in recent years a number of suggestions have been made about ways to help fix the program. There have been some problems. Some of these problems have been fixed. What I am trying to do here is continue the process of fixing it, of improving it.

As I indicated earlier, some 80 percent of this money was once tied up only for these four groups. Now it is lower, but it still represents 65 percent of available grant money. What I am saying is, let us fix it, improve it, over the next 5 years, phasing this down so each year this gets a little smaller. By the time we get to the end of that 5-year period, we have all the money based on a fair competition and still have a board that has representatives of both political parties and of business and labor so there is no real possibility of unfairness or partisanship in this regard.

All of this is offered in the spirit of trying to further improve the program, acknowledging its great worth, acknowledging the many good things that are done. Let's just do a little better job of making sure our taxpayers' dollars are spent in a manner that involves the best interests and the best applicants getting the money.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes 23 seconds.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the Feingold amendment.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the State Department authorization bill. Specifically, I would like to commend Chairman HELMS for the inclusion of a number of provisions dealing with China. These provisions closely mirror legislation that I introduced last year and earlier this year as Senate bill 89.

Section 701 of this act contains a number of findings on the human rights situation in China from the State Department's Annual Report on human rights practices. The government of the People's Republic of China continues to commit widespread and egregious abuses of internationally recognized human rights. Its prisons are overflowing with tortured and mistreated citizens who would dare to practice their faiths or exercise a political voice. Religious persecution, crackdowns on political dissent, restrictions on the press, forced labor, forced abortions, repression of people in Tibet and Xinjiang province are, unfortunately, still a part of daily life in China.

In order to shed light on the dark practices of the Chinese government, section 702 of this bill earmarks $2.2 million of money authorized for the Department of State for additional personnel in U.S. embassies and consulates for each of FY2000 and FY2001 to monitor political and economic conditions, particularly human rights. These new personnel, along with the creation of a prison information registry for the People's Republic of China in section 703, will make it all the more difficult for the Chinese government to deny that these abuses persist. With more centralized and accessible information, we will be able to better advocate for the release of these prisoners of conscience or faith.

It is also important that the people of China have access to the truth. The U.S. may have accidentally bombed the Chinese embassy in Belgrade, but it was no accident that the people did not hear President Clinton's repeated apologies. Section 502 of this bill reauthorizes Radio Free Asia, bringing objective reporting to the people of China.

Section 705 strongly condemns the practice of organ harvesting, where organs from executed prisoners are sold

on the black market or where prisoners are executed for their organs. According to our own State Department, ''In recent years, credible reports have alleged that organs from some executed prisoners were removed, sold, and transplanted. Officials have confirmed that executed prisoners are among the sources of organs for transplant but maintain that consent is required from prisoners or their relatives before organs are removed * * * there were credible reports that patients from Taiwan had undergone organ transplant operations on the mainland, using organs removed from executed criminals.'' Where and when organ harvesting is taking place in China, it must be stopped.

Equally horrific is the practice of forcing women to undergo forced abortions or forced sterilization under the Chinese government's population control policies. Women who are pregnant with a second child find themselves and their relatives harassed, fined, and sometimes even have their homes destroyed until they are ultimately forced to undergo an abortion, even in the latest stages of pregnancy. Last June, the House International Relations Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights heard testimony of these practices from Gao Xiao Duan, a former administrator of forced abortion, as well as Zhou Shiu Yon, a victim of these policies. I believe that it is only appropriate that Congress act in response to this horrid devaluation of human life. Section 721 restricts visas for any foreign national whom the Secretary of State finds to have been directly involved in the establishment or enforcement of population control policies involving forced abortion or forced sterilization. There is no reason why we should welcome into our country those individuals who have no respect for human life.

United States–China relations are strained at this time. Amidst the whirlwind of controversy, including espionage, campaign donations, the accidental embassy bombing, and a near $60 billion trade deficit, there are some who would argue that we should be quiet about human rights in order to preserve the relationship. But I would argue that human rights must not be swept off our agenda. The Chinese government would like nothing more than for us to censor ourselves. I believe that this legislation will help to ensure that human rights and the defense of internationally recognized standards are kept intact.

Mr. President, there are two additional provisions it this legislation. Section 704 requires the Secretary of State to report within 180 days on the feasibility and utility of establishing an Organization for Security and Cooperation in Asia, modeled after the OSCE. Section 722 requires semiannual reports to Congress on the status of U.S. efforts to support the membership of Taiwan in international organizations that do not require statehood, and the appropriate level of participation in international organizations that do require statehood for full membership. Taiwan's entry into international organizations has been held hostage to China's wishes for too long. In many instances, such as World Trade Organization membership, Taiwan is more qualified to join than China, yet simply because of China's sensitivities, it has been prevented from joining.

In the long run, we must recognize that the Chinese government is a totalitarian regime. This dictatorship does not represent the people of China, rather it abuses them in any way necessary to maintain its power. Similarly, this regime will use any necessary means to expand its power in Asia. If we are to effectively manage these aims, we will need the help of our neglected allies in the region, namely Japan, Taiwan, and South Korea.

We cannot recover stolen information, but we must prevent future theft through increased security at our national labs and other facilities, more stringent background checks, controls on technology transfers, and a Justice Department that does not hinder its own FBI's investigations. We cannot afford to give the Chinese government the means to fulfill its military aims.

We should, however, give the people of China the means to build their own democracy. Increased funding for Radio Free Asia, the Voice of America, democracy building programs, and rule of law initiatives are vital because they represent an engagement with the people of China rather than the regime at the top. We must recognize the limits to engaging an insecure, transient government that is on the wrong side of history.

Finally, Mr. President, industry must do its part and aggressively advocate human rights. Americans doing business in China must be active advocates for human rights, to the Beijing government and to the people. They must not be complicit in slave labor or other human rights violations. The simple fact is that China desperately wants American trade and American business. U.S. companies must use this leverage to advance more than profits.

China is not yet our enemy, but neither is it our friend. Our China-centered foreign policy must be replaced with a regional policy. We must break off this Administration's obsession with trying to acede to Beijing's every demand. Such a policy can only strengthen a regime that will seek to extinguish the flames of democracy abroad as it has done so effectively at home.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget through June 16, 1999. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Res. 209, a resolution to provide budget levels in the Senate for purposes of fiscal year 1999, as amended by S. Res. 312. The budget levels have also been revised to include adjustments made on May 19, 1999, to reflect the amounts provided and designated as emergency requirements. The estimates show that current level spending is above the budget resolution by $0.4 billion in budget authority and above the budget resolution by $0.2 billion in outlays. Current level is $0.2 billion above the revenue floor in 1999. The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is $56.1 billion, less than $50 million above the maximum deficit amount for 1999 of $56.0 billion.

Since my last report, dated May 12, 1999, the Congress passed and the President signed the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 106–31). The Congress also cleared for the President's signature the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act (H.R. 435). These actions changed the current level of budget authority, outlays, and revenues.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 17, 1999.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the 1999 budget and is current through June 16, 1999. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Res. 209, a resolution to provide budget levels in the Senate for purposes of fiscal year 1999, as amended by S. Res. 312. The budget levels have also been revised to include adjustments made on May 19, 1999, to reflect the amounts provided and designated as emergency requirements. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

Since my last report, dated May 12, 1999, the Congress passed and the President signed the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31). The Congress also cleared for the President's signature the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act (H.R. 435). These actions