more dangerous, as technology prolif-erates, as we see those we are send-ing technology to using that tech-nology for their military purposes, then pass. I hope I am wrong. We, and we see our agencies and our com-mittees—like the Cox committee—say-ing our lax export laws are causing some of this, and we are in the process of loosening export laws, I think that is unwise. I hope I am wrong.

As I said yesterday, I can afford to be wrong. If I am wrong, a few companies have been held up a few days. If the proponents of this legislation are wrong, it could cause problems for the country. I hope I am proven to be wrong and that I am strong enough to be able to stand up and say it when and if that time comes. I hope it does come to that. But we will not know for a while.

In the meantime, hopefully, through changes as we go along, through con-tinuing to work with the administra-tion in heightening their awareness of some of the problems and details we have seen in our committee work over the years, if we see we are going down the wrong track, we will be able to re-spond and adjust in midstream. I know my colleagues on the other side will join in that hope and desire, and I am sure we will be able to work together toward that end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-a tor from New Jersey.

U.N. WORLD CONFERENCE AGAINST RACISM

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, the U.N. World Conference Against Racism recently proceeding in Durban, South Africa, had the enormous potential to make a contribution in the historic fight against race and intolerance. In-deed, holding the conference itself in South Africa was a tribute to the peo-ple of that country and their long struggle against racism and apartheid. It could have been a seminal moment in the evolution, in our long fight for individual liberty.

While much progress has been made, we can all attest that racism and dis-crimination continue to affect hun-dreds of millions of people around the globe.

This conference had such potential. It could have addressed issues such as the rising intolerance toward refugees, intolerance towards asylum seekers, the unjustified denial of citizenship be-cause of race, religion, or origin. The conference had the potential for the United States to demonstrate the great progress we have made in this country on issues of tolerance, of the fight against racism. In showcasing the American experience, nothing could have more vividly demonstrated the changes in the United States than the presence of Colin Powell, an American Secretary of State, not only of African ancestry but of ancestry beyond our own shores.

Instead of realizing this potential, the conference has collapsed in a storm of recrimination and venomous rhet-oric. The United States and Israel have walked out of the conference. It ap-pears that others will soon follow.

The conference, which was intended to be forward looking and to come up with a plan of action for fighting rac-ism around the globe has instead de-stroyed itself because of old hatreds and the resurrection of discredited agendas. The insistence of Israel’s en-mies on using this conference to launch vile attacks on Israel, to at-tempt to equate Zionism with racism, has fully and completely justified the Bush administration’s decision to with-draw from the conference.

I take the floor today because on a bipartisan basis I believe it should be clear this Senate supports the Bush ad-ministration’s decision to leave the conference, to attack its agenda, and to make clear we will have no part of it.

For many years, Arab regimes have used the United States to advance their anti-Israel agenda. What is hap-pening in Durban today is not new. The tragedy is the lesson has not been learned. In 1995, with the support of the so-called nonaligned nations, these re-gimes succeeded in passing the infamous “Zionism equals racism” resolution. After much work, the United States, to our considerable credit, had that odious resolution rescinded in 1991.

The U.N. Secretary General, Kofi Annan, has referred to that resolution as the “low point in the history of the United Nations.” To his credit, Annan has acknowledged the historical U.N. position of calling for the normalization of Israel’s status within the U.N. Indeed, normalization has been achieved.

For 40 years, Arab and Muslim na-tions prevented Israel from becoming a member of any regional group. By that denial of regional status, Israel and Israel alone is prohibited from becoming an eligible member of the Security Council. This tremendous injustice was finally rectified only last year when Israel was able to join the Western Eu- ropean and Others Group.

Despite the Secretary General’s lead-ership in trying to improve U.N. reso-lutions regarding Israel, we are now forced to fight these old battles again, in the rhetoric being placed in official negotiated documents of a U.N. conference itself. This demonstrates that not only have we not made progress, but indeed this is as bad as any action taken in the unfortunate history of the U.N. on this subject.

The declaration being produced by the conference and the actions which flows from it are intended to help countries strengthen national mechanisms to promote the human rights of the very victims of racism. But including anti-Semitic language in these documents cannot possibly have a positive effect for the conference agenda. If the anti-Israel language is allowed to stand in the conference dec-la ration, it will have real and lasting effects. The language proposed in this conference will only serve to encourage virulent anti-Semitic language pouring forth from the Palestinian media and media of those of Israel’s neighbors. The language of intolerance and hatred is a key factor in inciting the brutal acts of terrorism now being perpetrated against Israel’s civilians.

So an organization created and dedi-cated to peace is now promoting lan-guage, in an official conference, during a time of violence in the Middle East, that can only result in the loss of life and further hatred. American with-drawal from this conference sends an emphatic message to the Arab world that the United States commitment to Israel has not wavered and our concept of the United Nations as an organiza-tion dedicated to peace and resolving these very disputes has not changed.

The administration’s decision to abandon the racism conference once it was clear that Israel would continue to be singled out was not a partisan ac-tion; it was a principled action. I fully endorse it.

I hope the United States will defend any nation, not just Israel, which is un-fairly singled out for criticism.

