Resolution 99, a resolution designating November 20, 1999, as “National Survivors for Prevention of Suicide Day.”

SENATE RESOLUTION 105—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF SLOBODAN MILOSEVIC AS A WAR CRIMINAL.

Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. SPECTER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 105

Whereas the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (in this resolution referred to as the “International Criminal Tribunal”) has not sought indictment of Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic for war crimes committed by Yugoslav and Serbian military and paramilitary forces in Bosnia:

Whereas Serbian military and paramilitary forces have undertaken a massive ethnic cleansing campaign that has displaced more than one million Kosovar Albanians:

Whereas Serbian military and paramilitary forces have conducted a systematic effort to strip Kosovar Albanians of their identity by confiscating passports, birth certificates, employment records, driver’s licenses, and other documents of identification:

Whereas the International Criminal Tribunal has collected evidence of summary executions, mass detentions, torture, rape, beatings, and other war crimes:

Whereas in 1992, the then-Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger identified Slobodan Milosevic as a war criminal:

Whereas the statute governing the International Criminal Tribunal requires that the office of the prosecutor need only determine that a prima facie case exists in order to seek indictment:

Whereas the House of Representatives and the Senate have previously passed resolutions condemning Serbian police actions in Kosovo and calling for Yugoslav leader Slobodan Milosevic to be indicted for war crimes:

Whereas the Administration has made no public attempt to urge the International Criminal Tribunal to seek an indictment against Slobodan Milosevic, despite the necessity of NATO air strikes to respond to his campaign of genocide: Now, therefore, be it

SENATE RESOLUTION 105—expressing the sense of the Senate relating to consideration of Slobodan Milosevic as a war criminal;

SEC. 1. SENSE OF SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the President should:

(1) publicly declare, as a matter of United States policy that the United States considers Slobodan Milosevic to be a war criminal; and

(2) urge the chief prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal to seek immediately an indictment of Slobodan Milosevic for war crimes committed by his troops under his leadership.

It is the sense of the Senate that the President should publicly declare, as a matter of United States policy that the United States considers Slobodan Milosevic to be a war criminal; and

(2) urge the chief prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal to seek immediately an indictment of Slobodan Milosevic for war crimes committed by his troops under his leadership.

We have a responsibility to do this. The failure to do this, and a resulting negotiated settlement at some point down the line that would leave Slobodan Milosevic in power, would be, in my judgment, a tragic mistake. In or out of power, this leader ought to be branded a war criminal. Whether we deal with him now, or out of power, this leader ought to be indicted and convicted of war crimes.

I understand that perhaps we would not have been able to arrest him, but at least in abeyance evidence could be presented to say that this is a war criminal.

This monster, Slobodan Milosevic, and the despicable acts committed in his name by his troops, ought to persuade our country to support his indictment and conviction in the International Criminal Tribunal.

Why would we not do that? I am told that, at some point there has to be a settlement to end this war, and those who are involved in the settlement do not want to be negotiating with a convicted war criminal. That doesn't make any sense to me. The very reason for launching the airstrikes was that this person and the troops under his leadership was committing unspeakable horrors against the ethnic Albanians, which, in my judgment, brands him a war criminal.

I am submitting another resolution today, and the resolution is very simple:

It says:

It is the sense of the Senate that the President should publicly declare as a matter of United States policy that the United States considers Slobodan Milosevic to be a war criminal.

The Tribunal exists for a very specific purpose. Should this country not be pressing very aggressively to have Mr. Milosevic tried in the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia?

We made a mistake, in my judgment, with respect to Iraq. Saddam Hussein was never tried for war crimes. He committed many. He is one of the few leaders in the world who has murdered people in his own homeland with weapons of mass destruction, but we did not press for his conviction in an international tribunal. So now, instead of being a convicted war criminal, Saddam Hussein is still in power.

I understand that perhaps we would not have been able to arrest him, but at least in abeyance evidence could be presented to say that this is a war criminal.

This monster, Slobodan Milosevic, and the despicable acts committed in his name by his troops, ought to persuade our country to support his indictment and conviction in the International Criminal Tribunal.

