United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, September 6, 2001*

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 6, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN SHIMKUS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Roy Mays, III, Southland Christian Church, Lexington, Kentucky, offered the following prayer:

Dear Gracious Father, for years we have sung ''America, America, God shed his grace on thee,'' and in this prayer we affirm You have done it and we ask You to do it again.

As the Giver of grace, we need Your presence and assistance; Your good favor and great power. For whatever situation we face today, show us that Your strength is sufficient.

On the day following my diagnosis with myeloma cancer, You gave me an insight for experiencing grace in the metaphor of a railroad track, one rail represented healing and one rail symbolized dealing. I was invited to embrace Your grace and endure my race, keeping both rails parallel or I would wreck. Your part was to establish Your purpose and supply Your power. My part was to pray and persevere.

For all of the Members of this House and those they represent, we implore You to please touch us with Your healing grace, forgive us when we have forgotten You, lift us up when we have let You down, deliver help to those who are hurting, and provide peace for those who are in pain.

Also, we entreat You to please give us Your dealing grace: wisdom for our work, discernment for our decisions, resources for our responsibilities, and joy for our journey.

In all these requests, Heavenly Father, we pray that Your will be done, and we accept that Your grace is sufficient. For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FLETCHER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER) will be recognized for 1 minute. There will be only one 1-minute until after the joint meeting of the House and Senate.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND ROY H. MAYS III

(Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a dear friend and classmate, Reverend Roy Mays, for his beautifully insightful prayer opening today's session of the United States House of Representatives.

Within the hallowed walls of this Chamber, my colleagues and I gather to attend to the business of this great Nation. Since the beginning of our democracy, we have begun each day's work petitioning our creator that we might know truth and have the wisdom and understanding to rightfully fulfill our duties. As Reverend Mays so eloquently stated in his prayer, our creator grants us grace and strength sufficient for our duties.

Reverend Mays continues to be a beacon for everyone who has crossed paths with him or who has made his acquaintance, including people in over 40 States where Roy ministered as an evangelist, also among the students, faculty and administration whose lives he has touched during 12 years of service at Cincinnati Bible College and Seminary. For the past 16 years, Reverend Mays has blessed thousands through the congregation at Lexington's Southland Christian Church as the senior executive associate minister.

Additionally, it is said that the character of a person is reflected in the countenance of one's spouse and children so it is with Roy and his lovely wife of 28 years, Beth, and his two children, Amanda and Ryan, who reflect the grace and peace engendered by mutual unconditional love.

Even after being diagnosed with multiple myeloma cancer in 1999, Reverend Mays continues to touch the lives of those around him, refusing to allow his testimony to fade and his countenance to dim, even when struggling to overcome persistently failing health. He stands humbly but firm with God, and with God's help of peace and perseverance during the most trying times of life. Through this example, countless others have received hope.

In this House, we pray alongside Reverend Roy Mays that we might be touched with both our Father's healing grace and dealing grace. We are inspired by Reverend Mays' unflagging faith and his steadfast confidence in God's plan for all.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep appreciation that I recognize Roy Mays, not only for his service to us here today,

but also to countless others across our Nation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that during the joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Vicente Fox, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his right and left will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance which is anticipated, the Chair feels that the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly adhered to.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor, and the cooperation of all Members is requested.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess, beginning at about 10:48 a.m. the following proceedings were had:

□ 1048

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY VICENTE FOX, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Bill Sims, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Vicente Fox, the President of the United Mexican States, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY);

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS);

The gentleman from California (Mr. COX);

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE);

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER);

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE);

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER);

The gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON);

The gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON);

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ);

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO);

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR);

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS);

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ);

The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BACA);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ);

The gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD);

The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ);

The gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ); and

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as a committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency Vicente Fox, the President of the United Mexican States, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE);

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY);

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER);

The Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER);

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY);

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS);

The Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN);

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY);

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT);

The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES);

The Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON);

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG);

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST);

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI);

The Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS);

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM); and

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK).

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, the Honorable Jesse Bibiano Marehalau, Ambassador of Micronesia.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

□ 1100

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

□ 1115

At 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m., the Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the President of the United Mexican States, His Excellency Vicente Fox.

The President of the United Mexican States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great privilege and I deem it a high honor and a personal pleasure to present to you the President of the United Mexican States, His Excellency Vicente Fox.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY VICENTE FOX, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

(Portions of the following address were delivered in Spanish, with a simultaneous translation in English.)

President FOX. Thank you. The applause in this room welcoming me has been heard by 100 million Mexicans which, in the name of them, I thank all of you for being so kind with us in Mexico.

Honorable Members of the Congress of the United States of America, it is a distinct honor for me to meet you here in the oldest legislative assembly on the American continent, a Congress whose deliberations have such a strong influence not only on the history of this country, but of the entire world.

This is an historic moment between our two nations in which the governments of Mexico and the United States have decided to begin a new era of friendship and cooperation to benefit both our peoples.

Mexico and the United States wish to bring together our principles and interests, as well as our traditions and hopes. The meeting of our two countries at the dawning of this new century may represent the beginning of the most promising chapters in our common history.

My presence in this Chamber bears witness to that will to bring our countries closer together. It is our very firm wish as Mexicans and Americans to establish a new relationship, a more mature, full and equitable relationship based on mutual trust.

Honorable Members of the United States Congress, I stand before you today with a simple message. Trust needs to be the key element of our new relationship. I am aware that for many Americans and for many Mexicans the idea of trusting their neighbor may seem risky and perhaps even unwise. I am sure that many on both sides of the border would rather stick to the old saying that good fences make good neighbors.

This perception has deep roots in history. In Mexico, they derive from a long-held sense of suspicion and apprehension about its powerful neighbor. And in the United States, they stem from previous experiences with a political regime governing Mexico which for the most part was regarded as undemocratic and untrustworthy.

Our countries, thus, cautiously distanced themselves from one other to pursue this frame of mind; but circumstances have changed. We are now bound closely together, whether in trade or tourism, economic or family ties. Our links are countless and ever growing. No two nations are more important to the immediate prosperity and well-being of one another than Mexico and the United States.

That is why our two great nations must go forward together to establish wider and deeper forms of cooperation and understanding. In this task, trust will be essential to achieve our goals. We must, therefore, leave behind the suspicion and indifference that have so often in the past been the source of misunderstandings between our two peoples, for it is only by engaging more fully as neighbors and partners that we can make a difference to our societies, and we now have before us a historic opportunity to achieve this end which has proved so elusive in the past.

We intend to be forthright in our friendship and unwavering in our commitment. For as Corinthians states so simply and truly, it is required that those who have been given a trust must prove faithful. The relationship between Mexico and the United States has changed in one fundamental way. True democracy in Mexico, for decades an unfulfilled dream, is now a reality.

As a result of last year's vote, Mexico now has a legitimate and truly democratic leadership. This has meant a change in government, but it is also a reflection of a profound change in the values and aspirations of Mexican society. I am, therefore, determined to make democracy and tolerance the principles that guide all government actions, and to ensure that public institutions in Mexico become the guarantors of the rights and highest aspirations of citizens.

I have also pledged to address the most pressing problems now confronting Mexico, some of which are perhaps unintended, but nonetheless tangible legacies from our authoritarian past. Among them, the poverty and inequality that for so many decades have condemned millions of Mexicans to a life of disadvantage and insecurity; the crippling disease of corruption, which has had such an insidious effect on the life of our country; and the fragility and weakness of our judicial system, which itself must be reformed in order to bring an end to impunity and to consolidate the rule of law throughout the country.

I am convinced that it is time to bring Mexico up to date on all fronts, both within and beyond our borders. It is also time to bring Mexico up to date in its relations with the United States. Both of our nations now fully share, without qualification, the fundamental values of freedom and democracy. Thanks to those democratic changes inaugurated in Mexico last year on July 2, the time has come for Mexico and the United States to trust each other.

Simple trust, that is what has been sorely absent in our relationship in the past, and that is what is required for us to propel and strengthen our relationship in the days, weeks, and years to come. Let us foster trust between our societies. Let us build trust along our common borders. Let us take the road less-traveled-by and build confidence every step of the way. Only trust will allow us to constructively tackle the challenges our two nations face as we undertake to build a new partnership in North America.

Take, for example, our common struggle against the scourge of drugs. It should be clear by now that no government, however powerful, will be able to defeat on its own the forces of transnational organized crime that lie behind drug trafficking. Intense cooperation is required to confront this threat, and trust is certainly a prerequisite of cooperation.

This is why since I took office last year, Mexico has enhanced its cooperation with U.S. authorities. We have arrested key drug kingpins and extradited drug traffickers wanted by the United States Justice Department.

However, much more needs to be done. Trust will be crucial to enhance intelligence and information sharing between both governments. We are committed to becoming a full partner with the United States in the fight against drugs. But trust requires that one partner not be judged unilaterally by the other.

Members of this honorable Congress, give trust a chance. Give both governments a chance. The bill to suspend drug certification for 3 years, S. 219, will allow us to move forward. In the fight against drugs, cooperation is not a nicety; it is a necessity.

We ask that you demonstrate your trust in us by passing this legislation as a gesture of your faith and confidence in this new country that we are working so hard to build.

We must also trust each other if we are to deal successfully with the issue of migration. In recent months, President George Bush and I have already shown our willingness to trust each other by agreeing to discuss this most complex matter.

As the history of this country shows, migration has always rendered more economic benefits to the United States than the costs it entails. Let us also not forget that migrants invariably enrich the cultural life of the land that receives them. Many among you have a parent or a grandparent who came into this country as an immigrant from another land.

Therefore, allow me to take this opportunity to pay homage to those brave men and women who in the past took on the challenge of building a new life for themselves and for their families in this country.

And let me also salute the Mexican migrants living in this country and say to them, Mexico needs you. We need your talent and your entrepreneurship. We need you to come home one day and play a part in building a strong Mexico.

When you return, when you retire, we need you to come back and help us convince other Mexicans that the future lies in a prosperous and democratic Mexico. My dear countrymen, Mexico will not forget you and will support you. We will not fail you.

There is one crucial fact that we must not lose sight of. Migration flows that respond to deep underlying economic incentives are all but impossible

to stop and must instead be regulated. Mexico is therefore seeking an agreement that will lend greater security and orderliness to the migration flows between our two countries.

That is why trust in dealing with migration entails reaching common ground to address the status of Mexican migrants already working and living in the United States, already contributing to enrich this Nation. Let me be clear about this: regularization does not mean rewarding those who break the law. Regularization means that we will provide them with the legal means to allow them to continue contributing to this great Nation.

The agreement that we seek would establish a higher ceiling for permanent visas awarded to Mexicans coming to this country, and it would also expand opportunities for Mexican workers to obtain temporary work visas so they can enter the United States safely and legally. Additionally, the agreement would require us to enhance our cooperative efforts to improve border safety, save lives and crack down on criminal smuggling gangs, or polleros. And, finally, it would demand that we promote economic growth in Mexico, and we know this is our responsibility, to promote specific opportunities for all those kids and young persons specifically in those regions that are the source of most migrants.

Progress regarding migration will not be easy. Yet it is essential that we maintain our commitment to an open and frank discussion, so that we may find a lasting solution that is acceptable to both our countries.

Such a discussion can only take place in a climate of trust. We have a fundamental decision to make. It is a decision that provides us with an opportunity to achieve the highest aspiration of any politician, leaving a lasting legacy of well-being to their people.

Mexico and the United States must also work constructively to promote our common values within our region. By adopting a clear and consistent stance, our governments may jointly address some of the most relevant and pressing issues of our hemisphere, such as the deepening of democracy and the promotion of human rights. This should be our most noble cause in the Americas and in the rest of the world.

On issues of common concern, such as the situation in Colombia, the promotion of economic development across Central America, the establishment of the Free Trade Area of the Americas, the negotiation of a democratic charter for the OAS, or the shared goal of fostering financial stability and disarming financial crises throughout our region, it is vital that Mexico and the United States work together, each one as a partner that we are, in building peace and stability throughout the Americas on the basis of our own principles and interests.

Evidently, we will not always see eye to eye. But both countries should convey to each other, in all sincerity and candor, their respective perceptions about how best to tackle issues of common concern for the well-being of our peoples. Trust will allow us to do this.

Members of the Congress of the United States of America, we have before us today the opportunity to dramatically change the future of our relationship. This meeting between Mexico and the United States is today the meeting between two democracies willing to build a better future.

The relationship between Mexico and the United States is now in our hands. It is up to us to open wide the windows of opportunity before us. We are the architects of our common destiny.

This means that we must re-create the relationship between our two great nations in a conscious and deliberate manner, moving forward firmly without leaving anything to chance. We must fully share this commitment in order to later enjoy together the fruits of our common labors.

Obviously, we all know full well that there are no easy answers nor magical solutions to the challenges faced by Mexico and the United States, but there is a path along which we can make progress with firm steps towards their solution, the path of mutual trust, trust that our governments will always behave with integrity in their daily work, trust that the strength of our relationship as partners and friends is strong, trust in our future of shared prosperity.

□ 1145

Honorable Members of the U.S. Congress, the political change currently under way in Mexico is the most powerful reason why we are now able to establish new forms of friendship and cooperation with the United States. We are ready to turn this change into the seed of a better future for both of our countries.

I hope that the United States will embrace this historic opportunity to build a new era of prosperity and understanding between our peoples. It requires will, as well as vision, to take advantage of this favorable turn in history and forge a new friendship between Mexicans and Americans.

This legislative body, along with its peers in Mexico, can play a decisive role in bringing our two countries together. You are a key partner in fostering trust between our two peoples.

Years ago, the United States Congress faced a difficult decision and chose to vote in favor of a greater integration with Mexico through the North American Free Trade Agreement.

The partnership between Mexico and the United States is still incomplete. There remain many unresolved issues that must be dealt with in order to achieve our common goals as partners. One of these goals is an issue which this great body will soon consider and which entails an important obligation under NAFTA; it is the issue of access to the United States for Mexican trucks. For this, as in many other items of our common agenda, we need your trust. Trust will allow both countries to comply responsibly and maturely with their obligations to one another.

The overarching question is not, then, whether we can afford to trust each other, but whether we can afford not to. The growing convergence of our nations can lead to shared responsibility and prosperity and to the strengthening of those values that we have in common.

Let us begin anew, as those who founded our modern nations once did, remembering on both sides that there can be no friendship without trust and no trust without true commitment.

When history comes knocking on our doors, as it has done now, bold decisions are required. Let us make one today. Let us decide to trust one another.

John F. Kennedy believed in new beginnings. In accepting his party's nomination as President he spoke of a New Frontier, ''We stand today on the edge of a New Frontier . . . the New Frontier of which I speak is not a set of promises—it is a set of challenges.'' That was in 1960.

Today, at the dawn of a new century, our two great nations face new challenges. But we do so with new opportunities, unimaginable even a few years ago.

Our new frontier will be conquered not by confrontation, but through cooperation; not by threats, but by common aspirations; not by fear, but by trust.

My friends, let us pledge today to create a new special partnership between the United States and Mexico for the benefit of our two great peoples.

Senoras y senores:

Viva Mexico!

Viva Estados Unidos!

Viva nuestro futuro en comun!

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 11 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m., the President of the United Mexican States, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet;

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 11 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess until 12:15 p.m.

□ 1215

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

STATEMENT FROM FAMILY OF CHAPLAIN JAMES DAVID FORD

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I have been asked to read a statement by the entire Ford family on the death of Chaplain Ford.

''The Ford family thanks everyone for their sympathy and concern about the death of Chaplain James David Ford.

''We wish to clarify that Chaplain Ford was very ill for an extended period of time. Many people did not realize this. This physical illness gave him no hope of regaining his zest for life.

''The family is at peace with his decision. We have supported him his entire life in everything he did and thought and we support him still. Most importantly, he is at peace now with his Creator. Of this we are certain.''

This is signed by Marcy Ford and the entire Ford family.

PRESIDENT FOX'S VISIT AND IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to reemphasize the need for immigration reform in the United States. In recent days, we have heard lengthy discussions from opponents and proponents on this issue. I want to make sure that the people, the hardworking immigrants and the many families that I represent, are not lost in that debate.

Millions of immigrants have lived here for an extended period of time. They go to work every single day. They pay taxes just like you and me. They own homes and many own businesses, and many have played by the rules. They also have children who are U.S. citizens. These people deserve respect. They deserve to be acknowledged for the many contributions that they have made to this great country.

Mexican President Vicente Fox has done a superb job of highlighting the need for immigration reform. He recognizes the immense contributions all immigrants make to the U.S. economy and to foreign economies such as his own, and a majority of U.S. citizens recognize the important contributions that immigrants have made to this country. A recent bipartisan poll found that 62 percent of voters support legalization for immigrants who pay taxes, break no laws, and play by the rules.

I ask for this Congress to begin discussions, as President Fox stated yesterday at the White House, to begin discussions on immigration reform.

CONGRATULATIONS TO UNITED STATES LITTLE LEAGUE CHAMPIONS FROM APOPKA, FLORIDA

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the United States Little League champions from Apopka, Florida. While I may represent the people of Apopka in the U.S. Congress, the Apopka Little Leaguers represented our entire country with class and dignity.

Led by Coaches Brewer and Tapley, these 11 young men put the little town of Apopka, Florida, front and center on the world stage. They entered the 16-team world series tournament as underdogs, but they fought their way to the top of the heap to become national champions. Their persistence and hard work will surely inspire thousands of future Little Leaguers.

On behalf of myself, Senator NELSON, and the entire U.S. Congress, we say to the Apopka Little Leaguers, congratulations on a job well done, and we thank them for inspiring us all.

U.S.-MEXICO RELATIONS

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I join President Bush and my colleagues in welcoming His Excellency Vicente Fox to the U.S. Capitol today.

Listening to President Fox's words this morning confirms the special relationship that we enjoy between Mexico and the United States.

We all know, as my colleague and friend just mentioned, that immigration policy is crucial and should be the focus of discussions between the United States and Mexico. We should be an America that welcomes again, and I say that from the heart as the grandson of an Irish immigrant to this country.

But we must also look, Madam Speaker, beyond immigration. We have a historic opportunity to expand our relationship rooted in free trade, to which President Fox also alluded. President Fox accurately acknowledged that we share the most dynamic border in the world. Let us show the world how neighbors can improve lives through mutual trust and mutual respect.

Today more than ever it is time for America and Mexico to prove that adage that we ought to love our neighbors as ourselves.

VIET NAM HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, pursuant to a previous order of the House, I call up the bill (H.R. 2833) to promote freedom and democracy in Viet Nam, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 2833 is as follows:

H.R. 2833

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Viet Nam Human Rights Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Findings.
Sec. 102. Purpose.

TITLE II—PROMOTION OF FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY IN VIET NAM

Subtitle A—Prohibition on Nonhumanitarian Assistance to the Government of Viet Nam

Sec. 201. Bilateral nonhumanitarian assistance.
Sec. 202. Multilateral nonhumanitarian assistance.

Subtitle B—Assistance to Support Democracy in Viet Nam

Sec. 211. Assistance.

Subtitle C—United States Public Diplomacy

Sec. 221. Radio Free Asia transmissions to Viet Nam.
Sec. 222. United States educational and cultural exchange programs with Viet Nam.

Subtitle D—United States Refugee Policy

Sec. 232. Refugee resettlement for nationals of Viet Nam.

Subtitle E—Annual Report on Progress Toward Freedom and Democracy in Viet Nam

Sec. 241. Annual report.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Viet Nam is a one-party state, ruled and controlled by the Vietnamese Communist Party.

(2) The Government of Viet Nam denies the people of Viet Nam the right to change their government and prohibits independent political, social, and labor organizations.

(3)(A) The Government of Viet Nam consistently pursues a policy of harassment, discrimination, and intimidation, and sometimes of imprisonment and other forms of detention, against those who peacefully express dissent from government or party policy.

(B) Recent victims of such mistreatment, which violates the rights to freedom of expression and association recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, include Dr. Nguyen Dan Que, Dr. Nguyen Thanh Giang, General Tran Do, Most Venerable Thich Huyen Quang, Most Venerable Thich Quang Do, Father Nguyen Van Ly, numerous leaders of the Hoa Hao Buddhist Church and of independent Protestant churches, and an undetermined number of members of the Montagnard ethnic minority groups who participated in peaceful demonstrations in the Central Highlands of Viet Nam during February 2001.

(4) The Government of Viet Nam systematically deprives its citizens of the fundamental right to freedom of religion. Although some freedom of worship is permitted, believers are forbidden to participate in religious activities except under circumstances rigidly defined and controlled by the government:

(A) In 1999 the Government issued a Decree Concerning Religious Activities, which declared in pertinent part that ''[a]ll activities using religious belief in order to oppose the State of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, to prevent the believers from carrying out civic responsibilities, to sabotage the union of all the people, to against the healthy culture of our nation, as well as superstitious activities, will be punished in conformity with the law''.

(B) The Unified Buddhist Church of Viet Nam (UCBV), the largest religious denomination in the country, has been declared illegal by the Government, and over the last twenty-five years its clergy have often been imprisoned and subjected to other forms of persecution. The Patriarch of the Unified Buddhist Church, 83-year-old Most Venerable Thich Huyen Quang, has been detained for 21 years in a ruined temple in an isolated area of central Viet Nam. Most Venerable Thich Quang Do, the Executive President of the Unified Buddhist Church, has also been in various forms of detention for many years, and was recently rearrested and placed under house arrest after he had proposed to bring Most Venerable Thich Huyen Quang to Saigon for medical treatment.

(C) The Hoa Hao Buddhist Church was also declared to be illegal until 1999, when the Government established an organization which purports to govern the Hoa Hao. According to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, ''[t]his organization is made up almost entirely of Communist Party members and apparently is not recognized as legitimate by the vast majority of Hoa Haos . . . [n]evertheless, [this government-sponsored organization] has sought to control all Hoa Hao religious activity, particularly at the Hoa Hao village, which is the center of Hoa Hao religious life''. Hoa Hao believers who do not recognize the legitimacy of the government organization are denied the right to visit the Hoa Hao village, to conduct traditional religious celebrations, or to display Hoa Hao symbols. Many have been arrested and subjected to administrative detention, and several Hoa Hao have been sentenced to prison terms for protesting these denials of religious freedom.

(D) Independent Protestants, most of whom are members of ethnic minority groups, are subjected to particularly harsh treatment by the Government of Viet Nam. According to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, such treatment includes ''police raids on homes and house churches, detention, imprisonment, confiscation of religious and personal property, physical and psychological abuse, and fines for engaging in unapproved religious activities (such as collective worship, public religious expression and distribution of religious literature, and performing baptisms, marriages, or funeral services) . . . [i]n addition, it is reported that ethnic Hmong Protestants have been forced by local officials to agree to abandon their faith''.

(E) Other religious organizations, such as the Catholic Church, are formally recognized by the Government but are subjected to pervasive regulation which violates the right to freedom of religion. For instance, the Catholic Church is forbidden to appoint its own bishops without Government consent, which is frequently denied, to accept seminarians without specific official permission, and to profess Catholic doctrines which are inconsistent with Government policy. A Catholic priest, Father Nguyen Van Ly, was arrested in March 2001 and remains in detention after submitting written testimony to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom.

(F) The Government has also confiscated numerous churches, temples, and other properties belonging to religious organizations. The vast majority of these properties—even those belonging to religious organizations formally recognized by the Government—have never been returned.

(5) Since 1975 the Government of Viet Nam has persecuted veterans of the Army of the Republic of Viet Nam and other Vietnamese who had opposed the Viet Cong insurgency and the North Vietnamese invasion of South Viet Nam. Such persecution typically included substantial terms in ''re-education camps'', where detainees were often subjected to torture and other forms of physical abuse, and in which many died. Re-education camp survivors and their families were often forced into internal exile in ''New Economic Zones''. Many of these former allies of the United States, as well as members of their families, continue until the present day to suffer various forms of harassment and discrimination, including denial of basic social benefits and exclusion from higher education and employment.

(6)(A) The Government of Viet Nam has been particularly harsh in its treatment of members of the Montagnard ethnic minority groups of the Central Highlands of Viet Nam, who were the first line in the defense of South Viet Nam against invasion from the North and who fought courageously beside members of the Special Forces of the United States Army, suffering disproportionately heavy casualties, and saving the lives of many of their American and Vietnamese comrades-in-arms.

(B) Since 1975 the Montagnard peoples have been singled out for severe repression, in part because of their past association with the United States and in part because their strong commitment to their traditional way of life and to their Christian religion is regarded as inconsistent with the absolute loyalty and control demanded by the Communist system.

(C) In February 2001 several thousand Montagnards participated in a series of peaceful demonstrations throughout the Central Highlands, demanding religious freedom and restoration of their confiscated lands, and the Government responded by closing off the Central Highlands and sending in military forces, tanks, and helicopter gunships.

(D) Credible reports by refugees who have escaped to Cambodia indicate that the Government has executed some participants in the demonstrations and has subjected others to imprisonment, torture, and other forms of physical abuse.

(E) The Government of Viet Nam has also taken steps to prevent further Montagnards from escaping, and there are credible reports that Vietnamese security forces in Cambodia are offering bounties for the surrender of Montagnard asylum seekers.

(7) The Government of Viet Nam has also persecuted members of other ethnic minority groups, including the Khmer Krom from the Mekong Delta, many of whom fought alongside United States military personnel during the Viet Nam war and whose Hinayana Buddhist religion is not among those recognized by the Government.

(8) The Government of Viet Nam also engages in or condones serious violations of the rights of workers. In August 1997, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) reported that child labor exploitation is on the rise in Viet Nam with tens of thousands of children under 15 years of age being subjected to such exploitation. The government's official labor export program also has subjected workers, many of whom are women, to involuntary servitude, debt bondage, and other forms of abuse, and the reaction of government officials to worker complaints of such abuse has been to threaten the workers with punishment if they do not desist in their complaints.

(9)(A) United States refugee resettlement programs for Vietnamese nationals, including the Orderly Departure Program (ODP), the Resettlement Opportunities for Returning Vietnamese (ROVR) program, and resettlement of boat people from refugee camps throughout Southeast Asia, were authorized by law in order to rescue Vietnamese nationals who have suffered persecution on account of their wartime associations with the United States, as well as those who currently have a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group.

(B) In general, these programs have served their purpose well. However, many refugees who were eligible for these programs were unfairly denied or excluded, in some cases by vindictive or corrupt Communist officials who controlled access to the programs, and in others by United States personnel who imposed unduly restrictive interpretations of program criteria. These unfairly excluded refugees include some of those with the most compelling cases, including many Montagnard combat veterans and their families.

(10) The Government of Viet Nam systematically jams broadcasts by Radio Free Asia, an independent broadcast service funded by the United States in order to provide news and entertainment to the people of countries in Asia whose governments deny the right to freedom of expression and of the press.

(11) In 1995 the Governments of the United States and Viet Nam announced the ''normalization'' of diplomatic relations. In 1998

then-President Clinton waived the application of section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974 (commonly known as the ''Jackson-Vanik Amendment''), which restricts economic assistance to countries with non-market economies whose governments also restrict freedom of emigration. In 1999 the Governments of the United States and Viet Nam announced ''agreement in principle'' on a bilateral trade agreement. This agreement was signed in 2000 and has been presented to Congress for approval or disapproval.

(12) The Congress and the American people are united in their determination that the extension or expansion of trade relations with a country whose government engages in serious and systematic violations of fundamental human rights must not be construed as a statement of approval or complacency about such practices. The promotion of freedom and democracy around the world—and particularly for people who have suffered in large part because of their past associations with the United States and because they share our values—is and must continue to be a central objective of United States foreign policy.

SEC. 102. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to promote the development of freedom and democracy in Viet Nam.

TITLE II—PROMOTION OF FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY IN VIET NAM

Subtitle A—Prohibition on Nonhumanitarian Assistance to the Government of Viet Nam

SEC. 201. BILATERAL NONHUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.

(a) ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), United States nonhumanitarian assistance may not be provided to the Government of Viet Nam—

(A) for fiscal year 2002 unless not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act the President determines and certifies to Congress that the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (2) have been met during the 12-month period ending on the date of the certification; and

(B) for each subsequent fiscal year unless the President determines and certifies to Congress in the most recent annual report submitted pursuant to section 241 that the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (2) have been met during the 12-month period covered by the report.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of this paragraph are that—

(A) the Government of Viet Nam has made substantial progress toward releasing all political and religious prisoners from imprisonment, house arrest, and other forms of detention;

(B) the Government of Viet Nam has made substantial progress toward respecting the right to freedom of religion, including the right to participate in religious activities and institutions without interference by or involvement of the Government;

(C) the Government of Viet Nam has made substantial progress toward respecting the human rights of members of ethnic minority groups in the Central Highlands or elsewhere in Viet Nam; and

(D)(i) neither any official of the Government of Viet Nam nor any agency or entity wholly or partly owned by the Government of Viet Nam was complicit in a severe form of trafficking in persons; or

(ii) the Government of Viet Nam took all appropriate steps to end any such complicity and hold such official, agency, or entity fully accountable for its conduct.

(b) EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply for any fiscal year with respect to the provision of United States nonhumanitarian assistance for any program or activity for which such assistance was provided to the Government of Viet Nam for fiscal year 2001 in an amount not to exceed the amount so provided for fiscal year 2001.

(2) CONTINUATION OF ASSISTANCE IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST.—Notwithstanding the failure of the Government of Viet Nam to meet the requirements of subsection (a)(2), the President may waive the application of subsection (a) for any fiscal year if the President determines that the provision to the Government of Viet Nam of increased United States nonhumanitarian assistance would promote the purposes of this Act or is otherwise in the national interest of the United States.

(3) EXERCISE OF WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may exercise the authority under paragraph (2) with respect to—

(i) all United States nonhumanitarian assistance to Viet Nam; or

(ii) one or more programs, projects, or activities of such assistance.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SEVERE FORM OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—The term ''severe form of trafficking in persons'' means any activity described in section 103(8) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–386 (114 Stat. 1470); 22 U.S.C. 7102(8)).

(2) UNITED STATES NONHUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.—The term ''United States nonhumanitarian assistance'' means—

(A) any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including programs under title IV of chapter 2 of part I of that Act, relating to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation), other than—

(i) disaster relief assistance, including any assistance under chapter 9 of part I of that Act;

(ii) assistance which involves the provision of food (including monetization of food) or medicine; and

(iii) assistance for refugees; and

(B) sales, or financing on any terms, under the Arms Export Control Act.

SEC. 202. MULTILATERAL NONHUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.

The President shall ensure that section 701 of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262d), relating to human rights, is carried out with respect to Viet Nam.

Subtitle B—Assistance to Support Democracy in Viet Nam

SEC. 211. ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to provide assistance, through appropriate nongovernmental organizations, for the support of individuals and organizations to promote human rights and nonviolent democratic change in Viet Nam.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out subsection (a) $2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

Subtitle C—United States Public Diplomacy

SEC. 221. RADIO FREE ASIA TRANSMISSIONS TO VIET NAM.

(a) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—It is the policy of the United States to take such measures as are necessary to overcome the jamming of Radio Free Asia by the Government of Viet Nam.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to such amounts as are otherwise authorized to be appropriated for the Broadcasting Board of Governors, there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the policy under subsection (a) $9,100,000 for the fiscal year 2002 and $1,100,000 for the fiscal year 2003.

SEC. 222. UNITED STATES EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS WITH VIET NAM.

It is the policy of the United States that programs of educational and cultural exchange with Viet Nam should actively promote progress toward freedom and democracy in Viet Nam by providing opportunities to Vietnamese nationals from a wide range of occupations and perspectives to see freedom and democracy in action and, also, by ensuring that Vietnamese nationals who have already demonstrated a commitment to these values are included in such programs.

Subtitle D—United States Refugee Policy

SEC. 232. REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT FOR NATIONALS OF VIET NAM.

(a) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—It is the policy of the United States to offer refugee resettlement to nationals of Viet Nam (including members of the Montagnard ethnic minority groups) who were eligible for the Orderly Departure Program or any other United States refugee program and who were deemed ineligible due to administrative error or who for reasons beyond the control of such individuals (including the inability to pay bribes demanded by officials of the Government of Viet Nam) were unable to apply for such programs in compliance with deadlines imposed by the Department of State.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITY.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for Migration and Refugee Assistance for each of the fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003, such sums as may be necessary are authorized to be made available for the protection (including resettlement in appropriate cases) of Vietnamese refugees and asylum seekers, including Montagnards in Cambodia.

Subtitle E—Annual Report on Progress Toward Freedom and Democracy in Viet Nam

SEC. 241. ANNUAL REPORT.

Not later than May 31 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report for the 12-month period ending on the date of submission of the report, on the following:

(1)(A) The determination and certification of the President that the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of section 201(a)(2) have been met, if applicable.