While I support this decision, I be-lieve there are larger problems in-olved that deserve our attention. The forces that compelled us to withdraw from the conference—anti-westernism, anti-Americanism—have come to-gether in the U.N. before and may rep-resent a growing challenge to our coun-try. So the decision to withdraw be-cause of anti-Semitism was proper. But it may not be the only justifiable rea-son. There are others.

Only a few months ago, in May of this year, we had another debacle in-volving the United Nations when the United States was voted out of the U.N. Human Rights Commission. What an unbelievable outrage. I do not stand in the well of the Senate believing that the United States succeeded in historic acts worthy of criticism; clearly we have. I do not argue that the United States is beyond criticism for actions in our generation; clearly such acts have occurred. I am willing to atone and the United States is held to the highest standard. But for the United States of America to be removed from the Human Rights Commission upon
I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CANADIAN SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the U.S.-Canadian dispute on softwood lumber.

Although it might have escaped the attention of many in Washington, the Bush administration announced a critical trade policy decision over the August recess.

After considering truck loads of evidence provided by a legion of lawyers, the Department of Commerce once again decided that Canadian provinces giving away timber at a fraction of its value was a subsidy to Canadian lumber production.

Specifically, the Commerce Department issued a preliminary finding that these subsidies amounted to 19.3 percent of the value of Canadian lumber. Further, the Commerce Department took the unusual step of declaring critical circumstances, which back dates the duties by 90 days. It did this because it determined Canadian lumber producers were flooding the U.S. market—in an attempt to take advantage of the expiration of the previous U.S.-Canada agreement on this topic.

The Commerce Department is due to issue another preliminary finding under another U.S. fair trade law, antidumping law, in the middle of October. I agree with most observers that this will likely result in a substantial increase in the current duty.

But I do not rise today to discuss the intricacies of U.S. trade laws.

Nor, Mr. President, do I plan to discuss the details of Canadian lumber programs.

I have never understood how giving away timber at a fraction of its market value and allowing government-set prices instead of market prices could be anything but a market distortion. But that is a debate that we have had for 20 years and I myself have discussed.

The Commerce Department is due to issue another preliminary finding under another U.S. fair trade law, antidumping law, in the middle of October. I agree with most observers that this will likely result in a substantial increase in the current duty.

But I do not rise today to discuss the intricacies of U.S. trade laws.

Nor, Mr. President, do I plan to discuss the details of Canadian lumber programs.

I have never understood how giving away timber at a fraction of its market value and allowing government-set prices instead of market prices could be anything but a market distortion. But that is a debate that we have had for 20 years and I myself have discussed on the Senate floor at least a dozen times.

I see little point in repeating facts that the Commerce Department and the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, the Commerce Department witnesses, the Administration witnesses, the Department of Justice, the Commerce Department and the Department of the Interior, the Commerce Department.

I ask unanimous consent that the forward and executive summary of an excellent analysis of Canadian subsidy programs in British Columbia, prepared by a coalition of Canadian environmental group—"Cutting Subsidies, or Subsidized Cutting?" be printed in the RECORD after my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1)

Mr. BAUCUS. Instead I want to look to the future, I rise today to offer a true and lasting solution to what has become the world’s largest bilateral trade dispute and, by far, the largest fly in the ointment in the U.S.-Canada relationship. Given some political change on both sides of the border, I believe it is now possible to negotiate a lasting and real agreement on the U.S.-Canada softwood lumber dispute.

In 1986, at a similar juncture in a trade case, the U.S. and Canada agreed to resolve the dispute by allowing Canada to collect an export duty—a duty the United States would have otherwise collected. At the same time, Canadian provincial officials agreed to a set of forestry program reforms to eliminate subsidies and begin reforestation.

This arrangement broke down when Canada unilaterally—and without explanation—rewound from the arrangement. But with some adjustments, a similar approach could be pursued to a real solution.

The basic concept is simple. Once the final preliminary duty is known, Canada would agree to collect this on its exports and thus gain the revenue that would otherwise go to the U.S. treasury.

The antidumping element complicates this understanding, but it could be addressed through a minimum export price or a duty adjustment to account for the dumping.

Once the basic export duty rate was set, both sides would agree that the duty would be lowered as Canadian provinces eliminated subsidies. For example, if Canada—or particular provinces—stopped artificially lowering the price of stumpage, the portion of the duties payable on Canadian exports would be reduced, and stumpage subsidies would be dropped.

Unfortunately, evaluating the impact of proposed reforms in Canada’s forestry subsidies is a complex task and, sadly, these complexities have been used to hide subsidies and replace old subsidies with new ones.

In order to assist the trade negotiators from both countries in evaluating proposals for reform, I propose an ad hoc—made up of representatives of both countries, representatives of organized labor from both countries, and representatives of the environmental community from both countries.

This panel would evaluate proposals for forestry reform in Canada and provide a non-binding evaluation of the proposed changes to relevant U.S. and Canadian government officials.

I feel particularly strong that representatives from the environmental community be included in this group because they are the closest thing to truly independent observers of Canadian forestry practices.