Why would we not do that? I am told that, at some point there has to be a settlement to end this war, and those who are involved in the settlement do not want to be negotiating with a convicted war criminal. That doesn't make any sense to me. The very reason for launching the airstrikes was that this person and the troops under his leadership was committing unspeakable horrors against the ethnic Albanians, which, in my judgment, brands him a war criminal.

I am submitting another resolution today, and the resolution is very simple:

It says:

It is the sense of the Senate that the President should publicly declare as a matter of United States policy that the United States considers Slobodan Milosevic to be a war criminal.

The Tribunal exists for a very specific purpose. Should this country not be pressing very aggressively to have Mr. Milosevic tried in the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia?

We made a mistake, in my judgment, with respect to Iraq. Saddam Hussein was never tried for war crimes. He committed many. He is one of the few leaders in the world who has murdered people in his own homeland with weapons of mass destruction, but we did not press for his conviction in an international tribunal. So now, instead of being a convicted war criminal, Saddam Hussein is still in power.

I understand that perhaps we would not have been able to arrest him, but at least in abeyance evidence could be presented to say that this is a war criminal.

This monster, Slobodan Milosevic, and the despicable acts committed in his name by his troops, ought to persuade our country to support his indictment and conviction in the International Criminal Tribunal.

Why would we not do that? I am told that, at some point there has to be a settlement to end this war, and those who are involved in the settlement do not want to be negotiating with a convicted war criminal. That doesn't make any sense to me. The very reason for launching the airstrikes was that this person and the troops under his leadership was committing unspeakable horrors against the ethnic Albanians, which, in my judgment, brands him a war criminal.

I am submitting another resolution today, and the resolution is very simple:

It says:

It is the sense of the Senate that the President should publicly declare as a matter of United States policy that the United States considers Slobodan Milosevic to be a war criminal.

The Tribunal exists for a very specific purpose. Should this country not be pressing very aggressively to have Mr. Milosevic tried in the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia?

We made a mistake, in my judgment, with respect to Iraq. Saddam Hussein was never tried for war crimes. He committed many. He is one of the few leaders in the world who has murdered people in his own homeland with weapons of mass destruction, but we did not press for his conviction in an international tribunal. So now, instead of being a convicted war criminal, Saddam Hussein is still in power.

I understand that perhaps we would not have been able to arrest him, but at least in abeyance evidence could be presented to say that this is a war criminal.

This monster, Slobodan Milosevic, and the despicable acts committed in his name by his troops, ought to persuade our country to support his indictment and conviction in the International Criminal Tribunal.

Why would we not do that? I am told that, at some point there has to be a settlement to end this war, and those who are involved in the settlement do not want to be negotiating with a convicted war criminal. That doesn't make any sense to me. The very reason for launching the airstrikes was that this person and the troops under his leadership was committing unspeakable horrors against the ethnic Albanians, which, in my judgment, brands him a war criminal.
WHEREAS English is the most widely used language in the areas of finance, trade, technology, diplomacy, and entertainment, and is the living library of the last 100 years of scientific and technological advance;

WHEREAS more speakers of English as a second language in the world than are native English speakers, and the large number of English language school-age students confirm that English is as close as any language has been to becoming the world’s common language;

WHEREAS Spanish exploration in the New World began when Ponce de Leon explored the Florida peninsula, and included the expeditions of Francisco Coronado throughout California to Kansas and across Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma from 1540 to 1542;

WHEREAS in 1998 the Nation commemorated the 400th anniversary of the first Spanish Settlement of the Southwest (Ohkay Yunque at San Juan Pueblo, New Mexico) with official visits from Spain, parades, festivals, masses, and other celebrations to emphasize the importance of the first encounters with American Indian cultures and the subsequent important encounters with other European cultures;

WHEREAS El Paso, Texas, the first gateway for Spanish explorers in the Southwest, also celebrated its Quadricentennial commemorating the 400th anniversary of the colonization expedition of Don Juan Onate in New Mexico and Texas along the Camino Real;

WHEREAS Hispanic culture, customs, and the Spanish language are a vital source of family and individual strength;