(B) The determination of the President under section 201(b)(2), if applicable.

(2) Efforts by the United States Government to secure transmission sites for Radio Free Asia in countries in close geographical proximity to Viet Nam in accordance with section 221(a).

(3) Efforts to ensure that programs with Viet Nam promote the policy set forth in section 222 and with section 102 of the Human Rights, Refugee, and Other Foreign Policy Provisions Act of 1996 regarding participation in programs of educational and cultural exchange.

(4) Steps taken to carry out the policy under section 232(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, September 5, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2833.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and other cosponsors of this important human rights legislation for their strong support for this measure that is before the body today.

Madam Speaker, to hear some of our colleagues talk, we would think that Viet Nam was well on its way to being a human rights success story. Unfortunately, this is simply not the case. Just this week, a Buddhist monk in Danang committed suicide by self-immolation to protest the increasingly harsh repression of the Unified Buddhist Church of Viet Nam.

Just yesterday, the Hanoi security cadres arrested two prominent reform advocates, retired Colonel Phan Que Duong and writer Hoang Minh Chinh. Their only crime appears to have been asking permission to start a nongovernmental organization that would expose corruption and promote transparency in government.

Yet, these thoughtful and courageous men were dragged away from their homes and families on the very eve of the vote on the trade agreement whose supporters say is evidence that the Vietnamese Government is on the road to reform.

It is true that there have been some improvements since the dark days of the late 1970s and early 1980s, when hundreds of thousands of people were confined to so-called ''reeducation camps;'' and as we know, many died there, simply because they had taken the side of freedom. But in recent years, there has been no such progress. Indeed, in the last few months, the government of Viet Nam has substantially increased the frequency and the severity of its human rights violations.

Madam Speaker, the Government of Viet Nam systematically denies the fundamental right to freedom of religion. Although some freedom of worship is permitted, believers are forbidden to participate in religious activities except under circumstances rigidly defined and controlled by the government.

In 1999, the government issued a Decree Concerning Religious Activities which declared, in pertinent part, ''All activities using religious belief in order to oppose the State of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, to prevent the believers from carrying out civic responsibilities, to sabotage the union of all the people, to go against the healthy culture of our Nation, as well as superstitious activities, will be punished in conformity with law.''

The Unified Buddhist Church of Viet Nam, Madam Speaker, the largest religious denomination in Viet Nam, has been declared illegal by the government, and over the last 25 years its clergy have often been imprisoned and subjected to other forms of persecution.

□ 1230

The Patriarch of the Unified Buddhist Church, 83-year-old Most Venerable Thich Huyen Quang, has been detained for 21 years in a ruined temple in an isolated area of central Vietnam. Most Venerable Thich Quang Do, the Executive President of the Unified Baptist Church, has also been in various forms of detention for many years, and was recently rearrested and placed under house arrest after he had proposed to bring the most Venerable Thich Huyen Quang to Saigon for medical treatment. For that, he was punished.

The Hoa Hao Buddhist Church was also declared to be illegal until 1999, when the government established an organization which purports to govern the Hoa Hao, but is dominated by government and Communist cadres, which is not acceptable to the believers. Several Hoa Hao have been sentenced to prison terms for protesting this denial of their religious freedom.

Independent Protestants, most of whom are members of ethnic minority groups, are subjected to particularly harsh treatment by the Government of Vietnam. According to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, such treatment includes police raids on homes and house churches, detention, imprisonment, confiscation of religious and personal property, physical and psychological abuse, and fines for engaging in unapproved religious activities such as collective worship, public religious expression, the distribution of religious literature, and performing baptisms, marriages, and funeral services. In addition, the U.S. Commission's report goes on to say, it is reported that ethnic Hmong Protestants have been forced by local officials to agree to abandon their faith.

A Catholic priest, Madam Speaker, Father Nguyen Van Ly was arrested in March of 2001, just a few months ago, and remains in detention after submitting written testimony to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom. For that, this great trading partner of the United States, this man, this priest, was arrested: submitting testimony to an official organ, a function of the United States Government that investigates religious persecution.

Madam Speaker, the other human rights violation in Vietnam right now is the recent intensification of the government's systematic repression of the Montagnards. Since 1975, the Montagnard people have been severely persecuted, in part because of their wartime association with the United States, and in part because of their strong commitment to their traditional way of life and to their Christian religion, and that is regarded as inconsistent with the absolute loyalty and control demanded by the Communist system.

In February 2001, several thousand Montagnards participated in a series of peaceful demonstrations throughout the Central Highlands, demanding religious freedom and restoration of their confiscated lands. The government responded by closing off the Central Highlands and sending in military forces, tanks and helicopters. Credible reports by refugees who have escaped to Cambodia indicate that at least one participant in the demonstration was killed and that the government has subjected others to imprisonment and torture and other forms of physical abuse. The Government of Vietnam has also taken steps to prevent further Montagnards from escaping, and the Vietnamese security forces in Cambodia are offering bounties for the surrender of Montagnard asylum seekers.

Madam Speaker, I want to also call attention to the active involvement of officials and entities of the Vietnamese Government in severe forms of trafficking in persons. There is evidence that the government's official labor export program has subjected workers, many of whom are women, to involuntary servitude, debt bondage, and other forms of abuse. In the recent case of several hundreds of workers who were trafficked by Vietnamese-owned corporations to the Daewoosa factory in American Samoa, the reaction of government officials to worker complaints of severe mistreatment was to threaten the workers with ''punishment under the laws of Vietnam'' if they continued to complain.

Madam Speaker, as most Members know, these are not the only human rights violations committed by the Vietnamese Government. The Government of Vietnam also pursues a policy of harassment, discrimination, intimidation, and other types of detention against those who peacefully express dissent from the government or the party policy. The arrests of Mr. Chinh and Colonel Duong are just the latest episode in that awful story.

Madam Speaker, the Human Rights Act for Vietnam will ensure that putting an end to those egregious abuses remains central to U.S. foreign policy toward Vietnam. It will not restrict trade in any way, but it uses other forms of leverage to construct a human rights program that is comprehensive yet reasonable and flexible.

First, the act tells the truth about human rights and the situation of human rights in Vietnam. It describes the violations by the Government of Vietnam of the rights to freedom of expression, association, and religion, and the rights of workers, as well as the persecution of ethnic minorities, as I said, including the Montagnards and persons associated with the United States prior to 1975. The act concludes that Congress and the American people are united in their determination that expansion of trade relations should not be construed as approval or complacency or complicity about human rights violations, and that the promotion of freedom and democracy must be central to U.S. foreign policy.

Second, the act will link increases in foreign aid, other than humanitarian assistance to the Government of Vietnam, to a finding by the President that the government has made ''substantial progress'' toward meeting certain human rights benchmarks. These benchmarks are reasonable and easily attainable: substantial progress toward release of political and religious prisoners; substantial progress toward respect by the Government of Vietnam to the right of freedom of religion, including the right to participate in religious organizations not connected to the Government of Vietnam; substantial progress, Madam Speaker, toward respect for the rights of members of ethnic minority groups in the Central Highlands and elsewhere; and an end to the government complicity and severe forms of trafficking in human persons.

Madam Speaker, the Vietnam Human Rights Act does not require cuts in current levels of assistance or impose any restrictions at all on assistance that goes to nongovernmental organizations or private sector enterprises. It affects only increases in nonhumanitarian aid that goes to the Government of Vietnam. It also has a waiver capability that the President can exercise in the national interest or if he feels that the purposes of the act would be better served by waiving its provisions.

Madam Speaker, finally, just let me say the act also authorizes assistance to NGOs committed to promoting freedom and democracy in Vietnam. It will support efforts by the United States to overcome Hanoi's systematic jamming of the profreedom broadcasts by Radio Free Asia. It is amazing to me that right now, as we are about to approve a bilateral trade agreement, they are jamming every day the broadcast coming out of Radio Free Asia.

The act would require the State Department to take steps to ensure that U.S. cultural and exchange programs are open to people who share our values not just of the Vietnamese Government and Communist Party officials and persons close to those officials.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the act declares it to be the policy of the U.S. to offer refugee resettlement to pro-American combat veterans and other residents of Vietnam who meet the statutory criteria for U.S. refugee programs, who have been wrongfully denied access to these programs for reasons beyond their control, including but not limited to their inability to pay bribes that have been demanded by the Vietnamese Government officials.

The act does not change existing refugee law and does not mandate the admission of any person or group. The act does insist, however, that discretion under current law should be exercised to promote fairness for people who have been persecuted for 25 years because of their wartime associations with the U.S. or simply because they share our values.

Madam Speaker, I urge a positive vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2833.

First, I would like to commend my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for introducing this very important legislation and for doggedly pursuing the Vietnam human rights issue, as indeed he has been pursuing so many human rights issues during his entire course of great service to this Nation. I would also like to express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), for moving this legislation so expeditiously.

Madam Speaker, yesterday afternoon I returned from the Durban Conference in South Africa on Racism and Discrimination, as the American delegation was withdrawn by Secretary of State Colin Powell, a decision I fully support.

It is ironic to listen to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), outlining in great detail the discrimination and persecution unfolding in Vietnam against religious and ethnic minorities, because Vietnam was not on the agenda at Durban. The Sudan was not on the agenda at Durban, although as we speak, slave trade is taking place in the Sudan.

Afghanistan and the Taliban were not on the agenda in Durban, although we know what happens to individuals who attempt to introduce Christianity into that country. There are few things Afghanistan needs more than some Christian values.

Saudi Arabia was not on the agenda, although the persecution of women continues unabated, discrimination against women continues unabated.

The only country singled out for criticism at the farce which was Durban was the democratic state and our ally in the Middle East, the State of Israel. So the timing of this legislation, as it comes before us, could not be more opportune.

I would like to identify myself with the statements made by the gentleman from New Jersey with respect to all the specific acts of religious and ethnic persecution which unfold in Vietnam. None of us here should be under any illusion about the nature of the Vietnamese Government. According to the State Department's Human Rights Report, the Vietnamese Government is an unrepentant authoritarian regime. True political opposition in that country is not allowed. Freedom of expression does not exist, and Vietnamese are put in prison for good for simply expressing political opinions the government does not approve of.

The Vietnamese Government places the most severe restrictions on the expression of religious beliefs, particularly beliefs in Buddhism, as my good friend and colleague so eloquently outlined.

Madam Speaker, today the House will approve the U.S.-Vietnam bilateral trade agreement. I support that agreement, but it is critical that we send a signal to Hanoi that the U.S. continues to care about the human rights and the religious freedom situation in Vietnam, not just trade. Passage of the Smith legislation will indicate to the administration and to the Vietnamese Government that the Congress expects to see true progress on the human rights front, and we have not forgotten those Vietnamese who are being persecuted for their religious beliefs or their political views.

The legislation that we are considering will ensure that there is not a rollback in our trade and aid relationship with Vietnam, only a cap on the level of our aid to Vietnam unless decent human rights conditions are created.

□ 1245

It is ironic that this legislation is before us today, because if it were not and if it would be merely a discussion of trade with Vietnam, we ourselves would be engaging in hypocrisy as are the delegates in Durban as we speak. It is important to promote trade. But it is important to stand up for human rights as well.

I commend and congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for introducing this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support its passage.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for his outstanding statement and for pointing out the hypocrisy of the Durban conference, especially in leaving out some of these egregious violators and, as he pointed out, focusing on the state of Israel. I want to thank him for that statement and for his support for that bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act of 2001.

As an original co-sponsor of this landmark legislation, I believe passage of the Viet Nam Human Rights Act will send a strong message to the Hanoi regime and to its victims that expansion of trade relations does not imply approval of or complacency about the continuing pattern of severe human rights violations in Vietnam.

As an ardent supporter of human rights and a strong proponent of free trade, I want to stress that the Viet Nam Human Rights Act is about aid, not trade. This legislation sends a clear message to Hanoi, and also to other interested observers including the Vietnamese-American community, that the U.S. is serious about our commitment to the principles of free speech, freedom of expression, and the freedom of religious exercise.

As a founding member of the Congressional Dialogue on Viet Nam and a member of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, I am acutely aware of the Vietnamese government's human rights violations, including religious persecution and indefinite criminal sentences for political prisoners.

On May 12 of this year, I attended a hearing which addressed the issue or religious suppression and persecution in Vietnam. My colleagues and I heard testimony from many religious Vietnamese-American leaders who shared their perspectives on this important issue. Many of them had suffered personally at the hands of the Vietnamese government. In July, I sent a letter to Secretary of State Colin Powell before he went to Vietnam, asking him to raise these very issues with the government.

This legislation sets a framework for an honest and detailed assessment of the human rights situation in Vietnam. It accurately identifies violations by the Vietnamese government against the rights of the Vietnamese people to exercise their freedom of expression, association, and religion, and the rights of workers, as well as persecution of religious figures and ethnic minorities including the Montagnards and other people associated with the U.S. prior to 1975.

In addition, H.R. 2833 summarizes the history of U.S. policy towards Vietnamese refugees and of normalization of U.S.-Vietnam diplomatic and trade relations. This legislation concludes that Congress and the American people are united in their belief that expansion of trade relations should not and must not be construed as approval of or ignorance about the Vietnamese government's human rights violations. Furthermore, we, the government and the American people, seriously believe that the promotion of freedom and democracy must be central to U.S. foreign policy.

This legislation makes conditional any increases in foreign assistance, other than humanitarian assistance, to the Vietnamese government on a finding by the President that they have made substantial progress toward meeting certain human rights benchmarks, which include the release of all political and religious prisoners from all forms of detention including imprisonment and house arrest; respect by the Vietnamese government towards the right to freedom of religion, including the right to participate in religious organizations not connected to the Vietnamese government; respect for the rights of members of ethnic minority groups in the Central Highlands and elsewhere; and an end to government complicity in severe forms of trafficking in human beings, in particular, women and children.

This bill will also require an enforcement of a provision of a current law designed to withhold non-humanitarian loans and other extensions of funds from international financial institutions to governments that consistently commit gross violations of fundamental human rights.

This legislation will help to actively promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam by authorizing assistance to nongovernmental organizations committed to encouraging and advancing these principles in Vietnam.

Additionally, this legislation declares it to be the policy of the United States to take such measures as are necessary to overcome the jamming of Radio Free Asia by the Vietnamese government. It requires periodic reports on efforts by the U.S. government to secure transmission sites for Radio Free Asia in countries near Vietnam. It also authorizes additional funding to enhance transmission facilities in order to overcome jamming.

This bill seeks to ensure that U.S. educational and cultural exchange programs promote American values. It requires the U.S. State Department to take steps to make sure that U.S. cultural and exchange programs are open to people who share our values, not just Vietnamese government and Communist Party officials and persons close to them.

Finally, this bill would declare it to be the policy of the United States to offer refugee resettlement to residents of Vietnam who met the statutory criteria for the Orderly Departure Program and other refugee programs, but who were incorrectly deemed ineligible for such programs or who, for reasons beyond their own control including but not limited to inability to pay bribes demanded by Vietnamese government officials, were denied access to U.S. programs in time for deadlines imposed by State Department officials. This legislation also requires the State Department to report on what steps it has taken to provide such persons with access to U.S. refugee resettlement.

This bill does not affect any form of humanitarian assistance, nor does it limit assistance that is provided through nongovernmental organizations. Essentially, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act will require the Vietnamese government to make substantial progress towards the release of political and religious prisoners, and an end to religious persecution, respect for the rights of ethnic minorities, and elimination of trafficking in human beings before receiving any further increases in government-to-government U.S. aid. It is my strong belief that this is the least we can do for all those being oppressed by the Communist Government.

For these reasons, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2833 so that we can hold the Vietnamese government accountable for the human rights abuses committed by their regimes and hopefully bring justice to the Vietnamese people.

I commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and his staff for their hard work and commitment in bringing attention to this important issue.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) who has been a persistent and outspoken champion of human rights.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act, a resolution to promote democracy and freedom in Vietnam.

Madam Speaker, last weekend many of us were celebrating Labor Day with our constituents and families honoring our country's proud traditions of democracy and freedom. But last weekend in Da Nang, Vietnam, a 61-year-old monk set himself on fire in protest of the communist authorities' repression of religious freedoms.

Before his death, Ank wrote letters to the U.N. Human Rights Commission, the Human Rights Commission of the European Union and other international groups, stating simply, ''I have decided that the only way I can protest is by setting my body on fire to denounce repression against the UBCV and all other religions.''

I have with me the Declaration of Vietnamese Priests Abroad, an open letter to the international community condemning the vicious repression of religious and other basic human rights in Vietnam. This letter, dated August 15, was signed by 144 Catholic priests worldwide and calls upon ''freedom-loving governments to defend the values of human rights which are being trampled on in Vietnam.''

Madam Speaker, I include the letter for the RECORD.

DECLARATION OF VIETNAMESE PRIESTS ABROAD

We, the undersigned Vietnamese priests abroad, want to express our great concern about the present urgent situation of Vietnam's religious life in general, and the life of the Vietnamese Catholic Church in particular.

Though living and serving away from the Fatherland, we as Vietnamese and as priests remain attached to our people and country. We always pray for our people to be truly free and for our country to be prosperous, in which every Vietnamese is loved and respected in accordance with his or her human dignity.

As for religious life in Vietnam, we are convinced that religious freedom is absolutely a basic and spiritual need for man and society. For the future of Vietnam, religious freedom is not only a legitimate demand but also a matter of human rights that needs to be urgently solved. Vietnam will lose an opportunity to create a bright future if the Vietnamese people do not have true religious freedom. The history of Vietnam has proved that religious life is strongly tied with the destiny of the people. Once religion is free, society will be peaceful and healthy and a human development will be secured for the country.

It is unfortunate for the Vietnamese people that what is happening in our country increasingly proves that religion is at risk of being used as an instrument by the Vietnamese Communist Government and enslaved by it to the point of dying away in the end. Using this as its strategy involves agonizing policies of the legal system (especially the procedure of begging the government permission and policies of discrimination), unreasonable administrative system, ''divide and conquer'' causing division among leaders of the same religion, etc. All of these aim to deprive religious belief of sacred values and to render it meaningless and finally useless. Religious freedom in Vietnam is being distorted and trampled brutally and shamelessly by the Vietnamese Communist Government. The present conditions of society are unstable and only conducive to bribery and power abuse at all levels. In the face of these great social problems, religious organizations do not have a right to truly speak out. If they say anything, they must espouse the policies of the government.

Concerning the Vietnamese Catholic Church, we are in one accord with the pastoral approach of the Vietnamese Episcopal Conference as stated in the Joint Letter May 1, 1980: ''To live the Gospel in the midst of the people.'' It is also for the sake of living the Gospel in the midst of the people that we cannot fail to share the common concern of our people as stated in the above observations.

In the spirit of those observations, we, the undersigned Vietnamese priests abroad, want to declare our position regarding several urgent issues of the present situation of religions in Vietnam as follows:

1. We fervently support the spirit of self-engagement of Reverend Thaddeus Nguyeãn-Vaên-Lyù, a Catholic priest of the Archdiocese of Hueá, and his demands regarding true religious freedom. At the same time, we also support other religious leaders' legitimate demands regarding religious freedom. We demand that the Vietnamese Communist Government guarantee religious leaders' safety and security and their right to freely exercise religious duties.

2. We demand the Vietnamese Communist Government, for the sake of the future of our people and country, bring to an end religious persecution and insidious and malicious strategy, which is ordered to use religions in Vietnam as instruments leading to their destruction.

3. We call freedom loving governments and international human rights organizations to defend the values of human rights, which are being trampled on in Vietnam, especially the right to religious freedom according to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Declared in Washington, D.C.

On the Fifteenth of August, 2001.

Solemnity of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Body and Soul, into Heaven.

Signed by the following Vietnamese priests abroad:

Rev. Msgr. Dominic Mai-Thanh-Löông, Archdiocese of New Orleans, USA
Rev. Joseph Ñinh-Coâng-Huyφnh, Archdiocese of Philadelphia, USA
Rev. Peter Nguyeãn-Thanh-Long, Archdiocese of Washington, USA
Rev. Joachim Traàn-Quyù-Thieän, Diocese of Arlington, USA
Rev. Andrew Nguyeãn-Höõu-Leã, Diocese of Auckland, New Zealand
Rev. Paul Traàn-Xuaân-Taâm, Archdiocese of Washington, USA
Rev. Joseph Traàn-Kim-Thieän, Archdiocese of Philadelphia, USA
Rev. Vincent Nguyeãn-Höõu-Duï, O.P. Canada
Rev. John Ñinh-Xuaân-Minh, Diocese of Mainz, Germany
Rev. Joseph Phaïm-Xuaân-Thaéng, Diocese of Richmond, Virginia, USA
Rev. Joseph Nguyeãn-Phuù-An, Diocese of Camden, New Jersey, USA
Rev. Joseph Toáng-Thieän-Lieân, Diocese of Dallas, Texas, USA
Rev. Joseph Phaïm-Thanh-Löông, Diocese of Camden, New Jersey, USA
Rev. Joseph Traàn-Vaên-Huaân, Archdiocese of San Antonio, Texas, USA
Rev. Vincent Kim-Vaên-Toan, Diocese of Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
Rev. Anthony Ngoâ-Kim-Traïng, Diocese of Richmond, Virginia, USA
Rev. Dominic Vuõ-Ngoïc-An, Archdiocese of Washington, USA
Rev. Peter Phaïm-Vaên-Chính, Diocese of St. Petersburg, Florida, USA
Rev. Joseph Phaïm-Vaên-Tueä, Archdiocese of New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
Rev. John Baptist Nguyeãn-Huφng-Laân, O.F.M., Diocese of Bruxelles, Belgium
Rev. Matthias Vuõ-Ngoïc-Ñaùng, Diocese of San Jose, California, USA
Rev. Peter Ñinh-Ngoïc-Queá, C.Ss.R., Archdiocese of Los Angeles, USA
Rev. Alphonsus Nguyeãn-Hoà-Ñaenh, Diocese of Pontoise, France
Rev. Vincent Phan-Höõu-Toφa, Archdiocese of Mobile, Alabama, USA
Rev. John Vuõ-Haân, Ardchdiocese of New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
Rev. Peter Phan-Phaùt-Huoàn, C.Ss.R., Archdiocese of Los Angeles, USA
Rev. John Nguyeãn-Thaφnh-Chung, Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
Rev. Joseph Phaïm-Maïnh-Cöôφng, Diocese of Camden, New Jersey, USA
Rev. Joachim Nguyeãn-Dao-Kim, Diocese of Galveston-Houston, Texas, USA
Rev. Joseph Hoaφng-Minh-Thaéng, Archdiocese of Rome, Italy
Rev. Vincent Nguyeãn-Vaên-Kieân, Diocese of Honolou, USA
Rev. Peter Nguyeãn-Vaên-Huφng, S.S.C., Taiwan
Rev. Alexis Ñoaφn-Quang-Tröôφng, Diocese of Hsinchu, Taiwan
Rev. Peter Nguyeãn-Huφng-Cöôφng, M.M., New York, USA
Rev. Joachim Vuõ-Ñình-Thoân, Diocese of Chiayi, Taiwan
Rev. Joseph Nguyeãn-Minh-Chính, Archdiocese of Taipei, Taiwan
Rev. Andrew Traàn-Cao-Töôφng, Archdiocese of New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
Rev. Joseph Nguyeãn-Theá-Quang, Archdiocese of Birmingham, London, England
Rev. Anthony Traàn-Höõu-Laân, Archdiocese of Seattle, Washington, USA
Rev. Joseph Ngoâ-Quang-Ñònh, Archdiocese of Tokyo, Japan
Rev. Christopher Leâ-Huy-Baûng, C.Ss.R., Houston, Texas, USA
Rev. Joseph Mai-Thaφnh-Haân, Archdiocese of Brisbane, Queensland, Australia
Rev. John Traàn-Ngoíc-Bích, C.Ss.R., Diocese of Tucson, Arizona, USA
Rev. Joseph Ñoaφn-Huy-Chöông, Diocese of Galveston-Houston, Texas, USA
Rev. Paul Chu-Vaên-Chi, Archdiocese of Sydney, Australia
Rev. Dominic Nguyeã-Vaên-Ñoài, Archdiocese of Sydney, Australia
Rev. Canut Nguyeãn-Thaùi-Hoaïch, Archdiocese of Sydney, Australia
Rev. Joachim Ñoaφn-Só-Thuïc, Archdiocese of Sydney, Veritas Radio, Philippines
Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Minh-Nguyeân, Archdiocese of Sydney, Australia
Rev. Dominic Mai-Minh-Luaän, Diocese of Springfield Cape Girardeau, USA
Rev. Joseph Chu-Coâng, O.Cist., Diocese of Worcester, Massachusetts, USA
Rev. Joachim Nguyeãn-Ñình-Ñaφm, Diocese of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA
Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Xuaân-Tröôφng, Diocese of Brooklyn, New York, USA
Rev. Joseph Leâ-Phuïng, C.Ss.R., Diocese of Galveston-Houston, Texas, USA
Rev. Paul Leâ-Anh-Vöõng, S.V.D., Diocese of San Bernadino, California, USA
Rev. Anthony Traàn-Trí-Tueä, Diocese of Hsinchu, Taiwan
Rev. Thomas Ño-Minh-Taâm, Diocese of St. Paul-Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA
Rev. Mark Ñoaφn-Quang-Baùu, C.M.C., Archdiocese of Boston, Massachusetts, USA
Rev. Peter Vuõ, Diocese of Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA
Rev. Michael Nguyeãn-Linh-Ghi, Diocese of Chiayi, Taiwan
Rev. Joseph Tröông-Vaên-Phuùc, Diocese of Hsinchu, Taiwan;
Rev. Peter Leâ-Vaên-Quaûng, Diocese of Hsinchu, Taiwan
Rev. Dominic Ñinh-Duy-Khieâm, Diocese of Tulsa, Oklahoma, USA
Rev. Joseph Ñaφo-Vaên-Nhöôφng, Archdiocese of Saφi Goφn, Retired, Louisiana, USA
Rev. Peter Leâ-Thanh-Quang, Diocese of Little Rock, Arkansas, USA
Rev. Peter Nguyeãn-Thanh-Baèng, Incarnational Consecration (Hereafter: I.C.), Archdiocese of New Orleans, USA
Rev. Francis Nguyeãn-Vaên-Hoφa, Archdiocese of Oklahoma, USA
Rev. Vincent Traàn Ninh-Phuùc-Quyù, Archdiocese of New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
Rev. Louis Nguyeãn-Haäu, C.Ss.R., Archdiocese of Paris, France
Rev. John Nguyeãn-Kim-Ngoân, Diocese of Meaux, Paris, France
Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Ngoïc-Chaâu, Archdiocese of Taipei, Taiwan
Rev. Peter Döông-Baù-Hoaït, Diocese of Chiaya, Taiwan
Rev. Vincent Traàn-Quang-Ñieàm, Diocese of Orange, California, USA

Rev. Joseph Chaâu-Xuaân-Baùu, C.Ss.R., Diocese of Dallas, Texas, USA
Rev. Joseph Nguyeãn-Vaên-Thaùi, Archdiocese of Chicago, Illinois, USA
Rev. Peter Nguyeãn-Ñinh-Ñeä, Diocese of San Jose, California, USA
Rev. Paul Phaïm-Vaên-Hoäi, Diocese of Orange, California, USA
Rev. Joseph Nguyeãn-Coâng-Hoaùn, Diocese of Fresno, California, USA
Rev. Philip Nguyeãân-Vaên-Hieáu, Diocese of Sioux City, Iowa, USA
Rev. Peter Ñoã-Quang-Chaâu, Diocese of Nashville, Tennessee, USA
Rev. Philip Ñinh-Vaên-Thieäp, Diocese of Green Bay, Wisconsin, USA
Rev. Joseph Nguyeãn-Duy-Huφng, Diocese of Stockton, California, USA
Rev. Joseph Phaïm-Minh-Vaên, Chaplain for Vietnamese Catholics in Switzerland
Rev. Joseph Nguyeãn-Vaân-Soñ, Diocese of Dallas, Texas, USA
Rev. Leo Vuõ-Huyeán, C.M.C., Diocese of San Bernardino, California, USA
Rev. Peter Traàn-Vaên-Trôï, S.J., Austraila
Rev. Augustine Nguyeãn-Nöùc-Thuï, S.J. Austraila
Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Moäng-Thô, Diocese of Tours, France
Rev. Maurice Nguyeãn-Vaên-Danh, O.S.B., Monastery of Buckfast, England
Rev. Stephen Nguyeãn-Maïnh-Taân, O.F.M., Archdiocese of San Francisco, USA
Rev. Peter Mary Nguyeãn-Höõu-Hieán, Archdiocese of Tokyo, Japan
Rev. Andrew Duõng-Laïc Cao-Duy-Linh, O.F.M., Diocese of Nayoga, Japan
Rev. John Baptist Nguyeãn-Vieát-Huy, S.J. Australia
Rev. Vincent Traàn-Vaên-Baèng, Diocese of Bamberg, Germany
Rev. Peter Hoaφng-Kim-Huy, O.S.B., Archdiocese of Hobart, Tasmania, Australia
Rev. Paul Taï-Thanh-Bình, C.Ss.R., Archdiocese of New Orleans, Lousiana, USA
Rev. Joseph Phan-Ñöông, C.Ss.R., Diocese of Oakland, California, USA
Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Ngoïc-Thaân, Diocese of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA
Rev. Peter Nguyeãn-Huφng-Ñöùc, Diocese of Sioux City, Iowa, USA
Rev. Paul Nguyeãn-Huφng-Cöôφng, S.V.D., Iowa, USA
Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Thaφnh, Diocese of Galveston-Houston, Texas, USA
Rev. Louis Vuõ-Laâm, Diocese of Lafayette, Louisiana, USA
Rev. Francis Xavier Nguyeãn-Trung-Duõng, Diocese of Nagasaki, Japan
Rev. Joseph Cao-Phöông-Kyû, Diocese of Honolulu, Hawaii, USA
Rev. Dominic Nguyeãn-Vaên-Haûo, Diocese of St. Jean Longueuil, Canada
Rev. Peter Ngoâ-Ñinh-Thoûa, C.Ss.R., Archdiocese of Los Angeles, USA
Rev. Joseph Ñoàng-Vaên-Vinh, Archdiocese of Perth, Australia
Rev. Andrew Phaïm-Quang-Phong, Diocese of Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA
Rev. Joseph Traàn-Minh-Nhaät, Archdiocese of Perth, Australia
Rev. Stephen Buφi-Thöôïng-Löu, Diocese of Rottenburg-Stuttgart, Germany
Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Ñöùc, Archdiocese for the Military Services, USA
Rev. Michael Joseph Nguyeãn-Ngoïc-Vinh, Archdiocese of New Orleans, USA
Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Ñaûo, S.V.D., Indiana, USA
Rev. Joseph Traàn-Theá-Maãn, Archdiocese of New Orleans, USA
Rev. Joseph Nguyeãn-Chính, Archdiocese of Boston, Massachusetts, USA
Rev. Francis Buφi-Quyeát, Diocese of Houma-Thibodaux, Louisiana, USA
Rev. John Baptist Nguyeãn-Vaên-Hieàn, Diocese of Long Island, New York, USA
Rev. Peter Mary Buφi-Coâng-Minh, Diocese of Orange, California, USA
Rev. Joseph Ñinh-Xuaân-Long, Diocese of Charlotte, North Carolina, USA
Rev. Peter Traàn-Ñieàn, Retired, Carthage, Missouri, USA
Rev. Joseph Nguyeãn-Ñöùc-Duõng, Archdiocese of Hartford, Connecticut, USA
Rev. Joseph Ñoã-Baù-AÙi, Wyoming, Michigan, USA
Rev. Jerome Nguyeãn-Thanh-Laâm, O.S.B., Carthage, Missouri, USA
Rev. Peter Nguyeãn-Vaên-Phong, (Society of the House of the Lord), Diocese of Dallas, Texas, USA
Rev. Dominic Ñoã-Duy-Nho, Diocese of Little Rock, Arkansas, USA
Rev. Peter Traàn-Vieät-Huφng, Archdiocese of Newark, New Jersey, USA
Rev. John Baptist Traàn-Vaên-Taân, Diocese of Des Moines, Iowa, USA
Rev. Anthony Nguyễn-Vaên-Ñoâ, Archdiocese of Oklahoma, Oklahoma, USA
Rev. Peter Traàn-Ñình-Thaûo, Diocese of Hoalien, Taiwan
Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Xuaãn-Minh, Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA
Rev. John Bosco Phaïm-Trung-Thöïc, C.M.C., Archdiocese of Boston, USA
Rev. Martin Nguyeãn-Thanh, I.C., Diocese of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA
Rev. Thomas Thieân-Ñonh, I.C., Diocese of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA
Rev. Peter Nguyeãn-Vieät-Taân, I.C., Diocese of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA
Rev. Msgr. Philip Traàn-Vaên-Hoaφi, Vatican, Rome, Italy
Rev. Thomas Nguyeãn-Vaên-Chaùnh, Archdiocese of New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
Rev. Joseph Nguyeãn-Huφng-Cöôφng, Diocese of Wichita, Kansas, USA
Rev. Thomas Ñoã-Thanh-Haφ, Diocese of Orange, California, USA
Rev. Thomas Nguyeãn-Xuaân-Toaφn, Archdiocese of San Francisco, California, USA
Rev. Peter Ngoâ-Coâng-Thaéng, Archdiocese of Los Angeles, California, USA
Rev. Dominic Ñinh-Minh-Haûi, C.Ss.R., Diocese of Dallas, Texas, USA
Rev. Joseph Phaïm-Ñöùc-Khôûi, Diocese of Stockton, California, USA
Rev. Vincent Phaïm-Minh-Chaâu, S.V.D., Archdiocese of St. Louis, Missouri, USA
Rev. Joseph Traàn Ñinh Huynh, S.V.D., Archdiocese of Taipei, Taiwan/R.O.C.

