Millions of people have survived civil unrest, famine and other disasters because of a project called Food-for-Life which makes emergency operations the primary focus of the World Food Program. Other projects include Food-for-Work which uses food as a tool to encourage people to work within their communities in order to become self reliant and Food-for-Growth which distributes food aid at schools, clinics and hospitals to help children and pregnant women.

I am proud to say that Judy Lewis, a native of Scott County, Mississippi, and past Director of Organization of my 1978 campaign staff, has been named the World Food Program's Country Director for Ethiopia. Since 1992, Ms. Lewis has many times endured dangerous conditions to participate first-hand in helping to bring food to starving people whose lives were threatened by natural disasters or armed conflicts. She has played a key role in many of the World Food Program's biggest emergency and development projects around the world in places like Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Somalia. As Country Director for Ethiopia, Ms. Lewis will be managing a $30 million emergency and development operation aiming to help over 800,000 people, focusing on refugees, famine relief and urban poverty.

I commend Ms. Lewis for her strength and diligence. And I congratulate the World Food Program for all of its good work.●

$RENO_X$ '98

● Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce today the release of findings from an important environmental conference held in my home State this summer. $RENO_X$ '98 gathered together experts from across the country to focus on the issue of oxides of nitrogen (NO_X) pollution. NO_X is a hazardous pollutant that is produced primarily by internal combustion engines and power generation boilers and furnaces.

In 1996, more than 23 million tons of NO_X were released into the atmosphere in the U.S. alone. NO_X is a key component in the formation of ground-level ozone and urban smog. The health effects of ground-level ozone are well-documented. It contributes to respiratory diseases that cause premature death. It is harmful to children who play actively outdoors and damages agricultural crops and natural vegetation.

$RENO_X$ '98 explored all of these effects and identified strategies and solution for the control of NO_X pollution. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has some NO_X reduction programs under way in both the transportation and power generation sectors. However, one of the messages of $RENO_X$ '98 is that more needs to be done and it needs to be done more quickly if we are to make our cities more livable for children and the elderly, who are the most vulnerable to the effects of NO_X emissions.

For these reasons, I hope that all Members of the Senate and their staff will take some time to read the copy of the $RENO_X$ '98 proceedings that was mailed to each office last week. After reading it, I believe you will see the urgency of this issue. I know the Gunnerman Foundation, the lead sponsor of $RENO_X$ '98 intends to aggressively pursue legislation and policy changes that will make NO_X emissions reductions a higher national priority. Dr. Jack Gibbons, formerly Science Advisory to the President and one of the keynote speakers and $RENO_X$ '98, said: ''We must move the NO_X problem, which has languished, toward the front of the line.''

This is an issue worthy of our attention and I urge you to give it a closer look.●

NATIONAL DAY FOR THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON TAIWAN

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as Americans prepare to celebrate Columbus Day, I notice that there are other celebrations going on around Washington, including ''National Day'' celebrations in Chinatown. October 10, 1998 marks the 87th anniversary of the founding of modern China. This is a very special day for Chinese people around the world, and especially in Taiwan where October 10 is celebrated as National Day in the Republic of China on Taiwan.

Dr. Sun Yat-sen is the father of modern China, and is widely regarded and revered both in mainland China and in Taiwan. On October 10, 1911, Dr. Sun's Revolutionary Alliance succeeded in putting an end to imperial rule in China, a date which also marked the formal planting of the seeds of democracy which continue to flourish in Taiwan today.

People often speculate as to the real reasons for the ''Taiwan Miracle'' and how Taiwan continues to defy the odds today; how this island nation continues to expand economically when nations all around her are at an economic standstill or contracting; and they speculate as to how Taiwan not only survives politically, but how she has evolved into such a strong democracy despite the pressures by the People's Republic of China (PRC) to isolate her from the international community.

While there is no easy answer to this question, Taiwan is a flourishing and successful society in every sense of the word, and is a source of optimism in an increasingly uncertain world. In this light, it gives me particularly great pleasure to wish everyone on Taiwan, and Chinese people around the world, a very special October 10 National Day. And so to all of you, congratulations.●

THE DRUG CURRENCY FORFEITURES ACT

● Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, Mark Twain once said, ''Get your facts first, and then you can distort them as much as you please.'' There has been some distortion and misinformation about my bill, the Drug Currency Forfeitures Act, and I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the facts.