WHEREAS the Bureau of the Census estimates that 1 in 5 Americans will be of Hispanic descent by the year 2020, and by the year 2030, one of every four Americans will be a minority by the year 2005, and will constitute a significant skill;

WHEREAS knowledge of English, Spanish, French, Italian, Russian, German, Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, Korean, Vietnamese, African languages, and the many other languages of the world, enhances competitiveness and tremendous growth in world trade;

WHEREAS the United States is well postured for the global economy and international development with the United States’ diverse population and rich heritage of languages from all around the world language;

WHEREAS many American Indian languages are indigenous to the United States, and should be preserved, encouraged, and utilized, and in the early years of World War II when the Navajo Code Talkers created a code that could not be broken by the Japanese or the Germans;

WHEREAS the skilled labor force is crucial to the competitiveness of the Nation in today’s global economy, foreign language skills are a tremendous resource to the United States, and such foreign language skill enhances American competitiveness in global markets by permitting improved communication and understanding; and

WHEREAS knowledge of other languages and other cultures is known to enhance the United States diplomatic efforts by fostering greater communication and understanding between nations, and can promote greater understanding between different ethnic and racial groups within the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Government should pursue policies that—

(1) support and encourage Americans to master the English language plus other languages of the world, with special emphasis on the growing importance of the Spanish language for our Nation’s economic and cultural relationships with Mexico, Central America, and South America;

(2) recognize the value of the Spanish language to millions of Americans of Hispanic descent, who will be the Nation’s largest minority by the year 2005, and will constitute one of every four persons in the year 2030;

(3) recognize the importance of English as the unifying language of the United States, and the importance of English fluency for individuals who want to succeed in American society;

(4) recognize that command of the English language is a critical component of the success and productivity of our Nation’s children, and should be encouraged at every age;

(5) recognize that a skilled labor force is crucial to United States competitiveness in a global economy, and the ability to speak 1 or more languages in addition to English is a significant skill;

(6) support literacy programs, including programs for those who learn English first, many thousands of New Mexico’s population is conducted in English, and there is much pride in the ability to speak English as well as to read in one’s native language. Those who know English and have mastered another language or two have a distinct advantage in a more competitive world.

Tens of thousands of New Mexico families still speak Spanish at home. Spanish remains a strong tie to their culture, music, history, and folklore. After decades of being taught to learn English first, many thousands of New Mexico’s Hispanic families also speak Spanish fluently.

In New Mexico, 1998 marked the 400th anniversary of the first permanent Spanish settlement near San Juan Pueblo in the Espanola Valley. Many celebrations and educational events marked this important anniversary. Hispanic culture, customs, and language received much attention throughout New Mexico. More than a third of New Mexico’s population is Hispanic, and the Spanish language culture and history have a special place in the state’s distinct heritage.

New Mexico is the only state in the United States that has a constitutional requirement to use both English and Spanish in election materials and ballots.

In New Mexico, 37 percent of the people are Spanish-Americans or Mexican-Americans. The term “Hispanic Americans” is used in our country to describe Americans whose roots are in Spain, Portugal, Cuba, Central America, and South America. As U.S. News reported in the May 11, 1998, issue, “the label Hispanic obscures the enormous diversity among people who
come (or whose forebears came) from two dozen countries and whose ances-
try ranges from pure Spanish to mix-
tures of Spanish blood with Native
American, African, German, and
Italian, to name a few hybrids.”

U.S. News also reported that “The
number of Hispanics is increasing al-
most four times as fast as the rest of
the population, and they are expected
to surpass African-Americans as the
largest minority group by 2005.” In the
October 21, 1996, issue, U.S. News re-
ported that “Nearly 28 million people—
1 American in 10—consider themselves
Hispanics.” By 2050, projec-
tions are that 1 in every 4 Americans
will be Hispanic.

An article in The Economist of April
21, 1996, stresses the value of the Span-
ish language to America’s fastest grow-
ning minority group. “America’s Latinos are rapidly becoming one of its
most useful resources.”

In the western hemisphere, Spanish is clearly the dominant language. With
established and emerging markets in
Mexico, Central America, and South
America, the Spanish language is a key
to foreign competition in our own
hemisphere.

