

In recent statements to Congressional committees, members of the administration have counseled that America stay the course and continue importing cheap foreign imports at record levels. But this policy is unsustainable. The U.S. cannot continue as an oasis of prosperity while the rest of the world experiences economic depression of a magnitude in some countries that greatly overshadows our own Great Depression of the 1930's.

The extent of the economic crisis around the world is so great that even if the United States doubles its record trade deficit, it will not be enough to pull the rest of the world out of its troubles, but it will be enough to send thousands and thousands more Americans out of work and send the United States into a recession.

That is why we are here today, Mr. Speaker, to step into the breach by proposing the Visclosky-Quinn-Kucinich-Ney steel quota bill. Our bill will impose limitations on the imports of cheap foreign steel at levels not to exceed the average volume of steel products that was imported monthly during the three years before the recent import surge began in July 1997. Our bill is the only action that will directly confront the major cause of layoffs in the steel industry. Our bill is America's best hope in averting an economic crisis of our own.

It is time to stand up for American steel workers. It is time to stand up for America's future. We cannot have a free nation if we let our manufacturing base fall apart, and that is what our trade policy is doing.

#### NO PARDON FOR POLLARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 16, expressing the sense of Congress that Jonathan J. Pollard should serve his full sentence and not receive any presidential pardon for his crime of espionage.

Jonathan Pollard was a civilian employee at the Department of the Navy from September 1979 until November 1985. He had access to classified documents and information and began making those documents available to Israeli intelligence officers in 1984. When he was arrested, by his own estimate, Pollard had given the Israelis enough documents to fill some 360 cubic feet. In 1987, he pled guilty and was sentenced to life in prison.

The President has twice rejected release for Pollard, in 1994 and again in 1996. In fact, the White House press statement in 1996 found that, "The enormity of Mr. Pollard's offenses, his lack of remorse, the damage done to our national security and the need for

general deterrence in the continuing threat to national security that he posed made the original sentence imposed by the court warranted."

Of course, nothing has changed. Pollard remains unrepentant, and the damage to national security has not paled with the passage of time. But something must have changed, at least in the mind of the Clinton White House.

In October 1998 President Clinton acceded to the request of the Israeli prime minister to review Pollard's sentence. The answer should have been a polite but a firm "no." But, instead, the President agreed to a review.

On January 11, the relevant executive agencies were to report back on the virtues of releasing Pollard. Not surprisingly, the director of the CIA, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense and the director of the FBI were unanimous in opposing any pardon for Pollard.

The position of the Department of Justice has been less clear. Attorney General Janet Reno has delayed in offering an opinion to the President in the case pending a meeting with the prominent Jewish figures who support Pollard's release. The AG's office could not confirm for me yesterday whether such a meeting had taken place, nor could they offer any date when any legal opinion on Pollard's release may be offered.

To me, this seems like a clear case for the Department of Justice. But apparently they require more extensive deliberations than our national security agencies are capable of providing.

But what deliberation is really needed? Press accounts have given us some indication of how damaging Pollard's betrayal really was. He didn't just give away intelligence estimates, he also betrayed sources and methods, the very capabilities that make sound intelligence estimates possible.

Revealing how our intelligence services learn secrets is extremely damaging, because it provides opportunities for our targets to hide assets and plant misinformation, negating the very capabilities we spend billions of taxpayer dollars over the years to develop and maintain.

Of course, Pollard is now claiming that he never intended to spy against the United States. He claims that his espionage efforts were motivated by a noble concern for the State of Israel and a desire to avoid a return of the Yom Kippur War.

He says, very charitably, that the money he was paid, more than \$50,000, did not motivate his spying, and that he intended to repay it all, and he suggests that because Israel is an ally of the United States, his sentence should be reduced, as if spying for a friend is a lesser evil than spying for an enemy.

