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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I am troubled by our efforts, which I support, to help the nation of Colombia.

I serve on the Narcotics Committee. I serve on the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee and Committee. Over quite a number of months, we have had testimony and hearings involving this issue. I have become quite concerned about the stability of the nation of Colombia. I believe it is a democracy, and it is one of the oldest in the Western Hemisphere. It is worthy of our support.

I believe Colombia is in a critical point in its history with over 50 percent of its territory—or at least over 40 or perhaps 50 percent of its territory—under the hands of insurgent forces. This great nation is in trouble.

I hope we can devise a way to effectively assist them in their efforts to preserve democracy and freedom, economic growth and prosperity, and safety and freedom for their people.

That is the intent of my amendment. It goes to an issue that I think is important.

This is the problem we are dealing with. The President, his State Department, and his representatives have testified and said repeatedly that our goal here is to reduce drugs in America and to save lives in America.

Our goal is to fight drug dealers in Colombia. Our goal is to help defend which they can operate without Hind. The administration has steadfastly avoided and refused to say that this Nation, the United States of America, stands with the democratically-elected Government of Panama against two major Marxist organizations that seek to overthrow the Government of Colombia, and have actually occupied large portions of that nation.

It is baffling to me why this is so. I do not understand what it is. Maybe it is an effort to appease the hard left in this country. Maybe it is an effort to appease certain liberal Members of this Senate who just can’t see giving money to fight a left-wing guerrilla group anywhere in the world. I, in fact, recall an instance in which the administration has ever given any money to support democratically-elected governments, or other kinds of governments, for that matter, against left-wing Marxist guerrillas.

These guerrilla groups have been involved in Colombia for many years. They have destabilized the country. They have undermined economic progress. They have provided cover and protection for drug dealers. They have in fact damaged Colombia substantially.

I believe it is time for us to encourage Colombia to stand up to these organizations, to retake the country, and to preserve democracy in the country. It is a serious matter, in my view.

Colombia has been an ally. We have encouraged them to enter into peace negotiations, and President Pastrana has tried his best to negotiate with these guerrilla groups. In fact, Colombia has given a piece of their territory, which I inform, the size of Senator Leahy’s State of Vermont to the guerrillas as a cease-fire zone, a safe zone in which they can operate their guerrillas. I believe they can operate their guerrillas as a cease-fire zone, a safe zone in which they can operate without fear, and that the duly constituted Government of Colombia would not enter there and do something about it while they attempt to establish peace. But that concession, this appeasement to the guerrilla groups, has not appeased them. It has not caused them to be less violent or aggressive. But in fact it appears it has encouraged them in some ways.

I believe Colombia is at the point where they can achieve stability. I believe they can drive home, through a combination of diplomacy and military efforts to these insurgent forces, that war is not going to pay off, that war is over and over again. But fundamentally they have to send a message that they are willing to pay the price, that they are going to produce an army capable of putting these guerrillas on the
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I believe and worked extraordinarily hard to achieve the end of drugs in America by stopping drug production in South America, Colombia, for well over 20 years, has been the primary source of cocaine for this country. They remain so. In fact, cocaine production in Colombia has exploded. It has more than doubled in the last 3 years. It is a dramatic increase. That is a concern of ours.

I believe we can. I believe Colombia can, make some progress in reducing that supply. My best judgment tells me that after years of experience and observation, this Nation is not going to solve its drug problem by getting other countries in South America to reduce their production. In fact, an ounce of cocaine sells in the United States for maybe $150. The cost of the coca leaf utilized in the production is about 30 cents. Farmers in South America are making a lot of money producing coca at 30 cents for those leaves. They could pay them $2, $3, $4, 10 times what they are paying now for coca leaf, and these farmers would yield to the temptation and produce coca.