First of all, the purpose of my bill is to dismantle the fortunes of drug traffickers by helping law enforcement seize their drug profits. It is all about confiscating the money of drug dealers, drug traffickers, and drug kingpins. It is NOT about seizing the money of innocent, law-abiding citizens, as some have charged. Confiscating the money of innocent citizens violates the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution, and I would oppose such an attempt with every effort at my command. That is why this legislation includes constitutional safeguards which protect innocent Americans against illegal searches and seizures.

Mr. President, let me tell you why I introduced my bill. There have been a recent series of court cases which have handed down some very disturbing verdicts. In each case, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, the court ruled against seizing the assets of drug traffickers—one of our most effective weapons in the war against drugs. Let me give you just one example.

A traveler was stopped in an airport carrying almost $14,000 in cash. A trained drug dog responded positively to the presence of drugs on the money. When asked for an explanation, the drug courier produced a fake ID and lied about the money's source. He also had a previous drug arrest on his record. Yet despite the evidence, the court gave the money back to the trafficker. Why? The court ruled there was sufficient evidence to show that the money came from some kind of criminal activity. But the court held there was insufficient evidence to prove that the crime was drug trafficking. United States v. $13,570.00 in U.S. Currency, 1997 WL 722947 (E.D. La. 1997).

Every year drug sales in this country generate $60 billion in drug profits. Every day drug couriers move huge quantities of this multi-billion-dollar pot out of the U.S. in loads big enough to fill suitcases, trucks, and even airplanes. This movement of drug kingpins' cash crop is the most vulnerable part of their drug operation. Yet current law allows the drug trafficker and his couriers to say nothing at all when their money is seized. That's right, Mr. President. Under the law, the drug trafficker is obliged to give no explanation at all as to where his money came from. If the government can only show that the money was involved in a crime—but can't show that it was a drug crime—the drug dealer gets his money back.

My legislation proposes a presumption that the money is drug proceeds if certain clearly defined circumstances are present—circumstances which typically are found in drug trafficking cases: the presence of drugs or drug residue; a positive alert by a properly

trained dog; packaging of the money in a suspicious and highly unusual manner; false statements made to the police; previous drug trafficking convictions.

Let me take just a moment, Mr. President, to answer those critics who discount the positive alert by a properly trained dog. These critics say that so much of our currency is tainted with drug residue that a positive dog alert is meaningless. Yet these critics fail to take into account the scientific evidence that shows that the drug dogs are NOT alerting to the presence of cocaine—which may or may not contaminate a large fraction of all U.S. currency. Instead, the scientific evidence shows that the dogs are alerting to methyl benzoate, a highly volatile chemical by-product of the cocaine manufacturing process that remains on the currency only for a short period of time. The bottom line is that the dogs are alerting only to money that has recently, or just before packaging, been in close proximity to a significant amount of cocaine. This research explains why these dogs do not routinely alert to currency.

To repeat: These clearly defined circumstances in my bill are safeguards to protect the innocent. More important, my bill establishes only a presumption that the money is drug money. Individuals have every opportunity to rebut the government's claim and get their money back. Criminals, however, will no longer be able to play dumb and recover their drug money without having to provide an explanation of where that money came from.

To those critics who maintain that my bill violates the rights of innocent citizens, let me say loud and clear: My bill takes effect only AFTER a determination has been made that the money in question is from an illegal source. This is how the process works.

A police officer or federal agent assigned to an airport task force seizes the money of a traveler based on ''probable cause.'' The traveler, for example, has exhibited suspicious, counter-surveillance behavior, such as signaling to seemingly unrelated travelers who, in fact, are traveling with him. He has concealed a large quantity of money in his carry-on bag along with odor-disguising items like fabric softener sheets to throw off the drug dog. He produces a fake ID and offers a false explanation for the money. Someone whose name he doesn't remember packed the bag, and he had no idea there was any money in it.

Let me repeat: There must be probable cause for the government to seize the money. Once the money is seized, notice of the seizure must be published in the newspaper on three successive weeks and direct notice must be given, in writing, to the person from whom the money was seized as well as to any other person known to have a potential legal interest. The notice explains the procedure for filing a claim to the money. In 85 percent of all federal cases, no one files a claim. To my critics, let me repeat: In 85 percent of the cases, the individual never contests the seizure.

