

printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I would urge all of our colleagues to take a moment to read it when they have the opportunity to do so.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 2000]

A POLICE FOR ALL IN N. IRELAND

(By Edward M. Kennedy)

This month Britain's House of Lords will have the opportunity to improve the flawed legislation approved by the House of Commons in July to reform the police force in Northern Ireland and give it the support and respect it needs from the Catholic community.

The case for reform is clear. The current force—the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC)—is 93 percent Protestant. The vast majority of Catholics, who make up more than 40 percent of the population in Northern Ireland, do not support it because it does not represent them or protect them and has too often failed them.

Many Catholics believe the RUC has been involved in a long-standing "shoot-to-kill" policy. Questions continue about collusion of the RUC with Protestant paramilitaries in the murder of Patrick Finucane, a defense attorney shot dead in front of his wife and children in 1989. In 1997 RUC officers stood by as Robert Hamill, a young Catholic, was kicked to death by 30 Protestants shouting "kill him" and ethnic slurs. The RUC was shamefully inactive when death threats were made against another defense attorney, Rosemary Nelson, who was later murdered when her car was blown up as she drove to work last year. Many other examples could be cited to demonstrate why Catholics distrust the police.

Northern Ireland's 1998 Good Friday agreement presented a historic opportunity to change all that—to reform the police service and make it representative of the entire community. Under the agreement, an independent eight-member international commission was established, led by a former chairman of the British Conservative Party, Christopher Patten. Its mission was to propose an alternative and create a community-oriented, human rights-based police service that Catholics and Protestants alike would be prepared to join. In September 1999, the Patten Commission published its unanimous report containing 175 recommendations for change.

The assertion has been made that in the current legislation, the British government will implement 95 percent of the Patten's recommendations. But quantity does not measure quality. In fact, the most significant reforms recommended by the commission are not adequately implemented in the legislation.

The commission's task was to balance the desires of each community against what is necessary to create a fair and representative police force. The recommendations of the Patten Commission reflected those compromises. Patten is the compromise. It must not be diluted.

Unfortunately, the British government has done just that. It has made unwise concessions to those of the Protestant majority who still view the police as "theirs," and to the police themselves, who have always resisted reform. If the new police service is to succeed, it must represent and be accepted by the community it serves. Catholics must

be convinced they should support and join it. Otherwise, the entire Good Friday agreement is in jeopardy.

As the legislation is considered by the House of Lords, the British government should propose changes to implement fully the Patten recommendations. Among the most obvious:

Name, badge and flag: As Patten recommended, to attract Catholics, the police force should have a neutral name and symbols. The legislation should ensure that the proposed name change to the neutral "Police Service of Northern Ireland" is made for all purposes, not just some purposes. The badge should be free of any association with Great Britain or Ireland, and the British flag should no longer fly above police buildings.

Oversight Commissioner: Patten recommended the appointment of an oversight commissioner to supervise the implementation of its recommendations. Thomas Constantine, former New York State police chief and former head of the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, was recently named oversight commissioner. He should be free to comment on the adequacy of British decisions in implementing the Patten Report—not just oversee the changes made by the government.

Accountability: Patten recommended a new policing board to hold the police accountable and an ombudsman to investigate complaints against and wrongdoing by the police. Restrictions on the board's power to initiate inquiries and investigate past complaints should be eliminated, as should the British government's power to interfere in its work. The ombudsman should be able to investigate police policies and practices—not just report on them.

On June 15 British Secretary of State for Northern Ireland Peter Mandelson wrote, "I remain absolutely determined to implement the Patten recommendations and to achieve the effective and representative policing service—accepted in every part of Northern Ireland—that his report aims to secure." This determination has yet to be convincingly demonstrated.

Full implementation of the recommendations of the Patten Commission is essential to guarantee fair law enforcement and to create a new police service that will have and deserve the trust of all the people of Northern Ireland. It will be a tragedy if this opportunity to achieve a new beginning is lost.

The writer is a Democratic senator from Massachusetts.

PIERRE ELLIOT TRUDEAU

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is often said that Canada and the U.S. share the longest undefended border in the world. While this is repeated so often it has become a cliché, like all clichés, there is a fundamental truth in it. In this case, the fundamental truth is a striking geopolitical reality which Americans do not always appreciate. The peace we enjoy in North America is largely a function of this border.