Madam Speaker, a few months ago the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) and I held a hearing on human rights in Vietnam. Several of our invited guests, prominent religious leaders in Vietnam, were unable to leave Vietnam to give their testimony. As a result of this hearing, the congressional dialogue on Vietnam relaunched its Adopt a Voice of Conscience campaign. My colleagues and I have been in constant contact with the Vietnamese American community and the Department of State about the safety of Father Nguyen Van Ly, Venerable Thich Quang Do, and other leaders we know are being harassed or detained.

I invite my colleagues to again join this bipartisan campaign and make the release of these prisoners of conscience a prominent issue in U.S. policy towards Vietnam.

The Vietnamese people deserve to live in full freedom. Countless brave Vietnamese are currently in prison, under house arrest, or suffering other kinds of persecution.

These ''voices of conscience'' are both our inspiration and our responsibility. It is our duty to ensure that those who are courageous enough to speak out against injustice have our support and our protection.

Our offices have received hundreds of letters from our Vietnamese American constituents, calling upon Congress to pass the Vietnam Human Rights Act.

This bill tells the truth. It does not restrict trade in any way. It does not limit humanitarian aid to Vietnam. It remembers by name those who have been persecuted because of their beliefs. It is important human rights legislation that I am proud to support, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2833. Let me commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for the strong leadership they have provided. It has been my honor to stand with these two gentlemen on numerous occasions on issues dealing with human rights.

I only wish our other colleagues had the commitment to freedom and democracy and human rights that the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) have because America truly could save the world if we had that type of commitment. It is up to us to try to reach out to our colleagues, and that is what we are doing today.

The Vietnam Human Rights Act stresses the importance of human rights in American policy towards Southeast Asia. During the last 24 hours, let us take a look at what has happened. The Vietnamese communists understand what is going on with the debate here. In fact, some people in Hanoi may understand this debate more than some of our colleagues who are not paying attention to this debate right now. They prepared for this debate by what? What happened in Vietnam?

Well, two prominent elderly dissidents were arrested, one simply after he applied to set up an anti-corruption body in Vietnam to try to deter corruption in Vietnam. Think about that.

The Vietnamese government, the regime, the dictators in Vietnam, have sent us their message. We talk about human rights in Vietnam. They start arresting dissidents. The British Broadcasting Corporation reports that

dozens of other dissidents have been called and questioned by police, called into the police departments and been given the message. These incidents exemplify the reality of what we are voting on today. They have verified themselves by their own arrogance the need for us to pass a bill concerning human rights in Vietnam.

During the past 6 years, the United States has normalized relations and extended trade subsidies through waivers in the Jackson-Vanik Act, and we have a bilateral trade agreement with Communist Vietnam. These initiatives by our government have made absolutely no impact on promoting democracy and human rights in Vietnam. To paraphrase a song I heard as a kid, when will we ever learn. Trying to cozy up and ignore the pitfalls and the bad parts of a dictatorial regime, trying to ignore the violence and the crimes of gangsters will not make this a better world.

Right now the Hanoi regime is proving that they are as stubborn and as brutal as ever in their campaign against Buddhists, Catholics, and others. They are proving their very nature by continuing these attacks on anyone who believes in religion in Vietnam who has not succumbed to the temptation of simply trying to register their church and run their church affairs in the way that the government would have them run.

Finally, we know now of a brutal suppression of the Montagnard hill tribes people. These people fought valiantly alongside Americans during the war and since then have faced brutal repression; and now that the war is long over when these chapters should be closed, the Vietnamese Communist Government is reopening this type of repression against the Montagnards. I feel a personal obligation for the Montagnards. I was in a Montagnard village in 1967, and I believe that my life was a lot safer with those Montagnards because they were on the side of the United States. It is up to us to be on their side now, and on the side of all religious believers throughout the world, especially in Vietnam, who are persecuted, and to be on the side of those people who believe in democracy throughout the world, especially Vietnam. That is what this legislation does.

Madam Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to join us in supporting it.

□ 1300

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield as much time as she might consume to my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), my colleague, for being such a defender and proponent of human rights, not just in this debate today, but in his recent work also when he was in South Africa.

Madam Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor and a strong supporter of H.R. 2833, which promotes the development of freedom and democracy in Vietnam. While the United States should move toward promoting economic relations with Vietnam, we must first address the current human rights violations, religious persecution, and the social injustice that is faced by so many in that country.

In our support for the economic revitalization of Vietnam, we cannot ignore these basic human rights. We cannot ignore that they go unresolved in that country. Although diplomatic and trade relations between the United States and Vietnam have improved in recent years, very little headway has been made with respect to the rights of people in that country.

Madam Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the largest Vietnamese community outside of the country of Vietnam. They are the parents, siblings, the children of families who fought communism for 2 decades.

The majority of the people that I represent feel that the economic relations with Vietnam should not be established until specific immigration, political and human rights are addressed; and in this debate, I am their voice.

On their behalf, I support H.R. 2833, which links bilateral, non-humanitarian aid to Vietnam's progress on human rights. While encouraging economic revitalization of Vietnam, it will require a climate of freedom and democracy.

At this point, the Vietnamese Government has not made sufficient progress. In fact, in the 4 years, now 5 years that I have been in Congress, very little progress has been made.

When we held a human rights hearing recently on Vietnam with my other colleagues, we reviewed the United States State Department records, and they reported that the Vietnamese Government has made some change, but their human rights record remains poor.

Moreover, human rights groups report that over the past year the Vietnamese Government, in order to avoid international criticism, has cracked down on political and religious dissidents by isolating and intimidating them through such practices as house arrest and constant surveillance rather than imprisoning them.

In fact, I myself saw some of this while I was in Vietnam this past year. I was supposed to meet with six of the leading dissidents on human rights in Vietnam. Unfortunately, two were unable to make it because of that constant watch and the ability to stop them.

The four that I did meet with, Professor Nguyen Thanh Giang, General Tran Do, Mr. Pham Que Duong and Mr. Hoang Minh Chinh, discussed the restrictions. They talked about the rising fear that they have because of this government oppressing them in particular as they continue to speak out on human rights.

The Government of Vietnam systematically deprives its citizens of the fundamental right to freedom of religion. Numerous respected religious leaders, including the Most Venerable Thich Huyen Quang and the Most Venerable Thich Quang Do, Father Ly, all of these have been under house arrest in the last few years. The Venerable Thich Quang Do, 28 of our colleagues in this House and I signed a letter to the Nobel peace prize people because of the work he has done on behalf of trying to stop this religious persecution.

The Patriarch of the Unified Buddhist Church, Thich Huyen Quang, has been detained for 21 years, 21 years, in a ruined temple, and Thich Quang Do has recently been put under house arrest once again simply because he wanted to get his colleague to Saigon for medical treatment.

Contrary to the pretense of the Vietnamese Government that it has no political or religious prisoners, many Vietnamese continue to languish in prisons because of their beliefs. All they simply do is say they broke the law. Well, if the law is to ask for the right to assemble, if the law would be the right to free speech, if the law would be the right to religious freedom, if it was a right to collective bargaining, if it was a right to own the press or speak up in the press, then the laws of that country would be correct; but currently all of that is deprived these people in Vietnam.

Madam Speaker, today I will support H.R. 2833 because I believe we must keep the pressure on the Government of Vietnam to improve its record on religious and human rights.

It is the United States' responsibility, the world's beacon of democracy, to make certain that the Vietnamese Government is making sufficient progress with the human rights of their own people before we give them concessions with respect to trade normalization.

I urge my colleagues to join me in keeping the spotlight on the Government of Vietnam so that it may improve its political and human rights record.

Vote yes to end that religious persecution. Vote yes to promote free speech and democracy. Vote yes on H.R. 2833.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Viet Nam Human Rights Act.

Last year I led a delegation to Vietnam to survey the political, social and

economic situation there in the country. During my trip, I paid a visit to the Venerable Thich Quang Do, who was imprisoned there under house arrest. He is the leader of the banned Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam. Because of his years of peaceful protest in support of religious and political freedom, he has suffered constant harassment, constant imprisonment; and even though he was under house arrest and under surveillance, Thich Quang Do nevertheless welcomed my visit.

Because of my private visits with this brave dissident and Le Quang Liem, another courageous fighter for freedom, I came to the conclusion that we needed frankly to speak out. What was surprising was how quickly I was denounced by the government, by the Communist government of Vietnam. That told me something. That told me that the Vietnamese Government is sensitive to international criticism. And I think this obliges the United States to speak out constantly against Vietnam's human rights violations. We may not always realize it, but protests by the American Government and the American people do help the cause of freedom in Vietnam and elsewhere. Silence I think for us, Madam Speaker, is not an option.

However, I am afraid that we as a Nation have been tepid when it comes to challenging human rights abuses in Vietnam. Our last ambassador to Vietnam even went so far as to say, ''I don't hear anyone reporting problems here. Vietnam by any standard has been rated a success.'' That is what he said. By no standard is Vietnam a success. Just ask those who were forced to flee their country. Just ask those who want freedom of speech. Just ask, as I did, Thich Quang Do or Le Quang Liem.

Today is our chance to correct the mistakes of the previous administration and to act against human rights abuses in Vietnam. The bill before us today is a good one. The legislation links human rights as a condition to nonhumanitarian aid to Vietnam, it authorizes assistance to democratic forces in Vietnam, and it provides additional funding of Radio Free Asia to overcome jamming efforts by the Communist government of Vietnam.

I am particularly supportive of the Radio Free Asia provisions in this act, because it should now be more able to bring objective news, the truth, to the Vietnamese people. The spread of democratic values in Asia is critical to U.S. security interests. Radio Free Asia is a step in the right direction. The Vietnamese service airs important programs on issues like democracy and press freedoms, and it tells the Vietnamese people what the world is saying, what this Congress is saying, about their repressive government. It gives critical moral support to Thich Quang Do and Le Quang Liem. We know that these broadcasts are effective. Why do we know that? Because the Vietnamese Government spends so much time trying to block them. With this bill, that will be a harder task.

I urge its passage.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, let me thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding the time.

Today, as we consider improving our relations with the country of Vietnam, we must not overlook our longstanding commitment to human rights in our global relationships. In recent months, the Government of Vietnam has significantly increased its suppression of religious and personal freedoms within its borders. The regime has imprisoned scores of religious leaders, mostly Christians, who have courageously spoken out against their government's repressive actions, and it has caused hundreds more to flee into Cambodia to avoid imprisonment. Still other Vietnamese religious leaders are currently under government-ordered house arrest, effectively cutting off contact with their parishioners and congregations.

In addition to its actions against free expression and religious activities, the Vietnamese Government has also confiscated church properties, where in some cases they have turned church sanctuaries into state-run nightclubs.

In light of these continued crackdowns on religion, dissidents and minorities, Congress must make it clear to the Vietnamese Government that in order for the U.S. and Vietnam to have a closer relationship, they must do more to improve their human rights record.

The Viet Nam Human Rights Act, H.R. 2833, seeks to establish such human rights safeguards. H.R. 2833 would prohibit any increase in nonhumanitarian assistance to the Vietnamese Government unless there is clear progress on human rights on their part. It would also authorize $2 million to help promote human rights and democratic change within Vietnam and support additional Vietnamese refugee resettlement.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2833.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate time be extended by 10 minutes, equally divided between the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, who has been a forceful advocate for human rights worldwide, including Vietnam, and is one of the cosponsors of this legislation.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1315

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I strongly support H.R. 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the vice chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, and other cosponsors of this comprehensive human rights legislation.

Later this afternoon, the House will consider a resolution to approve the U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement. We are all hopeful that free trade will improve the lives of the Vietnamese people and that it will eventually create irresistible domestic pressure for human rights and democracy in Vietnam. In the meantime, however, the Vietnamese Government remains one of the most repressive regimes on Earth. Religious persecution, especially of Buddhists and of Evangelical Protestants, has taken a turn for the worse during the last year. Since February, the government has engaged in a brutal crackdown against members of the Montagnard ethnic minority groups who participated in peaceful demonstrations seeking the return of their traditional lands.

I think it is important, therefore, that in expanding trade relations we avoid sending a message of approval or complacency about Hanoi's human rights record.

This bill makes clear that progress towards freedom and democracy will continue to be a central theme of U.S. foreign policy toward Vietnam. It uses forms of leverage other than trade sanctions to promote this objective, such as conditions on nonhumanitarian foreign assistance, guarantees that U.S. educational and cultural exchange programs will be open to people who share our values, and serious efforts to overcome the jamming of Radio Free Asia.

I urge a unanimous vote in favor of this important human rights legislation.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as she may consume to my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who has been an eloquent champion of human rights across the globe.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for his leadership and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his leadership on this legislation.

Clearly, I believe it is important that those of us who may go in the face of adversity on issues that may provide a certain degree of contention and tension, that we continue to be united around the question of human rights and the right kind of human rights.

Let me thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). The gentleman helped me out. Although my constituent is still incarcerated in Vietnam, we spoke a couple of months ago about the gentleman who simply walked across the border because he had a sense of concern. A Vietnamese citizen out of Houston walked across the border in Vietnam trying to express the desire for political freedom.

I thank the gentleman for assisting his family, though we know that he is still incarcerated and his family, of course, is suffering greatly in my community.

I come here today because I support H.R. 2833 because it is important for America to know that Vietnam is our friend. The Vietnamese stood alongside of us in the Vietnam War, and those same Vietnamese are now here in our country. They are our friends and neighbors. They have simply asked us to allow the freedom that they experience in this country to be the same kind of freedom that their friends and relatives could achieve in Vietnam.

We are friends of Vietnam. There are many of us who lost good relatives and friends in that country. But now, today, this legislation is needed, because it simply ties to the funding process a very strong statement: no increase in appropriations from the United States of America until you address the human rights abuse.

What do I mean by that? The incarceration of a Catholic priest, who simply wanted to include testimony in the U.S. Commission's hearing on International Religious Freedom; also the incarceration of the cofounder of the Inter-Religious Council, a leader of the banned Buddhist church, incarcerated; since 1992, the detaining of the Patriarch 82 year old Mr. Nguyen of the Unified Buddhist Church. These people are ailing. They are seeking justice, and they are seeking freedom.

Madam Speaker, these individuals are simply an example of those who we have lost contact with, who because of their particular views or their desire to practice their religion without intimidation, have been lost in the prison system of the Vietnamese Government, the present Vietnamese Government.

So I would simply say that the United States has its responsibility to ensure that the message of freedom, the opportunity of equality, most importantly, human rights and religious freedom, is promoted to our friends. And the Vietnamese community here has exhibited for us a true partnership. I stand with them in supporting H.R. 2833, thanking the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his leadership and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

I am hoping and praying that my neighbor, who is still incarcerated, leaving his family in financial destitution, can raise his head again in dignity and come back home. But if I do not stand for him on the floor of the House with this legislation, then I would say to my friends and colleagues in this Congress, we do a disservice to those who lost their lives and stood alongside of us as brothers as we fought for justice and peace in the Vietnam War. That, I consider to be a war that was for a just cause, and I will never, never, I will never cease thanking those brothers and sisters who served in the Vietnam War from the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Vietnam Human Rights Act, HR 2368.

Madam Speaker, last year the United States signed a sweeping bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam. The World Bank estimates that this world increase U.S. imports from Vietnam by $800 million from last year—a gain of 60 percent.

Madam Speaker, the U.S. State Department's year 2000 review of human rights in Vietnam noted that Vietnam has made improvements in its human rights record. Despite these improvements, the State Department still rated Vietnam as "proof" overall on human rights. The State Department noted that the Vietnam Government continues to repress basic political freedoms, is intolerant of dissenting viewpoints, and selectively represses the religious rights of its citizens.

In protest of these practices, I voted to disapprove normal trading relations with Vietnam prior to the recess. By doing so, I did not seek to disparage the gains Vietnam has made in re-engaging the world. Rather, I hoped my vote would cause this body to seek a consistent balance between our trade priorities and the principles we use to steer this nation. We cannot continue to hold ourselves out as a nation of laws and turn our back on our convictions at every economic opportunity. Therefore, I am supportive of the provisions of H.R. 2368, because it brings promise for human rights reform that is needed in Vietnam. This bill establishes a Congressional-Executive Commission on Vietnamm to monitor the acts of the Government of Vietnam which reflect compliance with or violation of human rights, in particular those contained in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the rule of law in Vietnam and the development of U.S. programs and activities and private organizations to increase the interchange of people and ideas between the United States and Vietnam.

The bill also prohibits U.S. non-humanitarian assistance to the Government of Vietnam unless the President determines and certifies to Congress that the Government of Vietnam has complied with certain human rights requirements. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the U.S. Executive Director of specified international financial institutions to use the U.S. vote to deny multilateral non-humanitarian assistance to Vietnam unless the President determines and certifies to Congress that such requirements have been met. It authorizes U.S. assistance for the support of individuals and organizations to promote human rights and nonviolent democratic change in Vietnam. It sets forth U.S. policy with respect to overcoming the jamming of Radio Free Asia by Vietnam, U.S. educational and cultural exchange programs to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam and the offer of refugee resettlement to Vietnam nationals.

It is crucial that we do whatever is possible to ensure that Vietnamm complies with human rights, particularly in connection with its guarantee of the freedom of religion, association and expression and its treatment of prisoners. I have closely followed the persecution of religious leaders, including the Vietnamese government's restriction on church activities. I have commended and supported the work of courageous individuals such as Catholic priest Father Nguyen Van Ly, a champion for religious freedom in Vietnam. For example, Father Ly's parish bravely planted a large banner with the words "We Need Freedom or Religion" on the church property. It should not have to be an act of bravery to stand up for religious freedom. It should be an assured right. Father Ly also submitted written testimony for hearing of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom and joined with other religious leaders in Vietnam to organize an Inter-religious Council to campaign peacefully for religious rights. In May, Vietnamese authorities arrested Father Ly.

I have also received dozens of letters from Vietnamese constituents expressing their own profound concern over the persecution of Father Ly and of religious leaders from the Bhuddist Church. I must conclude that these concerns of my constituents are representative of those of Vietnamese heritage across the nation. More importantly, it is our role as leaders of the free world to promote the core values of our human rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and also the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for coming up with this bill.

Madam Speaker, I am fortunate to have many Montagnard tribesmen living in my district, so it is a pleasure today to be able to speak out in favor of this bill, H.R. 2833.

Today, we have an opportunity to send a clear message to Hanoi that human rights abuses will not be forgotten with the passage of a resolution to codify the trade agreement recently negotiated between the U.S. and Vietnam. Vietnam's record on human rights has remained poor, with very few real improvements. Government crackdowns on religious groups and political dissidents continue today. In a 1999 State Department report, it said, "In areas populated by ethnic minorities, authorities allow little discretion in practicing their faith."

One particular group that bears heavy-handed Hanoi treatment are the Montagnard people of the Central Highlands. Since 1975, the Montagnards have been singled out, in part for their past assistance to the United States, their strong commitment to the Christian religion, and a traditional way of life.

In February of 2001, several thousand Montagnard protestors gathered for a series of peaceful demonstrations throughout the Central Highlands. These peaceful demonstrations were forcibly stopped by the Vietnamese military, using helicopter gunships and tanks. In addition, refugees that did escape to Cambodia are being sought now by Hanoi for their return and, in some cases, bounties are offered by the Vietnamese Government to ensure their return.

With these events occurring on a daily basis, it is imperative that the international community know that the United States remains committed to improving the human rights situation in Vietnam. The bill we are debating now, H.R. 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act, is a positive step forward in that direction.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. By passing this resolution, we will reaffirm our resolve to help the Montagnards, along with other ethnic minorities in the same position. The Montagnards fought hard alongside members of the United States Army Special Forces in the war in the North. Do not give up the fight for them now.

I urge all my fellow Congressmen to vote yes on H.R. 2833.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights who has been a very potent and strong force on behalf of human rights worldwide, but also on behalf of the Vietnamese.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the people of Vietnam who clamor for democracy and the right to live free of oppression, on behalf of all the faithful and religious leaders who have been imprisoned, tortured and subjected to the most barbaric persecution simply for exercising their universal rights, as a refugee from another Communist regime, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, I rise in strong support of the Viet Nam Human Rights Act.

The Vietnamese regime continues to systematically violate the human rights, the civil liberties and the religious freedoms of its people. In March of this year, the Vietnamese authorities prevented the Hoa Hao Buddhist believers from participating in a mass pilgrimage to their sacred ground. Key leaders were arrested or their homes surrounded by police. Devotees were threatened or detained on their way to visit the holy site. Those who were finally able to reach the Hoa Hao village were met by police and security officials.

The extent of the human rights violations and religious persecution is so acute that on Tuesday of this week Amnesty International reported that a Buddhist monk killed himself as a form of protest for the heinous practices used by the Vietnamese authorities to usurp the rights of their people to practice their religious beliefs.

Just last night, Hong Kong AFP reports that a dozen dissidents were detained in dawn raids by Vietnamese authorities. After several hours of interrogation, they were released with warnings from security police to stop their activities.

Vietnam uses a maze of laws, decrees and regulations to prohibit religious worship and to justify the arbitrary arrest, detention, harassment, abuse and censorship of those seeking to exert their religious liberty and their right to free association.

Article IV of the Vietnamese constitution, for example, enables the security apparatus to enforce an extralegal administrative decree against any dissidents under the pretext of endangering national security. The regime is among the totalitarian or authoritarian regimes specifically rebuked by the State Department in its annual reports on religious freedoms and human rights practices.

Earlier this year, the report issued by the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom also stated that human rights and religious freedoms are ''severely repressed in Vietnam in a manner common to Communist countries in general: through arbitrarily enforced registration laws, tightly controlled official organizations and strict limitations on religious activities.''

This same commission created by the Congress called on the new administration and on us to factor into the development and implementation of U.S.-Vietnam policy the protection of religious freedom and human rights. It underscored the need for the Congress to pressure the Vietnamese authorities to ''make substantial improvements in the protection of religious freedoms'' and to ''undertake obligations to the United States to make such improvements.''

It further called on the Congress to incorporate Vietnam's progress in the protection and respect of human rights and religious freedoms as part of an annual review of the normal trade relation status for Vietnam.

The Viet Nam Human Rights Act is an integral component of such a strategy, using nonhumanitarian assistance, democracy programs and U.S. Government broadcasts to support the Vietnamese people in their struggle to exert their rights as human beings and as citizens. It sends a clear signal to the Vietnamese authorities that the U.S. Congress is keeping a watchful eye.

As the wife of a proud Vietnam veteran, I ask my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation, and I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH) for once again being the forceful leader that he is on the issue of international human rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her kind comments and strong support and advocacy for human rights in Vietnam.

This is an issue, especially with the trade bill pending later on this afternoon, where we have to make a strong, cogent statement on behalf of those who are persecuted. We must stand with the oppressed and not the oppressor. I know some people, and I think it is naive, but some people honestly believe if we just engage in trade, somehow that will mitigate, and some day end, these egregious abuses. The evidence would suggest otherwise.

Having said that, we have in this legislation some very significant milestones that we call upon the Government of Vietnam to achieve. Among these are the release of political and religious prisoners, an expansion of a provision of religious freedom which allows these Buddhist and Evangelical Christians, and so many others being repressed at this particular time, to engage freely in the exercise of their religion; and stop the repression of ethnic minorities, especially the Montagnards, who have suffered a cruelty that many of us would find absolutely appalling.

Finally, on the issue of trafficking, Members may recall I was the prime sponsor last year of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000. Vietnam has a trafficking problem. There is some complicity on the part of the government.

□ 1330

This bill calls upon our own government to make a finding as to whether or not and to what extent the Government's complicity in trafficking is real or whether or not there has been progress in ending trafficking. Hopefully, for the sake of those who have been abused in modern slavery-like conditions, we will see an end to this abuse of women and children.

Madam Speaker, as we come to a close of the debate on this legislation, I want to especially thank my good friend and my former staff director on the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights which I used to chair, Grover Joseph Rees, who has done an extraordinary job in helping to shape this legislation. He has done great work getting the facts for all of us. We only deal with facts, no hyperbole, no exaggeration. What is the situation on the ground right now? What is the prognosis for reform, and how do we get there?

I want to thank Peter Yeo on the Democratic staff of the Committee on International Relations who not only serves the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) so well, but serves the entire committee so well, and I want to thank him for his contributions.

I want to thank Uyen Dinh, in the office of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) who weighed in and helped. Also thank to Tom Mooney, the staff director of the full International Relations Committee, for all the work that he and his staff did. This has been a true team effort. This is a bipartisan effort. The government of Vietnam should be very clear that we go on record today with the support of human rights organizations, the support of the American Legion, who submitted an effective letter, which I will include as part of the RECORD, from Steve Robertson, the director of the National Legislative Commission of the American Legion.

I just want to say again how important this legislation is and, hopefully, it will pass with a vote as close to unanimous as humanly possible.

Those who vote against this are saying that human rights do not matter, because this has a waiver in it. This legislation has a provision that gives the President the ability to decide whether or not waiving a provision, a sanction, if you will, is in the national interest.

So I strongly support this legislation. It is a bipartisan product.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2001.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: The American Legion thanks you for authoring H.R. 2368, the Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2001. The American Legion fully supports this important legislation which seeks to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam.

The American Legion opposes Normal Trade Relations (NTR) with Vietnam based on what we believe is less-than-full cooperation by the Vietnamese government in regard to the accounting of the over 1,900 Americans still missing from the Vietnam War. The current state of human rights in Vietnam requires as much, if not more, attention than normalized trade relations.

Currently, Vietnamese authorities are targeting many ethnic groups who were faithful allies of U.S. forces during the Vietnam War, and denying them their basic human rights. The Montagnards of the Central Highlands are just one example. We believe H.R. 2368 will help ensure compliance with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the Vietnamese government.

Although trade may be increasing between both countries, The American Legion does not believe this will, in any way, guarantee Vietnam's speedy transition to democracy. Continual pressure needs to be applied to the Vietnamese government to treat their citizens in a fair and equitable manner.

Once again, The American Legion fully supports H.R. 2368, the Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2001. The American Legion appreciates your continued leadership in addressing the issues that are important to veterans and their families.

Sincerely,

STEVE A. ROBERTSON,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

Madam Speaker, I yield any remaining time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), my good friend.

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act, and I encourage my colleagues, as did the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), to vote for passage of this very important legislation. I want to applaud the gentleman from New Jersey, my good friend, for his hard work and devotion and dedication in bringing this legislation to the floor, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his efforts on not only this, but on frankly all of the major important human rights issues that we have had before the Congress. I also applaud the bipartisan group of colleagues who have cosponsored this piece of legislation.

I would say to the government, is it too much to ask that the government of Vietnam be required to make ''substantial progress'' toward the releasing of political prisoners, ending religious persecution, increasing respect for the rights of ethnic minorities, and eliminating their participation in the trafficking of human beings before they receive any further increases in government-to-government, nonhumanitarian assistance from the United States? These steps should be at a minimum, the minimum actions taken by any Nation who is serious about establishing normal relations with the United States.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2833 requires that the President of the United States certify that the government of Vietnam make substantial improvements in the area of human rights. Those of us who have held hearings and listened to the heartbreaking testimonies of witness after witness who have endured the persecution from Hanoi policies know that these substantial improvements are long overdue. Witnesses attest that many groups of people in Vietnam have suffered unending persecution since the war ended in 1975, and the persecution has continued.

Regarding religious persecution, no faith, no faith is untouched by Hanoi's persecution. In January, 42 colleagues in the House sent a letter to Vietnamese Prime Minister Phan Van Khai expressing concern for the lack of religious freedom and continued persecution of religious leaders in Vietnam. Catholic bishops, Buddhist monks, leaders of Christian house churches and Muslims have all endured nonstop persecution by the Communist government in Vietnam since 1975.

Earlier this year, prominent leaders of the outlawed Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam, UBCV, the 83-year-old patriarch, Thich Huyen Quang, and Thich Quang Do, a Nobel Peace Prize nominee, were detained and placed under house arrest for what the government described as ''as a number of wrongful acts they have recently committed.'' This action was followed by the detaining of Catholic Father Nguyen Van Ly and a stepped up offense against the Montagnard people of the Central Highlands in Vietnam, as the gentleman from California was talking about.

Many of the Montagnard are people who fought alongside American troops years ago and are now victims of imprisonment, torture, and death for speaking out against the Communist government abuses. Christians in Vietnam have had their property confiscated and their leaders imprisoned and tortured for simply trying to worship their God. It should be clear that imprisonment, torture, and killing of innocent citizens, based on their religious beliefs by any country, will always stand in the way of normal relations with the United States.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2833 also tries to address the issue of the complicity of the Vietnamese government in severe forms of trafficking in human beings. In June of this year, the Congressional Human Rights Caucus chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), held a hearing on the trafficking of women and children into sex markets around the world. One of the expert witnesses showed covertly filmed negotiations of girls as young as 7 and 8 years old being sold into sex markets in Vietnam, 7 and 8 years old. So as Members come pouring in down here to talk about the opportunities for trade in Vietnam, think in terms of these young girls, 7 and 8 years old. Governments who tolerate or participate in this type of cruel and inhumane behavior should never qualify, should never qualify for foreign aid or expect to enjoy Normal Trade Relations with the United States.

It is my hope that the passage of the Viet Nam Human Rights Act will send a strong message to the government in Hanoi that continued abuses of its citizens will not lead to an expansion of trade, increases in aid, or normal relations with the United States or the rest of the Free World. I encourage my colleagues to protect the innocent in Vietnam by voting for H.R. 2833. I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from California will ask for a rollcall vote on this, I would assume. But hopefully, hopefully there will be no negative votes against this so that the message goes into Hanoi of the United States Congress and the people of the United States Congress, and so that the people in Hanoi and the people in Vietnam who will wake up tomorrow and find out that the Congress has passed this legislation, take hope because of the overwhelming vote.

So again, in closing, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). I hope this bill passes with 435 votes or, if there is somebody missing, 434 to nothing, because if we really want to open up the gulags of Vietnam and allow the Catholic priests and the bishops and the monks and the Montagnard people to be heard, and stop the sexual trading that has gone on in the past, the passage of this bill will really do it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary, for his very, very strong statement. We both got elected back in 1981; and we have worked together on human rights issues all around the world, including in Vietnam. It was the gentleman's idea years ago to go to a gulag called Perm Camp 35, 1,000 miles outside of Moscow in the Ural Mountains. There we met with political prisoners who had been abused, who had been tortured, and that meeting and the subsequent representation that he and I and others made—but he led the way on that—helped to secure the freedom of those individuals.

We did the same thing in China and in other places in Asia. He has been all over Africa. When he speaks—and he and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) speak with enormous amounts of credibility—on humanitarianism and respect for human rights and respect for life, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), I think, takes a second to no one.

I do hope Members are listening—and K Street and some of the lobbyists, and the government of Vietnam itself, which through its embassy has admonished this Congress not to support this legislation. Why? I went to their Web site, Madam Speaker, just the other day and looked and they had a statement about how religious freedom is respected, it is constitutionally protected. Then what do they have to worry about? This simply says there has to be ''substantial progress'' in that area; we are not even saying achievement. We are saying progress; move in the right direction. I would hope that Members would find it in their hearts to vote for this and say, we are going to give away the store and have free trade with the hope and expectation that will lead to a liberalization of human rights. I do believe that is naive, but if this is our belief, I do not know how we cannot support this legislation. This is waivable. It provides the President, who we hope will make an honest determination, to decide whether a waiver is in the best interests of the tenets that are contained within this legislation.

