

Thomas C. McKinley came from a humble background and endured a troubled youth. However, his life was changed forever at the age of 17, when McKinley acknowledged his calling to the ministry. On October 15, 1980, he was ordained by the Indiana Christian Bible College. For the past ten years, Reverend McKinley has served as the spiritual shepherd for the Twentieth Century Missionary Baptist Church, located at 700 West 11th Avenue in Gary, Indiana.

Reverend McKinley has proven himself to be a selfless example to his congregation. He has been invaluable to the members of his community as both a teacher and evangelist, and particularly through his teaching ministry for stewardship. While a wonderful pastor, Reverend McKinley's leadership skills do not end with the spiritual realm; he has served as President of the Baptist Ministers' Conference of Gary, and as Treasurer of the Gary Police Chaplain Department.

While Reverend McKinley has selflessly served his community in Gary, his service to humanity has known no boundaries. In 1999, he spent a month in Honduras, completing two pilgrimages aiding hurricane victims with food, clothing, and medicine. Not only did he donate his own time and resources, he also organized other churches back home to assist many other Hondurans in need. His desire to help those overseas also led Reverend McKinley to serve as a missionary in Haiti.

Although Reverend McKinley gives much of his time to others, he is still a devoted family man. Nothing is more important to him than his supportive and beloved wife, Camellia, and his three daughters, Charletta, Charlotte, and Sabrina, and his son Russell.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating Reverend Thomas C. McKinley for his commendable efforts towards improving himself, his family, his community, and the world. Reverend McKinley is to be admired for the wonderful example he has set for our community as a pastor, a father, and an involved citizen.

TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF MANILA

HON. MARION BERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2001

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Arkansas city that celebrated its centennial on July 3rd. I am proud to recognize the City of Manila in the Congress for its outstanding community spirit and its contributions to Arkansas and the nation.

Manila was incorporated in 1901 after a population and industry boom in the area. Recordings of Manila go all the way back to the 1500's when Hernando de Soto crossed the Mississippi River. Accounts taken from his travels talk about a Native American settlement, although there were several European settlers also said to be living in the area.

Manila is also known for being a settlement of fugitive Cherokee who snuck away from the Trail of Tears as they were being forcibly driven from Georgia in 1838. The swamps were so overgrown that the federal soldiers didn't

want to go look for them and simply declared them as dead. These runaways later settled in what is today Manila and the surrounding areas.

From its beginning, Manila was primarily an agriculture town. The people in the area lived on the plentiful game and fish in the area and developed an industry by shipping it to markets in St. Louis, Chicago, and as far east as New York. Later, timber became the chief industry. Logs would be sent to mills down the river until the quality and quantity of the timber reached the railroad industry. In 1900, the Jonesboro, Lake City, and Eastern Railway extended its line to Manila. With the railroad came a schoolhouse, general store, a mill, and a population boom.

Today Manila is still growing. In fact, it is the fastest growing town in Mississippi County. That is why I rise today on behalf of the citizens of the First Congressional District, the State of Arkansas, and the United States Congress to wish the City of Manila a happy 100th birthday.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 2001

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2001

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise together with my distinguished colleague from Arizona, JEFF FLAKE, to introduce the Export Administration Act of 2001.

My colleagues, it is high time for the Congress to responsibly legislate export controls. We have not done so properly since the end of the Cold War, when the *raison d'etre* for the Export Administration Act of 1979, of preventing the proliferation of sensitive dual-use technologies to the Soviet Union, ceased to exist.

As went the Soviet Union, so went the threat of an all-pervasive, mind-focusing totalitarian threat to the United States. So, also, went the very multilateral non-proliferation system, CoCom, that effectively helped keep a lid on that Soviet threat.

Now, new threats are upon us—cyber warfare, the potential for proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and terrorism. It is incumbent upon this Congress to update this legislation in a manner that effectively can address those threats and in a manner that can effectively restrict dual-use exports that may threaten the United States.

Indeed, the key single criteria for this renewal, it seems to me, is whether those export controls that we legislate can actually protect Americans.

As a matter of principle, before enacting export restriction legislation, both Congress and the Administration must ensure that the affected exports in fact can be effectively restricted. I doubt anyone would responsibly suggest that legislating an unworkable control achieves any worthwhile goal or makes any sense.

