

jobs lost to many of those at the lowest end of the economic spectrum. We must do much more to assist those who need skills and training in order to get new, better-paying jobs, and we must ensure full and real opportunities for all the children in our country. That is central to our task so that we can be a beacon to China and the world and use our policy of engagement to its fullest.

The question before us today is what are the best and most appropriate means to achieve our goals. The most effective way to bring about improvements in human rights and political and religious freedoms in China is through continued engagement with the Chinese government and increased contacts with the Chinese people about our way of life. Withdrawal and ceasing to do business with China by removal of NTR status will harm, not improve, the situation.

We must also remember that history has shown that using trade as a weapon can work only if there is a consensus among our trading partners that we will work collectively and apply similar policies. I led the fight on trade with South Africa, but the effectiveness of that effort depended on the participation of numerous other countries. By contrast, in the case of our embargo against Cuba, we stand alone. The failure of this outdated and misguided policy has proven that our unilateral trade sanctions do nothing to advance our objectives and only give our foreign competitors an advantage.

Too many other countries are ready and willing to fill the vacuum we would leave in the huge Chinese market as a consequence of withdrawal of NTR status. We would merely lose exports and the jobs they create. As also shown by our experience with Cuba, punishing a country through trade does not help the cause of democracy or promote fundamental freedoms. Isolationist policies do not promote the free exchange of ideas. Isolationist policies do not bring leaders to the negotiating table. What isolationist policies do is further separate people.

We should also not forget that the benefits of trade—of engaging fully in the global marketplace, including through trade with China—are considerable for our country. Jobs supported by exports pay 13 percent more than the average U.S. job, and the number of export-related jobs in the U.S. grew four times faster than overall private job growth from 1986–1994. U.S. exports to China have almost tripled since 1990, increasing steadily in nearly every year, and trade with China supports over 200,000 export-related jobs. Market access provisions in a WTO accession agreement with China would further open Chinese markets to U.S. products and services.

The United States must not withdraw from the world economy of the next century—a world economy that will be built increasingly on trade, trade and more trade. Our country's economic future will largely rest on educating and training our young people for the world economy of the 21st century—not by turning away from the reality of trade's benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no to this resolution. Continuing dialogue and interchange with China, I truly believe, is the more rationale and better course of action than terminating the discussion.

INTRODUCTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT TRUST AND INTEGRITY ACT OF 1999

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1999

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act of 1999, along with additional cosponsors. This legislation adopts a new approach to the dilemma of police misconduct. Rather than focusing on episodic incidents, this legislation targets hiring and management protocols much farther up the chain of causation that can stop incidents of misconduct long before they occur. Moreover, this bill focuses on the long-term improvement of the law enforcement profession. Further, it strengthens our federal prosecutorial tools with demonstrated effectiveness at sanctioning misconduct. This bill seizes upon the opportunity to initiate reforms that would restore public trust and accountability to law enforcement.

This legislation provides a direct contrast to other proposals that merely provide, without any selection criteria or performance benchmarks, a select number of police organizations more money—proposals which have been widely criticized by the Administration, civil rights group and even law enforcement organizations.

Our bill makes seven concrete steps toward improving law enforcement management and misconduct prosecution tools and has the support of a broad range of groups, from the NAACP to the Southern States Police Benevolent Association:

1. Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies—The bill requires the Justice Department to recommend additional areas for the development of national standards for accreditation of law enforcement agencies in conjunction with professional law enforcement accreditation organizations, principally the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (“CALEA”). The bill further authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to law enforcement agencies for the purpose of obtaining accreditation from CALEA.

2. Law Enforcement Agency Development Programs—The bill authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to States, units of local government, Indian Tribal Governments, or other public and private entities, and multi-jurisdictional or regional consortia to study law enforcement agency operations and to develop pilot programs focused on effective training, recruitment, hiring, management and oversight of law enforcement officers which would provide focused data for the CALEA standards promulgation process.