□ 1300

Of course, this logic also ignores the suggestions in the public record that much of what Pollard provided to

Israel may have ended up in the hands of the Soviet Union. Then there is the issue of his willingness to provide information to countries in addition to Israel.

It is important to point out that even though Pollard is now eligible for parole, he has not chosen to apply. All of the public deliberations on Pollard are occurring without his having even sought release.

The granting of pardons is a constitutional power reserved for the President of the United States, but that does not mean that Congress is obliged to sit by quietly as this decision is made. Two weeks ago, 60 Senators from the United States Senate sent a letter to the President urging that Pollard not be set free. House Concurrent Resolution 16 similarly will allow the House of Representatives to go on record opposing any pardon, reprieve, or any other form of executive clemency for Mr. Pollard. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has also introduced a resolution opposing a pardon, and I encourage all Members to join us as cosponsors of both resolutions. This betrayal of U.S. national security must not be rewarded with a presidential pardon.

Last week, two Americans were convicted of spying for East Germany throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Releasing Pollard now suggests that when the political price is right, we are willing to look the other way on espionage. Pollard's betrayal of U.S. national security must not be rewarded with a Presidential pardon and I hope Members will join as cosponsors to H. Con. Res. 16.

#### NO NEW INITIATIVES YIELDS EMPTY PROMISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of comments about this steel dumping issue, and it continues to amaze me how we debate this issue on a lot of sophisticated, philosophical grounds when it is basically a very simple issue. A number of foreign countries are invading our marketplace with illegal criminal trade practices.

The White House, it was rumored, was going to come out with a response and that response, they said, would include no new initiatives. Well, that rumor is true. The White House response includes absolutely no new initiatives.

So let us go over just briefly the old initiatives that we will, as diplomats and bureaucrats, sit down with the Japanese, the Russians, the Brazilians, the South Koreans, and we will ask them to please stop violating our laws. We are going to ask them to make another promise, another promise. And I can remember Richard Nixon and every President up to and including President Clinton who threatened Japan

with sanctions, just Japan alone, if they did not open up their markets. Now, every President in our recent history threatened Japan, and evidently, every time Japan responded with a promise, they broke it. They broke it.

Now, what is this policy? It is like putting a kid in a candy store and telling him, you cannot touch, you cannot smell and certainly you cannot eat anything here, but we want you to run free in this candy store and take a look at all of the goodies here, folks.

I have submitted a bill I think is right to the point. They say it has no shot, but I know the Trade Representative is negotiating with it right now. And what they are saying is, and I can almost give my colleagues the words: Do we want such a dramatic action? Shape up, or the House may even ban illegal dumping. And it is not an outright ban, it is a 90-day ban, and it is the only thing that will stop this hemorrhaging. If the wound is open and one is hemorrhaging, one must stop the hemorrhaging. That is the bottom line.

This administration and no administration in the last 25 years will support import quotas. So what will it be? Voluntary restraint agreements? Side-bar agreements? Unbelievable to me.

One other aspect of this thing that really bothers me, and it should bother my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), whose voice is needed on this issue, and that is the White House wants to give some tax relief to American steel companies. Now, I think that is great, and I would like to see some relief for our industry. But quite frankly, I have to oppose this, because that tax relief will be coming from American taxpayers, many of them laid off and fired steelworkers, downsized, whose taxes are going to go to help American industry that is being ripped off by foreign ingrates. Beam me up here. Is there any balsam left? We give foreign aid to Brazil and Russia. We give open markets to South Korea and Japan, and they kick us right in the crotch, and that is the bottom line.

I am hoping this House schedules for debate a 90-day temporary ban, and quite frankly, Scarlet, I do not give a damn what the final agreement is that is worked out after that ban. Because I guarantee my colleagues this: As soon as the shock waves come from that ban, they will all be sitting at the table and they will be machining those pencils and within 7 days this problem will be worked out. I am absolutely convinced of that.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, it is not only the steel industry. Farmers are getting as low as 7 cents a pound live weight for hogs in America. We are exporting 40,000 and importing a half a million hogs. Agriculture, steel, huge trade imbalances. A paper tiger stock market. No one is listening, no one is looking, and we are going to ask for more promises. I say it is time to stop the promises and promulgate some plan.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members that they should refrain from using profanity in the House Chamber.