Other important criteria need to be determined:

Would this bill sensibly update the outdated 1979 law? That is, would it recognize that na-

tion-states and other global actors, technology and the threats to the United States have changed significantly since the end of the Cold War?

Would it enhance America's economic prosperity without sacrificing America's national security?

And would it provide the Executive Branch with all the legal authority and the flexibility it needs to protect the American people? Put another way, would it unduly tie the hands of the Administration in a way that could obstruct its constitutional duty to provide for the national defense?

I have taken a hard look at S. 149, which would update the Export Administration Act. After a careful review, I believe this bill, as reported by the Senate, satisfactorily addresses the criteria I outlined above and enhances America's economic prosperity without sacrificing America's national security.

It would protect Americans by ensuring that the national security agencies in the Executive Branch may be used to identify any actual or looming threats to our national security. In addition to the Commerce Department, the Defense Department, State Department and intelligence community are at the immediate disposal of the President of the United States and can signal at any time to the administration the need to restrict any export.

The Enhanced Control provision of Title II and the Deferral Provision of Title III would provide the President with the authority to control any export he may see an urgent need to control, notwithstanding any other provisions in the bill—including mass market status or foreign availability or set-asides.

There is a glaring need, however, that I believe must be addressed by Congress. The Wassenaar Arrangement for that replaced CoCom is simply inadequate to address multilateral nonproliferation concerns. While the Soviet Union is no longer with us, nuclear proliferation concerns are real and present. Simple periodic reports on dual-use exports are clearly insufficient to address these concerns.

I want to commend Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS and their staffs for holding hearings and briefings on export administration and their very hard work on this issue. But now it is time to move forward with re-authorization, not re-extension.

Officials from the Departments of Defense, State and Commerce have testified at the three hearings before the House International Relations Committee has held on this matter and all have signaled their support for passing the Export Administration Act of 2001, as reported by the Senate Banking Committee. The Administration has provided a clear and unambiguous position that titles two and three provide adequate authorities to the President with regard to export controls, notwithstanding any other provisions of law. I also look forward to working with the Administration on non-proliferation matters and building a better multilateral mechanism than the Wassenaar Arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House International Relations Committee, I am keenly aware of the national security issues and threats that face our great country. As former Ranking Member in the last Congress of the

International Economic Policy and Trade Subcommittee, I came to better appreciate the advent and permanence of rapid technological change and its immediate effects on our national security and economic prosperity.

These considerations have persuaded me of the importance of updating the Export Administration Act. I have concluded that passage of S. 149, as reported, is the prudent way ahead both to protect our national security and to enhance our economic prosperity. I am convinced this bill gets it right. The Administration support for this bill attests that it also believes this is the optimal way ahead. I commend the Administration for that because this truly must be a bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must do its duty and act now to protect Americans and to enhance our economic prosperity. Let us act now to pass the Export Administration Act of 2001.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT
AUTHORIZING CONGRESS TO
PROHIBIT PHYSICAL DESECRATION
OF THE FLAG OF THE
UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVE LARGENT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2001

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 36, which would grant Congress the power to add an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the physical desecration of the United States flag. This resolution will preserve the honor and respect due to our national flag.

When I reflect on the men and women who fought and died to protect the flag as a symbol of democracy and freedom, it amazes me that any American would purposely want to destroy that symbol. I believe that most Americans feel a sense of outrage at the sight of the flag being burned or desecrated by protesters trumpeting freedom of speech as their shield for such a heinous act.

In recent history, our flag has lost the protection it deserves. I've noticed a sad pattern developing that we would even permit our flag to be desecrated. When we allow our nation's honor to be disgraced, should we be surprised that we have traitors in our midst? We allow the symbol of all that is good and pure about our country to be defiled and then we are shocked when our leaders are devoid of the values we cherish.

It is time to restore our flag to its rightful place under the law so that our children and our grandchildren will never be confused about its meaning, its value, or the price paid to preserve it.

A great author once wrote: "You cannot truly love a thing without wanting to fight for it." I love the United States and I want to fight for the hope and freedom it represents to the world. That fight will include protecting our nation's flag.