Madam Speaker, we want to see real progress. We are tired of words. We want deeds by the government of Vietnam. They are repressing people. They are beating people. They are killing people. That is not hyperbole, that is the truth on the ground. There are religious believers such as the Unified Buddhist Church, as we mentioned earlier, and others have mentioned it, who have suffered immeasurably simply because of their faith. Again, the gentleman from Virginia was the prime sponsor of the International Religious Freedom Act, legislation that the previous administration did not want and then signed. I hope this administration does not follow that course as well. Embrace human rights. Be real, transparent, up front.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his very, very strong advocacy. He is a champion and someone for whom I have a tremendous amount of respect. I hope my colleagues hear these words and will support this legislation.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

I want to thank all of my colleagues for their eloquent statements. Earlier this year, under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader in the House, a number of us went to Vietnam to see on the ground the development of that country that has suffered so much during the long and painful war. We feel for the Vietnamese people. They are an enormously talented and hardworking, committed people to leading better lives. But we have to stand with them, not just in terms of their economic aspirations, but in terms of their aspirations along individual and human rights, rights of religious freedom, political freedom, press freedom, none of which they enjoy at the moment. This legislation attempts to address those issues.

As we open up our relations with Vietnam, politically and economically, it is critical that this body speaks out loud and clear on the issue of human rights in Vietnam. I again want to pay tribute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my friend and colleague, who has led us on this issue, and I call on all of my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I submit two letters relating to the consideration of H.R. 2833, the ''Viet Nam Human Rights Act.''

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 6, 2001.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 2833, the ''Viet Nam Human Rights Act,'' which contains legislative language which may be the subject of a sequential referral of the bill to your committee. From your letter of this date, I understand that you are willing to waive the right to a sequential referral which will permit this committee to move expeditiously to the floor.

I understand that this waiver in no way affects your subject matter jurisdiction, and I will support appointment of conferees from your committee on these or other related matters within your jurisdiction.

I appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 6, 2001.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE
Chairman, House Committee on International Relations, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR HENRY: I write regarding H.R. 2833, the ''Viet Nam Human Rights Act,'' which was referred to the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Rules. As you know, the Committee on the Judiciary has a jurisdictional interest in this legislation, and I appreciate your acknowledgment of that jurisdictional interest. While the bill would be sequentially referred to the Judiciary Committee, I understand the desire to have this legislation considered expeditiously by the House; therefore, I do not intend to hold a hearing or markup on this legislation.

In agreeing to waive consideration by our Committee, I would expect you to agree that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this or any similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future. The Committee on the Judiciary takes this action with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdiction over the provisions within the Committee's jurisdiction is in no way diminished or altered, and that the committee's right to the appointment of conferees during any conference on the bill is preserved. I would also expect your support in my request to the Speaker for the appointment of conferees from my Committee with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of my Committee should a conference

with the Senate be convened on this or similar legislation.

Again, thank you for your cooperation on this important matter. I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during today's debate of H.R. 2833.

Sincerely,

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act. This legislation is an important component of our Viet Nam trade policy.

This bill was additionally referred to the Committee on Financial Services, which I chair, because it contains provisions relating to international financial institutions and multilateral banking organizations. I am including for the record a letter to the Speaker memorializing the cooperation between my committee and the Committee on International Relations in reaching this important compromise.

I want to thank the Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for his hard work, and Chairman HYDE and Chairman SMITH for their willingness to engage the Committee on Financial Services on matters within its jurisdiction.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important measure.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 6, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing with regard to H.R. 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act, which is scheduled to be considered by the House today. This bill is similar to H.R. 2368 which was reported by the Committee on International Relations yesterday and additionally referred to the Committee on Financial Services. As you are aware, both bills contain provisions relating to international financial institutions and multilateral banking organizations which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services pursuant to clause 1(g) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

As a result of the continuing consultation between the Committees on Financial Services and International Relations, H.R. 2833 contains language responsive to the concerns raised by Members of my committee. Therefore, I have no objection to allowing the Committee on financial Services to be discharged from the further consideration of both H.R. 2833 and H.R. 2368. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Financial Services Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over either measure. In addition, the Committee on Financial Services reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of H.R. 2833 that are within the Financial Services Committee's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this or related legislation.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to commend Chairman Smith for crafting this important bill. I also wish to commend Committee Counsel Joseph Rees for his excellent work in helping to prepare this comprehensive measure.

Madam Speaker, the Vietnam Human Rights Act is a landmark initiative that sets out clear goals and direction for our Nation's policy towards Vietnam. It is an example of the sort of policy the State Department should be doing with other repressive governments.

Unfortunately, in the past few years, our government delinked trade restrictions to human rights improvement in Vietnam. This action was shortsighted and an insult to the memory of these American and Vietnamese men and Woman who died during the war attempting to bring about positive change. Their sacrifice to promote democratic governments in the region must not be forgotten.

The Vietnam Human Rights Act will ensure that the State Department puts our Nation's best foot forward. Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, September 5, 2001, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)

Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—19

Conyers
Crane
Davis (IL)
Frank
Gillmor
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Horn
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Lipinski
Meek (FL)
Mollohan
Oxley
Portman
Sherman
Traficant
Watts (OK)
Young (AK)

□ 1407

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 335 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 335 due to my recovery from hip surgery. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 335.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. CON. RES. 144

Mr. PICKERING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as cosponsor from H. Con. Res. 144.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

APPROVING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT WITH RESPECT TO PRODUCTS OF THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 51) approving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to the products of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 51 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 51

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to the products of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam transmitted by the President to the Congress on June 8, 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, September 5, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and a Member opposed to the joint resolution each will control 1 hour.

Is there a Member opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. MCNULTY. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY) will control 60 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and that he be permitted to yield time as he sees fit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Joint Resolution 51, as appropriate with its title, deals with a trade agreement with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. This is the most comprehensive trade agreement with a nonmarket economy country that the United States has ever entered into. That is why I want to underscore that it is with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Normal trade relations used to be called Most Favored Nation treatment, and frankly, it was a misnomer; most nations receive Most Favored Nation treatment. And so a few years ago we appropriately changed the terminology. I think, therefore, if we are asking that we have normal trade relations with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, who do we not have normal trade relations with? And in this part of the world, in the Far East, there are basically two nations that do not enjoy normal trading relations with the United States. Those are Laos and North Korea. All other countries in the Far East enjoy this status.

The idea of having a bilateral trade agreement with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in a comprehensive way allows us to deal with access in areas of industrial and agricultural goods, in services, in intellectual property rights, in investment, and in the transparency of all of those activities.

□ 1415

It is a trade agreement that will allow us to continue to improve the relations between one of the fastest growing countries, both in terms of population and in terms of economy, in Southeast Asia.

Madam Speaker, I would place in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy with regard to H.J. Res. 51.

This statement says, "The administration supports H.J. Res. 51 which would approve the extension of non-discriminatory, i.e., normal trade relations treatment for products of Vietnam."

The closing of the paragraph says that "the Bilateral Trade Agreement's entry into force completes a normalization process that has spanned four administrations. Completion of this process will facilitate important bilateral engagement on other issues of concern."

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, September 6, 2001.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies)

H.J. Res. 51—Approving the Extension of Normal Trade Relations Status for Vietnam)—(Rep. Armey (R) TX and 2 cosponsors)

The Administration supports H.J. Res. 51, which would approve the extension of nondiscriminatory, i.e., Normal Trade Relations (NTR), treatment for the products of Vietnam.

The Administration has continued to work with Vietnam to incrementally normalize our bilateral political, economic, and consular relationship. U.S. engagement helps promote the development of a prosperous Vietnam and integrates it into world markets and regional organizations, which, in turn, helps contribute to regional stability. In addition, U.S. involvement has secured Vietnamese cooperation and engagement on a range of important U.S. policy goals, including achieving the fullest possible accounting of POW/MIAs from the Vietnam War. U.S. engagement also gives hope of producing gains in respect for human rights as well.

The U.S. has extended a Jackson-Vanik waiver to Vietnam for the past 3 years. This waiver, which is a prerequisite for NTR trade status, has permitted U.S. businesses operating in Vietnam to make use of U.S. Government programs supporting U.S. exports to and investments in Vietnam. U.S. business views Vietnam the thirteenth most populous country in the world, as an important potential market.

On June 8th, President Bush submitted the U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement (BTA) to Congress for its approval as part of extending NTR to Vietnam. This BTA binds Vietnam to an unprecedented arrays of reforms, including tariff reductions for key U.S. exports, elimination of non-tariff barriers, intellectual property rights protection, market access for American service industries, protections for American investors, and mechanisms to promote the rule of law.

The BTA's entry into force completes a normalization process that has spanned four Administrations. Completion of this process will facilitate important bilateral engagement on other issues of concern.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORING

Any law that would reduce receipts is subject to the pay-as-you-go requirements of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act. Accordingly, H.J. Res. 51, which would reduce revenues, will be subject to the pay-as-you-go requirement. The Administration will work with Congress to ensure that any unintended sequester of spending does not occur under current law or the enactment of any other proposals that meet the President's objectives to reduce the debt, fund priority initiatives, and grant tax relief to all income tax paying Americans.

Madam Speaker, the U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement marks a milestone in the strengthening of our bilateral relations. This agreement is a sensible and necessary step. Vietnam has emerged as one of Southeast Asia's more promising economies, and it has the potential to be a strong trading partner for America.

Continued engagement with Vietnam must lie at the core of our relationship. It has already produced concrete results in terms of the achievement of U.S. policy objectives, such as the fullest possible accounting of U.S. servicemen missing in action and resolution of remaining emigration cases.

This trade agreement—the product of many years of bipartisan effort—will allow this engagement to continue, offering us the opportunity to promote significant change in Vietnam's trade and economic policies, enhancing both internal reform and regional stability. It commits Vietnam to the core principles of a market economy: open goods and services markets, expanded rule of law, and broader economic freedoms.

You get off the plane in Vietnam and sense immediately the profound changes that interaction with the world at large has already brought. Vietnam moves at a vibrant pace. Its streets teem with new enterprises alongside the old. Young entrepreneurs sell modern electronic goods beside ancient shopkeepers and purveyors of hand-painted bowls. Joint ventures create modern factories where remote rice paddies once lay.

But Vietnam is a work in progress. Its commitment to reform has been tested by two years of slow economic growth following an extended period of strong improvement. The economy is now recovering, but that recovery remains fragile.

The country leapt toward a market economy in the last 1980s, and its GDP doubled in the '90s, making it one of the fastest growing economies in the world with 7.6 percent growth over the last decade.

In a country where official per capita GNP hovers at $370, poverty is declining sharply as a direct result of the government's recognition of the value of market forces.

Vietnam's ongoing commitment to structural reform has laid the path for this continuing recovery. But its economic promise has yet to be fulfilled. The bilateral trade agreement and American engagement will help move Vietnam toward fulfillment of that promise. Its exports to the U.S. are expected to more than double once the agreement is in place, helping to create jobs and raise living standards.

Just as important, what does the agreement mean for the U.S.?

First, American business gets greater access to Vietnam's market of almost 80 million people, as well as lower tariffs on U.S. goods.

The agreement also reinforces Vietnam's full commitment to cooperate in accounting for the remaining American servicemen still missing in action.

Most of all, continued engagement maximizes U.S. influence over the pace and direction of Vietnam's reforms, allowing our voice to be heard as Vietnam determines its future. And a strong Vietnam matters to America. It matters because history has proved that we pay a heavy price for instability in Southeast Asia.

I urge you to vote yes for H.R. 51.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCNULTY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that half of my time be yielded to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and that he be permitted to allocate that time as he sees fit, and that, further, I be permitted to yield the time that I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCNULTY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 51, a resolution approving the U.S.-Viet Nam Bilateral Trade Agreement.

As my colleagues know, this debate is no longer about the limited use of issue of whether Vietnam should be eligible to participate in U.S. credit and credit guarantee programs, which I also oppose at this time. Approval of this resolution would allow Vietnam to be eligible to receive normal trade relation status, or NTR, on an annual basis similar to what China had for the last 20 years.

I also believe, Madam Speaker, that this debate is about something much more important. As I said last year, I do not oppose the eventual normalization of relations with Vietnam, but I do oppose declaring business as usual when the remains of American service personnel are still being recovered. According to the Department of Defense Prisoner of War Missing Personnel Office, we are receiving newly discovered remains on a fairly frequent basis.

In the most recent joint field activity accounting which concluded on August 7, 2001, just 4 weeks ago, Madam Speaker, the remains of five more American military personnel were identified. They will be formally repatriated in the next few weeks. Two of the identified are unilaterals meaning the Vietnamese simply handed over the remains. In my opinion, this indicates that the Vietnamese government has more information about our missing personnel.

My question, Madam Speaker, is this: Cannot we just wait until this process is completed?

I have stated before on this floor, Madam Speaker, the story of my family as it relates to Vietnam. On August 9 of 1970, my brother, Bill, HM–3 William F. McNulty, was killed in Vietnam. He was a Navy medical corpsman transferred to the Marines. He spent his time patching up his buddies, and one day he stepped on a land mine and lost his life. That was a tremendous loss to the members of our family. I can tell my colleagues from personal experience that while the pain may subside, it never goes away.

There is a difference between what the McNulty family went through and what an MIA family goes through because Bill's body was returned. We had a wake and a funeral and a burial. What we had, Madam Speaker, was some closure. I can only imagine what the family of an MIA has gone through over these past several decades.

Madam Speaker, until there is a more complete accounting for those missing in action, I will propose that my colleagues vote against NTR for Vietnam.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, clearly our relationships with Vietnam represents a major challenge. There is the troubled past, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY) has once again reminded all of us here in the Nation of that past. The present reality is, as the chairman has indicated, we are dealing in relationships with an economy and a society still controlled by a single political entity. So the question in facing this major challenge is how do we respond.

I think we are struggling once again for a formula that combines engagement and pressure. The bill that we just passed reflects the need for pressure from this country on the country of Vietnam.

What has happened in terms of engagement is, more or less, this: we are dealing with a large nation of over 80 million people. As some progress was made in 1994 regarding POW/MIA's, the embargo was lifted. In 1995 diplomatic relationships were established. At that time, there was the beginning of negotiations for a bilateral trade agreement. These negotiations went on for several years. They were finalized within a few years, by 1997.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) indicated, this agreement has some very major ingredients, and I think basically positive ingredients in terms of our national interest: market access for industrial and agricultural goods; protection of intellectual property rights; market access for services on a broad basis, assuming they are enforced in a country with a weak rule of law; investment provisions; and also, very importantly, some transparency provisions to try to strengthen the rule of law within Vietnam.

So here we are today considering normal trade relations as a result of this trade agreement. We have waived Jackson-Vanik several times now, and that allowed an agreement to provide certain economic support for our businesses.

Madam Speaker, I support this agreement, realizing and pointing out its shortcomings. One of those relates to the failure to address labor market issues. Several years ago, a number of

us urged our Ambassador in our administration to address these issues. As we review the chronology that was sent to us by the former Ambassador, Pete Peterson, it is clear that the embassy and the administration attempted to move the ball in terms of labor market issues. And I will not relate the entire history of it, but it included involvement of OPIC, of the AFL–CIO, of teams from the AFL–CIO under OPIC auspices, to discuss worker-rights issues within Vietnam.

We urged that the administration and the Ambassador go further, and I think in part because of that there was a Memorandum of Understanding that was reached with the Vietnam Government that provided for technical assistance, including by the ILO regarding labor market issues.

However, those are provisions for technical assistance. And the question remains as Vietnam goes further, what efforts will be made not only to free up their capital markets but also to free up their labor markets.

In July of this year, a letter was sent by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and Senator BAUCUS, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, and myself to the Ambassador saying the following: ''Since the BTA was signed last year, we have been working to ensure that as we move forward in strengthening the U.S.-Vietnam economic relationship, we also move forward to advance the issue of labor standards in Vietnam. Vietnam has taken some steps in that regard, including by signing a Memorandum of Understanding on labor issues with the United States last November. However, more should be done.

''To that end, we urge the administration to include a positive incentives labor provision in the eventual U.S.-Vietnam bilateral textile and apparel agreement. This approach would provide incentives for Vietnam to take additional, concrete measures to strengthen adherence to core labor rights and would reward Vietnam with tangible, commercial benefits as it continues to strengthen labor standards.

''We encourage the administration to make clear its intent to pursue a labor provision in the textile and apparel agreement as the BTA resolution moves through the Congress. We know that a number of Members of Congress share our belief that addressing these concerns will strengthen the bipartisan support necessary for prompt congressional approval of the BTA, and will represent positive action on trade legislation.''

The response we received some weeks ago from Mr. Zoellick on behalf of the administration was disappointing, essentially noncommittal, so I want to say just a few things rather quickly about the labor provision.

Number one, there is no use of calling it a social issue. It is an economic issue. It is part of the trade equation. I refer to a letter that was sent by Senator LOTT and a number of other Senators and House Members to Mr. Zoellick on February 9, 2001. It is just one example of how labor market issues are relevant to the trade and competitive equation. I quote from this letter. ''We are concerned about imports from Vietnam of an Asian-type catfish displacing U.S. farm-raised catfish in the U.S. and world market.

''Most of the fish from Vietnam are grown in floating cages under the fishermen's homes under the Mekong River Delta. Vietnam can produce these fish at a much lower cost because of cheap labor and very loose environmental regulations for ponds, therapeutics and feed.''

The letter continues, ''It is our hope that as the USTR, you will keep our concerns foremost in mind when you meet with top Vietnamese trade officials. It is essential that we take every action possible to preserve the U.S. catfish industry.''

Another example is the agreement that was negotiated with Cambodia regarding the textile and apparel industry. I refer to an article of July 12, 2001, in the New York Times, and I urge that everybody read this article if they have any doubt about the importance of labor market issues in our relationships in our competition. This article talks about this negotiation, about the efforts by Cambodia to adopt a labor code with the help of the AFL–CIO and the ILO. I quote, ''The incentive to improve working conditions and permit unions has come from Washington where in 1998 trade negotiators were preparing to put quotas on fast-growing Cambodian garment imports. Amid pressure from American unions and public opinion, the Clinton administration pushed Cambodia to accept unprecedented conditions. If Washington decided in an annual review that its industry was in substantial compliance with Cambodian labor law and international standards, it would raise Cambodia's quota by 14 percent.''

□ 1430

This article describes how it is an uneven picture, but I think it is basically clear that with the help of this provision in the textile agreement there has been improvement in the ability of workers in Cambodia to associate, to represent themselves, and to get a piece of the action.

So this is what I want to make clear. As we did in Cambodia, as was done in the Jordan agreement, as was done in the CBI agreement, it is important that labor market issues be part and parcel of trade negotiations.

There is going to be an annual review of Vietnam and its progress; and I want everybody to know that for myself and many, many other members, we will be watching this administration. We will be watching Vietnam to see, if and when there is an apparel and textile agreement, there is due consideration of labor market issues as there was with the Cambodia agreement and in other trade agreements.

I consider it to be not a social issue alone. It is clearly an economic issue and indispensable issue. How we handle this can be basis for disagreement but not whether it is relevant.

So I urge support within that statement, within these circumstances for this agreement, while I also indicate that we have to be vigilant. As we are in human rights through the agreement or the resolution we just passed, we have to be vigilant that as our relationship with Vietnam unfolds, it broadens in a way that makes sense in terms of Vietnam, in terms of its ability to progress; but that we, as these relationships unfold, take into account the full economic competitive picture.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the bilateral trade agreement with the Communist government of Vietnam.

Madam Speaker, we just had a vote in this body of 410 to 1 reconfirming that we believe that human rights in Vietnam is something of importance to the people of the United States.

I would submit that large votes like that, being followed by basically agreeing to a treaty to treat the Communist government of Vietnam the same way we treat economically democratic countries of not only that region but throughout the world, is one reason why, number one, the dictators of the world do not pay attention to us and think that we are being either frivolous or lying about our commitment to human rights.

It also is a disheartening factor for people who live under tyranny, because those people who live under tyranny, their only hope for many of these people who live under tyranny is the commitment by the people of the United States of America to try to make this a better world.

These types of contradictions between human rights, but giving precisely the same trade rights and economic rights to these vicious dictatorships as we do to democracies, is very disillusioning to most of the free people of the world who struggle for democracy.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this Vietnam bilateral trade agreement. Let us remember, as we have just stated in the last debate, during the last 12 months, despite presidential waivers, the Communist regime has actually increased its brutal repression of religious clergy, advocates of democracy and ethnic tribal minorities,

many of whom were actually loyal to the United States during the war.

What does voting against this agreement really do, and what are we talking about? What will happen with this agreement? We are not talking about breaking relations or isolating Vietnam. That is not what this debate is about. This will not in any way, no matter how we vote, break our relations with Vietnam. We will not be isolating Vietnam.

People will still be free to trade. Americans can still go over there and sell their goods and services, and so it is not about whether or not we are going to have relations or isolate Vietnam. It is not about whether American companies can sell their products there, because there will be no law in the United States preventing that.

So what is this bill all about? I have repeated this on numerous occasions because we have studied this trying to find what other reason a bill like this has such momentum in Congress.

This bill is about whether or not American businessmen who want to build factories in Vietnam to exploit the near slave labor there and the lack of labor rights that they have in Vietnam, whether or not those American businessmen will be eligible for taxpayer subsidies or loan guarantees so that they can set up their factories over there, literally putting American workers out of work and setting up factories to exploit the near slave labor of this Communist tyranny in Vietnam done with American taxpayer subsidies and guaranteed loans through the Export-Import Bank and other international financial institutions that are supported by the taxpayer.

This is a travesty. I do not know anybody who can really defend that policy. But, as I have presented the case, those people on the other side have refused to even acknowledge this part of the debate. And over the years, even though I have made this charge over and over again, no one seems to even comment on it, the people who are advocating from the other side. I would like to hear the proponents of this trade agreement tell me why it is a good thing for the American taxpayers, our working people, to be taxed in order to subsidize and guarantee loans to American businessmen so they can build factories over there which will produce goods that will compete with the jobs of the American people over here. I want to hear a comment on that. I would hope that my colleagues who are supporting this trade agreement will at least take that into consideration. So we are extending American tax dollars to subsidize and insure the businesses going into a Communist dictatorship.

This is bad business, for one thing, because the reason they need the government to guarantee, meaning our tax dollars, to guarantee their investments over there is that it is a risky proposition to invest in a dictatorship. And it is especially risky to invest in Vietnam. It is a risky thing, because when you do not have really the rule of law working in a country and it is a dictatorial regime, they can have their property confiscated. Many American businessmen have already fled Vietnam. But they will not invest with their own money and our banks certainly will not give them a loan, unless the taxpayers guarantee it.

That is bad business, and it is also contrary to American values. If we really do believe in democracy and human rights, it is contrary to our values. If we are going to be using taxpayer dollars to guarantee loans so that American businessmen can do business in a foreign country, and I do not think we should even be doing it anywhere, but if we do, at the very least it should be with democratic countries. And by insuring these loans and insuring this type of an incentive for American businessmen to go use that slave labor, we are not only hurting our own people, we are hurting governments and people like who are in the Philippines.

In the Philippines they are struggling to have democratic government. They have got opposition newspapers. They have got opposition parties. They have trouble with keeping a truly democratic system because of corruption there. But there are honest people who want to have democratic government in the Philippines. What are we doing? Instead of encouraging our businessmen to go to the Philippines, a country that loves us, we are subsidizing our businessmen to plant factories in a Communist dictatorship. This makes no sense. No wonder why the dictators of the world do not believe us when we pass 410–1, a resolution claiming that we believe in human rights and that it is important to us.

Let me talk about one last element here, and I appreciate the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY) yielding me the time that he has and the points that he made about American POWs in Vietnam. This is an important point. I have been in Vietnam numerous occasions. I took this personally upon myself.

My chief staff member here, Al Santoli, was wounded three times in Vietnam. I was not in the military, but I spent time in Vietnam during the war in 1967 doing political work there; and so I have over these last 30 years had a personal interest and have gone back many times, as has Mr. Santoli, to Vietnam.

The idea that the Communist regime in Vietnam has in good faith cooperated with us on the POW issue is a fraud. It is not true. There is no basis to it. They have exploited the POWs search since day one. Even to this day they are charging the American Government a million dollars every time we go out and try to search for some bones. What they have done is relegated our search for justice and our search for real truth about what happened to our POWs to a search for bones which they give up every now and then. The fact is that there were over 200 Americans last seen in captivity, alive and in captivity, in Communist hands that were never accounted for. Since that time, during this supposed cooperation, the Government of North Vietnam has done nothing that will help us determine what happened to those 200 men.

I have repeatedly asked during this debate, during trips to Vietnam in which I talked directly to the leaders of North Vietnam, I asked for the records of the prisons in which American POWs were held during the war. Why? Because if we get those records, we can find out exactly who was in the prison, how many people were kept there, how much food was bought because they had the number of prisoners and we can determine if there is a difference between the number released and the number that they were taking care of during the war. What have I been told? ''Oh, those records aren't available. They were destroyed in B–52 raids near the end of the war.''

Well, baloney. The Communist regimes throughout this world have been noted time and again for the fact that Communists keep such incredible records. They keep records of everything. When they have meetings of their central committee, they keep intricate notes. They did not throw away those records. They were not burned by B–52 raids. They will not give them to us because it indicates that they kept Americans after the war. Now, why with a regime like this are we going to give our businessmen subsidies to invest over there and create jobs over there, exploiting their slave labor? This is ridiculous.

I would hope that we can see an evolution in Vietnam. The people of Vietnam are wonderful people. In fact, I represent many Vietnamese in my area, Vietnamese Americans. They came to the United States and under freedom these very people have prospered. They are the very best of citizens. They love democracy. They have taken advantage of the opportunity to increase the standard of living of their lives. That could be true of all of the millions of people who live in Vietnam if they were not suffering under the yoke of tyranny. This is not the time to ignore what that government has done about the POWs. It is not time for us without any democratic reform going on in Vietnam.

We have heard about what was happening in Cambodia. In Cambodia, they have not had those same reforms in

Vietnam that they have had in Cambodia. In Cambodia there are opposition parties. There are actually opposition newspapers. They have got nothing like that in Vietnam. Let us see some reform there before we bestow upon them subsidies by our taxpayers and incentives for our businessmen to go over there and create jobs over there.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam and to really take human rights seriously. If the United States takes human rights seriously like we did with Ronald Reagan and the Soviet Union during the Cold War, we will be striking a blow for peace. Ronald Reagan never provided most-favored-nation status for the Soviet Union. And the Soviet Union fell apart, and we have a chance for true democratic government there today. Let us do the same thing in China, and let us do the same thing in Vietnam. Let us do the same thing with dictatorships around the world. Let us let America be a shining light of hope of liberty and justice for all.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

There has been such a long period now between our war on Vietnam and now that I think it is only appropriate to have a trade agreement which symbolizes how far our two countries have come.

It was not very long ago that President Carter and President Ford were unable to establish any kind of relationship with Vietnam, accordingly, the first Bush Administration got more positive responses to their attempts to begin a new relationship. This set the stage for President Clinton in 1994 to order the lifting the trade embargo against Vietnam. The following year the two countries established ambassadorial-level diplomatic relations. And former Congressman Peterson who had been held as a POW in Vietnam was sent as our first ambassador. I think it says a lot about the need for healing that we have the Vietnam Trade Agreement before us today. Of course, it would not have occurred if the Vietnamese had not become sensitized to our need to return American bodies to their families. And to also have yearly reports made on their progress on human rights—a subject we will discuss later today.

But it is here! A bilateral trade agreement which took almost five years to craft. When one goes to Vietnam one expects to be confronted as an American for what took place during the war but 50% of the population were not alive at that time. This is really an old country with very young population who do not see Americans in the same light as their parents and want to establish a new relationship with us.

They are eager to open up their country to trade even though to this day there is disagreement between the economic hard-liners and those who want to really open up the Nation.

This agreement will do that. Although we do not export much to Vietnam and vice versa at the present time, this is a young and vibrant nation that wants to participate in global economics.

They have a high literacy rate and the desire to open up their markets. And American industry wants to sell them lots of goods. Who would have thought that all these years later that our war with Vietnam would result in what could be a highly productive relationship. I believe this is the beginning of a whole new era.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, all of us express continued regret about the loss of American lives in Vietnam and treatment that Americans received during that war. Some of those very same individuals have been and are Members of the United States Congress.

□ 1445

The stories that they tell are ones that truly depict a very difficult and troubled time. I do believe, however, that we can make a relatively firm statement that a no vote on this measure will not increase our ability to work with the Vietnamese for the fullest possible accounting of missing Americans.

I also want to respond briefly to my colleague from Michigan about the question of a lack of a labor agreement in this particular provision. The last administration, in November of 2000, entered into a very specific labor agreement with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. I might underscore that they are no longer on my map as a North Vietnam and a South Vietnam. There is a Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

That agreement, which was announced on November 17, 2000, was a United States and Vietnam agreement on labor cooperation. The press release issued by the last administration stated, in the Secretary of Labor's words, ''This is a significant step in establishing labor issues as an important component of our overall relationship with Vietnam. In fact, more than $3 million in technical assistance is being provided in collaboration with the International Labor Organization to address such issues as establishing skills training and employment services, including placement services, development of unemployment insurance and pension systems, improving access to employment for workers with disabilities, eliminating child labor and child trafficking, and launching workplace education to prevent HIV and AIDS.''

So although there is no specific labor component in this particular agreement, clearly the two countries have entered into an ongoing relationship to improve the labor standards and working conditions in Vietnam.

I would respond to my friend from California to indicate that this is a bilateral trade agreement to establish normal trade relations with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. It pertains to the tariffs that apply to Vietnamese goods coming into the United States. It does not apply to credits extended to American business people who wish to do business in Vietnam. That is a provision of the Jackson-Vanik structure, and this body voted 91 no, 324 yes on the Jackson-Vanik waiver. That was the structure that provided the credits to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

A no vote on this particular measure, House Joint Resolution 51, would be a vote against allowing Americans, consumers, business people, to bring Vietnamese goods into the United States not subject to the tariff. So if you are looking for a measure to stop the international credits going to business people doing business with Vietnam, that is under the Jackson-Vanik waiver. If you vote no on this particular measure, you are trying to make sure that Americans do not get the benefit of a tax-free relationship with the products that are going to be imported into the United States.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), a member of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this joint resolution to approve the United States-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement. I am very happy to see that we are finally passing this important trade agreement with the third largest nation in ASEAN, which is the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, and the second most populous country in Southeast Asia.

This is an historic agreement. It will reduce tariffs and it will improve market access for United States services and for our products.

I am also very pleased with Vietnam's commitment to adopt international standards to protect intellectual property rights. This is a very important step for Vietnam, and it will help very much in reducing piracy and in safeguarding American innovation.

For the State that I represent, Washington State, this agreement could mean more high-paying jobs. The Vietnamese Government has made a commitment to purchase four 777 airplanes. These are commercial aircraft. Their construction will be directed by people who live in the district I represent.

For our farmers in eastern Washington, lower tariffs and better transparency rules will reduce the red tape that has caused us great trouble in finding markets abroad, and it will expand the exports of our apples, potatoes and wheat to Vietnam.

I think it is very important, as we continue this debate, to reaffirm that

continuing economic engagement with Vietnam does not diminish our commitment for a full accounting of American soldiers still missing in action. I would say to the gentleman from California that engagement with Vietnam also does not diminish our commitment toward pressing the Vietnamese Government to respect basic human rights. This is important to all of us, and we will not take our eyes off the interaction between our governments.

We appreciate that much must be done before Vietnam can join the global community, but by expanding economic freedom, I think that we can foster an environment for further political reforms that can lead to greater openness and tolerance.

It seems to me that it is time that we no longer view Vietnam simply as a war. We have got to begin seeing the Vietnamese as a people who want to build a stronger relationship with us and who will provide enormous economic opportunity for our American producers. Continuing our policy of engagement is the best way, I believe, to help both our people and the Vietnamese people.

I ask my colleagues to support this joint resolution.

Mr. MCNULTY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT).

Mr. EVERETT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 51, a bill that would grant permanent normal trade relations with the communist country of Vietnam. I am especially concerned that until Vietnam stops illegally substituting an inferior species of fish for U.S. farm-raised catfish, the American consumer and the American farmer will continue to suffer.

The catfish industry in Alabama and in the southeast is a very vital industry that employs tens of thousands of workers in primarily rural and economically depressed areas, and contributes hundreds of millions of dollars annually to these states' economies. In Alabama, for example, catfish production ranked second nationally and had over $81.6 million in sales last year. Nationwide, the catfish industry accounts for over 50% of the total volume and value of all U.S. aquaculture at 600 million pounds.

