the integrity and sanctity of our most precious national symbol.

I understand that this issue has experienced years of contentious debate involving constitutional challenges. Rather than focus on these arguments, I would rather take this time to share parts of a story written in my local newspaper, the El Paso Times. The story concerns a local shopping center that proudly flies a 30-by-50 foot American flag that has recently been taken from its flag pole for the first time in several years in order to have its wind-torn, tethered appearance repaired so that it may return with a new and fully restored appearance. Since its removal, motorists and pedestrians, inhabitants of the neighborhood of where the flag resides, tourists and travelers, every single person that has come in contact with this flag have missed its presence. As one person stated, “People love it when they notice it, and they notice when it’s gone.”

And the people who love this symbol, not just the people in my district who give directions to their homes based on the shopping center flag, but people all over the country will notice when their symbol is destroyed. We have traditional codes and customs that encourage utmost respect for the American flag, yet we have never protected this symbol with the strength of our laws. We have sent soldiers to wars who fought and sometimes died in defense of the flag, carrying it honorably and proudly into battle. We have erected monuments all over this country and around the world that fly the American flag. We have placed the American flag on places where Americans have claimed victory in battle and scientific achievement, including one place that is not even on this Earth. I ask the Members to consider what protest would be profound, what speech should be protected and what principle is to be defended if the American flag flying over the Iwo Jima memorial is burned, or the flag flying over the memorial at Normandy, or the flag that adorns the casket of a fallen soldier, or the flags that fly proudly over our international embassies, or the flag that flies in a shopping center in my district of El Paso, Texas. People will certainly notice it when it is gone.

Mr. Speaker, the brilliance of our constitutional laws is that they are amendable, they can change with the will of the people. And I believe and encourage that the will of Congress is to finally protect the symbol that flies over this House.

INTRODUCTION OF THEEXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 2001

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 2001

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the “Export Administration Act of 2001”, H.R. 2581.

This bill is identical to counterpart legislation that has been reported by the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, S. 149, except that it includes two additional sections relating to nuclear transfers to North Korea. These additional sections are substantively identical to legislation that Congressman ED MARKEY and I introduced last year. H.R. 4251 (106th Congress), the “Congressional Oversight of Nuclear Transfers to North Korea Act of 2000”. H.R. 4251 was intended to ensure that congress will be fully involved in the decision our nation may have to make in several years to either permit or delay the transfer to North Korea of key components for the two light water nuclear reactors that are being built in North Korea pursuant to the 1994 Agreed Framework with North Korea. H.R. 4251 commanded broad bipartisan support in the House of Representatives and was approved on May 15, 2000, by a vote of 374–6. Regrettably, the Senate did not approve H.R. 4251 before final adjournment of the 106th Congress last year.

Last year’s vote demonstrates that the two additional sections I have added to the text of S. 149 are essentially non-controversial. I have included them in the text of the bill I am introducing today because they relate the control of dual-use exports and should, in my opinion, be included in any Export Administration Act enacted this year.

I would note that I have based the bill I am introducing today on S. 149 because that measure commands strong support in the Senate and elsewhere. I have reservations about certain aspects of the Senate bill, however, and accordingly anticipate that I will support some amendments to this legislation as it moves forward in the legislative process.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 2001

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, since I was unexpectedly called away from the Capitol, I was unable to participate in the following votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

July 17, 2001:
Rollcall vote 233, on H. Amdt. 169 to H.R. 2500, increasing funding by $11.7 million for the methamphetamine lab seizures program by the DEA, I would have voted “nay.”
Rollcall vote 234, on H. Amdt. 170 to H.R. 2500, increasing funding for the Economic Development Administration by $73 million, I would have voted “nay.”
Rollcall vote 235, on H. Amdt. 171 to H.R. 2500, striking Section 103 from the bill which prohibits the use of funds to pay for abortions services in federal prisons, I would have “nay.”

July 18, 2001:
Rollcall vote 236, on approving the Journal, I would have vote “yea.”
Rollcall vote 237, on the motion to disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to a conference on H.R. 1, I would have voted “yea.”
Rollcall vote 238, on the motion to table the motion to instruct conferees to H.R. 1, I would have voted “yea.”