I do not believe this market of illegal cocaine is going to be eliminated from our country by efforts to shut off production in South America. The reason countries need to shut off the production of cocaine—and Bolivia and Peru have made progress in that regard—is to preserve the integrity of their own country. They do not want to allow illegal Mafia-type drug cartels to gain wealth and power to destabilize their countries in democracy and turn it into chaos and violence as has so often occurred. They have a sincere interest in achieving that goal, but that interest has to be understood to be primarily their own.

This administration refuses to talk about the real situation in Colombia. It refuses to be honest with the American people. Their foreign policy request was $1.6 billion. That has been approved in the House. This bill wisely reduces that. I believe, to a little less than $1 billion. They are requesting this much money to make a government that our Nation, the President, and the Secretary of State will not assert to be fighting against the guerrillas. I believe that is wrong. I think we need to be more clear eyed, more honest about our foreign policy. I believe that would be the healthy approach. It will help the American people to understand exactly what their money is being spent for. It will help them to understand what our goals are in the region. It will help them to understand whether or not we are achieving those goals.

If we do so correctly, we could utilize this money to inspire President Pastrana and the people of Colombia to rise up, take back their country, to preserve their democracy, take back their territory from those who don’t believe in democratic elections, who kidnap, kidnap protect drug dealers, who rob and steal. That is what is going on.

We can do something about it. We have an opportunity to utilize the wealth of this country to encourage that kind of end result. If we do so, it would be a magnificent thing for the country. To say we will spend $1 or $2 billion in Colombia, give it to a country we don’t even support in their efforts to take back their territory, is typical of the kind of disingenuousness that has characterized this administration’s foreign policy. It is not healthy. It should not be done.

Therefore, I have offered a simple amendment that will say one thing: Mr. President, you can spend this money, but you have to publicly state and assert and certify to this Congress that you support the duly elected Government of Colombia in their efforts against the Marxist, drug dealing insurgents who are bent on destroying democracy.

This is more important than many know. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for allowing me to have this time, and more than that, for his leadership on a foreign operations bill that protects the interests of the United States. It is frugal, as frugal can be in this day and age. He has done his best to contain excessive spending and has improved and reduced this spending bill. I appreciate his leadership.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank my friend from Alabama. We look forward to dealing with his amendment.

In that regard, the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECKER, has an amendment related to cooperation with Cuba on drug interdiction that he would like to have considered after the Sessions amendment is disposed of tomorrow.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Sessions). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the pending Sessions amendment be set aside so I can offer an amendment for consideration at this time.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3493

(Purpose: To make available funds for India)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.
The President has national security waiver authority for military-related sanctions, but we are not dealing with military-related sanctions. He has authority to waive the prohibition on sales of defense articles, but we are not doing that here. We are not dealing with defense services, foreign military financing, or dual-use technologies.

If the administration really wants to get to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty with India and say we want to force you to sign the CTBT, wouldn’t it be better to use the military set of sanctions rather than economic sanctions that the administration is currently using? Plus, if you think about the current piece of legislation, is it likely we are going to force India, by economic sanctions, to sign CTBT? They are a democracy. How will their people react if their leaders are seen as capitulating to U.S. economic pressure to sign something their leaders are saying they needed to do? Is that a way we are actually going to be able to force India to do this? I think not.

Plus, this is a much bigger country with much broader issues than simply the U.S. issue of CTBT. We have a broad array of issues with India. We need to grow this relationship rapidly. To hold the entire relationship hostage to one issue is bad foreign policy on our part. It is hurting us. I think it will hurt India and hurt our ability to shape things in that part of the world.

I was hopeful that during the President’s recent trip to India, he would use that chance to remove the economic sanctions on India. He was there for a number of days and had the opportunity to do that. It would help set up the atmosphere for a more aggressive, broad-based relationship with India. This was a way to leapfrog this relationship forward. This trip did improve relations with India, but he could have done so much more that he failed to do.

I ask unanimous consent to have this amendment printed in the Record.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Brownback] proposes an amendment numbered 3493.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 11432. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR INDIA.