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK KURTZ

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2001

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to your attention the outstanding career of Chuck Kurtz, who on July 20th concludes a distinguished 33-year career with The Olathe Daily News, which serves my congressional district. Chuck started with The Daily News as a photographer, and later moved to sports writer, sports editor, features editor, seniors editor, and concluded his career as managing editor.

At a retirement party that will be held at The Daily News' office on this Friday, the following letter will be presented to Chuck on my behalf; I am pleased to have this opportunity to share this correspondence with my colleagues:

DEAR CHUCK, I want to add my voice to the chorus of those who are praising you on the occasion of your "retirement."

I'm using the term "retirement" loosely, because I think we all know that though you may enjoy a few weeks of fishing or travel, you will soon return to making a positive impact upon the lives of those around you—just as you have done for so many years at The Daily News.

I have enjoyed working with you over the years, first as Johnson County District Attorney, and now as a Member of Congress. Needless to say, we have often found ourselves on opposite sides of the issues. You wouldn't be the Chuck Kurtz I know if we would have agreed on everything!

But no matter the issue or whether or not we agreed, you always understood that there were at least two sides to every story, and that there may be good reasons for individuals to believe and act as they do. I have seen this not only in your writing, but also in your factions—you listen, ask questions, provide different points of view, and have always given me an opportunity to make my case. I appreciate the fact that, if you disagree, you do so in a reasonable and civil way, and do your best to reflect every side of the issue for the benefit of your readers.

You have not only brought a sense of civility to your profession, but you have also brought something of which those in my line of work are often in need—common sense. This is why I will miss you most, and why I think the readers of The Daily News will, also.

Common sense says you shouldn't forget why you do what you do, and you never have. One can tell you are a journalist because you want the public to have the facts they need to make good decisions about their collective future, both locally and nationally. There is honor in this, and I know from firsthand experience that you have had great—and altogether positive—influence on the direction our community has taken. Thank you for your service.

Again, congratulations on your "retirement," and I am looking forward to running into you again soon.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS MOORE,
Member of Congress.

DOGS OF WAR BARE THEIR TEETH
OVER COLOMBIA

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2001

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to offer for the RECORD an op-ed piece written by Ms. Arianna Huffington that appeared in the Los Angeles Times on Tuesday, July 17, 2001. This article regards our country's involvement in Plan Colombia. Before we begin debate on the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, I think it is important that the Congress and the people of the United States reconsider our current policy toward our southern neighbor and third most populous country in South America.

DOGS OF WAR BARE THEIR TEETH OVER
COLOMBIA

For more than a year, critics of our government's drug-war aid package to Colombia (now hovering at \$2 billion) have been warning of the mission creep that threatens to embed us ever deeper in that country's 4-decades-old civil war.

Well, the slippery slope just got greased.

The House of Representatives is about to vote on the \$15.2-billion foreign operations spending bill. Buried amid the appropriations for many worthwhile projects such as the Peace Corps and international HIV/AIDS relief is a legislative land mine. It comes in the form of a couple of innocuous-sounding lines that could lead to a massive escalation of U.S. involvement in Colombia's unwinnable war.

Contained in the section of the bill earmarking \$676 million for "counterdrug activities" in the region are the following eye-glazing provisions: "These fund are in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes and are available without regard to section 3204(b)(1)(B) of Public Law 106-246. Provided further, that section 482(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply to funds appropriated under this heading."

Got that? I didn't think so.

Legislative gobbledegook does not get any gookier. but once the meaningless numbers and letters are decoded, and the statutory dots connected, the ominous significance of those provisions becomes all too clear. If approved, they make possible the unlimited buildup of "mercenaries" and the removal of any constraints on the kinds of weapons they can use.

Under current law, the number of U.S. military personnel that can be deployed in Colombia is limited to 500, and they are prohibited from engaging in combat. But as politicians discovered long ago, there are two parts to every law: the spirit of the law and the letter of the law.

As regard Colombia, our government chose the latter, carrying out a classic end-run around the prohibition by funding a war conducted by mercenaries—hundreds of U.S. citizens working for private military contractors like DynCorp, Airscan and Military Professional Resources Inc.

At the moment, the number of these mercenaries is capped at 300. But the first new provision, if it becomes law, does away with this restriction. The other provision removes language that says "weapons or ammunition" while engaged in narcotics-related activities. It's a deadly cocktail: unlimited private forces armed with unlimited weapons.