If an individual does file a claim, the agency which has seized the money must refer the case to the United States Attorney, who then makes an independent determination of the merits of the case. If the U.S. Attorney does not believe the government can establish that the money was drug proceeds, the case is rejected and the money is returned. On the other hand, if the U.S. Attorney believes the case has merit, he or she must file a civil forfeiture complaint in federal district court. The claimant is granted a certain number of days to renew his claim and file an answer to the government's complaint.

The case is then litigated in the district court. In each and every case, the burden of proof is on the government. In each and every case, the government has the burden of establishing—to the satisfaction of the district court—that there is probable cause to believe that the money is drug money and therefore subject to forfeiture. Only if the government successfully overcomes this hurdle is the case scheduled for a jury trial where the claimant is required to offer his explanation for the legitimate source of the money. If the jury accepts this explanation, and the government is unable to rebut it with admissible evidence, the claimant will prevail and will recover the money. Otherwise, the court will enter judgment for the government and order the forfeiture of the money.

Mr. President, the federal forfeiture laws are carefully written to provide due process to the innocent and the guilty alike. My bill conforms to these high standards while closing a legal loophole that benefits only the guilty. In the court cases which my bill addresses, the cases are dismissed before the claimant ever has to go before a jury to explain the source of the money. My bill addresses this problem by creating a presumption that if certain factors are present, the money is drug proceeds, and thereby allows the case to move forward to the next stage.

To those who have expressed concern with the concept of rebuttable presumption, let me emphasize this fact: The presumption does not lead inevitably to the forfeiture of the money. Its role is only to force the claimant to come forward with an explanation for a legitimate source of the money. Therefore, my bill in no way infringes upon a property owner's rights under law.

To those who have expressed concern over the possible impact of my bill, let me cite these facts. In fiscal year 1995—a time period prior to most of the court decisions which have limited the use of drug asset seizures—the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service made 35,000 seizures of forfeitable property. Of the 35,000 cases, more than 85 percent were uncontested. Of the 5,250 contested cases, the U.S. Attorney declined to prosecute 3,057. Of the 2,193 complaints filed, the government lost in only 48 cases. These statistics are similar for the prior three years. There is therefore little evidence of actual abuses of drug asset forfeitures in the past, and there is even less likelihood of such abuses under the enhanced safeguards in my proposal.

In closing, let me state once again: The Drug Currency Forfeitures Act goes after drug money only. Drug trafficking is a business, and drug traffickers are in this business for one reason—money. Their multi-billion-dollar war chests allow drug lords to have some of the world's most sophisticated airplanes, boats, and communications equipment. Because of their war chests, drug cartels possess weapons in quantities that rival the capabilities of some legitimate governments. If we want to make our streets safer, if we hope to make our children's lives drug-free, it is not enough just to apprehend the drug trafficker. Throw the drug kingpin in jail, and he continues his drug operations from behind prison walls. As evidence, just look at the leaders of the most powerful international organized crime group in history—Colombia's notorious Cali cartel. Even now, the Rodriguez-Orejuela brothers are able to run their drug trafficking business from prison through the use of private quarters and telephones.

Critics of my proposal talk about the need to protect innocent victims. If we want to talk about innocent victims, look at the children who are being sold drugs at increasingly younger ages. Mr. President, I'm proud to be the sponsor of the Drug Currency Forfeitures Act. It hits the drug cartels where it hurts the most—their wallets. The ability of law enforcement to confiscate drug money hinges on the government's ability to prove that the money is drug proceeds, and not the proceeds of some other form of unlawful activity.

My bill is endorsed by the Fraternal Order of Police, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association. The Drug Currency Forfeitures Act closes a legal loophole that benefits only the guilty. At the same time, it upholds the Constitution's Fourth Amendment, which protects the innocent against unlawful searches and seizures. I worked very closely with the Department of Justice in crafting this legislation. It is a positive—and needed—step forward, and at the appropriate time I urge my colleagues to support this measure.●

SENATE QUARTERLY MAIL COSTS—THIRD QUARTER

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, in accordance with section 318 of Public Law 101–510 as amended by Public Law 103–283, I am submitting the frank mail allocations made to each Senator from