3. Administrative Due Process Procedures—The bill requires the Attorney General to study the prevalence and impact of any law, rule or procedure that allows a law enforcement officer to delay for an unreasonable or arbitrary period of time the answer to questions posed by a local internal affairs officer, prosecutor, or review board on the investigative integrity and prosecution of law enforcement misconduct.

4. Enhanced Funding of Civil Rights Division—The bill authorizes appropriations for expenses related to the enforcement against pattern and practice discrimination described in section 20401 of the Violent Crime Control

and Law Enforcement Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 14141) and authorizes appropriations for expenses related to programs managed by the Community Relations Service.

5. Enhanced Authority in Pattern and Practice Investigations—The bill amends section 21041 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C.A. 14141) to create a private cause of action for declaratory and injunctive relief relating to police pattern and practice discrimination.

6. Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law—The bill amends section 242 of Title 18 of the United States Code to expressly define excessive use of force and non-consensual sexual conduct as deprivations of rights under color of law.

7. Study of Deaths in Custody—The bill amends section 20101(b) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C.A. 13701) to require assurances that States will follow guidelines established by the Attorney General for reporting deaths in custody.

Given the litany of incidents—Rodney King, Amadou Diallo, Abner Louima—it should now be clear to all members, and the nation at large, that this issue must be addressed in a bipartisan manner. Faced with such compelling evidence, we cannot recommend yet another study of problems that we all know to exist. The energies of Congress should be focused on the adoption of legislative priorities that address the substance of law enforcement management and strengthen the current battery of tools available to sanction misconduct.

As a Congress we have been enthusiastic about supporting programs designed to get officers on the street. We must be just as willing to support programs designed to train and manage them after they get there. The current national climate requires decisive action to implement solutions. This legislation initiates the reforms necessary to restore public trust and accountability to law enforcement.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES F. BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2561) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the FY00 Defense Appropriations Act and to express my support for the Air Force's F–22.

I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. LEWIS, for producing a bill that addresses the serious and evolving challenges facing our military. Under his guidance, the Subcommittee has worked very hard to promote our national security within a constrained budget, and I believe the bill before us goes a long way toward addressing many of our most urgent military requirements.

I am, however, troubled by the Subcommittee's recommendation to cut \$1.8 billion from

the F-22 program. I certainly appreciate the Subcommittee's concerns about the program and am fully aware of the substantial challenges it faced as it sought to reconcile military requirements with available resources. Nevertheless, I believe that the F-22 remains critical to maintaining the air superiority that has proven invaluable to the United States to date and will continue to be fundamental requirement in the future if our interests are to be protected. Indeed, the F-22 program is the Air Force's number one priority.

Mr. Chairman, although I support the bill before us on the whole, I look forward to working with the Subcommittee Chairman and other members of the Committee to ensure that the F-22 is fully funded in the final bill.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG
BENEFIT PLAN

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague ALBERT WYNN (D-MD) on behalf of the citizens of the United States and their requests for a much-needed Medicare prescription drug benefit plan.

Some of the greatest financial difficulties faced by seniors today come as a result of increasingly exorbitant medication prices. As the price of prescription drugs continue to rise, access to these vital drugs decrease concurrently.

Just this week, we received the following petition from the Homecrest House Resident Council of Silver Spring, Maryland. This petition was sent to various members of Congress as well as President Clinton urging us to work together for the institution of a Medicare prescription drug benefit plan. Close to 300 of the residents signed this letter which stretches some seven feet long. It is an urgent plea that not only lays out their own concerns, but also those of seniors nationwide who are constantly restricted financially from obtaining vital prescription drugs.

The petition notes that decreased access to vital medications only contributes to prolonged illness and more frequent hospitalization, which subsequently increases the government's costs of caring for these elderly and disabled citizens.

We ask our colleagues to join with us today in protecting our seniors and in aiding them in gaining access to the prescription drugs to which they are entitled. This petition is yet another visible example of the need for Congress to actively improve and protect the Medicare program. All seniors deserve access to prescription drug medications. It is our duty today to guarantee that access through prompt enactment of legislation that adds a prescription drug benefit to Medicare.

I am submitting a copy of the petition we received which clearly illustrates the Homecrest House residents' concerns and requests.