Funds appropriated by this Act (other than funds appropriated under the heading “Foreign Military Financing Program”) may not apply to India.

My amendment is simple. It would suspend economic sanctions against India—suspend them. While we provided the administration with the waiver authority so they could do it, they, by this amendment, would be levying these economic sanctions against India.

I want to say as well what this amendment does not do. My amendment does not suspend any military or dual-use technology assistance to India. The President has national security waiver authority for military-related sanctions, but we are not dealing with military-related sanctions. He has authority to waive the prohibition on sales of defense articles, but we are not doing that here. We are not dealing with defense services, foreign military financing, or dual-use technologies.

If the administration really wants to get to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty with India and say we want to force you to sign the CTBT, wouldn’t it be better to use the military set of sanctions rather than economic sanctions that the administration is currently using? Plus, if you think about the current piece of legislation, is it likely we are going to force India, by economic sanctions, to sign CTBT? They are a democracy. How will their people react if their leaders are seen as capitulating to U.S. economic pressure to sign something their leaders are saying they needed to do? Is that a way we are actually going to be able to force India to do this? I think not.

Plus, this is a much bigger country with much broader issues than simply the U.S. issue of CTBT. We have a broad array of issues with India. We need to grow this relationship rapidly. To hold the entire relationship hostage to one issue is bad foreign policy on our part. It is hurting us. I think it will hurt India and hurt our ability to shape things in that part of the world.

I was hopeful that during the President’s recent trip to India, he would use that chance to remove the economic sanctions on India. He was there for a number of days and had the opportunity to do that. It would help set up the atmosphere for a more aggressive, broad-based relationship with India. This was a way to leapfrog this relationship forward. This trip did improve relations with India, but he could have done so much more that he failed to do.

I ask unanimous consent to have this amendment printed in the Record.

There is an amendment about lifting economic sanctions on India. The United States should not do that. Yet the Clinton-Gore administration continues to hold up international financial institution loans which are destined for infrastructure projects which would help sustain the economic activities in rural areas where the bulk of India’s poor population lives. More than a third of India’s population lives in poverty today. U.S. opposition to development loans to India is a direct threat to the future of India. That is not the way to improve U.S.-India relations. These loans are being held up by the administration until India signs the CTBT.

The President of the United States has more appropriate carrots, as I mentioned at the outset, particularly in the non-economic area, and particularly those associated with military functions, which could be used rather than these sanctions which hit the poorest people in India. Nuclear proliferation is a vitally important issue, but it should not be the only issue on which we deal with a country such as India, the largest democracy in the world. There are even recent newspapers reporting that I want to submit for the Record about the development of nuclear material. This was in a newspaper in Japan, about North Korea’s secret underground facility producing uranium for use in its weapons programs. These are weapons programs. They are the largest proliferator around the world.

There should be better economic sanctions on India, period. The United States should not do that. Yet the Clinton-Gore administration continues to hold up international financial institution loans which are destined for infrastructure projects which would help sustain the economic activities in rural areas where the bulk of India’s poor population lives. More than a third of India’s population lives in poverty today. U.S. opposition to development loans to India is a direct threat to the future of India. That is not the way to improve U.S.-India relations. These loans are being held up by the administration until India signs the CTBT.
SANKI SHIMBUN: DPRK SECRET UNDERGROUND FACILITY PRODUCING URANIUM

(SEOUL, 8 June.—North Korea has reportedly utilized natural uranium produced in the country for its nuclear weapons development program. Meanwhile, Sanki Shimbun has obtained a detailed report on North Korea’s secret underground uranium and its material production procedures. The secret underground plant is widely called “Mt. Chonma” and located at Mt. Chonma in North Pyongan Province. North Korea has operated the plant in secret since the end of 1989 for uranium production for the nuclear weapons program, the report said.