With our neighbor to the north, we share a border of approximately 4,000 miles, a border that runs through New England and the Great Lakes, through the great forests, plains, and mountains, and along the Alaskan frontier of this rich North American continent. Mutually respected sovereignty is the

fundamental basis of peaceful international discourse. But I will add that an undefended border makes for the warmest of relations, and the greatest of respect.

Last Thursday, Canada lost perhaps its best known Prime Minister of recent times, when Pierre Elliott Trudeau died, at the age of 80. For the past week, our neighbors to the north have been in mourning, and I stand today to pay my respects to the family of former Prime Minister Trudeau and to all the citizens of the country he served with singular dedication.

Mr. Trudeau and I did not share a common political tradition, nor did we share a political ideology. This does not diminish my respect for the man and his work one bit. I note, with appreciation, that one of Mr. Trudeau's mottos was "reason before passion," a principle I certainly believe conservative lawmakers would share.

I admired former Prime Minister Trudeau for his dedication to his country, to the rule of law, and to the betterment of the world. In his moving tribute at his father's funeral earlier this week, Justin Trudeau said, "My father's fundamental belief never came from a textbook, it stemmed from his deep love and faith in all Canadians."

Pierre Trudeau led Canada at a tumultuous time in its history and in the history of the world. In 1970, he was confronted with a terrorist, separatist threat from Quebecois extremists. Prime Minister Trudeau—who, in Canadian history, was at the time, only its third of Quebecois descent himself—was a dedicated federalist and, even more fundamentally, dedicated to the rule of law. He faced down the terrorists, and since then issues of separatism have been dealt with at the ballot box. While he successfully defended the rule of law, Canadians recognize the advances he instituted to preserve Canada's unique cultural diversity.

Mr. Trudeau had a different view of geopolitics than did most of the American administrations with which he dealt. It is said that he succeeded, at times, in aggravating U.S. presidents from Nixon to Reagan.

Some of this had to do, in my opinion, with the nature of the relationship between our countries. While Canada is the second largest political land-mass in the world, its population is small, approximately one-tenth of ours, and its economy is dwarfed by ours. In fact, the former Prime Minister famously said once: "Living next to you is in some ways like sleeping with an elephant. No matter how friendly and even-tempered is the beast, one is affected by every twitch and grunt."

While Mr. Trudeau held substantively different views on the world than many American leaders, he demonstrated that policy disputes can exist and nations remain civilized and respectful. And that is how I think of former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau.

In closing, I wish to note another story his son, Justin, told at his father's funeral this week. He recounted how, as a child, his father took him one day for lunch at the cafeteria in Ottawa's Parliament. There, young Justin saw a political rival of his father and made a childish crack about him to his dad. His father sternly rebuked him and, according to his son, said "You never attack the person. You may be in total disagreement with the person; however, you shouldn't denigrate him." That day, Pierre Trudeau taught his son, who is now a teacher, that "having different opinions from those of another person should in no way stop you from holding them in the greatest respect possible as people."

That is the principle of a civilized man, and the practice of a civilized nation. As the world bids adieu to Pierre Trudeau, I extend my deepest condolences to his family and to all the good citizens of our great neighbor Canada.

THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL AND THE CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President. I would like to say a few words about the Interior Appropriations bill and CARA. The Interior Appropriation is a good bill. CARA is a great bill. CARA brought together a variety of supporters from all parts of the country to develop a program that would provide for wildlife protection, urban parks, green space, coastal impact protection and would guarantee funding for the development of recreation areas for years to come.

Elements of CARA have been included in the Interior bill, although the funding for these provisions is paltry by comparison to the House and Senate CARA bills. Other provisions may find a home in other appropriations packages, but one of the most important elements may be orphaned in the end. That is the provision for wildlife and habitat protection. Just as we are cheering our success in securing a place for wildlife, as we celebrate a growing population of eagles on the Potomac River, we are failing to fund the programs that make this possible. State wildlife agencies have clearly demonstrated their ability to bring back populations of threatened and endangered species, such as the pronghorn and the bald eagle. But they lack the resources to repeat the success on thousands of other species.

The purpose of CARA was to provide the ounce of prevention that keeps species from becoming threatened. CARA was to protect both game and nongame populations. By providing dependable state based funding we could ensure on-the-ground protection of wildlife, and continued maintenance of habitat for all wild species. It is important to note that there is an educational component in Title III of CARA. We are increas-

ingly becoming an urban nation, and it is important to provide an introduction to wild places and wild things to our children. This introduction will help them become the next generation of good land stewards.