Additionally, the catfish industry has contributed over $50 million to familiarize the American consumer with the superior quality of the U.S. farm-raised, grain-fed catfish product. As such, the substitution of fish that are not even in the same genus or species as the North American channel catfish has led to consumer confusion. These Vietnamese fish are raised in cages in rivers, the same polluted rivers that sewer and waste are dumped into. Moreover, they are fed a diet of various things including other fish, not a completely grain-fed diet like the U.S. farm-raised catfish.

Efforts to substitute the cheaper Vietnamese species of fish, through what I and many believe is the improper use of the name "catfish", has also led to unprecedented levels of imports that have displaced American catfish. In fact, Vietnamese fish imports are displacing U.S. catfish at a rate of 70 million pounds annually according to U.S. Census Bureau estimates in May. This is equivalent to an estimated 15–20% of the total U.S. farm-raised catfish market.

It also appears that Vietnam is encouraging increased production and export of these fish by recently announcing new incentives for collateral-free loans until 2005 for investment in aquaculture. Figures from the Department of Commerce indicate that imports of these fish from Vietnam have tripled from what they were this time last year, and now account for 84% of catfish imports into the U.S. This has also led to the decreased exports of farm-raised catfish from the U.S. to other countries.

U.S. catfish farmers have spent millions of dollars and years of hard work to build a market for their product based on its guaranteed quality and safety and do not deserve to have it destroyed. Moreover, consumers deserve to know exactly what kind of food they are putting on their dinner tables.

Industry officials have met with the Administration, and with the government of Vietnam and so far have not had their problems addressed. Until the Administration and the government of Vietnam address this issue satisfactorily, I cannot support normalizing trade relations with Vietnam.

Mr. MCNULTY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS).

Mr. SHOWS. Madam Speaker, I stand before you today to speak of something that I care deeply about and have been working hard to correct, irresponsible trade agreements that ignore the needs of rural communities. I am not opposed to free trade, but I am opposed to trade agreements which further harm communities, families and industries in Mississippi and across rural America.

Today we are considering extending normal trade relations with Vietnam. We must promote reasonable, responsible trade agreements, and we must be mindful of some of the unintended consequences trade agreements have had on rural America, and especially in Mississippi.

Where I come from in rural Mississippi, some of our trade agreements, like NAFTA, have failed our rural communities. The result has been factory shutdowns and job losses that have devastated communities throughout my district. This is the case in rural communities and urban cores across America.

We know that NAFTA has worked fine for many of the places in our Nation, but our rural communities have been ignored. Hard-working people in places like Prentiss, Collins, Magee or Centreville have been hurt by these trade deals. When a factory shuts down in a rural community like this, it is devastating to every family.

We have a responsibility to fight for fair trade that supports American workers, families and communities from unwise trade agreements. Today I stand in opposition to extending normal trade relations to Vietnam.

One example is the damage even restrictive trade with Vietnam has done to the catfish industry in Mississippi. Domestically grown catfish, which meet strict environmental and health standards, are being displaced by inferior and potentially unsafe products from Vietnam. These fish products are disguised by labels that imitate those placed on legitimately farm-raised catfish to mislead the consumer about the origin of the product.

I urge a no vote on this measure.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about an issue that is very important to some the citizens of my district. Over the August recess I met with a large group of Southeast Asian and Vietnamese Americans about issues of importance to them. The issue they expressed the greatest concern about had to do with human rights in Vietnam. They expressed to me their fear that an increase of trade with Vietnam may only serve to strengthen the hand of the Communist government that denies its citizens basic freedoms of association, religion and other human rights. I believe those fears are valid and important for us to consider.

I do not believe we can discuss trade with Vietnam without addressing the human rights violations of the Vietnam Government. Therefore, I was very pleased that the legislation we passed earlier today addressed precisely these issues. Without adequately monitoring human rights situations and without real consequences for noncompliance, I would have had strong reservations about passing the Vietnam trade agreement we are debating now. But by considering these bills in conjunction, we will be able to send a message that the U.S. believes in engaging Vietnam and strengthening economic and political ties, but we still demonstrate our concern for the lack of rights afforded to the Vietnamese people.

I think it is especially important to send to the Vietnamese Government the message that it remains unacceptable for them to continue to imprison religious leaders, including individuals such as Father Nguyen Van Ly, the Venerable Thich Tam An, Thich Khong Tanh, Thich Quang Hue, Ly Tong, and other religious and political prisoners.

Madam Speaker, I will vote in favor of this legislation, but only because this body has assured us that we will continue to put pressure on this country to further human rights.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BIGGERT). The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has 18 minutes remaining, the gentleman from

California (Mr. THOMAS) has 19½ minutes, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 17 minutes remaining and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY) has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, let us, as this debate goes on, remember that Vietnam as it is today does not have an independent court system, does not have opposition parties, does not have freedom of the press, not to mention all the political prisoners they have thrown in jail, et cetera, and the persecution of religion. But without courts, without opposition parties, without freedom of the press, what does that mean normally? What it means is exactly what you have got in Vietnam, a corrupt system.

We may try to say, well, we have already given these loan guarantees and these subsidies with the Jackson-Vanik waiver already passed by this House. The fact is, this vote freezes that into place. This vote freezes those loan guarantees and those subsidies into place that we put into place over my objection with the passage of the Jackson-Vanik waiver.

We should not in a situation, in an environment where there are no courts or opposition parties or freedom of the press, expect that our businessmen are going to go over there and find anything available to them without a bribe. What they are going to find, and that is what is happening there, our businessmen are faced with bribes, they are faced with a corrupt regime they are not used to.

And then what happens? The American taxpayer, because we have given these subsidies and loan guarantees, has to pick up the check when these businessmen close up their operation and flee back to the United States of America.

This is a bad deal. It is bad business. Not only is it bad in terms of American values, in terms of human rights and freedom, but it is just a bad deal all around, having the taxpayers subsidize loans and guarantee these loans in order to go into this corrupt environment where you do not even have a court system that can operate independently and provide judgments there, when you have people asking for bribes, et cetera, et cetera.

This is not what we should be doing. It is bad business and contrary to our values.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1500

Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I stand in support of H.J. Resolution 51. Let no one be fooled. What this basically does is normalize the trade relationship with Vietnam. We are trying to have a bilateral trade relationship with this country. I am very proud of the fact that the State of Oklahoma was the first State to have an office in Vietnam to do trade. We are still the only office basically there that has a presence, but we have an office there, and we have people there.

Yes, Oklahomans are there trying to engage in having a normal trade relationship, but we are also trying to work with educational and cultural exchanges, because we know the only way we are going to resolve the human rights problems are to be able to engage and be able to carry on that conversation one on one with our values, our values. I started to say we normalized California. A lot of Okies went out that way, but the chairman is from California so I have to be very careful about what I say about California.

But let me say I know there are conditions there, and I visited with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) about some economic trade policies that we need to continue to be concerned about and aware of, and I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this point up.

First let me say that I have great respect for the Committee on Ways and Means chairman and the subcommittee and all of my colleagues who have worked so feverishly and so effectively on these free trade policies. I am a free trader I do not deny, and I am quite proud of it, and I have voted for each and every bill they have brought to the floor. But sometimes we have to talk to our own administration and the only chance we have to talk to them effectively, and usually I do this on the appropriation bills, is by threatening to withhold their money.

But we do have a tremendous problem in the catfish industry. The catfish industry in Alabama is a growing industry that is employing thousands of people. They have developed a hybrid catfish that is raised in fresh water ponds that are grain fed, that are high quality catfish. Now we find that the Vietnamese, and the Commerce Department or the FDA is allowing them, to ship into the United States, the Vietnamese, a poor quality fish that is not even a catfish, that is labeled a catfish.

The reason I stand here today is to shoot a bow over the front of the ship of the FDA, and I have written Ms. Janice Oliver a letter and asked for her immediate decision on this classification.

We do not mind importing any product from the Vietnamese that is a safe, edible product, but we do not want it mislabeled, and the FDA can do something about it. My message today to the FDA is to do something about it and do it immediately, or else they are going to be facing my wrath when these appropriation bills come to the floor.

I had to do it one other time. I remember I had the same problem with the chairman that is sitting right behind my colleague now, and I threatened to withhold $1 million a day until they made a decision. I am not threatening to withhold $1 million a day from the FDA; I am just insisting that FDA make this decision today, make it as expeditiously as they can, and let us get on with this ability to trade with Vietnam and other countries.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would ask our colleague, the gentleman mentioned the catfish industry. Is the gentleman aware of whether or not the American company dealing with the catfish industry there, was there any loan guarantees by the Export-Import Bank to any American company that was involved or a subsidy from the American taxpayer involved in the creation of the catfish industry in Vietnam that is now wreaking such havoc in the gentleman's State?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am not familiar with anything that the Ex-Im Bank has done there, although I am a big supporter of the Ex-Im Bank. I do know that the government of Vietnam is offering interest-free loans for people, which I think is in violation of all of our agreements, is offering interest-free loans to people to start catfish farms, and if they want to do that and play on the same level playing field that we are playing on here in the United States, that is all right with me too.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, there is a real possibility, and neither one of us knows that now, but I do not think there is anyone on this floor that would step up and say, no, it is impossible; the catfish industry in Vietnam has not been created with the help of subsidies from the American taxpayers. We cannot say that, because we do not know. We are laying down the rules now, so that would be a real possibility.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote for this legislation to establish a bilateral trade relationship with Vietnam. This legislation is the product of long negotiations between our governments, and builds on the trade relationship we have been developing over the past decade. Just a few weeks

ago, this House again voted by an overwhelming vote against imposing trade restrictions on Vietnam; now, we should pass this BTA by just as overwhelming a vote.

We all recognize the sensitivity of any legislation involving Vietnam because of our nation's past history. But we in the House have begun a healthy, expanding and maturing relationship with this country of nearly 80 million people. And this legislation is not about the past; it is about the future relations of our governments and our economies.

I have had the opportunity to visit Vietnam, to meet with government leaders and private citizens, and to talk at length with our former ambassador, Pete Peterson, who has been one of the most passionate supporters of improved political and economic relations with Vietnam. Ambassador Peterson has devoted countless hours during his years of service to developing improved economic and political relationships between Washington and Hanoi, and between the American and Vietnamese people. Our vote today is, in no small way, a testament to the success of his efforts and a credit to his hard work.

Vietnam is a large and changing country. There are multinationals involved in production of oil and gas and the manufacture of sportswear; Vietnam is also a country where most people labor in rice paddies and start businesses with micro-loans of less than $100. It is a country of educated, industrious people that will continue to play a key role in the future of Southeast Asia. We should not cut ourselves off from that nation, but rather work closely to help it advance and to encourage moves towards a more open economy.

We are building a new and positive relationship with Vietnam, which is the 12th largest population in the world and plays a key role in the political and economic security of Southeast Asia. Last year, the Congress enacted legislation I helped to write creating a program to promote higher education exchanges between our countries. We should continue to build on these efforts, because they are in the best interests of both nations.

Some may wish to turn this debate into one over sensitive issues between the United States and Vietnam. That strategy is inappropriate here, and should be rejected. Vietnam, as illustrated by our annual Jackson-Vanik votes, has made great strides on immigration and is a full partner in the effort to locate remaining American soldiers missing in action. Negative and unjustified attacks on Vietnam's efforts at cooperation can only injure future efforts, and have no place in this debate.

However, let us note that this BTA does not end our review of Vietnam's moves towards openness and transparency. We will still engage in annual reviews of its practices. Nor does this BTA or the memorandum of understanding concerning labor standards adequately address concerns I have, along with many others, about the need for a free labor movement in Vietnam that allows workers to organize and collectively bargain with their employers. As we move towards the next stages of trade agreements, we will continue to press for assurances that the working men and women of Vietnam will enjoy the basic rights to free association recognized by the International Labor Organization.

Free trade unionism, improved environmental policies, expanded political and religious rights for all Vietnamese: these are, and should be, legitimate factors for securing improved and lasting trade relations with the United States and other democracies. We will continue to work with the Vietnamese to assure that these goals are achieved.

Those are issues that remain to be discussed in the course of future negotiations. For today, we should move ahead and pass this Bilateral Trade Agreement which sets the stage for those future discussions, while helping to bring our countries and our people together.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 51, which extends temporary most favored nation status to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. The Vietnam-U.S. bilateral trade agreement is unwarranted until Vietnam demonstrates tangible progress in addressing its human rights and the moving forward to a more market-oriented economy.

Free trade does not mean trade at any cost. In the case of Vietnam, certain conditions, I believe certain conditions should be met, to have long, meaningful, lasting trade relations developed. I am concerned that we are losing our economic leverage without gaining concrete, verifiable steps towards reform in exchange.

In our support for the economic revitalization of Vietnam, we cannot ignore basic human rights issues that need to be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the largest Vietnamese community outside of Vietnam. They are the parents, the siblings, the children of families who fought communism for over 2 decades, and they, the majority of these people, do not want to establish normal trade relations with Vietnam until we do something about immigration, political and human rights issues for the people of Vietnam.

Recently, I have learned of the distressing case of Mr. Dac Vi Hoang, a former Vietnamese businessman who fled Vietnam recently to escape persecution. His situation is emblematic of the economic repression and political corruption that stifles free enterprise in Vietnam. Mr. Hoang was a prominent Vietnamese entrepreneur who owned Thanh My, Incorporated, an international exporter of lacquerware. In fact, he enjoyed an astounding success, this private corporation, in the midst of a communist regime, with annual sales of $3 million and over 400 employees. Thanh My was internationally recognized as the first private corporation in Vietnam to receive permission to sell its shares to a foreign entity, although that permission was eventually revoked by the Vietnamese government. Nonetheless, just 1 year ago, in August of the year 2000, Mr. Hoang found himself having to flee Vietnam with his family, leaving this entire business behind.

Let me take a minute and tell my colleagues the story. In February of 1976, nearly 1 year after the end of the war, Dac Vi Hoang started his small, family-oriented company specializing in lacquerware products. At the time, the communist government was closing down large corporations and industrial plants because they were considered to be tools of capitalism, but they allowed a few small, private companies to operate, as long as they did not have a lot of capital or heavy machinery.

Although the business was allowed to remain in operation, Mr. Hoang was imprisoned for 5 years so that he could be ''reeducated,'' which meant that his wife had to run the business in the meantime. During his time, it should be noted that Mr. Hoang was severely tortured, mentally and physically, when he underwent reeducation.

Although business operations were kept to a minimum, when he was released, he started into the business, and by 1991, Thanh My was allowed by the Government of Vietnam to actually export its lacquerware to other countries. Ultimately, Thanh My became one of Vietnam's largest exporters with customers in the U.S., in France, Japan, Germany, Sweden, even Canada. Because of his success, however, Mr. Hoang became a well-known member of the Vietnamese business community. He was one of the founding members of the Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry; he was elected Vice President of the Union of Associations of Industry and Commerce, and he was also featured in Baron's Who's Who in the Asian Pacific Rim.

Well, all of this caught the attention of the Vietnamese communist government. Mr. Hoang voiced the concern of the business community with respect to what was going on. His criticisms of the government were unfair and arbitrary taxing against private corporations and that there was corruption at virtually every level of doing business.

In recent years, the communist government of Vietnam began cracking down on executives of leading private corporations. Using various pretexts, the communist regime has imprisoned executives of successful, private companies when they are considered too vocal, too vocal, in criticizing the government or when their companies become too successful, thereby threatening the regime's grip on power.

This is what was happening to Mr. Hoang when he decided to flee with his family. He learned from the government ministry of public security task force officer who was assigned to monitor what was going on at Thanh My that Mr. Hoang was a target for persecution. This security officer was someone that Mr. Hoang gave side bribes to

in addition to the usual money you have to pay these people to supervise what was going on with Thanh My. He would give this money to get good government reviews and not have problems with the government. Finding out that a change in the government supervision over Thanh My was going to occur, was going to be an excuse for the government to come in and bring somebody to try to find incriminating evidence against him, Mr. Hoang took his family and fled Vietnam leaving the entire business behind. He currently is residing in southern California while he awaits his political asylum hearing.

I ask my colleagues to understand that this is continuing to happen in Vietnam. As the person who represents so many of the Vietnamese, we get all of these cases all of the time. After hearing this story, does Vietnam appear to be a country that is moving toward market-oriented reforms?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this, and I hope that my colleagues will help and not support this either.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), a very distinguished colleague who has had a very long and deep interest in this issue.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support normal trade status for Vietnam.

The vote today is really about how we best achieve change in Vietnam, and I believe the record speaks for itself. We have achieved progress by engagement: by encouraging Vietnamese cooperation on important issues such as human rights, immigration and political and economic reform.

I can speak about this personally. I have been to Vietnam and seen the work of the Joint Task Force-Full Accounting, our military presence in Vietnam tasked with looking for our missing servicemen and women. I have visited these young women and men, and they are among the bravest and most motivated soldiers I have ever seen. Every day, from the searches of jungle battle sites to the excavation of crash sites on precarious mountain summits, they put themselves in harm's way to recover our missing. In talking with them, it made it clear to me that they were performing a mission that they truly believed in.

On April 7 of this year, that danger became all too real. On that date, seven American members of the joint task force, along with nine Vietnamese, lost their lives in a helicopter crash as they were on their way to a recovery mission. This tragedy was a huge blow for our recovery efforts, as we lost both Americans and Vietnamese who had deeply been involved in finding our missing. We should remember our deceased Americans are heroes who gave their lives in pursuit of a mission they believed to be a high honor and a sacred duty.

The only way we can carry out this mission effectively is to have a presence in Vietnam. To maintain that presence means reciprocating on the promises that we made to reward Vietnamese cooperation. Failing to approve this resolution would definitely send the wrong signal to the Vietnamese, not to mention the brave American men and women who are still searching for our missing in the rice paddies and mountains of Vietnam.

□ 1515

The opponents of this argument or the opponents of this agreement will say that the Vietnamese Government has a terrible record on human rights, that they do not deserve normal trade arrangements with our Nation.

I will not defend the Vietnamese human rights record. It needs serious improvements. We should focus on obtaining basic freedom for all Vietnamese. But former Ambassador and colleague here in the House of Representatives, Mr. Pete Peterson, demonstrated that we can achieve progress on human rights and a number of other issues that are important to our Nation by encouraging cooperation from the Vietnamese.

As our first ambassador to this nation since the war, his stewardship led to tangible and dramatic progress on issues that have changed the lives of North Americans and Vietnamese for the better.

By continuing this policy, the families of POWs and MIAs will get the answer about their missing, Vietnamese emigres will also be reunited with their families, and our country will have benefits from the fruits of Agent Orange research. We can risk all this if we turn our backs on this successful policy. Voting against this agreement would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the House overwhelmingly supported a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment restrictions on Vietnam. This is the fourth year in a row that the House, with growing and overwhelming support, voted for better relations with Vietnam.

I believe that we should follow this course. Let us support the Joint Task Force for Full Accounting, and let us support our Nation's bipartisan policy that has only furthered our goals towards a more cooperative and open Vietnam. Please vote for this resolution.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have learned that the Vietnamese catfish industry is having a very detrimental impact on Americans who were involved with producing catfish for the American table. Yet also, at least I suggested, and I have not heard anything to the contrary, that what we are doing is laying down the economic ground rules so that we can subsidize, through American taxpayer subsidy or loan guarantees, businessmen to go to Vietnam and set up other businesses in order to do to the current businesses of the United States what the catfish industry from Vietnam did to the catfish industry here.

That does not make any sense to me. What is this all about? This is about a dictatorship in which some American businessmen want to go over there and exploit the slave labor, and want to do so with loan guarantees and subsidies by the American taxpayer.

I am very happy to hear that Oklahoma set up a business office in Vietnam. A lot of other people set up business offices in Vietnam. But what we need to hear about are all the offices that have closed up, all the businessmen who thought they were going to do business there, but the environment is so corrupt that they were unable to do business, and that they have closed shop and left.

The only way American business companies are going to go over there is if we guarantee their loans and subsidize them. That makes no sense. We have already put all these people who grow catfish, we put them out of work. What is the next industry that we want the Vietnamese slave labor forces to be able to put out of work with the subsidy from American taxpayers? What industry is that?

How about refrigerators, radios, clothing? I do not know what factories these people want to open. Probably I would guess it would be tennis shoes.

I believe in free trade. People who oppose this particular trade legislation, it does not mean they are opposed to free trade. I believe in free trade between free people. When we sort of set the same rules with vicious dictatorships as we do with democratic countries, surprise, surprise, we are going to bolster the strength of the regime, of the clique that holds power in those dictatorships.

No, we should be having freer trade with countries like the Philippines, who are struggling, struggling to have a good democracy with human rights, instead of giving more incentives and more ways of making profit by setting up businesses in dictatorships like Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), someone who has been extensively involved in a number of trade discussions and debates.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I thank the gentleman again for yielding me this time, and I appreciate the leadership he has shown with his committee on so many trade issues this year. This is just one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 51, which would extend normal trade relations to the nation of Vietnam. Let us begin, as I know the chairman has made clear earlier, what this is and what this is not. This is not a free trade agreement. It is a bilateral trade agreement, a trade agreement that allows us to trade on the same basis as we trade with all the other countries of the world except the very small handful with whom we do have a free trade agreement.

Because Vietnam is a socialist or a Communist country, it comes under the banner of the Jackson-Vanik requirements, and still, with this passage, would require an annual Jackson-Vanik waiver from the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in 1995 this country embarked on a new path with the country of Vietnam. We chose to take a different direction toward better political, economic, and consular relations. In making that decision, we recognize the need to encourage the development of Vietnam as a prosperous country, and believed, as I believe today, that doing so would begin to bring about the fruition of democracy within that country.

We understood how important it is to integrate our former adversary, with whom some of us in this body itself fought in a war in that country, to integrate that former adversary into the economic progress of Asia and ultimately into the global community.

Since starting down the path, our policy, I believe, has reaped some very important benefits. It secured Vietnamese cooperation on achieving the fullest possible accounting of the POWs and MIAs from the Vietnam War. It has helped to contribute to regional stability. It has helped to open a new market for U.S. businesses and U.S. workers in the world's 13th most populous country.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago today I returned from a trip to Vietnam. It was my first time in that country in 10 years, in exactly the 10 years ago that I was there, and the 22 years before that that I had been there during the Vietnam War. I was struck with the tremendous changes that have taken place over the last 10 years.

Ten years ago, we had no embassy in Hanoi. We had no consular office in Ho Chi Minh City. We had no American business presence. In fact, there was almost no foreign business presence anywhere in Vietnam at that time.

Today we find the city of Ho Chi Minh, or Saigon, with five-star hotels, with very upscale restaurants and shops catering to foreign shoppers, high-rise buildings and a skyline that is beginning more to resemble Hong Kong or Bangkok than the somnolent Saigon many of us knew during the time of the Vietnam War when we served there 30-plus years ago.

It is a different city. It is changing. I believe with this agreement we will accelerate that change. I believe that change will be to the good, both for the United States, but most importantly, for the people of Vietnam.

Certainly the U.S.-Vietnam foreign policy relationship is one that is still maturing. We would all agree that we must continue to make progress in our relationship along several dimensions.

But today, this legislation marks a very important milestone in the development of that relationship. Today we can support the extension of normal trade relations between our two countries. U.S. trade and economic ties with Vietnam can help the country see the benefits of developing a society that is based upon the rule of law. That faith in the rule of law can then serve as a foundation upon which further social and political development can be based.

Mr. Speaker, no country can engage in trade with other countries, can engage in foreign relations, without ultimately having to come to terms with the rule of law. That is the most important aspect of this legislation.

So to my colleagues in the House, I urge their support for this resolution.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose House Joint Resolution 51, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution. I am fortunate to represent Santa Clara county, an area in California with a vibrant Vietnamese-American population. Quite a few of my constituents came to San Jose as refugees escaping an oppressive political regime.

Over the last 25 years, as the Santa Clara County supervisor, as an administration lawyer, and as a Member of Congress, I have worked closely with these Americans; and many of them have become my friends. I value their knowledge, experience, and support, and believe they have a unique perspective on the United States' relationship with Vietnam.

While we are told that the government in Vietnam is making progress in the area of human rights, I continue to hear about religious persecution, political persecution, and unwarranted detentions from my friends in the Vietnamese community. During the past 12 months, the Vietnamese Government has intensified its campaign of brutal oppression, especially against religious leaders and ethnic minorities.

When I, along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Sanchez) hosted a hearing on human rights in Vietnam this spring, we learned of this firsthand. One after another, religious leaders testified to the lack of religious freedom in Vietnam. Several invited witnesses were unable to leave Vietnam to deliver their testimony in the face of government threats. They smuggled out written or audio testimony so their stories could be heard.

In light of the government crackdown on religions, dissidents, and minorities, unconditional ratification of the bilateral trade agreement will send the wrong message to the Vietnamese leadership. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom recommended that the U.S. Congress ratify the BTA only on the condition that Vietnam undertake substantial improvements in its policy towards and treatment of religion.

I am a firm believer in trade. I have voted repeatedly for trade agreements, but the situation in Vietnam is different. We have a clear opportunity to change the course of the nation's behavior by denying it what it desires greatly, a trading relationship with America.

President Bush, please stand up to the communists in Vietnam and insist on human rights in exchange for trade. We have the tools at hand to improve the human rights situation in Vietnam. I ask my colleagues how they justify not using this tool when so many have asked for our help.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, until such time as the administration can reach a fair agreement with Vietnam on the catfish issue.

□ 1530

Well, my suggestion is that they are going to continue stealing our software in Vietnam, just as in China, now that we have liberalized trade with them. It has not changed their practices one iota at all.

So let us understand that when we make agreements with these types of regimes, these criminal regimes around the world, surprise, surprise, we are not going to be treated as if we are dealing with an honest democratically elected government that keeps its word. Instead, we are dealing with gangsters who pirate, and not only pirate but repress their own people, even commit murder. I mean, they murder their opponents in these regimes, and that means Vietnam, and yet we expect them to abide by some nice trade agreement with us? No. The agreements that they make with us will only be followed to the point that they are beneficial to the Vietnamese Government and the clique that runs that country.

Let us take a look. We have heard about the catfish industry. I am very happy that the catfish industry was

brought up today because we do not know whether or not the catfish industry in Vietnam was established with the help of a taxpayer loan or subsidy from the U.S. taxpayers, but we do know that we have several Congressmen from a variety of States here worried about their constituents being put out of work because catfish from Vietnam are flooding into our market. We do not know whether or not that catfish industry was set up with a taxpayer subsidized loan; but we do know that there is slave labor in Vietnam, that there are none of the environmental health standards in Vietnam, and there are none of the other types of protections in Vietnam that would be required of them if they were raising those catfish in the United States.

And by the way, those same requirements might be put on Vietnam if they had a democratic government. If they had a democratic government, maybe they would be forced to pay their people more, or perhaps the people of Vietnam would demand higher health standards. But they do not have a democratic government. They have a gangster clique that runs the country and they are going to manipulate the catfish industry for their benefit. I would bet some of this clique in Hanoi are making money off the catfish industry by putting our people out of work.

By making this agreement today, we will just do for the rest of American industry, step by step, what was done to the catfish industry, and we will be doing it with subsidies from the American taxpayers and loan guarantees from the American taxpayer. It makes no sense.

Let us talk a little bit about the issue of human rights. And I will just say to my colleagues that suggest that if we would just open up these economic ties, there will be more respect. In fact, we have heard some people claim there has already been progress.

There has been no progress. There has been retrogression in China, and there has been no progress about opening up that system democratically in Vietnam whatsoever. There are more five-star hotels around so that there our big businessmen with guaranteed loans in their pockets from the American taxpayers can go over there and invest and set up factories over there to use slave labor. Oh, yes, there are some five-star hotels, but that is not progress. That is not progress at all.

What we still have are no opposition parties, no independent courts at all. There is no rule of law in that country, no freedom of the press, so nobody can criticize the corruption there. And that is why people do not invest unless they have government guarantees and loans or subsidies, because it is too risky a proposition.

Why are we setting up the rules of the game and doing trade with a country like that when instead we should be seeking to encourage people to invest in democratic countries like the Philippines or in our own country to protect people with our own jobs?

Last but not least, the POW issue. I have spent so much time on this issue over my 13 years in Congress. I cannot say it is more than any other Member, but I know that I have spent considerable time on it. I have been to Vietnam numerous occasions and Southeast Asia numerous occasions on this issue. I have studied it and I, without hesitation, can tell my colleagues that I do not believe this government has cooperated in good faith with the United States in trying to have an accounting for those Americans who were seen alive in captivity before the return.

There were over 200 of those Americans who were in captivity; we knew they were, yet they were not returned at the end of the war. We want to find out what happened to those people. We do not want to have this obfuscation. We do not want this issue sugar-coated or candy-coated.

They show pictures of this issue, of our people there digging for bones. Yes, digging for some of those bones will bring closure to some people, but we want truth. We want to establish the truth. If they kept those people and they murdered them later on, let us hear about it, and we can close this chapter of the book. But let us not let them get away with the same falsehood they have been using on their own people.

I would ask for my colleagues to join me in opposition to this trade deal. It is contrary to America's interests. It is a bad deal. It is contrary to our values and will not bring a close to the Vietnam era. It will just leave this corrupt dictatorship thinking they put one over on us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in allowing me to speak on this important legislation.

I agree with one thing from the comments of my colleague from California, and that is that this is closing a chapter in American history. But I think, most important, it represents opening a new era in relationships between the United States and Vietnam.

We have heard people talk on this floor about the painful experience. And I think there is no question why people feel so strongly and passionately about it. This was a chapter in our history where traditional measures simply do not apply.

Traditional concepts are of winning or losing a war, for example. Certainly the American public has lost over the course of the last third of a century. Certainly we paid heavily in economic terms, costing billions of dollars and throwing our economy into chaos.

Families lost. We all know people who lost loved ones. Over 56,000 Americans did not return. And there have been massive efforts on behalf of both the United States and the Vietnamese Governments to try to account for everyone, more than any other war in American history. Yet we are still striving to close that chapter.

And, of course, we have to look no further than the streets of America now where we see troubled and, in some cases, homeless veterans who returned seared by the process.

But those of us who have experienced a little bit of the situation in Vietnam recently, who have talked to our constituents who are here now and who are of Vietnamese heritage know that this chapter exacted a horrible price on Vietnam itself. There were hundreds of thousands of casualties, tens of thousands of missing and still unaccounted for, and it produced a flirtation with global communism as an ally that has delayed the modernization of that country, including not just its economy and human rights, but reintegration into the family of nations.

Thankfully, soon after the formal fighting ended, there were courageous people who stepped forward to try to begin this new era. No discussion of this issue would be complete without noting the unique contributions by American heroes, like Senator MCCAIN, Senator KERRY, and our own former colleague on the floor of this House and ambassador to Vietnam, Pete Peterson, who worked to engage our two countries.

We have made tremendous progress in reconciling our past to the new future. It is still not going to be easy. This terrible tragedy in Vietnam continues to claim victims every day. And those who visited the country lately cannot help but be touched by the young children who continue to be maimed by land mines and other unexploded ordnance, by people struggling with war injuries, physical and psychological, children with birth defects.

We have hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese who have fled to the United States, who are now citizens of our country, who are trying to reconcile it as well, struggling with the past, and who are hungry for reconciliation with divided families. This trade agreement is an opportunity to open up whole new avenues of commerce and contact between our two countries, but particularly for Vietnamese Americans.

Vietnam today is an entirely different nation, unlike what some would lead us to believe. It is entirely different from what we saw 40 and 50 years ago. The architects of the Vietnam War on the side of the Vietnamese, like Ho Chi Minh and his contemporaries, are gone. It is an oft-cited

statistic that 60 percent of the Vietnamese people have been born after the conclusion of that war and the vast majority have no memory of those efforts.

I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) yielding me this time, and I apologize if I got carried away a little bit, but we see this new country that is emerging that can take advantage of this trade agreement to forge new links. Southeast Asia is a cauldron today of over 600 million people, of diverse countries rich in natural resources, economic energies and rich cultures, and Vietnam is right in the middle of it. It is a country that has a long history of being leery of the country of China, for instance, and a thousand years of experience to back it up.

We have seen people labor mightily over this trade agreement. We are going to see a new era of economic prosperity in Vietnam. It is going to help us economically, but it will be transformational for them, and it is going to empower a new generation of leaders, of entrepreneurs, speed the healing, and give them the energy to slam the pages closed on this chapter and open a new one.

I deeply appreciate the leadership of the Committee on Ways and Means, my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), in bringing this forward, the many people who have labored mightily for this agreement, and I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I had a chance at the beginning to lay out a perspective of mine and, I think, many, many of my colleagues on the Democratic side. I think this has been a useful discussion, and I hope many have heard it, though not here. I simply want to reemphasize that this is not an easy relationship. It is a complex relationship because of the past, but also because of the present and likely the near future.

