



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2001

No. 52

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable LINCOLN CHAFEE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

God of all nations, Father of every tribe, color and tongue of humankind, You have created us to live at peace with one another in Your family. You have revealed to us Your desire that all Your children should be free to worship You. Here in America, freedom of religion is a basic fabric of our life. Sadly, this freedom is not enjoyed in so many places in our world. We are grieved by the shocking accounts of religious persecution. Prejudice expressed in hostility and then in hatred and violence exists throughout the world. As we think of the pain and suffering inflicted on Christians because of their faith, we also are reminded of all forms of intolerance over religion in the world today. We remember the suffering of the Jews in this century. Forgive any prejudice in our own hearts and purge from us any vestige of imperious judgmentalism of people whose expression of faith in You differs from our own. We pray for tolerance in the human family. And may it begin in each of us. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable LINCOLN CHAFEE led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 24, 2001.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable LINCOLN CHAFEE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CHAFEE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate begin consideration of Calendar No. 23, S. 1, the education bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I was here yesterday and again today. I am the ranking member of the Committee on Environment and Public Works. We have reported legislation out of the subcommittee—by the way, the Presiding Officer is the Chair of that subcommittee—we reported out of that subcommittee more than a month ago brownfields legislation. This is legislation that affects 500,000 sites.

I object, and I will at the appropriate time this morning talk more about what I think is so wrong about our inaction in the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, in light of the objection, I ask unanimous

consent that the Senate now be in a period for morning business until 12:30 p.m., with the first half of the time designated for the majority leader, or his designee, and the second half of the time controlled by the minority leader, or his designee.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, again reserving the right to object, at an appropriate time, I will withdraw my objection, but I again state to those assembled that it is absolutely wrong that we are going to spend all day today in morning business when we have waiting legislation that affects people in the State of Nevada. We could clean up lightly polluted areas starting this year if we simply move forward on this legislation.

I repeat, we have 500,000 sites in America today that are awaiting action of this Congress. The President of the United States said he supports brownfields legislation. Let us test him to find out if he does. I think it is absolutely wrong that we are going to spend all day in morning business.

Further, under the proposal my friend from Vermont has propounded, the first 90 minutes will be under the control of the Senator from Vermont or somebody on his side. My friend from North Dakota is here and wishes to speak this morning. Will the Senator allow the Senator from North Dakota to speak for 20 minutes? I do not see anyone here.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I have no objection so long as it is coming out of your time.

Mr. REID. Yes, of course. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that I be allowed to speak for 5 minutes and that the Senator from North Dakota be allowed to speak for 20 minutes and that the time be taken out of the 90 minutes designated by the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Vermont.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that at

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3797

2:15 p.m. the Senate resume morning business until 5:15 p.m., with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each and the time be equally divided in the usual form.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, negotiations are continuing on the education bill. It was hoped that negotiations could be completed this morning with the understanding there would be amendments offered to the legislation. However, the time between 2:15 p.m. and 5:15 p.m. is expected to be used for the initial discussion of the education legislation.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

BROWNFIELDS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this brownfields legislation is important. It provides three important steps to directly spur cleanup and reuse of these abandoned and contaminated sites.

No. 1, it provides critically needed money to assess and clean up abandoned and underutilized sites which will create jobs and increase tax revenues and preserve great parks and open space. It is estimated this legislation will bring tax revenues to local governments of up to \$2.4 billion.

No. 2, it encourages cleanup and redevelopment by providing legal protections for innocent parties, such as contiguous property owners, prospective purchasers, and innocent landowners.

Under the present state of the law, these places are left abandoned because people are afraid if they purchase these properties or lease them, they will be subject to Superfund liability. This legislation negates all that.

No. 3, it further provides for funding and enhancement of State cleanup programs and a balance between providing "certainty" for developers and others but still ensuring protection of public health.

We reported this bill out of committee by a vote of 15-3. A couple of Senators had some problems. We worked literally day and night on a staff level to resolve those problems. For example, the Senator from Ohio had some suggestions. I told him at the committee that we would work with him, and we have. We have satisfied Senator VOINOVICH's problems with this legislation.