Virginians have come out for CARA. Rarely have I heard from so many different groups who support a piece of legislation. I would like to submit for the RECORD a list of the Virginia groups who support this legislation and to thank all of the groups for the remarkable job they have done in promoting CARA and the principles of outdoor recreation and education. I am highlighting Title III in my remarks simply because it is being ignored in the Interior Appropriations bill. But each and every title in CARA was thoughtfully deliberated and negotiated. Rarely have I seen such care taken in developing a bill, and even though efforts to allay the concerns of some western Senators were not successful, they were genuine, and I hope useful for future discussions.

The Interior bill does provide substantial funding for the Lands Legacy program, and this is important. The bill also provides a good deal of funding for Virginia projects that are particularly worthy. But we could have done better, we could have done more. And I regret that the Senate has not yet risen to the occasion, that we did not complete this important work. Senator LANDRIEU, like the gracious lady that she is, has not asked CARA sponsors and supporters to withhold our support for the Interior Appropriation, and for the sake of the Virginia projects in the bill I will vote for the Appropriation. But, I will pledge to keep working for the passage of CARA in the final days of the session.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be included in the RECORD.

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

VIRGINIA ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING CARA
AFS—Virginia Chapter; American Bass Association; Anderson Cottage Bed & Breakfast; Augusta Bird Club; Burke Center Wildlife Committee; Carl Zeiss Optical, Sports Optics; Clarke County Citizen Council.

Duck Island Enterprises, Inc.; Evergreen Bed & Breakfast Inn; Fair View Bed and Breakfast; For the Birds, Inc.; Friends of Dragon Run State Park; Friends of Shenandoah River; Friends of the North Fork Shenandoah.

Friends of the Rivers of Virginia; High Meadows Inn; IWLA—Maury Chapter; IWLA—Virginia Chapter; James River Basin Canoe Livery, Ltd. Laurel Creek Nursery; Loudoun Wildlife Conservancy; Lynchburg Bird Club; Mattaponi River Company; Mill Mountain Zoo.

More Critters & Company; NAS—Cape Henry Audubon Society; NAS—Fairfax Audubon Society; NAS—Virginia Beach Chapter; Natural Resources Technology; New River Free Press; New River Valley Bird Club; New River Valley Environmental Coalition Newport House Bed & Breakfast.

North Bend Plantation; North Fork Nature Center; Piedmont Productions; Prince Wil-

liam Natural Resources Council Public Lands Foundation; Resource Management Associates; Responsive Management; Ridgerunner Forestry Services; River Place at Deltaville.

Selu Conservancy; The Alleghany Inn; The Conservation Fund; The Friends of the North River; The Mark Addy; The Opequon Watershed, Inc.

The Ornithological Council; The River'd Inn; The Wildlife Center of Virginia; Thornrose House Bed & Breakfast; Trout Unlimited (National); TWS—Southeastern Chapter; TWS—Virginia Chapter; TWS—Virginia Tech Student Chapter.

Valley Conservation Council; Virginia American Bass Association; Virginia Association of Soil & Water Conservation District Virginia BASS Federation, Inc.; Virginia Game Warden Association; Virginia Herpetological Society; Virginia Society of Ornithology; Virginia Tourism Corporation; Virginia Wildlife Federation; Virginia's Explore Park; Virginians for Wilderness; Western Virginia Land Trust.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read the names of some of those who have lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

October 5, 1999:

Norman P. Blasco, 47, Chicago, IL; Guy Colbert, 25, Detroit, MI; Daniel Galloway, 39, San Antonio, TX; Justin Eric Googenrand, 23, St. Paul, MN; Denise Long, 41, Nashville, TN; Shawndell Mosely, 27, Memphis, TN; Donald Roper, 34, Oakland, CA; and Theodore Slater, 87, Toledo, OH.

One of the victims of gun violence I mentioned, 41-year-old Denise Long of Nashville, was shot and killed accidentally by a 22-year-old co-worker who pulled out a handgun and dropped it on the floor. Her co-worker did not have a permit to carry a handgun. She also did not have permission to have the gun at their place of work.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The deaths of these people are a reminder to all of us that we need to enact sensible gun legislation now.

PNTR

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, as a strong advocate for Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China, I feel a personal responsibility to ensure that American companies benefit from this