HOMECREST HOUSE
RESIDENT COUNCIL,
Silver Spring, MD, July 8, 1999.

Hon. PETER STARK,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STARK: We are enclosing our petition signed by most of our 300 resident.

All acknowledgment would be greatly appreciated.

We are sure that we voice a concern of our friends around the nation, seniors and disabled, who do without other necessities in order to buy need medications.

We are confident that you will help us and that you and your party will get our vote, because you recognize how critically important it is to make prescription drugs more affordable for senior and disabled persons. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA BENSON,
President.

MARY RYGLER,

Chair, Community Affairs Committee.

Enclosure.

Copies of this petition have been either hand-delivered or mailed to President Clinton as well as several legislators.

As Members of Congress, you hold in your hands the future quality of life of retired and disabled Americans, most of whom worked hard all their long lives and contributed to the greatness of our beloved country!

The 300 Residents of a retirement community in Silver Spring, Maryland who signed this petition, reflect the strivings of most elderly and disabled Americans all over the country!

We are sending to you our urgent plea to address the most vital problem affecting our segment of population and that is the skyrocketing cost of prescription drug!

The fact that many vital medications are out of financial reach of most seniors and disabled contributes to the misery of prolonged illness and more frequent hospitalization, which—in turn—increases the government cost of caring for millions of elderly and disabled.

Please keep in mind that we, seniors, take full advantage of the privilege of voting.

TAX RELIEF

HON. DAVID L. HOBSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1999

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues in the Senate for moving forward with a companion measure to the substantial tax relief and debt reduction contained in the Financial Freedom Act of 1999 that this chamber approved last week.

As we move towards a conference with the Senate, I want to urge my colleagues to continue to maintain the high priority we assigned to debt reduction.

When I am back in Ohio's 7th district, my constituents ask me to make sure Congress is paying off its debts, the same way they have to make their credit card and mortgage payments.

I agree with this approach, which will help ensure that we meet our future obligations while reducing the burden the debt represents for our children and grandchildren.

We made the right decision this year, when Congress set aside two-thirds of the surplus

for Social Security and Medicare. This will help keep Social Security and Medicare solvent for the long-term.

Congress also pledged to pay down the national debt. This is a good step—we can put money back into the hands of taxpayers and maintain our fiscal responsibility.

I was very supportive of the "trigger" mechanism which was included in the Financial Freedom Act to make sure that our debt reduction plans remain on track. I urge my colleagues to insist this sensible and responsible provision remains a key priority during our negotiations with the Senate to produce a final tax relief and debt reduction measure.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT
APPROPRIATIONS ACT,
2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday 27, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2605, the FY 2000 Energy and Water Appropriations Act. This \$20 billion bill provides crucial funding to operate the Department of Energy (\$15 billion), which includes funding for renewable energy research; the Bureau of Reclamation (\$784 million); and the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) (\$4.2 billion), which builds flood control projects, including \$999,000 to build dune systems and horseshoe crab habitat along Delaware's fragile coastline. The ACOE is also responsible for keeping navigation channels clear, including the Delaware River channel. H.R. 2605 fully funds President Clinton's budget request for \$16.5 million to deepen the Delaware River shipping channel from 40 feet to 45 feet—a project Congress approved in 1992. This funding compliments bipartisan support for \$2 million for this project in Delaware's 1999 bond bill and other funding assistance from New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

I have spent a considerable amount of time researching this project over the last year after concerns about its environmental impacts were brought to my attention. I have reserved judgment on this project until I was satisfied that these concerns had been addressed. I would like to take this opportunity to share with this body some of the conclusions from my research and advocate a course of action for how this project should proceed.

One of the primary environmental issues that have been raised about the project is the impact of the project on water quality standards. The Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC) analyzed ACOE's soil samples and discovered higher concentrations of heavy metals, which I term "hot spots," at two bends in the river. One is located at the confluence of the Schuylkill and Delaware Rivers and will not be dredged as part of the project. The second spot is located north of Pea Patch Island. DNREC calculates that if this spot is