We need to do this. The reason I am so frustrated is that yesterday we did nothing, and today we are going to stand around and be in morning business. There is no reason we cannot do this. We have agreed on this side to 2 hours of debate evenly divided. I do not know why in the world we cannot move forward with this legislation. It is extremely important.

I believe President Bush is a good person, and I believe he means well and wants to do the right thing. He stated during the campaign that he supports brownfields legislation.

His environmental record has been abysmal this first 100 days. Why doesn't he lend his prestigious efforts to this legislation that he says he supports?

I cannot understand why we do not move forward with this legislation. This legislation is important. It is important to the State of Nevada. It is important to every State in the Union.

As we all know, this issue has wide support from groups including environmentalists, the Mayors' Association, businesses, the real estate community. This bill is a meeting of minds from all sectors of American society and from both sides of the aisle.

S. 350 is a model of how an evenly divided committee can work together. I urge the Republican leadership in the Senate to show this Senate can recognize good legislation when it sees it and prove to Americans a 50/50 Senate can be productive and we can enact good laws.

I urge my friend, the junior Senator from Mississippi, the majority leader, to allow us to debate this bill and move forward on it. We will do it with a short agreement. We agreed to 2 hours.

This bill will pass overwhelmingly. Work done by the Presiding Officer and the Senator from California has been exemplary, and the work the full committee did is excellent. I urge my colleagues to work toward moving this forward. Hard work has been done. The cooperation of the Republicans and Democrats on the committee was noticeable. It is a shame at this time we don't move forward with this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

THE TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, last week we were all witnesses to headlines in the newspapers about a meeting held in Quebec City, Canada. The newspaper headlines talked about tear gas, chain link fences, police lines, demonstrators, 30,000 people marching down streets. It also discussed anarchists.

What is this all about, 30,000 people demonstrating in the streets of a major city in our hemisphere? It is about international trade. The same sort of thing happened in Seattle a year and a half ago. The future WTO ministerial meeting will be held not in a major city but in a place called Qatar. Why? Because no city wanted to host it, as I understand it. They will have to even bring in cruise ships for hotel rooms. They feel if the ministers of trade from around the world can hold a meeting in an isolated place, no one will show up to protest their closed door meeting.

Last week's demonstrations in Quebec City underscored again that world

leaders are not going to hold trade talks without attention being paid to the issues concerns of the people and the problems related to global trade. It is not that global trade ought to be stopped. It is that global trade has marched relentlessly forward without the rules of trade keeping pace. There is a relentless accelerated march toward globalization. However our world leaders have not develop acceptable rules, so people demonstrate in the streets.

I want to make two points this morning: One, trade is very positive for our country when it occurs in circumstances where it is fair. It makes sense for us to do that which we do best and trade with others who in their comparative advantage are doing what they do best. That makes sense on the world stage. Our country has been a leader in world trade, a leader in expanded trade, and it does make sense to expand our trade opportunities as long as doing so represents the values that this country considers important in the development of our economy and in the development of our international relationships.

It is also the case that while all say that expanded trade is good for this country, it is also the case that we ought not allow the international corporations in this world to pole vault over all the issues that relate to labor, the environment and of production simply by saying: We are going to produce in Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Bangladesh, or China, and we will ship back into the United States. So what if they hire 12-year-olds and pay them 12 cents an hour, working them 12 hours a day. So what. They would like us to think that is fair trade.

It is not fair trade. That is why people are marching in the streets. It is not fair trade when corporations are able to become international citizens and decide to circle the globe in their airplanes and evaluate where they can produce the cheapest, where they can employ kids, where they can dump pollution in the water and the air, where they can have factories without the barriers and problems of making them safe and produce there, create a cheap product and send it to a department store in Pittsburgh or Los Angeles, or Butte, MT.

The question is, Is it fair trade when that happens? This country has fought for a century over these issues. All of those fights were agonizing. Many occurred in this Chamber. The fight about whether we ought to be able to employ children, so we have child labor laws saying we don't want you to send 12-year-olds into coal mines. We don't want 12- and 14-year-olds put on a factory floor to work 12 hours a day. We have child labor laws.

The question of safe workplace, demanding that those who employ people employ them in safe workplaces that are not going to pose risks to the life and safety of workers. We have fought, and made laws to protect our people.