There should be no rose-colored lenses. We are dealing with a society, a structure, that is very different from ours. Very different. A political structure that is very different and an economic structure that is very different. As a result, there is no automatic factor here. There is no magic wand. One thing will not lead automatically to another. I do not think a free capital market will lead automatically to a free labor market or to human rights.

I think, as a result, we need a well-rounded comprehensive approach. I think included must be engagement, including on intellectual property. This agreement covers intellectual property. It has restrictions in terms of how the Vietnamese handle it.

But beyond that, I think comprehensiveness must increasingly include, with this authoritarian society, their movement towards a free market in labor as well as in capital. That is why I think we need to both engage and pressure Vietnam. That is why I think, as we negotiate further agreements with Vietnam, we must consider the factors, including the labor market factors and perhaps even the environmental factors that at this point are not as critical.

□ 1545

So, in a word I think we need to move forward but in a comprehensive way. And on balance, I believe that this bill represents a movement forward, as long as we keep in mind the reality of a very different society with a very different structure that requires a different formula as we did with Cambodia, as we have wrestled with, with other countries, we would apply, if we were negotiating or approving an agreement with another industrialized democratic society.

So with this, I close, hoping that we will pass this within the framework that I have suggested and I believe so many of my colleagues agree with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my other colleagues who are in opposition to this measure have eloquently outlined the many reasons to oppose it. I will close by concentrating again just on the MIA issue.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Boyd Sponaugle, Ron Cima and Chuck Henley of the Office of the Secretary of Defense for the updated information on the search for our MIA's. I am grateful to them and all who are working to bring our MIA's home.

As I grow older, Mr. Speaker, I try to keep my priorities straight. That is why when I get up in the morning, the first two things I do are to thank God for my life and then veterans for my way of life. Because had it not been for my brother Bill and all of those who gave their lives in service to this country through the years, had it not been for people like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and PETE PETERSON and Senator MCCAIN who endured torture as prisoners of war, had it not been for people like Pete Dalessandro, a World War II Congressional Medal of Honor winner from my district who was laid to rest 2 years ago in our new cemetery in Saratoga, had it not been for them and all of those who wore the uniform of the United States military over the years, I would not have the privilege as an American citizen to go around bragging, as I often do, how we live in the freest and most open democracy on the face of the Earth. Because freedom is not free. We paid a tremendous price for it.

So today, Mr. Speaker, based upon the comments that I made earlier and the comments of my colleagues, and on behalf of all 1,474 Americans who are still missing in Vietnam, I ask my colleagues to join me, the American Legion, the Veterans of the Vietnam War, the National Vietnam Veterans Coalition, and the Disabled American Veterans in opposing this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that ordinarily in this debate the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), would be heavily involved in the debate; but due to a family circumstance, the gentleman is not here today.

Mr. Speaker, in my response to my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY) and his poignant comments, I too share the concern that he expresses.

I think it is important to note, however, that, for example, in World War II there were more than 50,000 missing in action. It is true we have a better capability and we have carried on a much longer search to verify each and every individual who was missing in action; but the two former major Axis Powers are now two of our major trading partners. I do have to say we engage in trade disputes periodically, but we do so in an ordered process.

I believe most of us who are in support of this resolution to enter into normal trade relations with the Socialist or Communist Government of Vietnam is to believe that this too will have a better outcome.

I do want to respond to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), about his concern in terms of taxpayers' money. While this debate has gone on, we have engaged in a number of conversations. For example, the Export-Import Bank of the United States has indicated that there have been no transactions, therefore, no funds have been authorized for participation in Vietnam by American businessmen.

We pursued farther. The Overseas Private Investment Corporation has indicated that there has been no activity. Beyond that they are required by law to examine any project to determine if it would have a negative impact on the U.S. economy and business. They would be required by law to turn a project down. So although there may be somebody's private dollars involved in the catfish operation, at this point I believe I can offer a degree of assurance to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) that there has been no taxpayer dollars.

But the point he makes, if not specific to the catfish industry, is one that we have to be concerned about. And that is why this agreement can be revoked at any time by the President under the structure that we have established. This is a year-to-year renewal. It is an embarkation on an attempt with a nonmarket economy to

improve not only the labor areas that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has indicated he has a concern about, but the intellectual property rights guarantee that has caused so much pain by the copying around the world. Of course, the key to that is the transparency in the transactions. This will be a good test of the Government of Vietnam to see if they can be trustworthy.

In fact, I find it entirely appropriate to reflect on the comments of the President of Mexico in the address he gave to the joint session today. He indicated one of the key commodities to improve the relationship between the United States and Mexico is a degree of trust. He indicated that notwithstanding the democratic title of the country over a number of years, it was far more authoritarian, that was his word, than democratic, but that there is a new era.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say the same for the current government of Vietnam, but I do believe sincerely that this agreement will move us more in the direction of an open opportunity for Vietnamese citizens to express themselves.

Currently, this will be in the more economic realm rather than in the political realm. There is no question they have what they believe to be a semblance of what they call a democracy; but the fundamental core of a democracy is that the decisions be made quantitatively with each person getting equal weight. We know that is not now the case in the Socialist or Communist Republic of Vietnam.

All of those facts laid bare on the table, House Joint Resolution 51, introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader, with the support of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), is worthy of a ''yes'' vote. We should move forward with this ongoing engagement with the Socialist or Communist Republic of Vietnam. It will be a yearly test to see if, in fact, our trust is well placed. If it is not, we can change. But for today, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on House Joint Resolution 51.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 51, a resolution approving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam.

Amnesty International reports that the government of Vietnam continued to prevent independent human rights monitors from visiting the country and dozens of prisoners of conscience remained in prison throughout 2000. Restrictions on released prisoners continued to be harsh. Political dissidents, independent labor leaders and religious critics of the government were subjected to imprisonment, beatings, torture, surveillance, harassment and denial of basic freedoms, including freedom of expression.

Last year, five members of the Hoa Hao Buddhist Church were sentenced to between one and three years' imprisonment on trumped up charges.

The State Department points out that the government of Vietnam prohibits independent political, labor, and social organizations; such organizations exist only under government control. The Vietnamese Government also restricts freedom of religion and significantly restricts the operation of religious organizations other than those entities approved by the State. Dissident groups of Buddhists, Hoa Hao, and Protestants, in particular, faced harassment by authorities.

Accordingly, we should not reward the Vietnamese communist dictatorship with trade benefits. It is an insult to the thousands of American and Vietnamese men and women who were wounded or died during the war fighting for democracy, the rule of law and human rights.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.J. Res. 51.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, last January, I traveled to South Korea, Cambodia and Vietnam to discuss issues of peace, reconciliation, trade and security between the United States and Asia. It was a remarkable trip that helped us to learn. We learned so much about Vietnam and I became convinced that implementation of this Bilateral Trade Agreement is the right policy both for the Vietnamese and the American people. Therefore, I urge Members to vote for the Vietnam trade agreement to establish a regular trade regime between the United States and Vietnam.

Thanks to Pete Peterson, former Ambassador to Vietnam, thousands of American and Vietnamese veterans, and the hard work of literally millions of people we have made large strides in reconciling our two nations after the agony of the Vietnam war. Over 50,000 Americans died in that conflict, thousands more were injured, and the war took the lives of hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese and left the country devastated. Pete Peterson has said: ''We cannot change the past. What we can change is the future.''

Working in this spirit, America and Vietnam have established diplomatic ties, undertaken joint efforts to locate the remains of those still missing in action, and trade between our countries has increased. Last year, the United States and Vietnam completed this bilateral trade agreement, to set the stage for an even closer relationship between our nations and a trade regime that is more robust.

On the last night of our trip, I spoke in Hanoi to the American Chamber of Commerce. That night, it became clear that both Americans in Vietnam and the Vietnamese wanted free and fair trade to lift up the lives of both our peoples. There is a hunger not to forget but to use the war as a springboard for healing and hope for the future of both countries. Virtually everyone we met said they wanted to join the global community and reap the benefits of the twin revolutions in trade and technology that are sweeping the globe.

Our challenge is to work with Vietnam among other partners in trade to bend globalization for progressive ends: to make sure globalization produces higher living standards and stronger economies in developing and developed nations alike. This agreement is only a first step to raise living standards in Vietnam. It is not a free trade agreement. It establishes a formal trade relationship between our countries, lowering tariffs, increasing the flow of trade, and providing important new protections of intellectual property and investments in Vietnam by American companies.

I hope that passage of this agreement will eventually help to strengthen labor rights and human rights for the Vietnamese people. We must continue the dialogue developed by Ambassador Peterson on labor rights and the U.S. technical assistance program. Also, I strongly support the suggestion from Congressman LEVIN, among others, that any textile agreement between Vietnam and the United States include a provision to promote labor rights. The model for such a provision lies in the agreement between America and Cambodia, to provide positive incentives in which we have promised to increase textile quotes once progress on labor issues has been established.

I urge the Bush administration to continue to press in Vietnam for progress on human rights and religious freedom. If Vietnam moves towards the rule of law in commerce, I believe that it must also make progress in freedom for the Vietnamese people.

Since the war ended in 1975, our countries have traveled on a journey, often difficult and agonizing, yet remarkable all the same; a journey defined by peace and reconciliation, motivated by healing and deeper human understanding. This trade agreement moves both countries forward in this remarkable effort. It is a positive development for both people. I hope all of my colleagues will support this resolution, and help us take another step on the road to healing and hope for all.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I stand in firm support of House Joint Resolution 51, which approves the U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement, grants NTR status to Vietnam, completes the normalization of our diplomatic relations begun in 1995. A failure to support this key legislation risks undercutting longstanding U.S. foreign policy objectives in Southeast Asia, damaging the credibility of the reform faction within the Hanoi government, and causing Vietnam's 80 million people to slide backwards toward isolationism.

In 1986, Hanoi initiated a policy of doi moi, or ''economic renovation.'' For the first time the government encouraged private business start-ups and permitted inward foreign investment. As a result, Vietnam sustained on average nearly 8 percent annual GDP growth and welcomed $8.3 billion in foreign investment during the 1990s.

I visited Vietnam this past April and was struck by its 92 percent literacy rate, its thriving entrepreneurship, and the thousands of zooming motorbikes. Industrial parks now line the suburbs of the major cities, and government is planning to open a stock exchange in downtown Ho Chi Minh City. As GDP has doubled and per capita income has risen 60 percent since 1990, a small but growing, consumer-oriented middle class is taking root.

Signed in July 2000, the U.S.-Vietnam BTA will buttress these enormous economic and social reforms. The BTA represents the most

far-reaching and comprehensive trade agreement ever negotiated with a non-market economy country. It grants the United States vastly improved access to Vietnam's potentially enormous consumer class, and improves market access for industrial and agricultural goods, services, intellectual property rights, and investment, while requiring greater transparency.

The U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement will help Vietnam's reformers lock in the economic transformation that slower growth after the Asian financial crisis threatens to unravel. Continued engagement with the Vietnamese government also advances key U.S. foreign policy objectives, including the fullest possible accounting of Prisoners of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA), freedom of emigration, increased U.S. business opportunities in Vietnam, and promoting Asian regional stability.

Former Vietnamese Ambassador to the United States, Le Van Bang recently noted the positive influence that continued engagement has had on the Vietnamese people. He said that since we first reestablished diplomatic ties, the Vietnamese people have changed their attitudes toward Americans from ''the bitterness of war to a love of America.'' In such a fresh and positive atmosphere, our values in other key areas surely stand a much better hearing and more open consideration if we continue down this road. Approval of the U.S.-Vietnam BTA demonstrates we too are healing from one of the most divisive wars in our nation's history and that we seek to begin a new and truly productive era in U.S.-Vietnamese relations.

Congressional approval of the U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement and the expansion of business contacts between our two nations provides the strongest foundation for encouraging even further progress and reform in Vietnam. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote yes for H.J. Res. 51.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure to expand our trade relations with Vietnam.

This resolution, which ratifies the U.S.-Vietnam bilateral trade agreement and extends normal trade relations to Vietnam, enjoys broad bipartisan support. The agreement represents a milestone toward building a stronger commercial relationship with Vietnam and promoting U.S. security and diplomatic interests in the region.

We have seen tremendous progress in our diplomatic and economic relations with the Vietnamese Government. The country is experiencing a new era, driven by a population where 65 percent of its citizens were born after the war. Vietnam today welcomes U.S. trade and economic investment.

Through a policy of engagement and U.S. business investment, Vietnam has improved its policies on immigration, cooperated on U.S. refugee programs, and worked with the United States on achieving the fullest possible accounting of POW/MIAs from the Vietnam War.

Despite problems of corruption and government repression, there is reason to believe that our presence in Vietnam can improve the situation and encourage its government to become more open, respect human rights and follow the rule of law. Former U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam, Pete Peterson, our esteemed former colleague and former POW, has been one of our nation's strongest advocates for expanding trade with Vietnam.

However, this resolution is not a blank check to Vietnam. Before the United States grants NTR status to Vietnam, the Vietnamese Government is required to sharply lower most tariffs; phase out all non-tariff measures; and adhere to WTO standards in applying customs, import licensing another measures.

This measure also takes an important step in requiring Vietnam to allow U.S., firms over a period of time to enter its services market in a full range of areas, including financial, telecom, engineering, computing, education, health and other services. Two other critical areas of this agreement require Vietnam to protect U.S. investments from expropriation and adopt a fully transparent trade and investment regime.

Mr. Speaker, disapproval of this resolution will only discourage U.S. businesses from operating in Vietnam, arm Soviet-style hardliners with the pretext to clamp down on what economic and social freedoms the Vietnamese people now experience, and eliminate what opportunity we have to influence Vietnam in the future.

Approval of this bilateral agreement will advance U.S. economic interests and, more importantly to our regional interests in Asia, further integrate Vietnam into the global economy. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.J. Res. 51. I am pleased to have the opportunity to vote in favor of free trade while respecting my commitment to Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, last year the U.S. signed a sweeping bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam.

The State Department year 2000 review of Vietnam human rights noted that Vietnam has made improvements in its human rights record. Despite these improvements, the State Department still rated Vietnam as ''poor'' overall on human rights, highlighting continued government repression of basic political freedoms. The State Department also noted that the Vietnam Government is intolerant of dissenting viewpoints, and selectively represses the religious rights of its citizens.

Because of these factors, I voted in favor of H.J. Res. 55, legislation disapproving Waiver Authority with respect to Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, my vote was a protest vote, for I believe we cannot continue to hope that trade alone will guarantee the basic human rights of our trading partners.

Today, this House also considers H.R. 2368, the ''Vietnam Human Rights Act,'' which establishes a commission to monitor human rights in Vietnam. I regard this as a step in a new direction, and one that I applaud. By discussing trade with Vietnam in the same context as its human rights situation, we are finally moving in a more comprehensive direction that respects our global obligations.

As the leader of the free world, we have an obligation to promote core values when engaging the rest of the world. Thus, I have fewer reservations about moving forward with Vietnam.

As we move into this new millennium, our actions here today signal a commitment to expanding the marketplace in a manner that benefits both the United States and Vietnam. The extension of Normal Trade Relations will grant market access to American industrial and agricultural products previously denied from competition. U.S. firms are also granted access to the Vietnam services market. We will be allowed to compete in telecommunications, financial services, engineering, accounting, and a variety of industries that will help develop an infrastructure in Vietnam to support our new commitment to engage Vietnam on all levels of concern.

The approval of this legislation will ensure that U.S. firms committed to trade with Vietnam receive the protection of investments necessary to commit resources in a foreign country. By requiring a fully transparent trade regime with the promulgation of laws and regulations though a public process, this legislation helps Vietnam develop policies that will help this nation fully engage the world.

This legislation cannot be evaluated, however, without the approval of H.R. 2368. Advancing the agenda of global trade in countries that do not respect their citizens is tantamount to modern day feudalism, and should not be supported by this House.

Establishing a trade regime with Vietnam that will ease this nation's transition into the WTO means nothing unless prisoners like Catholic Priest Nguyen Van Ly, Mr. Le Quang Liem of the Inter-Religious Council, and Buddhist leaders the Venerable Thieh Huyen Quang and the Venerable Thieh Quang Do are ensured their right to freely exercise their respective religions.

Mr. Speaker, today this House goes a long way toward reconciling the concerns of all parties interested in global trade and its consequences. Passage of H.J. Res. 51 ensures that American products will be given fair access to the Vietnamese marketplace. By combining the extension of this trade with the recognition of Human Rights here on the House Floor, we set a positive precedent for future trade legislation. I therefore support H.J. Res. 51.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, September 5, 2001, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment, and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 51, the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REREFERRAL OF H.R. 1448 TO COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES AND COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from consideration of the bill, H.R. 1448, and that the bill be re-referred to the Committee on Resources and to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2001

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□ 1600

SUDAN SPECIAL ENVOY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the President of the United States, President George W. Bush, for the appointment today of a special envoy, former Senator Danforth from Missouri to work on the issue of bringing peace in Sudan.

I also want to thank Secretary of State Colin Powell for his efforts and his work. I think the Bush administration, President Bush and Secretary Powell, have really taken a very bold and a very, very important step.

I also want to congratulate or thank or commend Senator Danforth for accepting this very difficult job. As many people know, there has been a war going on in Sudan for almost more than 18 years.

I have visited Sudan four times in the last 10 years. In Sudan more than 2.2 million people, most Christians, a number of Animists and a number of Muslims, have been killed as a result of this war.

There has been unbelievable famine in Sudan. In Sudan, every major terrorist group, Hamas, Abu Nidal and others, has had operations in and around Khartoum, and there is also, as many people know, Osama bin Laden had been in Sudan for a period of time.

There is slavery in Sudan. What happens is the militia go into the villages, kill the men, rape the women and take the children away for slavery.

So I think the move by President Bush today, working through the good efforts of Secretary Powell, appointing Senator Danforth will really make a tremendous difference. It is the greatest opportunity we have had in years to bring about a just and a lasting peace.

This puts a tremendous burden on the Khartoum government and both sides having to come together whereby the people of the south and the people of the north can live in peace.

This has been a particularly difficult time because with the revenue, over $700 million this year of oil revenues, they are using that revenue to buy weapons and helicopter gun ships to kill the people in the areas where they have discovered and are now drilling for oil.

This is an opportunity.

I want to also thank all of the groups, and I will submit for the record all of the names, but those individuals who have been working on this issue for so long. I am reluctant to get into specifics because there are so many; but I will at the end of the statement submit with it their names and all the people who have been working for the last, some for 10, 11 and 12 years, a number of Members of Congress.

When I think on the Senate side, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK). On the House side, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and other Congressmen who have been to the region that are working on this. Also, the numerous groups of all denominations from throughout America that are participating and because of their efforts this day has taken place.

With prayer and with the hard work of Senator Danforth, it will be my hope that we can bring peace whereby the people of Sudan could live in peace.

In closing, from the bottom of my heart, I want to thank President Bush for this action, those on the President's staff who helped put this together; also Secretary Powell for his actions and those who work at the State Department that are involved in this very, very important issue. Perhaps they will all be like Esther: they are being called just for a time like this, to bring about peace, whereby the people in the south and the north can live together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank and congratulate President George W. Bush and his administration for naming former Senator John Danforth of Missouri as the United States Special Envoy to Sudan. Earlier today, in a beautiful and powerful ceremony in the Rose Garden at the White House, President Bush, supported by Secretary of State Colin Powell, expressed to Sudan and the world that the United States is deeply committed to helping resolve the conflict in Sudan that has claimed an estimated 2.2 million lives during the past 18 years of civil war. This is a conflict that has also driven another 4 million from their homes, threatens 2 million additional innocent victims with starvation, has witnessed deliberate aerial bombings of schools and churches by the government of Sudan, and has even tolerated the disgrace of slavery in the 21st century.

It was noted today, that the degree of difficulty in bringing an end to the suffering in Sudan is very high, but if there is even a chance of success, then the United States must accept this role of peacemaker in this struggle. I applaud Senator John Danforth for stepping forward and accepting this most challenging position of trust. I believe he has the experience, character and reputation around the world to succeed in this job.

Everyone who has been involved in bringing an end to the suffering in Sudan acknowledges that this job will not be easy. This effort will require the United States government to speak as one voice. It will require the desire for peace by the combatants in this war, the government of Sudan and the SPLA. It will require the support of the European Union and neighboring countries of Sudan, such as Egypt Kenya and others. And it will require the support of non-government organizations, religious leaders and citizens of the world. I firmly believe that if successful in bringing a just peace to Sudan, Senator Danforth should win the Noble Peace Prize.

Today's ceremony announcing Senator Danforth as Special Envoy to Sudan was a long time in coming. It came after many long hours and hard work by many individuals and groups around our country. The bright blue skies and bi-partisan crowd in the Rose Garden reflected the perfect back drop for this ceremony today and signal bright hope for tomorrow for the people of Sudan.

As I mentioned earlier, many individuals and organizations are responsible for helping shape the administrations policy with regard to Sudan. I applaud the bi-partisan efforts of members of Congress in supporting the appointment of a high-level Special Envoy to Sudan. Representatives DICK ARMEY, TOM TANCREDO, DON PAYNE, TOM LANTOS, ED ROYCE, SPENCER BACHUS, J.C. WATTS, CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, CHRIS SMITH, TONY HALL, former Congressmen Walter Fauntroy and

Harry Johnston as well as Senators SAM BROWNBACK and BILL FRIST all have played critical roles in seeing that this day finally arrived and they deserve special mentioning.

Many in the administration also deserve mentioning for their efforts in making this day happen. Assistant Secretary of State Richard Armitage, National Security Adviser, Condolezza Rice, Karl Rove at the White House, Andrew Natsios, the director of USAID, Roger Winter, USAID, Elliot Abrams, former chairman of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom and current Assistant to the President at the National Security Council, Walter Kansteiner, Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, and Ted Dagne of the Congressional Research Service have all played pivotal roles in shaping U.S. policy.

Religious leaders and organizations around our country have also provided unbending support in these efforts. Franklin Graham, Cardinals Bernard Law and Theodor McCarrick, the late Cardinal John O'Conner, Father Michael Perry of the United States Catholic Conference, Faith McDonald of the Institute of Religion and Democracy, as well as, the Presbyterian Church, Jewish leaders and Christian colleges across our country have all contributed as well.

Finally, many outside of government have steadfastly beat the drum calling for action in Sudan. I would be remised if I didn't mention a few of them as well. Nina Shea and Rabbi David Saperstein, both commissioners on the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, Roger Robinson and Adam Penner of the Casey Institute, Michael Horowitz, Professor Eric Reeves of Smith College, Chuck Colson and Mariam Bell of Prison Fellowship, radio personality Joe Madison of WOL-Am in Washington, D.C., Steven Morrison of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Jerry Fowler of the U.S. Holocaust Museum, and Charles Jacobs of the American Anti-slavery group are just a few of the patriots for justice who have continued the efforts that led to a special envoy being named for Sudan.

Today is a great day of hope for those who speak out for the voiceless and innocent of Sudan who have suffered for too many years. But, today is just the beginning of the efforts that are hoped to bring a just peace to the insanity that has taken place in Sudan for the past two decades.

Today, President Bush described the war taking place in Sudan as brutal and shameful. He said it deserves the attention and compassion of the world if it is to end. Senator Danforth noted that the U.S. can encourage the peace, but can not make it happen on our own. He will need much help in successfully bringing the atrocities to an end.

It is my hope that through much prayer and hard work, both sides in this conflict will resolve to bring an end to the suffering of so many innocent people and end this war for ever. I thank and applaud President Bush, Secretary Powell, Senator John Danforth and everyone involved in making this day happen. I encourage the American people to stay vigilant in seeing to it that peace comes to Sudan. I pray for the people of Sudan that today will mark the beginning of peace in your country.

THE U.S. DOLLAR AND THE WORLD ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken a Special Order today to address the subject of the U.S. dollar and the world economy, and in the words of James Madison, the pestilent effects of paper money.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a constitutional responsibility to maintain the value of the dollar by making only gold and legal silver tender and not to emit bills of credit, that is, paper money. This responsibility was performed relatively well in the 19th century despite the abuse of the dollar suffered during the Civil War and despite repeated efforts to form a Central Bank.

This policy served to maintain relatively stable prices, and the shortcomings came only when the rules of the gold standard were ignored or abused.

In the 20th century, however, we saw the systematic undermining of sound money with the establishment of the Federal Reserve System in 1913 and the outright rejection of gold with the collapse of the Bretton Woods agreement in 1971. We are now witnessing the effects of the accumulated problems of 30 years of fiat money, not only the dollar but also all the world currencies, something the world has never before experienced.

Exactly how it plays out is yet unknown. Its severity will be determined by future monetary management, especially by the Federal Reserve. The likelihood of quickly resolving the deeply ingrained and worldwide imbalances built up over 30 years is remote. Yielding to the addiction of credit creation, as has been the case with every market correction over the past 30 years, remains irresistible to the central bankers of the world. Central planners who occupy the seats of power in every central bank around the world refuse to accept the fact that markets are more powerful and smarter than they are.

The people of the United States, including the U.S. Congress, are far too complacent about the seriousness of the current economic crisis. They remain oblivious to the significance of the U.S. dollar's fiat status. Discussions about the dollar are usually limited to the question of whether the dollar is now too strong or too weak. When money is defined as a precise weight of a precious metal, this type of discussion does not exist. The only thing that matters under that circumstance is whether an honest government will maintain convertibility.

Exporters always want a weak dollar; importers, a strong one. But no one demands a stable, sound dollar, as they should. Manipulation of foreign trade through competitive currency devaluations has become commonplace and is used as a form of protectionism. This has been going on ever since the worldwide acceptance of fiat money 30 years ago. Although some short-term advantage may be gained for certain manufacturers and some countries by such currency manipulation, it only adds fuel to the economic and financial instability inherent in a system of paper money.

Paper money helps the strong and hurts the weak before it self-destructs and undermines international trade. The U.S. dollar, with its reserve currency status, provides a much greater benefit to American citizens than that which occurs in other countries that follow a very similar monetary policy. It allows us to export our inflation by buying cheap goods from overseas while our dollars are then lent back to us to finance our current account deficit. We further benefit from the confidence bestowed on the dollar by our being the economic and military powerhouse of the world, thus postponing the day of reckoning. This permits our extravagant living to last longer than would have otherwise occurred under a gold standard.

Some may argue that a good deal like that should not be denied, but unfortunately the piper must eventually be paid. Inevitably the distortions such as our current account deficit and foreign debt will come to an end with more suffering than anyone has anticipated.

The monetary inflation of the 1990s produced welcomed profits of $145 billion for the NASDAQ companies over the 5 years between 1996 and 2000. Astoundingly, this entire amount was lost in the past year. This does not even address the trillions of dollars of paper losses in stock values from its peak in early 2000. Congress has expressed concern about the staggering stock market losses but fails to see the connection between the bubble economy and the monetary inflation generated by the Federal Reserve.

Instead, Congress chooses to blame the analysts for misleading investors. The analysts may not be entirely blameless, but their role in creating the bubble is minimal compared to the misleading information that the Federal Reserve has provided with artificially low interest rates and a financial market made flush with generous new credit at every sign of correction over the past 10 years.

By preventing the liquidation of bad debt and the elimination of malinvestment and overcapacity, the Federal Reserve's actions have kept the financial bubble inflated. Of course, it is an easy choice in the short run.

Who would deliberately allow the market tendency to deflate back to stability? That would be politically unacceptable.

Talk of sound money and balanced budgets is just that. When the economy sinks, the rhetoric for sound policy and a strong dollar may continue, but all actions by the Congress and the Fed will be directed toward reinflation and a congressional spending policy oblivious to all the promises regarding a balanced budget and the preservation of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds.

But if the Fed and its chairman, Alan Greenspan, have been able to guide us out of every potential crisis all the way back to the stock market crash of 1987, why should we not expect the same to happen once again? Mainly because there is a limit to how long the monetary charade can be perpetuated. Now it looks like the international financial system built on paper money is coming to an end.

Modern day globalism since gold's demise 30 years ago has been based on a purely fiat U.S. dollar with all other currencies tied to the dollar. International redistribution and management of wealth through the IMF, the World Bank, and the WTO have promoted this new version of globalism. This type of globalism depends on trusting central bankers to maintain currency values and the international institutions to manage trade equitably, while bailing out weak economies with dollar inflation. This, of course, has only been possible because the dollar's strength is perceived to be greater than it really is.

Modern day globalists would like us to believe they invented globalism. Yet all they are offering is an unprecedented plan for global power to be placed in the hands of a few powerful special interests.

Globalism has existed ever since international trade started thousands of years ago. Whether it was during the Byzantine Empire or the more recent British Empire, it worked rather well when the goal was honest trade and the currency was gold. Today, however, world government is the goal. Its tools are fiat money and the international agencies that believe they can plan globally, just as many others over the centuries believed they could plan domestically, ignoring the fact that all efforts at socialism have failed.

The day of reckoning for all this mischief is now at hand. The dollar is weakening in spite of all the arguments for its continued strength. Economic law is overruling political edicts. Just how long will the U.S. dollar and the U.S. taxpayers be able to bail out every failed third-world economy and pay the bills for policing the world? U.S. troops are now in 140 nations around the world. The answer is certainly not forever and probably not much longer, since the world economies are readjusting to the dislocations of the past 30 years of mismanagement and misallocation of capital characteristic of fiat money.

Fiat money has been around for a long time off and on throughout history, but never has the world been so enthralled with the world economy being artificially structured with paper money and with a total rejection of the anchor that gold provided for thousands of years.

□ 1615

Let there be no doubt, we live in unprecedented times and we are just beginning to reap what has been sown the past 30 years. Our government and the Federal Reserve officials have grossly underestimated the danger.

Current concerns are expressed by worries about meeting the criteria for a government-declared recession and whether a weaker dollar would help. The first is merely academic, because if you are one of the many thousands who have been laid off, you are already in a recession.

The second does not make a lot of sense unless one asks, compared to what? The dollar has been on a steady course of devaluation for 30 years against most major currencies and against gold. Its purchasing power in general has been steadily eroded.

The fact that the dollar has been strong against Third World currencies and against most major currencies for the past decade does not cancel out the fact that the Federal Reserve has systematically eroded the dollar's value by steadily expanding the money supply. Recent reports of a weakening dollar on international exchange markets have investment implications, but do not reflect a new policy designed to weaken the dollar. This is merely the market adjusting to 30 years of systematic monetary inflation.

Regardless of whether the experts demand a weak dollar or a strong dollar, each inevitably demands lower interest rates, hoping to spur the economy and save the stock market from crashing. But one must remember that the only way the Federal Reserve can lower interest rates is to inflate the currency by increasing the money supply and by further debasing the currency.

In the long term, the dollar is always weakened even if the economy is occasionally stimulated on a short-run basis. Economic growth can hide the ill effects of monetary inflation by holding some prices in check, but it cannot prevent the overcapacity, the malinvestment which causes the economic downturn.

Of course, the central bankers cling to the belief that they somehow can prevent the ugly corrections known as ''recessions.'' Economic growth, when artificially stimulated by money growth and low interest rates, generates the speculation we have seen in the stock, bond and real estate markets, along with the accumulation of excessive debt. Once the need for rectifying the overcapacity is recognized by the market, these imbalances are destined to be wiped out.

Prolonging the correction phase with the Fed's effort to reinflate by diligently working for a soft landing, or even to prevent a recession, only postpones the day the economy can return to sustained growth. This is a problem the United States had in the 1930s and one that Japan has experienced for more than a decade with no end in sight.

The next recession, from which I am sure we are already suffering, will be even more pervasive worldwide than the one in the 1930s due to the artificial nature of modern globalism with world paper money and international agencies deeply involved in the economy of every nation. We have witnessed the current and recent bailouts of Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Turkey, and countries in the Far East. While resisting the market's tendency for correction, faith in government deficits and belief in paper money inflation will surely prolong the coming worldwide crisis.

Alan Greenspan made a concerted effort to stave off the 1991–1992 recession with numerous reductions in the Fed funds rate, to no avail. The recession hit, and most people believe it led to George Bush's defeat in the 1992 election. It was not that Greenspan did not try. In many ways, the Bush people's criticism of Greenspan's effort is not justified. Greenspan, the politician, would have liked to please the elder Bush, but was unable to control events as he had wished.

This time around, however, he has been much more aggressive, with half-point cuts, along with seven cuts in just the last 8 months, for a total of 3 points cut in the Fed funds rate. But, guess what? So far, it has not helped; stocks continue to slide and the economy is still in the doldrums. It is now safe to say that Greenspan is pushing on a string.

In the year 2000, bank loans and commercial paper were growing at an annualized rate of 23 percent. In less than a year, in spite of this massive influx of new credit, these loans have crashed to a rate of minus 5 percent.