As the world economy moves into
the next century, it has become clear
the “domestic-only market planning” has
been replaced by the era of inter-
national trade agreements and the cre-
ation of regional trading blocs. In 1996, the
total volume of trade with Mexico and
other Spanish-speaking nations was es-
imated at $130 billion. Our trade
with the rest of Latin America that
same year was $101 billion.

Spanish is clearly a growing cultural
and economic force in our hemisphere.
It is also the common language of hun-
dreds of millions of people. Recent eco-
nomic trends of this decade show Latin
America as the most promising future
market for American goods and ser-
vices.

With Latin America as the next great
market partner of the United States,
those Americans who know both
English and Spanish will have many
new grand opportunities. Mexico’s re-
cently hired and celebrated its one-
millionth maquiladora worker in
international manufacturing plants
along our border. This milestone event
unquestionably shows the value of
knowing two languages as manufac-
turing in Mexico.

Mr. President, our nation’s potential
markets in Mexico, Central America,
and South America alone spell a vital
future for “English Plus” Spanish. If
we want to continue to expand our
nation’s cultural and economic Amer-
ican influence in the world, then we
urge the adoption of “English Plus” as
our national policy. We believe this ap-
proach will lead to a more prosperous
and secure world.

We believe we should not isolate
America to English only and to do that
would be a big mistake. The Senate
resolution I am speaking of supports
and encourages Americans to master
English first and English plus other
languages. We should add to that,
but not English only. We see English
plus other languages as a more
sensible statement of our national pol-
icy. Our Nation is rich in resources. We
want to encourage American citizens
to learn other prominent languages
that the world uses and that we must
use in the world and that many in our
country use as part of their cultural
background.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-
sent that our resolution regarding
English plus other languages be printed
in the RECORD.

SENATE RESOLUTION 107—TO ES-
TABLISH A SELECT COMMITTEE
ON CHINESE ESPIONAGE

Mr. SMITH (of New Hampshire)
submitted the following resolution;
which was referred to the Committee
on Rules and Administration:
S. RES. 107
Resolved,
SEC. 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SELECT
COMMITTEE

(a) In General.—There is established a
temporary Select Committee on Chinese
Espionage (hereafter in this resolution referred to as the “select
committee”) which shall consist of 12 members, 6 to be appointed
by the President pro tempore of the Senate
upon recommendations of the Majority
Leader from among members of the majority
party, and 6 to be appointed by the President
pro tempore of the Senate upon rec-
ommendations of the Minority Leader from
among members of the minority party.

(b) Chairman.—The Majority Leader shall
select the chairman of the select committee.

(c) Vice Chairman.—The Majority Leader
shall select the vice chairman of the select
committee.

(d) Service of a Senator.—The service of
a Senator as a member or chairman on the
select committee shall not count for pur-
poses of paragraph 4 of rule XXV of the
Standing Rules of the Senate.

SEC. 2. JURISDICTION.

(a) In General.—There shall be referred
the select committee, concurrently with refer-
ral to any other committee of the Senate
with jurisdiction, to investigations, mem-
orials, and other matters relating to
United States-China national security rela-
tions.

(b) Effect on Other Committees Jurisdi-
cion.—Nothing in this resolution shall be
construed as prohibiting or otherwise re-
stricting the authority of any other com-
mittee of the Senate or as amending, limit-
ing, or otherwise changing the authority
of any standing committee of the Senate.

SEC. 3. REPORTS.

The select committee may, for the pur-
pases of accountability to the Senate, make
such reports to the Senate with respect to
matters relating to national security,
and the rules of the Senate governing
procedure not inconsistent with this resolu-
tion, the select committee is author-
ized at its discretion—
(1) to make investigations into any matter
within its jurisdiction;
(2) to hold hearings;
(3) to sit and act at any time or place dur-
ing the sessions subject to paragraph 5 of rule XXVI of the Standing
Rules of the Senate; and
(4) to require, by subpoena or otherwise,
the attendance of witnesses and the produc-
tion of correspondence, books, papers,
and documents;

SEC. 5. TREATMENT OF CLASSIFIED INFORMA-
TION.

(a) Employe—