#### BIENNIAL BUDGET AND CONCEALED WEAPONS RECIPROCITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of what I consider to be two significant bills for the American people regarding the budget process here in Congress, and allowing law abiding citizens to carry concealed weapons outside of their home States.

The first bill I will be introducing is a companion bill to what has already been introduced by Senator DOMENICI to establish a biennial budget happening every two years and a biennial appropriation process. The Biennial Budgeting and Appropriations Act would fundamentally change how Washington and the Congress operates. It would be a change for the better in dealing with the Nation's fiscal matters. This bill would establish a two-year budget process and appropriations process for Congress.

The fundamental importance of this bill is that it removes politics from the budget process. The first session of Congress would be dedicated to passing a budget and the 13 appropriations bills. Establishing this method would free the Congress from the nastiest budget and appropriations fights during national election years.

I was greatly dismayed last year watching the outcome of the budget negotiations between the congressional leadership and the White House, where both sides agreed to spend as much of the budget surplus as they could. The administration was able to use, once again, the threat of a government shutdown in order to extract billions of dollars in extra spending for political gain. The American taxpayer deserves to be better treated than last year's cop-out on sticking to our budget priorities. I voted against that monster budget last year.

The second congressional session could then be dedicated for authorizing bills which are greatly needed and which are greatly bypassed, in our day and age, for general government oversight and for other important legislative priorities.

In addition, the second session would be used for any true, necessary emergency spending bills which would have to be dealt with in the appropriate spring months of an election year to avoid political manipulation. Since 1950, Congress has only twice met the fiscal year deadline for completion of all 13 individual appropriations bills. In the 22-year history of the Budget Act,

Congress has met the statutory deadline to complete a budget resolution just three times.

A biennial budget would at least reduce the rushed atmosphere of budgeting and appropriating during an election process. In addition, Senator DOMENICI asked 50 Federal agencies about a biennial budget. Thirty-seven agencies supported the idea, and not one Federal agency opposed it. These agencies responded that this process would actually save the Federal Government money, because it would reduce the burden on their operations of having to annually seek budget authority and appropriations.

Senator DOMENICI introduced a similar bipartisan bill in the last Congress and enjoyed cosponsorship of 36 U.S. Senators, including Minority Leader DASCHLE, Senators FEINGOLD, MOYNIHAN, BREAUX and other Republican Senators, including MCCAIN, NICKLES, and ROTH. The current bill already has 26 Senate cosponsors, and it appears that it will sail through the Senate. Therefore, I urge my colleagues that have interest in this matter to work together and to consider this proposal and to be a cosponsor.

The second bill, Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing is my concealed weapons reciprocity bill that I had introduced in the 105th Congress, which was cosponsored by 75 Members of the House. My bill would allow the citizens of every State the right to carry a concealed weapon across State lines into any State or Territory of our Nation. My bill creates a national standard for the carrying of certain concealed firearms by nonresidents of those States.

Every citizen, in order to carry a concealed firearm across State lines, would have to be properly licensed for carrying a concealed weapon in their home State and would have to obey the concealed weapons laws of the State they are entering. If the State they are entering does not have a concealed weapons law, the national standard provisions in this legislation would dictate the rules in which a concealed weapon would have to be maintained. For instance, the national standard disallows the carrying of a concealed weapon in a school, police station or a bar serving alcoholic beverages.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, my legislation exempts qualified former and current law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed handguns.

Mr. Speaker, again, these two pieces of legislation are very important. If Members of the House are interested in cosponsoring either of these bills, I urge that they contact my office.

#### KEN STARR'S MEDDLING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized during morning hour debates for 3 minutes.