Where is the money going? Some of it probably has helped to prop up the staggering stock market, but that cannot last forever. Plenty went into consumption and to finance extravagant living. The special nature of the dollar as the reserve currency of the world has permitted the bubble to last longer. That would be especially beneficial to American consumers. But in the meantime, understandably, market and political forces have steadily eroded our industrial base, while our service sector has thrived.

Consumers enjoyed having even more funds to spend as the dollars left manufacturing. In a little over a year, 1 million industrial jobs were lost, while saving rates sank to zero and capital investments plummeted. Foreigners continue to grab our dollars, permitting us to raise our standard of living, but unfortunately, it is built on endless printing of fiat money and self-limiting personal debt.

The Federal Reserve credit created during the last 8 months has not stimulated economic growth in the technology or the industrial sector, but a lot of it ended up in the expanding real estate bubble, churned by the $3.2 trillion of debt maintained by the GSEs, the Government Sponsored Enterprises. The GSEs, made up of Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and the Federal Home Loan Bank, have managed to keep the housing market afloat, in contrast to the more logical slowdown in hotel and office construction. This spending through the GSEs has also served as a vehicle for consumption spending. This should be no surprise, considering the special status that the GSEs enjoy, since their implied line of credit to the U.S. Treasury keeps their interest rates artificially low.

The Clinton administration encouraged growth in housing loans that were financed through this system. In addition, the Federal Reserve treats GSE securities with special consideration. Ever since the fall of 1999, the Fed has monetized GSE securities just as if they were U.S. Treasury bills. This message has not been lost by foreign central banks, which took their cue from the Fed and now hold over $130 billion worth of United States GSE securities.

The Fed holds only $20 billion worth, but the implication is clear: Not only will the Treasury loan to the GSEs, if necessary, since the line of credit is already in place, but if necessary, Congress will surely accommodate with appropriations as well, just as they did during the savings and loan crisis of the 1970s.

But the Fed has indicated to the world that the GSEs are equivalent to U.S. Treasury bills, and foreign central bankers have enthusiastically accommodated, sometimes by purchasing more than $10 billion worth of these securities in 1 week alone. They are merely recycling the dollars we so generously print and spend overseas.

After the NASDAQ collapsed last year, the flow of funds into real estate accelerated. The GSEs accommodated by borrowing without restraint to subsidize new mortgages, record sales and refinancing. It is no wonder the price of houses are rising to record levels.

Refinancing especially helped consumers to continue spending, even in a slowing economy. It is not surprising for high credit card debt to be frequently rolled into second mortgages, since interest on mortgage debt has the additional advantage of being tax deductible.

When financial conditions warrant, leaving financial instruments such as paper assets and looking for hard assets such as houses is commonplace and is not a new phenomenon. Instead of the newly inflated money being directed toward the stock market, it now finds its way into the rapidly expanding real estate bubble. This, too, will burst, as all bubbles do. The Fed, the Congress or even foreign investors cannot prevent the collapse of this bubble, any more than the Japanese banks were able to keep the Japanese miracle of the 1980s going forever.

Concerned Federal Reserve economists are struggling to understand how the wealth effect of the stock market and real estate bubbles affect economic activity and consumer spending. It should be no mystery, but it would be too much to expect the Fed to look to itself and its monetary policy for an explanation and assume responsibility for engineering the entire financial mess we are in.

A major problem still remains. Ultimately, the market determines all values, including all currencies. With the current direction of the dollar, certainly downward, the day of reckoning is fast approaching. A weak dollar will prompt dumping of GSE securities before Treasuries, despite the Treasury's and the Fed's attempt to equate them with government securities. This will threaten the whole GSE system of finance, because the challenge to the dollar and the GSEs will hit just when the housing market turns down and defaults rise.

Also a major accident can occur in the derivatives market, where Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are deeply involved in hedging their interest rate bets. Rising interest rates that are inherent with a weak currency will worsen the crisis.

The weakening dollar will usher in an age of challenge to the whole worldwide financial system. The dollar has been the linchpin of economic activity, and a severe downturn in its value will not go unnoticed and will compound the already weakening economies of the world.

More monetary inflation, even if it is a concerted worldwide effort, cannot solve the approaching crisis. The coming crisis will result from fiat money and the monetary inflation. More of the same cannot be the solution. Pseudo free trade, managed poorly and driven by fiat money, is no substitute for true free trade in a world with a stable commodity currency, such as gold.

Managed trade and fiat money historically have led to trade wars, which the international planners pretend to abhor. Yet the trade war is already gearing up, and the WTO, purported to exist to lower tariffs, is actually the agency that grants permission for tariffs to be applied when complaints of dumping are levied.

We are in the midst of a banana, textile, steel, lumber and tax war, all managed by the WTO. When cheap imports hit our market, it is a good deal for our consumer, but our manufacturers are the first to demand permission to place protective tariffs on imports. If this is already occurring in an economy that has been doing quite well, one can imagine how strong the protectionist sentiments will be in a worldwide slowdown.

Congress is starting to realize that the budget forecast based on an overly optimistic growth rate of 3 percent is way off target, and even the pseudo surpluses are soon to be eliminated.

Remember, the national debt never went down with the so-called surpluses. The national debt is currently rising at more than $120 billion on an annualized rate, and is destined to get worse. Our dollar problem, which affects our financial and budgetary decisions, originated at the Fed with our country's acceptance of paper money 30 years ago. Federal Reserve officials and other government leaders purposely continued to mislead the people by spouting the nonsense that there is no evidence of inflation as measured by government rigged price indices.

Even though significant price increases need not exist for monetary inflation to place a hardship on the economy, stock prices, housing prices, costs of medical care and education and the cost of government have all been rising at very rapid rates. But the true inflation, measured by the money supply, is rising at a rate greater than 20 percent as measured by MZM. This fact is ignored.

The deception regarding price increases is supported to reassure us, and may do so for a while. The Fed never admits it, and the Congress disregards it out of ignorance, but the serious harm done by artificially low interest rates leading to malinvestment, overcapacity, excessive debt and speculation are the distortions that always guarantee the next recession.

Serious problems lie ahead. If the Fed continues with the same monetary policy of perpetual inflation and the Congress responds with more spending and regulations, real solutions will be indefinitely delayed. The current problems hopefully will cause us as a nation and, in particular, Congress to reassess the policies that have allowed the imbalances to develop over these last 30 years.

Some day, stable money, based on the gold standard, must be reconsidered. Stable money is a constitutional responsibility of Congress.

□ 1630

The Federal Reserve Board's goal of stable prices, economic growth and interest rates, through centralized economic planning, by manipulating

money and credit, is a concoction of the 20th century Keynesian economics. These efforts are not authorized by the Constitution and are economically detrimental.

Economic adjustments would not be so bad, as many mild recessions have proven, except that wealth is inexorably and unfairly transferred from the middle class and the poor to the rich. Job losses and the rising cost of living hurt some more than others. If our course does not change, the entire middle class prosperity can be endangered, as has happened all too often in other societies that pursued a false belief that paper money could be satisfactorily managed.

Even the serious economic problems generated by a flawed monetary system could be tolerated, except for the inevitable loss of personal liberty that accompanies government's effort to centrally plan the economy through a paper monetary system and ever-growing welfare state. Likewise, an imperialistic foreign policy can only be supported by inflation and high taxation.

This policy compounds the threat to liberty because, all too often, our leaders get us involved in overseas military adventurism in which we should have no part. Today, that danger is greater than ever as we send our dollars and our troops hither and yon to areas of the world most Americans have no knowledge or interest in. But the driving force behind our foreign policy comes from our oil corporations, international banking interests, and the military industrial complex which have high-stake interests in the places our troops and foreign aid are sent.

If, heaven forbid, the economy sinks as low and for as long as many free market economists believe, what policy changes must we consider? Certainly, the number one change ought to be to reject the ideas that created the crisis, but rejecting old ways that Congress and the people are addicted to is not easy. Many people believe that government programs are free. The clamor for low interest rates and, therefore, more monetary inflation, by virtually all public officials and prominent business and banking leaders is endless. And, the expectation for government to do something for every economic malady, even if ill-advised government policy had created the problem in the first place, drives this seductive system of centralized planning that ultimately undermines prosperity. A realization that we cannot continue our old ways may well be upon us, and the inflating, taxing, regulating, and the centralized planning programs of the last 30 years must come to an end.

Only reigning in the welfare-warfare state will suffice. This eliminates the need for the Fed to monetize the debt that politicians depend on to please their constituents and secure their reelection. We must reject our obsession with policing the world by our endless foreign commitments and entanglements. This would reduce the need for greater expenditures, while enhancing our national security. It would also remove pressure on the Federal Reserve to continue a flawed monetary policy of monetizing endless government debt.

But we must also reject the notion that one man, Alan Greenspan, or any other chairman of the Federal Reserve, can know what the proper money supply and the proper interest rates ought to be. Only the market can determine that. This must happen if we ever expect to avoid continuous and deeper recessions and to get the economy growing in a healthy and sustainable fashion. It also must happen if we want to preserve free market capitalism and personal liberty.

The longer the delay in establishing a free market and commodity currency, even with interrupted blips of growth, the more unstable the economy and the more difficult the task becomes. Instead, it will result in what no one wants: more poverty and political turmoil.

There are no other options if we hope to remain a free and prosperous Nation. Economic and monetary meddling undermines its principles of a free society. A free society and sound money maximize production and minimize poverty. The responsibility of Congress is clear: avoid the meddling so ingrained in our system and assume the responsibility all but forgotten, to maintain a free society, while making the dollar, once again, as good as gold.

Now, I want to close with a quote from James Madison from The Federalist Papers, because the founders of this country faced the dilemma of runaway inflation with the continental currency and that is where our slogan comes from: ''It is not worth a continental.'' This was a major reason why we had the constitutional convention because they knew and understood the evils and the disastrous effects of what paper money could do to a society. These are the words of James Madison. He says, ''The extension of the prohibition to bills of credit must give pleasure to every citizen in proportion to his love of justice and his knowledge of the true springs of public prosperity. The loss which America has sustained since the peace, from the pestilent effects of paper money on the necessary confidence between man and man, on the necessary confidence in the public councils, on the industries and morals of the people, and on the character of republican government, constitutes an enormous debt against the States chargeable with this ill-advised measure.''

BRINGING BROADBAND TO RURAL AMERICA

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent Department of Commerce report states that only 38.9 percent of rural households have Internet access.

In this unprecedented age of information and global interaction, broadband access and the Internet are critical elements. Americans are increasingly using online services to conduct such everyday activities as bank account transactions, personal correspondence, shopping, and research. As our Nation continues to evolve, access to the opportunities of the Internet will have an important supporting role in the economic, educational, and social successes of our citizens.

Today, along with the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), I am introducing the Rural American Technology Enhancement Act, or RATE, of 2001. The legislation will: one, provide incentives to expand broadband/high-speed telecommunications access to rural America; two, provide incentives and tax credits for expanding and relocating high-tech businesses to rural America; three, provide funding to prepare, educate, and train our current and future workforce for high-tech-based employment; and finally, establish an Office of Rural Technology within the Department of Agriculture to coordinate rural technology programs and act as a clearinghouse for government and private, high-tech grant information.

Broadband access should not be an intangible idea lying beyond the reach of our rural citizens. We must continue to take steps to expand access to these information resources and include those Americans who are currently being left behind in the effort to eliminate the digital divide.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in the support of this legislation.

MARKING AN IMPORTANT MILESTONE FOR PARKINSON'S DISEASE RESEARCH, THE MORRIS K. UDALL RESEARCH ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to come to the floor this evening to mark the fourth anniversary of the passage of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act, an anniversary that occurred this week.

In 1999, along with my friends and colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS); the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN); the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MARK

UDALL); the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TOM UDALL); and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), I formed the Congressional Working Group on Parkinson's Disease. The working group strives to ensure that the Nation's decisionmakers remain ever aware of the needs of the more than one million Americans struggling with the devastating disease of Parkinson's.

Four years ago this Monday, Senator WELLSTONE was successful in adding the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act as an amendment to the Senate Labor-HHS Appropriations bill. Not surprisingly, the amendment was approved by a vote of 95 to 3.

Named for Arizona Representative Mo Udall to honor his legacy, the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act was originally introduced on April 9 of 1997. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) were the bill's lead sponsors in the House, and Senator MCCAIN and Senator WELLSTONE were the sponsors in the Senate. In the 105th Congress, this bill had over 255 cosponsors, and I was proud to be an original cosponsor.

The Udall Act expanded basic and clinical research in Parkinson's disease. It established Udall Centers of Excellence around the country and set up the Morris K. Udall Awards in Parkinson's Research to provide grants to scientists who are working to cure Parkinson's. One of the 11 Udall Centers is located in the City of New York. The New York group is doing innovative research, including identifying new genes, that when either expressed or suppressed, contribute to the degeneration of key nerve cells. They are also investigating gender and ethnic differences in people with Parkinson's Disease.

Notably too, Columbia University's Dean of Medicine is the former director of NIH's National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, Dr. Gerald Fischbach. The work at this Udall Center, as well as centers across the country, is leading to a better understanding of the brain and how this disease affects it. The ground-breaking research at the Udall Centers, as well as our Nation's public and private sector research efforts, will lead to better treatments and hopefully, a cure for Parkinson's.

In this Congress, I will proudly join the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MARK UDALL) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TOM UDALL) and members of the Congressional Working Group in introducing a reauthorization of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act. I urge all of my colleagues to join us in this effort.

In the spirit of Mo Udall's tenacity and strength of purpose, we cannot stop now. We must wholeheartedly support Parkinson's research until we find a cure.

As the President has said, we must continue on a path to doubling the NIH budget by 2003. In last year's appropriations, over $71 million of the NIH budget was designated for Parkinson's disease research, but this is only year 1 funding of the NIH's 5-year plan for Parkinson's disease research.

Leading scientists describe Parkinson's as the most curable neurological disorder. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the second year funding of the 5-year NIH plan. Recent advances in Parkinson's disease research have given us hope that a cure is very near. The science regarding Parkinson's has advanced to a stage where greater management and coordination of the federally funded research effort will accelerate the base of scientific progress dramatically. I ask all of my colleagues to support the NIH research agenda by fully funding the $143 million increase for fiscal year 2002 in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Secondly, we must continue to fund the U.S. Army's Neurotoxin Exposure Treatment Research Program. The research not only strives to improve the treatment of neurological diseases, but also aims to identify the causes of diseases and prevent them. I am heartened by the scientific progress being made. We are very close to a cure for this disease.

As my colleagues may know, this is a personal issue for many of us. Some of my colleagues are struggling with Parkinson's or have family members who are living with this terrible disease. My own father has been afflicted by Parkinson's, and I have seen the impact of this disease firsthand and have spoken to the experts. Professionals at NIH have said that this disease is curable within as little as 5 years, and I hope that our government will be part of making this research happen.

Mr. Speaker, an important part of curing Parkinson's disease depends on stem cell research and allowing that research to go forward.

WELCOMING OUTSTANDING WOMEN FROM AROUND THE GLOBE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome 24 outstanding women who represent eight countries on the continent of Africa who have come at the request of the League of Women Voters, who have come to look at what we, the women of the House, do in order to empower ourselves and empower the women throughout this country.

□ 1645

I am so pleased to welcome my friends from Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. These women represent non-governmental organizations, but are interested in the political process and how they can better serve the people of their respective countries upon their return.

As we all recognize, the League of Women Voters encourages the informed and active participation of citizens in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy.

They have come in that role as advocates to take back with them how we, the 62 women who make up the House of Representatives, function: the types of policies that we pass out of this House.

I happen to serve as the co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, and I simply told them that to empower themselves is to become part of the democratic process, and that is to vote, to encourage all of the folks within their countries to vote, to be participatory in the election process, and then to seek the needs of women and families so that they can address those through an advocacy program to follow the needs of those respective constituents, and certainly it will help them to build the base that is necessary to run for office.

Those of us who are women here in the House have not sought to get these seats initially. We were teachers and nurses and social workers and other types of fields of endeavor. But when the need came and when folks in our communities told us that the education systems were broken, that there were so many children who were not insured with health insurance, then we took up the gauntlet, and we began to build a base to run for office.

We encourage not only the women who are here who see this floor, who see this House, the House that receives people from around the globe. Earlier today we welcomed the President of Mexico, Mr. Vicente Fox. We are welcoming them today. We welcome all who come to seek out what we do in the House, the people's House, a House where we pass laws to make the quality of life better for all people.

It has been my pleasure to host them today with the members of the Congressional Conference of Women's Issues, and with women and men Congresspersons who came to welcome them to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome them to this House.

UNITED STATES DECISION TO PULL OUT OF THE UNITED NATIONS WORLD CONFERENCE AGAINST RACISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition and disappointment with the Bush administration's decision to end the United States participation in the World Conference Against Racism and not to even send initially Secretary of State Colin Powell to represent our interests.

Once again, the United States is on the wrong side of history. I traveled to South Africa to participate in the World Conference Against Racism as a congressional adviser, along with several of my colleagues with the Congressional Black Caucus.

Prior to attending the conference, I joined my colleagues in urging the Bush administration to send a high-level delegation led by Secretary of State Colin Powell.

As we all know, the decision of the United States to not participate in the conference was based on language in the draft document that would have resurrected the controversial debate of Zionism equals racism. Why then, on such an important issue, was the Secretary of State prevented from making every effort, and I mean every effort, to get rid of this destructive language? He should have been there doing that.

I am totally convinced that the United States should have been represented by Secretary Powell because he is well respected, very bright, and probably would have been able to help the conference move forward by insisting that it stay focused on its purpose, the elimination of racism, rather than the Middle East crisis, which warrants our full attention in trying to get the peace process back on track.

America should have asserted its leadership by fully engaging in the world conference against racism, not by detaching from it.

It is an outrageous insult to millions of Americans that our first African American Secretary of State, Colin Powell, was not allowed to join in this important discussion. Many Americans are equally and rightfully outraged by the Bush administration's decision.

We know, I know, this House knows, that this country has a long history embedded in racism. Full participation in the conference would have sent a message that the United States was joining the world in efforts to discuss strategies to eliminate racism, xenophobia, sexism, hate crimes, religious intolerance, and other forms of intolerance. No other country has this tragic history as we do. Who else should be leading the world community in addressing this? We should.

However, the manner in which the United States has addressed the World Conference Against Racism is really a disgrace. It is a slap in the face to millions of Americans who have been affected by past United States policies rooted in racist ideology and are dealing with the consequences each and every day in their daily lives.

The United States is sending a message that it is indifferent to the issues of circumstances facing Native Americans, Latino and Hispanic Americans, Asian Pacific Americans, as well as African Americans. I firmly believe that this is a grave mistake and a missed opportunity of the greatest magnitude.

The World Conference Against Racism provided an important and credible platform to address racism in all its forms. This platform is also critical to the discussion of the 10 priority action points of consensus presented by the Africans and African descendents at the conference, and should have been embraced by the conference and by the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD this statement on the Ten Priority Action Points.

The document referred to is as follows:

TEN PRIORITY ACTION POINTS OF CONSENSUS AFRICAN AND AFRICAN DESCENDANTS CAUCUS

1. The Slave Trade, Slavery and colonialism are crimes against humanity.
2. Reparations for Africans and African Descendants.
3. Recognition of the economic basis of racism.
4. Adoption of corrective national (domestic) public policies with emphasis on environmental racism and health care.
5. Adoption of culture-specific development policies.
6. The adoption of mechanisms to combat the interconnection of race and poverty, and the role that globalization (caused by governments and the private sector) has in this interconnection.
7. Adoption of mechanisms to combat racism in the criminal punishment (penal) system.
8. Reform of the legal system including national constitutional reforms and development of international and regional mechanisms for dismantling racism.
9. Adoption of policies specific to African and African Descendant Women that recognize and address the intersection of race and gender.
10. Support for the adoption of policies that recognize and address the intersection of race and sexual orientation.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Government sanctioned slavery for hundreds of years, completely devastating the lives of generations and generations of Africans in America. It is long past time that this government formally deal with its participation in the institution of slavery and to begin the healing process for millions of Americans who are descendents of slaves.

The United States should be leading the charge to address the lasting impact of the transatlantic slave trade, what to do about it, and specifically to discuss reparations. We cannot forget that America's racism is rooted in the institution of slavery. That must be dealt with in order to move forward as a healed and healthy country.

As an African American woman and a Member of Congress, it is embarrassing that this miscalculated and callous decision to abandon the conference will once again leave the United States out of serious international dialogue.

Racism is a fundamental question of human rights, and in the House Committee on International Relations and here on the floor we regularly question human rights practices in other countries. It is equally important that we apply the same scrutiny to our own society and examine the easily recognizable vestiges of slavery manifested in the current racial and economic divides that we experience today.

The World Conference Against Racism provided our government with a credible platform to do this. Yet once again, as with the previous two conferences, we are absent.

I want to urge my colleagues to support legislation offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), H.R. 40, which would commission a study to examine the effects of slavery and to begin a substantive discussion which I believe will move us forward toward healing our Nation. This legislation must move forward.

Again, let me reiterate my deep disappointment at the decision of the administration to pull out of this conference. The next time this opportunity presents itself, the United States not only needs to attend this conference, but to host it.

U.N. CONFERENCE AGAINST RACISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I attended the conference in Durbin on racism with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE). The Congressional Black Caucus had seven members there, and I think we were the ones that gave credibility to the United States, because I really feel that we missed an opportunity.

So I would like to read to this body my statement that was delivered while we were there in Durbin, South Africa, at the United Nations Conference on Racism, Xenophobia, and Other Intolerance, because I think it states the point.

''It is a distinct honor to participate with representatives from around the world who are joined in one common concern, and that is the elimination of the scourge of racism. No nobler intent can there be to express our support for eradicating this menace that has permeated our halls of justice, our halls and places of power, our board rooms, our schoolrooms, and our main streets.

I use as a frame of reference my own place of birth, the United States of America, which has failed to send a high-level delegation. So I have to say, shame, shame on America. You have

demonstrated your reluctance to sit at the table of nations to discuss past policies that have contaminated our relations between the majority and the minority in our own country. So deep are the wounds that healing appears to be unattainable and the political will evasive.

The legacy of slavery not only has broken the spirit of many African Americans in the Diaspora, but also left generations to come without the hope to look ahead with clarity. We seek a future without the pain of suffering from the indignities and intolerances spawned by the involuntary seizure of a people from the very continent on which we stand today.

The Congressional Black Caucus stands with the participating nations asking for a healing that will repair the broken and make them whole. But first our country must recognize its past mistakes and own up to them.

It is disingenuous for critics to harp on the theme that the past is the past, which they had nothing to do with, and now we must fast-forward to the future. It loses sight of the psychological and sociological damage remaining from the harsh and unjust treatment of the past. This refrain, ''the past is the past,'' cannot be washed away with only an apology, but could with a series of meaningful discussions held in the United States that acknowledge the past and develop plans for the future to eradicate racism.

I therefore call on the United States to host its own conference on racism in the near future and to support the legislation of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), H.R. 40, which will ask for a discussion, a study on racism.

Reparations can consist of a variety of approaches that indeed further the advancement of those oppressed and provide benefits for their offspring. We need to look at better educational opportunities for our young people from kindergarten to college; health insurance coverage, maybe; the unjust justice system; racial profiling; affordable housing; environmental racism; job opportunities; creation of entrepreneurships. There are many, many ways in which 40 acres and a mule can translate into productive activities without the need for budget-busting expenditures.

Let us start the debate here, and then go to our respective homes and continue these dialogues until the culture of racism and intolerance is eliminated from the face of the Earth, and especially, from the soil that we tilled and sowed.

PROGRESS ON CURING PARKINSON'S DISEASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to commemorate the anniversary of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Disease Research Act. This act, which was passed 4 years ago this month, has strengthened our national research effort to develop more effective treatments and hopefully a cure for Parkinson's disease.

Before I say what I have to say, I want to salute the millions of people who are in the daily battle against this disease.

□ 1700

I also want to thank Joan Samuelson and the Parkinson's Action Network for their hard work on behalf of all of us.

Additionally, I want to take this opportunity to thank all of my colleagues on the Congressional Parkinson's Working Group. To name a few, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN); they have been on the front lines in fighting for research dollars and holding various projects accountable for the wise use of these funds.

Parkinson's is a devastating disease that affects more than 1 million Americans and their families. Fifty thousand people are newly diagnosed with Parkinson's each year, and of those with Parkinson's today, roughly 40 percent are under the age of 60. Most of us know someone with Parkinson's, or we know someone whose life has been touched by Parkinson's. For some of us, this issue hits close to home.

Many people knew my dad, Mo Udall, and his story. He enjoyed great health until 1976, when he broke both his arms in a fall off a ladder, caught viral pneumonia, his appendix burst, he got peritonitis, and he contracted Parkinson's Disease, all within 8 months. He had a long battle with Parkinson's before he passed away in December of 1998.

One way my father chose to deal with Parkinson's was to make light of it. Shortly after he was diagnosed, there was a scandal involving a woman by the name of Paula Parkinson, a blond lobbyist who kissed and told about her affairs with several Congressmen. He used to tell a joke that there were two kinds of Parkinson's disease, the kind discovered by an English doctor during the 1800s and the kind you get when you go to Florida with a blond lobbyist. There were no similarities between the two afflictions, he said, except they both cause you to lose sleep and they both give you the shakes.

In all seriousness, though, I think Mo would be humbled and honored by the fact that this important act and the centers of excellence it creates are named after him. He dedicated his life to making a difference in the lives of people, and by having his name associated with this act, he continues to have an impact on the world even after his death.

The act authorizes $100 million at the National Institutes of Health for Parkinson's research. It also establishes 10 centers for research throughout the Nation and creates a national Parkinson's information clearinghouse for support of research and education.

Mr. Speaker, the Udall Act has helped us make tremendous progress in the fight against Parkinson's and in understanding other neurodegenerative diseases. That is why we need to act soon and reauthorize the act. We need to give researchers the necessary funding and support to combat this debilitating and ruthless disease.

We will be introducing legislation in the next month to reauthorize the act, and I fervently hope that my colleagues will work with us to make the dream of finding a cure for Parkinson's come true.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from the great State of North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and want to commend him for calling this Special Order today and giving Members an opportunity to join in honoring the late Morris Udall and in observing the fourth anniversary of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act.

Mr. Speaker, Parkinson's disease and related disorders afflict approximately 1 million Americans. Sixty thousand more are diagnosed each year with Parkinson's disease. Approximately 40 percent of those afflicted are under the age of 60. This is a devastating disease, and its incidence probably actually is underreported. Because it is not contagious and it does not have to be reported, we probably underestimate the extent of this devastating disorder. It is estimated that Parkinson's disease costs society $25 billion or more annually.

I appreciate very much our colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), coming to the floor today and sharing the story with his colleagues of his father's illness; and of course, we all remember his father's great accomplishments. Mo Udall was one of this body's greatest Members in the 20th century, a man of great humor, great concern for those in this society who are less fortunate, and a man of great achievement in this body. Mo Udall's last years were marred by Parkinson's disease, but he dealt with it courageously.

We are all fortunate that his son, our colleague from Colorado, and his nephew, the gentleman from Arizona, are carrying on his good work in this body.

We appreciate what the gentleman from Colorado is doing today and appreciate especially his sharing the story of his father with us and reminding us of the importance of carrying on this work, which we do in his name.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for expressing those sentiments, and I know everyone in my family appreciates the affection and respect that the gentleman has acknowledged that exists for my father.

I would add to the comments that the gentleman made that I think Parkinson's disease should truly be characterized as the most common uncommon disease. And by that I mean, the researchers tell us only about a million Americans have the disease. But I guarantee that if we were to walk out on the streets outside the Capitol here and we were to talk to four or five people, by the time we would get to the fifth person, they will know somebody in their immediate family or a friend who has Parkinson's disease and who is battling it valiantly.

They would also, I think, be excited to know that we are so close to not only finding ways to combat the disease but to actually identify a cure, and that is why it is so important to reauthorize this act and continue the momentum that has been generated over the past 10 years.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. That is absolutely true. The number of families affected by this disease directly and indirectly is, of course, in the millions, and that includes my own family. My late father had a brother who was afflicted with Parkinson's. He had an uncle who was afflicted with Parkinson's.

My dad, incidentally, was a great fan of the gentleman's father. I remember when I was the Democratic Party chairman in North Carolina, we were fortunate enough to line up Mo Udall as the speaker at our annual party banquet. It was over in the western part of the State, so my dad, who resided in east Tennessee, was able to come over for this function. He could not stop laughing. He said Mo Udall was the funniest man he had ever heard or seen anywhere, almost enough to make a Democrat out of him!

Mo Udall was a wonderful man who brought great good humor to politics, great warmth, and a wonderful spirit. He later autographed his book ''Too Funny to Be President,'' and we gave it to my dad to his great delight. So Mo Udall was a huge personal favorite in our family.

One cannot imagine a more fitting monument, a more fitting tribute to Mo Udall, than to pass this research act aimed at the scourge of Parkinson's disease and to carry out this path-breaking research in Mo Udall's name.

The gentleman, of course, is quite accurate also in depicting the promise of this research. We have now across the country 11 Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Centers. One of those is at Duke University in my part of North Carolina. Dr. Jeffery Vance leads the Udall Center at Duke University, where a research team is using several state-of-the-art methods to find genes that may contribute to the etiology of Parkinson's disease and to distinguish the genes that contribute to familial Parkinson's from those involved in sporadic cases. That is path-breaking research, typical of what is going on in these research centers.

The Udall program also has expanded basic and clinical research at institutions across this country. It has established the Morris K. Udall awards to encourage innovative research, and supported the creation of Parkinson's data banks and information clearinghouses in support of research and education.

So this is a landmark statute and the programs that it has spawned are ongoing and are full of promise. It is very, very important not only to observe this fourth anniversary of the Udall Act's passage, but also to pledge here and now that we are going to continue this work and build on this work.

We must double the NIH's budget over these 5 years, and I hope and believe we are on the way to doing that in this year's appropriations cycle. NIH has developed, under the directions laid down by the Udall Act, a 5-year Parkinson's disease research agenda. Last year, Congress funded the first year of that plan, so within NIH it is vitally important to continue that specific research program.

The Udall Act has gotten us started, and it has provided the framework for the comprehensive research that we simply must undertake as a Nation on Parkinson's disease. And I would say to the gentleman that I hope, in having this Special Order today and observing this fourth anniversary, that this can be an occasion for all of us, all of our colleagues, to resolve to continue to build upon the vital and necessary work that the Udall Act has gotten under way.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. If I might add an additional comment, I am confident that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in this important effort to reauthorize this piece of legislation. Parkinson's is not a Republican or a Democrat or a Green Party or Libertarian Party disease. It affects people across our country and across the world. And the work that has been done, as the gentleman points out, is far-reaching. And we are so close to understanding how to not only, as I mentioned earlier, make sure that the disease is mitigated but literally cured.

The area of the brain where this takes place has been identified and mapped. And as the gentleman points out, there are indications that the disease is, in some cases, genetic or hereditary; but in other cases, is environmentally induced. There is excellent work going on in the Department of Defense also, working with veterans, and they are looking through their own program on how to combat Parkinson's disease or contributing to the efforts at NIH has undertaken.

I want to again thank the gentleman for taking his time to come to the floor and to point out to our colleagues the great opportunity we have to make a difference in a lot of lives. If we think about a million Americans who have the disease, think about the extended families that are affected by the disease and the costs that are incurred, not just financially, but emotionally, in these communities, this is a terrible disease; and it is one that we can cure and we ought to get about the business of it now.

So I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his comments here today and for carrying on this great work. We must use this occasion to resolve to press forward.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for joining us today.

It is my pleasure at this point to yield time to my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, for yielding time for me to speak on this issue. Before I begin, I want to mention that, of course, I never had the opportunity to meet his father, Mo Udall, but I have nothing but respect for the reputation that he has established in public service, and I know that he would be proud of his son, the gentleman from Colorado, in continuing that proud family tradition of strong commitment to public service.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the fourth anniversary of the passage of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act and to stress the vital importance of expanding support and research for treatment of Parkinson's disease. Named for Arizona Representative Mo Udall, the Parkinson's Research Act expands basic and clinical research on Parkinson's disease and establishes Morris K. Udall Centers for awards for excellence in Parkinson's disease research.

Since its introduction, this landmark legislation has received overwhelming congressional support. In the 105th Congress, the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act garnered 255 cosponsors, and in the 106th Congress it passed the Senate by a nearly unanimous vote of 95 to 3.

I am proud that Congress embraced this initiative, as more people suffer from Parkinson's disease than multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy and Lou Gehrig's disease combined.

□ 1715

But our work is far from over. About 60,000 Americans are diagnosed with this disease each year, that is one person every 9 minutes, and more than half a million living with Parkinson's disease today.

