

India and Pakistan. Earlier this week, the U.S. Supreme Court, in a rare unanimous vote, ruled that state and local sanctions are unconstitutional. There has even been movement toward engaging Cuba, with legislation now moving in the Congress that would open the door to U.S. shipments of food and medicine.

While a few new sanctions—Burma and Sudan—have been imposed in recent years, it is clear that policymakers view unilateral sanctions in a more critical light. It is important to note that last year, and so far this year, the United States has not imposed any unilateral sanctions of note. This is a far cry from 1996, when USA\*ENGAGE was organized. In that year alone, according to the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. imposed 23 unilateral sanctions, including two measures—the Helms-Burton Act and the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act—that were unusually onerous in that extraterritorial sanctions were authorized.

For our part, business now sees value in supporting issues that it previously ignored—such as encouraging America to pay its UN arrears and ensuring that the IMF and Foreign Service are adequately funded.

Under the leadership of foreign policy and trade experts like Senators LUGAR, KERREY and HAGEL and Representatives CRANE, DOOLEY and MANZULLO, there is a serious effort in Congress to enact legislation that would put in place a more deliberate process to use when the U.S. considers new unilateral sanction proposals. Known as The Sanctions Process Reform Act, this common sense legislation is a good bill and should be enacted.

While this legislation is important, it won't be new laws that stop policymakers from adopting new unilateral sanctions rather than pursuing more effective multilateral actions. Nor will new laws ensure that our leaders recognize the full power of engagement and the risks associated with isolation. That is why we must continue to be vigilant and keep U.S. foreign policymakers on a path that included multilateral solutions to international problems.

What will ultimately change America's sanctions-base foreign policy will be Americans who—armed with the facts—demand a more effective foreign policy. To that end, the ultimate success of USA\*ENGAGE will depend on whether the lessons learned are reinforced by a commitment from our leaders to refrain from conducting foreign policy on the cheap.

As a conclusion, I'd like you to note that perhaps the most telling event to illustrate the evolution of U.S. sanctions policy took place earlier this week. The decision this week by President Clinton to drop many of the U.S. sanctions that have been in place against North Korea for nearly a half a century was indeed profound. What better way to mark the 50th anniversary of the Korean War than to finally make significant progress towards ending the Cold War on the Korean Peninsula?

The United States should now further follow the lead of South Korea, as we too face an opportunity to ease tensions with a hostile neighbor. America can learn from the Koreans by opening a dialogue with the government of Cuba. Engagement is working throughout the world—it can work in our backyard too. Perhaps that will be the greatest lesson we have yet to learn.

Thank you.

**BANKRUPTCY REFORM**

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to take a brief moment to speak on bank-

ruptcy reform legislation, which in my view, our Nation desperately needs. We have a balanced bankruptcy reform bill. The administration is on record as saying they support it. If the President really wants a bill, and if my colleagues in the Senate really want a bill, then they should let us move to a formal conference. Furthermore, they should tell us why the clinic violence provision is even necessary.

Current law already prevents perpetrators of clinic violence, as well as other types of violence, from discharging the judgments against them in bankruptcy. Given this, it is clear that the overbroad abortion clinic violence amendment serves no substantive purpose. No one has brought forth a single case in which current law has been used to discharge debts from clinic violence. I raised this issue in a letter to Senator SCHUMER last week, and am still awaiting a response.

Let's move forward with a bankruptcy conference—we have waited long enough.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, July 13, 2000.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER  
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHUCK: I am writing you regarding your clinic violence amendment to the bankruptcy reform legislation. This amendment appears to be one of the final remaining issues holding up the overdue reform our bankruptcy laws truly need to both stop the abuse of the system by those who are able to pay back a portion of their debts and to implement new consumer protections such as enhanced credit card disclosures, which you played a major role in drafting.

I respect your views and the general objective of your amendment to prevent criminals from paying their debts to society or to others by using our bankruptcy laws. Furthermore, I am committed to addressing any legitimate abuse of our bankruptcy laws. However, I am concerned that some who oppose the broadly supported proposed reforms have capitalized on the issue of abortion clinic violence and have spread some misconceptions regarding this issue. Such misconceptions, unfortunately, appear to be jeopardizing passage of the important bankruptcy reform legislation.

For example, in a document circulated by one of our colleagues, it was represented that "[t]he Schumer amendment prevents a documented abuse of the bankruptcy system. . . ." and the compromise language that is in the conference report "would continue to allow many perpetrators of clinic violence to seek shelter in the nation's bankruptcy courts."

There has not been a single case reported or presented where the current bankruptcy laws were held to allow a perpetrator of clinic violence to "seek shelter in the nation's bankruptcy courts," nor is this a "documented abuse" of the system. On the contrary, when those who have committed violence have tried to hide behind the bankruptcy laws, they have found their debts

were non-dischargeable under current bankruptcy law. Given this, I do not think that the amendment you offer is necessary.

Indeed, the abortion rights group NARAL recognized in a 1999 publication that "[c]oncluding that clinic violence-associated debts are non-dischargeable under section 523(a)(6) is consistent with the Supreme court's interpretation of [current bankruptcy law's] "willful and malicious injury." Therefore such true debts are non-dischargeable.

Even given such interpretation of current law, and though the House-passed bill had no abortion-related provision, the current reform legislation goes further and incorporates compromise language that would expand current law and further make debts arising from willful and malicious threats also non-dischargeable. This is done in a politically neutral manner and protects debts from all threats of injury irrespective of the political message of the protestors. In addition, knowing that one of your biggest concerns regarding this subject is the ability of perpetrators to avoid debts arising from settlement or contempt orders, the compromise language specifically covers debts from settlement orders and violations of other orders of the court.

I appreciate your consideration of these points and would welcome any response you might have.

Sincerely,  
ORRIN G. HATCH,  
Chairman.

**CHANGES TO H. CON. RES. 290  
PURSUANT TO SECTION 213**

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, section 213 of H. Con. Res. 290 (the FY2001 Budget Resolution) permits the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to make adjustments to the revenue aggregate, the reconciliation instructions, and the Senate pay-as-you-go scorecard, provided certain condition are met.

Pursuant to section 213, I hereby submit the following revisions to H. Con. Res. 290:

Current Revenue Aggregate: (sec. 101(1)(A))—FY 2001 Recommended Level of Federal Revenues .....	\$1,503,200,000,000
Adjustment: Additional reduction in revenues	- 5,000,000,000
Revised Revenue Aggregate: FY 2001 Recommended Level of Federal Revenues .....	1,498,000,000,000
Current Reconciliation Instruction: (sec. 104(2))—Reduce revenues by no more than	11,600,000,000 in 2001, 150,000,000,000 in 2001-05
Adjustment: Additional reduction in revenues	5,000,000,000 in 2001
Revised Reconciliation Instruction: Reduce revenues by no more than .....	16,600,000,000 in 2001 150,000,000,000 in 2001-05
Current Senate Pay-as-you-go Scorecard: FY 2001 beginning balance	26,509,000,000
Adjustment: Additional balance added to scorecard .....	5,000,000,000
Revised Senate Pay-as-you-go Scorecard: FY 2001 beginning balance	31,509,000,000