EX-MILITARY OFFICIAL WHO FLED TO CHINA UNVEILS EXISTENCE OF PLANT

The report was drawn up based on statements made by high-ranking defector Yi Chun-song [name as transliterated], 66, during interrogation by Chinese authorities. Yi is former vice director of the operation bureau of the Korean Ministry of People’s Armed Forces who served as commander in chief at a missile station. He fled from North Korea to China last year and was held in Chinese authorities’ custody. The report said that the “Mt. Chonma facility” has a uranium refining capacity of 1.3 grams a day. By simple calculation, the production during the past 10 years of operation would amount to approximately 5 kg. Concerning North Korea’s uranium production plants, there are some unconfirmed information indicating plants in Pakchon in Pyongan, but this is the first time that an accurate location and details of the inside of the facility were unveiled.

According to the report, the “Mt. Chonma facility” is built in a large tunnel under the 1,116-meter mountain. Soldiers of the 2nd Division of the Engineering Bureau of the Ministry of People’s Armed Forces started constructing the facility in 1984 and completed the work in 1986. The uranium-producing operations started in 1989.

Approximately 400 people, including 35 engineers and 100 managers, are working at the plant. The rest are physical laborers who were all released on parole as long as they agreed to live in prison. The uranium minerals are brought into the facility from mines in Songchon, South Pyongan Province, and Sohung, North Hwanghae Province, by the transportation unit of the Ministry of People’s Armed Forces.

The report said that the arched entrance of the tunnel is 7 meters wide and 6 meters high. A pathway of about 2.5 km is connected to the entrance, and there is a corner at the end of the pathway. Turning and going along the path about 1 km, you will find a 6-km-long main tunnel with a width of 15 meters and height of 6 meters. The inside of the tunnels is covered by aluminum plates, and there are 3-meter-wide drains and ventilation openings there.

The underground plant is comprised of 10 areas—two concentration grounds measuring 3,000 square meters each, a drying room of 400 square meters, four 400-square-meter-wide dissolusion rooms for uranium extraction and refining, a room for packing uranium into containers, storage for the finished products, and a room where the workers change into anti-radiation suit or take anti-radiation suit or take

The inside surface of the tunnels is covered with water discharges from the Chonma facility, the United States could not detect the Chonma plant despite the technical team’s inspections in Kumchangri.

According to Yi’s career record attached to the report, Yi graduated from P’yongyang University of Technology, and studied at Frunze (now Bishkek) military university of the former USSR from 1958 to 1962. A South Korean source said that Yi attempted to defect to a third country after fleeing to China, but it is highly likely that he was sent back to North Korea by Chinese authorities.

Mr. BROWNBACK. The U.S. has real, legitimate political and economic security interests with India. We need to engage with India on issues as soon as possible. In fact, seizing the opportunity we have to build greater ties should be one of our main foreign policy goals. That is one that is not talking place. We are, after all, the two most populous nations in the world. Our relationship should be based on shared values and institutions, economic collaboration including enhanced trade and investment, and the goal of regional stability across Asia.

I ask the President and other Members to take into consideration how we treat India versus China as well. In China, we are on a very aggressive relationship economically. We will be considering later in this body normalizing economic collaboration including enhanced trade and investment, and the goal of regional stability across Asia.

Moreover, economic sanctions which serve only to impede the development of this relationship. Maintaining economic sanctions on India which affect the poorest parts of the country is not the way to go about this.

The Prime Minister of India, I understand, will be in Washington this fall. I believe it is incumbent upon us to lift these sanctions, and if the administration will not do it, which they have shown to date they will not, then we should.

AMENDMENT NO. 3983 WITHDRAWN

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I understand there is a rule XVI problem with the amendment I have put forward. While I would dearly want to have a vote on the amendment on this bill, I understand it will be a problem.

Therefore, reluctantly and regretfully I ask that the body should take up this issue, I withdraw my amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for his remarks, to which I listened carefully. He made a number of very important points.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for a limited amount of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SENATOR ENZI’S 100TH PRESIDING HOUR

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today I have the pleasure to announce that