Fortunately, there may be some hope on the horizon. Parkinson's disease is one of the many diseases for which stem cell research offers significant promise. Yesterday I testified before the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee about the potential for embryonic stem cell research to alleviate pain and suffering in millions of people. It is my strong hope that our Nation's premier researchers will be able to engage in this ground-breaking research expeditiously to save, lengthen, and dramatically improve the quality of life of those who live with Parkinson's and other debilitating diseases and conditions.

On this anniversary of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act, I urge my colleagues to follow through on our commitment to double the budget of the National Institutes of Health, increase funding for the Morris K. Udall Center, and break down the barriers to unprecedented, life-saving stem cell research. Until we have conquered Parkinson's, our work is not complete.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for taking the time to come speak on this important issue; and I want to associate myself with his comments on stem cell research.

Stem cell research is an important part of understanding Parkinson's disease and eventually finding a cure. I look forward to working with the gentleman in the days and months and years to come to see that that promise is fulfilled. I thank the gentleman for taking the time to join us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), one, for his vision, for his family, and for this very special legislation of the day to honor the authorization, the fourth anniversary of the authorization and passage of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act. This is an important anniversary.

Throughout our tenure in Congress there are ups and downs. What I consider an up is an opportunity to meet with my constituents from my district and all over the Nation. Some of the most eloquent and articulate persons are those who are physically suffering from Parkinson's and others who come to collaborate on the importance of finding a cure and the ability to research this debilitating disease.

In the name of Morris K. Udall, this legislation passed an important milestone in striking a chord for finding out the reason that this disease has gotten such a grip on people around the world. This research or this research act has been funded and the legislation, of course, was passed through the leadership of Senator WELLSTONE in terms of adding an amendment and adding additional dollars. We now come to a time where it is necessary to reauthorize it.

Even more so during this stem cell research debate that I find the importance of this particular legislation which continually persists in attempting to find a cure by added research. It never allows to rest the continued theorizing and study of the importance of discovering new ways to attack this disease.

I am certainly disappointed that we are at a certain standstill in stem cell research. I would have wanted and do want the President to go further. I believe that he was well-intentioned but may be misadvised by those who would think that we had enough of the research elements that could do the vast massive research that needs to be done. This research act has shown that the broader, the better, the fuller, the better.

Let me congratulate the gentleman on the number of centers that already exist. We look forward to helping the funding expand, not frivolously, but so that centers could be expanded across the country. I would certainly welcome one in Houston, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for, one, having the insight to be at the forefront of the reauthorization of this legislation. Let me also say that I would willingly join as an original co-sponsor of this legislation and offer to say to those who have been suffering from Parkinson's for time before and today and tomorrow that we will continue to fight until we can find a cure.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her remarks and for her vision as well.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to urge all of the Members of this body to join us in a bipartisan fashion when we introduce this legislation in the next couple of weeks to reauthorize the Udall Act.

I want to thank, in particular, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for their support and hard work on behalf of all the people and all the families who suffer from Parkinson's disease. I know we will do the right thing in this body and reauthorize this very, very important act and we can all be proud when we find the cure for Parkinson's sooner rather than later.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the fourth anniversary of the passage of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act. I cannot think of a more fitting tribute to my friend and colleague than this legislation.

Mo Udall was a member of the House Representatives for thirty years from 1961–1990. He earned the respect of all who served with him through his humor and civility as well as his ability to work with Members from both sides of the aisle. Mo's courage and determination to continue to serve even after being diagnosed with Parkinson's disease in 1978 was an inspiration for all who had the privilege to be around him during that time. He was determined to continue to lead a full and vigorous life even in the face of this debilitating disease. Although his death in 1998 was a blow to all of us, his legacy lives on in the great and important work started through this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Parkinson's disease afflicts 1 million Americans, 40 percent of whom are under the age of 60. This landmark legislation dramatically expanded and coordinated clinical research into Parkinson's disease as well as established the Morris K. Udall Centers across the country. These centers have been an invaluable resource in the fight against Parkinson's disease. They have provided state-of-the-art training facilities for new researchers and the resulting work has greatly increased our knowledge and understanding of the disease.

We have an opportunity and an obligation today to rededicate ourselves to the goal of finding a cure for Parkinson's disease. Our initial investment into research four years ago has yielded impressive returns. Still, however, much more needs to be done. Mr. Speaker, I call on Congress to continue the valuable work we started four years ago and fully fund federal research into Parkinson's disease done by the National Institutes of Health and the Morris K. Udall Centers.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I commemorate today the anniversary of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act, and I am pleased to be here among other champions of the cause from the Parkinson's Working Group here in the House.

Mo Udall was more than a colleague. He was a friend. We didn't always agree on politics, but we could always share a laugh. I remember flying him around on my plane in NM. And, I remember helping to pick up his papers when they fell to the ground in the Interior Committee.

But, this anniversary honors more than Mo Udall. It honors our commitment to helping science keep it's promise. It has been more than fifteen years since America began to hear that a cure for Parkinson's was just around the corner, . . . perhaps just five years away. Yet it is not here yet. This Udall Act of 1997 was the first time we put the money where science's mouth was. Thanks to NIH, the U.S. Army, Udall Centers of Excellence, and private research carried on largely thanks to an outstanding advocacy community, we are still on target.

As this Anniversary hits . . . it also marks the sunset of the bill. Perhaps it is time we reauthorize it. Let us continue to help science keep its promise. Thank you.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to honor the memory of one of our great

former colleagues, the late Mo Udall, who served in this House for nearly three decades. Four years ago this week, Congress passed the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Disease Research Act as a tribute to his service and the courage that he displayed in the face of his illness. Sadly, Mo lost his battle with Parkinson's Disease in 1998. But his memory lives on in this Congress and in the research labs across the country that bear his name.

I served with Mo Udall from 1983 to his retirement in 1990. During those years, I came to know and admire him as an effective legislator, a consummate humorist, and a dear friend. Mo always had a kind word and a joke for everyone. He brought a levity to this body that you wouldn't expect from someone fighting for his life. Ask anyone here who had the pleasure to serve with Mo and they will have a side splitting tale of the time that Mo brought the house down. Coupled with his good humor, was a commitment to serve this nation well. Despite his Parkinston's Disease, he served as chairman of the Interior Committee where he was a champion of preserving America's widerness areas. I admired Mo then, but my esteem for him grew even greater when I was diagnosed with Parkinston's Disease ins 1995.

Our purpose here is to commemorate the passage of the Udall Act, which brings much needed resources to the study of Parkinson's Disease. The time has come to reauthorize the bill. And today, we have the honor of being joined by Mo's son, Congressman MARK UDALL, who will lead the charge to see this program continued. We will be introducing the reauthorization bill in the coming month. I hope that all of our colleagues will join us in supporting that bill.

The 11 Morris K. Udall Centers are busy conducting research on every aspect of Parkinson's Disease. The scientists there are some of the best and the brightest in their field. They believe that a cure for Parkinson's Disease is on the horizon—that it could be discovered in as littlle as five years. These researching give me hope. They are out there everyday working to make my life and the lives of the one million Americans living with Parkinson's Disease better. And let me tell you—it's nice having these bright men and women on your side. I know they will find a cure, but they can't do it without our continued support.

These Udall Centers are just one component of a larger effort on the part of NIH to develop more effective treatments, enhance prevention efforts, and eventually find a cure of Parkinson's Disease. At the request of Congress, NIH developed a five year Parkinson's Disease Research Agenda to bring the nation closer to a cure. Last year, we funded the first year of that agenda. This year, we must fund the second year by increasing funding for Parkinson's Disease research by $143 million. I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee will follow through with what it started and honor Congress' commitment to the NIH Research Agenda.

These initiatives are the lifeblood of the Parkinson's community. The Udall Centers and the NIH funded research are leading the world in the path to a cure. I encourage my colleagues support these programs.

RACISM IN SOUTH AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting as I had the opportunity to share with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) on a very important legislative initiative, this comes to mind that a key word that everything we do in this country and this Congress is engage, engagement, to be engaged.

I would be remiss if I did not take this time to join my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and as well the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), to speak to a situation, a conference, a series of events that are going on in South Africa that I think have been sorely misrepresented and misinterpreted, that is, the historic World Conference on Racism, the first conference like this in the past 18 years.

Of course, the first conference was in 1979. The second conference was in 1983 where the focus was on apartheid in South Africa. Gratefully, that conference was successful. Those who have not yet visited South Africa can see a country, with the opportunity to visit it, that seeks reconciliation, a country that is diverse, that struggles every day to ensure that no matter what one's color is, there is a seat at the table of empowerment.

I was very proud to be a member of the United States delegation comprised of Members of Congress, particularly and, in addition, members of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), as well as members from the State Department.

What I was most disappointed in is that the country that is the greatest democracy that the world knows, the United States of America, founded in the Declaration of Independence, that declares that we all are created equal, had the misguided interpretation that the best role for them would be to disengage and not to be engaged. That meant that they did not send, did not allow Secretary Colin Powell to be a part of this world conference.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe, having been intimately involved in the processes of this conference for a good number of days at the heart of the conference, that the leadership of the United States, the leadership of Secretary Powell, would have been immensely important in steering this conference to its rightful place in history. What is that place? The place of reconciliation.

After I returned to the United States, it pained me to see Catholic school girls running the gauntlet of attempting to get to their schools as Protestants stood by and chanted and jeered and cast aspersions, but more importantly, perpetrated violent acts.

This world is riveted by ethnic, religious, and racial divide. The conference that we were at was not one to cast doubt, to cast accusations, but frankly it was to bring about resolution.

The bulk of the people there, unfortunately, not brought to the attention of the American people, but the bulk of the people there were of goodwill and good intentions. Clearly they wanted to seek to clear the air. Gypsies were there asking for the ability not to be discriminated against. The untouchables of India were there to ask not to be discriminated against. The countries of Africa that suffered so brutally in the trans-Atlantic slavery as well as colonization were there asking, not to accuse, but simply asking to create a better world.

Those of us from the United States who were descendants of slaves were there asking that we provide a sense of healing, how can we move our Nation away from the divisiveness of race. Yet there was another issue, the tragedy of the Mideast, the PLO, and the Israelis. But there was a misguide there, a misdirect, a misconnect, and there was an attempt to write hateful language that should not have been present.

On September 2, 2001, I stood in that conference and denounced that kind of language, that we should move away from hateful language accusing one nation of racism, Zionism is racism; and, frankly, we should be engaged in the Mideast process to bring about peace.

An issue separate and apart from the racism conference, truly an issue for the United Nations and the United States, be engaged in peace, but do not bring down a conference of reconciliation, a conference that should be healing, a conference that should bring us together around the question of race.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the media has not told the story, the stories of meeting with heads of states, diverse heads of states, the President of Latvia, an Eastern European country, who wanted to be part of solving the question of race.

Those stories, the Mexican delegation, the delegation from Israel, the Arabs who were interested in ensuring that the conference was successful.

I am here to tell the story and say apologetically that the United States missed its opportunity of leadership, missed its opportunity to use the bully pulpit to stand before the world, 169 countries, denounce Zionism as being racist, and talk about peace and reconciliation, talk about bringing us together and healing the racial divide and making a difference.

Mr. Speaker, this conference will be successful if the right people take charge, and I will continue to work for peace and reconciliation and ending the racial divide.

D.C. APPROPRIATION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor not to take the whole hour, but for a few minutes because the D.C. appropriation today passed in full committee under the chair of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH). This was a noteworthy subcommittee markup.

Mr. Speaker, the controversy often associated with the D.C. appropriation was not there today. The bill passed unanimously. One important reason for this, indeed the most important reason for the smooth way in which the bill transacted its way through the committee today was its chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG). Like a laser beam, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) has been focused on the clear obligation of the chair of an appropriation subcommittee, and that is to get his bill to the floor as clean as he can get it so that it can get the necessary votes on the floor from both sides of the aisle.

I appreciate the way this bill was handled in subcommittee today, especially in contrast to when the District of Columbia appropriation finally got out of the House last year. It was in December, remember. The appropriation year ends September 30. My colleagues can imagine the hardship on our local jurisdiction that does not get its budget until almost Christmas. It was so late even when we got the bill itself out, that was sometime in November, it was held over in order to be the vehicle to carry other appropriations that had had difficulty getting out of committee.

So here we had the spectre of a local jurisdiction not being able to spend its own money while the bill was held hostage for Federal appropriations. It seems to me there is something in reverse order about that, that the smallest appropriation was being held to carry gigantic appropriations like HHS over.

I am deeply grateful that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) helped me get this bill out. I went to his office and described the hardship. I asked Mayor Tony Williams to help me describe it. With the help of the Speaker, we finally got our bill out in December.

What the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) has done is to take a first step toward avoiding any kind of train wreck of that kind for the District of Columbia.

□ 1730

Perhaps it will not happen because, if there are riders on our appropriation, get yourself ready for a fight. But if there are, they certainly will not be there because the chairman has been an enabler of such extraneous, irrelevant, undemocratic riders.

True to his word, the chairman himself respected local decision-making, and the way he did so was by announcing in advance shortly after he assumed the chairmanship that he did not want any riders in his appropriation. I do not think I have heard that for a very long time; but when a chairman says that, I think you will get a lot of respect from Members of the House because he is announcing how he wants his own appropriation to be handled.

He went further. In the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) looked at a project we in the District and I here in the House and with Members of the Senate for a couple years now have been working on.

Since home rule, there have been riders willy-nilly put on the District of Columbia's appropriation that went to operations and went to finances. Many of these are redundant of Federal law. They are redundant of District law. They are so out of date some of them that if they were, in fact, to be acted on they could cause a catastrophe.

What happens is they kind of stay on. The White House, seeing them on, carries them over from year to year; and so there are attachments to the District's appropriation that I think will embarrass this House because they have nothing to do with today. They are ancient. It is as if they were written in the last century.

We thought that such riders could do real harm. Because they are there and until they are gone, you are supposed to do what they say.

The fact that they are redundant or out of date does not mean that you are not supposed to do what they say, and they really cause great confusion in the local community that tries to abide by what indeed the Congress has said.

We worked hard last year while Mr. Clinton was in office and this year as well to see whether we could get the White House to agree with us that certain riders were operational and financial riders were no longer applicable and then to work with the District to see they were no longer applicable.

We did, and to his credit a great many of these riders, 35 of them, have been removed by Chairman KNOLLENBERG.

I regret to say that there are controversial riders that, of course, remain on our appropriation. They have been there for eternity, through Democratic and Republican Houses and Presidents. They are the kind of riders that hundreds of jurisdictions in the United States of America do not regard as riders at all because they have decided that those are the kinds of things they do not want to do.

Then there are hundreds of jurisdictions that have decided they want to do precisely what the Congress has forbidden us to do, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), could not do anything about those; and we do not hold him accountable to those.

Those, of course, are riders of the most controversial kind in this House. Riders, for example, under domestic partners that allow domestic partners in the District no matter what their sexual orientation. I guess most of them in the District would not be gay, but would allow a domestic partner to pay for the health benefits of his partner if the person worked for the District government with no cost to the District government.

Hundreds of jurisdictions allow that all across the United States. Many more private corporations allow it. It is a matter of when you consider the cost of health care, seems to me that anybody would want to help somebody get health insurance who wanted to pay for it and get on a group plan, particularly at a time when there are very serious consequences to not doing so.

There is one that this House rebels against that, again, all across the United States can be found. Members, I am sure, will vote against it. Live in places where this is done and, that is, riders allowing the local jurisdiction to pay for abortions for poor women out of its own funds.

Respecting the fact that this body has said you cannot pay for abortions out of Federal funds, you will not find a big city in the United States and many small towns which do not decide to pay for abortions out of their own local funds. Only with your Nation's capital does the Congress say no Federal and no local funds can be used, and they say so for these two items; and they have said so for other matters in the past.

Everybody who votes for it knows it is wrong. They know it flies in the face of Federalism, not to mention devolution. We will continue to fight those. We know that the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), was in no position to do anything about them; and the burden is on us to convince this body.

We accept that burden and we must find a way out of that dilemma so that we are treated in exactly the same way as every other jurisdiction in the United States.

I am a fourth generation Washingtonian. I can trace my American ancestry back to virtually the beginning of

the 19th century. The fact that before slavery some of them believed they would find a better life in the District of Columbia and walked off the plantation should not mean that today the District of Columbia has fewer rights than any other local jurisdiction and that nobody in my family for four generations has had the same rights as every other Member of this body. I take it personally. And, of course, I take it as my obligation to do something about it for 600,000 people who live in the District of Columbia.

I want to also pay tribute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chair of the Committee on Appropriations. Every year the gentleman from Florida tries to help the District of Columbia get its appropriation out. Again he is simply doing his duty as chairman. He wants to get his appropriations through. He has a well-known desire not to have riders cloud up his various subcommittee appropriations, and he does whatever he can to ward them off and to try to facilitate Members in getting their bills through.

I appreciate that the gentleman from Florida has met every year with our new Mayor, actually he is in his third year now, who has done so well in our city, Tony Williams, and tried to help us to design a way to get our appropriation in and out. It ought to be the fastest and the easiest of all 13 appropriations. It is not your money; it is ours. When it comes to the hard work the Members do here, and they do work very hard, you would think that coming to the D.C. appropriation would be a rest period for the Members of this body. Instead, it has tended to be among the most controversial when it affects nobody in this body. I want to say not only that Speaker HASTERT has been very helpful to this city in trying to move the appropriation but the gentleman from Florida has been very helpful as well.

Finally, I must say a word about the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. This is the first time that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been on the Committee on Appropriations at all. He is so clever that he managed to get himself a chairmanship straight off because of the way the bidding is done. But what marvelous good fortune it is for the District of Columbia because the gentleman from Pennsylvania comes from a jurisdiction much like our own. He is the first big-city Member to serve in such a position on our committee since Julian Dixon, the much revered chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia for 14 years who died last year.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania not only comes from a similar jurisdiction just a few hundred miles up the East Coast, but he comes from a jurisdiction that has been through exactly what the District of Columbia went through about 5 years ago when it had to get a control board. So what we have is a ranking member who was the prime mover in getting a control board for the city of Philadelphia which sprang back as a result of it. Now the District of Columbia has sprung back as a result of both the work of the control board and of our Mayor and city council. We have a ranking member who has a deep understanding of big cities, their finances and their educational systems in particular.

What the gentleman from Pennsylvania brings to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia is almost instinctive understanding of what should pertain here for this city, an instinctive empathy with residents who live and have to watch as the Congress of the United States doubles back over what its own Mayor and city council have approved in their budget and sometimes in their laws.

And so, Mr. Speaker, thanks to the chairman and the ranking member and the cooperation of the full committee, I might add, the D.C. bill is on its way to full committee. I come to the floor this evening to ask that the full committee show this kind of respect for the independent jurisdiction that is your Nation's capital, the District of Columbia, that the chairman has shown; that we follow his lead and that out of committee come a bill that is at least as clean as the bill was when it was passed off today to the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, we have many miles to go before this session is over. I hope and pray we are not here as long as we were last year. But if we spend a lot of time ruminating about the District of Columbia, we may well be here. You have got yourself a Republican President now. I think he wants to sign bills and not veto them, although I must say unless you get this surplus matter figured out, you are likely to have a Republican President vetoing bills that came from a Republican House. In any case, I want us all to focus on getting out of here and getting these bills, which are already very late, done.

I think that the last thing that should make us tarry is a local jurisdiction unrelated to your own business and your own district. I ask that you respect the work of our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), allow a clean bill to come out of the full committee and then out of this House. And, of course, I ask you to respect the 600,000 people who live in the Nation's capital, who are second per capita in Federal income taxes and ask of you only that you let them spend their own money as they see fit.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE JENNIFER DUNN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) laid before the House the following communication from Shannon Flaherty, staff assistant to the Honorable JENNIFER DUNN, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
September 5, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

SHANNON FLAHERTY,
Staff Assistant.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. OXLEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of traveling with the President.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. ISAKSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. BOSWELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 10, 2001, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3487. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Foreign Futures and Options Transactions—received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3488. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Treatment of Customer Funds—received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3489. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Delegation of Authority to Disclose and Request Information—received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3490. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Fees for Reviews of the Rule Enforcement Programs of Contract Markets and Registered Futures Association—received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3491. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Recordkeeping Amendments to the Daily Computation of the Amount of Customer Funds Required To Be Segregated (RIN: 3038–AB52) received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3492. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule— Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301161; FRL–6797–5] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3493. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Regulation for Public Water Systems; Amendment to the List 2 Rule and Partial Delay of Reporting of Monitoring Results [FRL–7048–8] received August 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3494. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3495. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3496. A letter from the Adviser, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Exchange Visitor Program—received August 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

3497. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Privacy Act of 1974; Systems of Records; Biennial Publication—received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3498. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Methods of Withdrawing Funds from the Thrift Savings Plan—received August 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3499. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—2001–2002 Refuge-Specific Hunting and Sport Fishing Regulations (RIN: 1018–AG58) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3500. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Fishery Management Plan for the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Recreational Measures for the 2001 Fisheries [Docket No. 010511122–1179–02; I.D. 031901C] (RIN: 0648–AN70) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3501. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Gulf of Alaska, southeast of Narrow Cape, Kodiak Island, AK [COTP Western Alaska-01–002] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3502. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Maumee River, Rossford, Ohio [CGD09–01–111] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3503. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administration Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Indian Summer Festival 2001, Milwaukee, Wisconsin [CGD09–01–110] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3504. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Arthur Kill, Staten Island, NY [CGD01–01–135] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3505. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Vicinity of Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, Vieques, PR and Adjacent Territorial Sea [CGD07–01–33] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3506. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E airspace, Poplar, MT [Airspace Docket No. 00–ANM–22] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3507. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Florida East Coast Railroad Bridge, St. Johns River, Jacksonville, FL [CGD07–01–052] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3508. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Mississippi River, Iowa and Illinois [CGD08–01–015] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3509. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, New Orleans, LA [CGD08–01–002] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3510. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Ouachita River, LA [CGD08–01–007] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3511. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30264; Amdt. No. 2065] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3512. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30265; Amdt. No. 2066] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3513. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Aerospace Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Patents and Other Intellectual Property Rights (RIN: 2700–AC48) received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

3514. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Aerospace Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Boards and Committees (RIN: 2700–

AC46) received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

3515. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Aerospace Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Inventions and Contributions (RIN: 2700–AC47) received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

3516. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Flat Rate of Duty on Articles Imported for Personal or Household Use or as Bona Fide Gifts [T.D. 01–61] (RIN: 1515–AC90) received August 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3517. A letter from the Acting Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes In the Insular Possessions Watch, Watch Movement and Jewelry Program [Docket No. 991228350–1118–02] (RIN: 0625–AA57) received September 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 434. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a cooperative agreement to provide for retention, maintenance, and operation, at private expense, of the 18 concrete dams and weirs located within the boundaries of the Emigrant Wilderness in the Stanislaus National Forest, California, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 107–201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2844. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the participation of the public in governmental decisions regarding the location of group homes established pursuant to the program of block grants for the prevention and treatment of substance abuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2845. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a monthly insurance benefit thereunder shall be paid for the month in which the recipient dies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 2846. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide comparable unrelated business taxable income treatment to tax exempt organizations which hold interests in S corporations to the treatment as is provided to such organizations for interests held in partnerships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSWELL (for himself and Mr. OSBORNE):

H.R. 2847. A bill to encourage the deployment of broadband telecommunications in rural America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 2848. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1601–1 Main Street in Jacksonville, Florida, as the ''Eddie Mae Steward Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida (for herself and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 2849. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 440 South Orange Blossom Trail in Orlando, Florida, as the ''Arthur 'Pappy' Kennedy Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 2850. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period in the disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 2851. A bill to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Western Shoshone identifiable group under Indian Claims Commission Docket Numbers 326–A–1, 326–A–3, 326–K, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2852. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on (3-(1-methylethyl)-1H–2,1,3-benzothiadiazin-4(3H)-one 2,2 dioxide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2853. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 5-methylpyridine-2,3-dicarboxylic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2854. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on 5-methylpyridine-2,3-dicarboxylic acid diethylester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2855. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 5-ethylpyridine dicarboxylic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2856. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on (E)-o(2,5-dimethylphenoxy methyl)-2 - methoxyimino - N - methyl - phenylacetamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2857. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-chloro-N-(4chlorobiphenyl-2-yl) nicotinamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2858. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3-(3,5-dichlorophenyl)-5-ethenyl-5-methyl-2,4-oxazolidine-di one; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2859. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on tetrahydro-3,5-dimethyl-2H–1,3,5-thiadiazine-2-thione; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2860. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Methyl N-(2[[1–4-chloro-phenyl)-1H-pyrazol-3-yl]oxymethyl]]-phenyl) N-methoxy carbamate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2861. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3,7-dichloro-8-quinoline carboxylic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself and Mr. SWEENEY):

H.R. 2862. A bill to provide for reclassification of certain counties for purposes of reimbursement under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 2863. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish and maintain a panel to provide expert scientific recommendations in the field of cell development; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 2864. A bill to provide for an educational center in Haleakala National Park in Hawaii; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. HART, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. GRAVES):

H.R. 2865. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to require a sequestration of discretionary non-defense spending for fiscal year 2002 equal to the size of any on-budget deficit for fiscal year 2001; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 2866. A bill to restore freedom of choice to women in the uniformed services serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 2867. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require the Administrator to submit certain disagreements to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget for resolution, and to establish a minimum period for the solicitation of offers for a bundled contract; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.J. Res. 60. A joint resolution honoring Maureen Reagan on the occasion of her death and expressing condolences to her family, including her husband Dennis Revell and her daughter Rita Revell; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. ISSA):

H. Con. Res. 217. Concurrent resolution recognizing the historic significance of the fiftieth anniversary of the alliance between Australia and the United States under the ANZUS Treaty, paying tribute to the United States-Australia relationship, reaffirming the importance of economic and security cooperation between the United States and Australia, and welcoming the state visit by Australian Prime Minister John Howard; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution honoring Robert Hautman for winning the 2001–2002 Federal Duck Stamp Contest; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SCHAFFER (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr.

CHABOT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H. Con. Res. 219. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding United States policy toward Taiwan's membership in international organizations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself and Mr. GOODE):

H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution affirming the commitment of Congress to preserving the sovereignty of the United States and the integrity of its border; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WU, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. DEUTSCH):

H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that it is the policy of the United States that the future of Taiwan should be resolved peacefully through a democratic mechanism with the express consent of the people of Taiwan and free from outside threats, intimidation, or interference; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 28: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 117: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 123: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 162: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 168: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 220: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 274: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 281: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 296: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 298: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 303: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 325: Mr. FILNER and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 458: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 476: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 488: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 504: Mr. BALDACCI, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. STUPAK, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 537: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 570: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 580: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. STARK, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 597: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 599: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 600: Mr. JOHN.

H.R. 630: Mr. WALSH and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 662: Mr. KERNS, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 677: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 702: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 744: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 792: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 817: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 822: Mr. HOLT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 826: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 827: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 840: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. BARRETT.

H.R. 876: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 902: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 938: Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 968: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 975: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 991: Ms. HART.

H.R. 1084: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1089: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1143: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1161: Mr. LEACH and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1170: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 1194: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 1201: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1202: Mrs. BONO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1212: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 1220: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1254: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1305: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 1556: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. OSBORNE.

H.R. 1594: Mr. FRANK, Mr. MCNULTY, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1597: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1604: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1624: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 1700: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. STARK, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 1711: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1717: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1731: Mr. WELLER, Mr. KERNS, and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 1734: Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 1750: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1751: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1766: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1767: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1779: Mr. WYNN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1784: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1795: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1798: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1806: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1810: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 1897: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1950: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1961: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1968: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1979: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1988: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1997: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2022: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2071: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2096: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 2098: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2125: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. ROSS, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Ms. LEE, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COYNE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2138: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 2157: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 2160: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 2173: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 2200: Mr. LEACH, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2211: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 2220: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ISAKSON, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2227: Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 2269: Ms. DUNN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 2308: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GORDON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MASCARA, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 2316: Mr. OTTER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma,, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BARTON of Texas,, Mr. POMBO, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.

H.R. 2322: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 2335: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 2338: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2348: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2355: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 2375: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MENDENDEZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2383: Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 2405: Mr. ACKERMAN. Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2466: Mr. RILEY and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 2484: Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr., ISRAEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2485: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2507: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2549: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 2550: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2555: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2578: Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BONO, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, Mr. MATSUI,

Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 2614: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2615: Mr. KERNS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 2623: Mr. WALSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 2629: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2630: Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2631: Mr. SCHAFFER and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 2635: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BACA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STARK, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2640: Mr. FROST, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2641: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2662: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2663: Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 2667: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.

H.R. 2675: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2709: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 2716: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2725: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PHELPS, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 2730: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 2747: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2750: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 2794: Mr. HERGER and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 2795: Mr. GOODE and Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 2800: Mr. TANCREDO and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 2802: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2805: Ms. HART, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 2806: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2830: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OWENS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 2833: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DELAY, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 2836: Mr. KING.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. OSBORNE.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. KERNS.

H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. WALSH.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. CLAY.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Con. Res. 104: Mr. EDWARDS.

H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. BACA and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H. Con. Res. 184: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TERRY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. ISAKSON.

H. Con. Res. 206: Mr. TOOMEY and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 214: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. JOANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHROCK, and Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 230: Mr. SHAW and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. Con. Res. 144: Mr. PICKERING.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2586

OFFERED BY: MR. SCOTT

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of title XXXV, add the following:

SEC. . USE OF CONVEYED NDRF VESSELS.

Section 3603(a) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2273) is amended by inserting ''or as a bulk grain carrier'' after ''for use as an oiler''.

SENATE—*Thursday, September 6, 2001*

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable E. BENJAMIN NELSON, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we commit ourselves to You, the work of this day, and the challenges we face. You have made commitment the condition for receiving Your grace and guidance. We accept the admonition of Proverbs: ''Commit your works to the Lord, and your thoughts will be established'' (Proverbs 16:3). We long to be divinely inspired thinkers. When we commit our problems, plans, and projects to You, You instigate thoughts we would not have conceived without Your help. Show us how the sublime secret of intellectual leadership works. The Psalmist knew that secret: ''Commit your way to the Lord, and trust also in Him, and He shall bring it to pass . . . rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for Him'' (Psalm 37:5, 7).

We claim Your presence; You are here in this Chamber and with every Senator and staff member in the offices and committees and hearing rooms of the Capitol. We praise You for Your superabundant adequacy to supply our needs spiritually and intellectually. You establish our thinking and energize our work. Bless the Joint Session of Congress this morning as we welcome Mexican President Vicente Fox and continue to strengthen the ties between Mexico and the United States.

We commit the day; You will show the way, and we will receive Your strength without delay. You are our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable E. BENJAMIN NELSON led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC., September 6, 2001.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of Rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable E. BENJAMIN NELSON, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10:40 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I thank the Chair.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—S. 2563

Mr. REID. I understand there is a bill at the desk for its second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2563), an act to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would now object to any further proceeding on this legislation at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as has been announced, in 5 minutes the Senate will recess for purposes of the joint meeting with President Fox of Mexico. Senators have been notified to be here in 5 minutes to proceed to the House Chamber for the meeting.

When the Senate reconvenes at 12 noon, we will continue on the export administration bill. It is my understanding, having spoken with the managers of the bill, Senators SARBANES and ENZI, that progress has been made over the evening, and I have been told—and we will hear more from the managers shortly—that that bill can be wrapped up this afternoon. I hope that is the case because we want to alert Senator HOLLINGS and Senator GREGG that we should move and will move to the Commerce-State-Justice Appropriations Act today as soon as this other legislation is finished.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, with respect to S. 149, which is before the Senate, it is our anticipation that upon returning from the joint meeting and going back into session at noon, we would be able then to move expeditiously. There are a couple of amendments that I presume Senator THOMPSON and Senator KYL will offer. We have had an opportunity to review those amendments. We think they strengthen the bill. We are prepared to accept those amendments.

There is a question of the blue ribbon commission on which an agreement has not been reached. I do not know whether Senator SHELBY, who authored that amendment, will proceed to offer it or not. If he does, we will have to take it up and, of course, be open to amendment. We hope to be able to resolve that issue rather quickly. We have a managers' amendment to be adopted. And then we anticipate going to final passage.

So that is the sequence that we envision. We think that could be done in short order. I don't think that it will really take a lot of time to do all of this, maybe an hour at most, and we could get this bill completed and off the floor. I say to the majority whip, we would be able then to move on to other legislation in the early afternoon. But that is my expectation of how we will proceed.

I want to acknowledge and thank Senator THOMPSON, Senator KYL, and Senator ENZI—Senator GRAMM was involved in the discussion that Senator ENZI had with the other two Senators—for moving this matter along.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the Senator yield.

Mr. SARBANES. Certainly.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I think the Senator very well states the status of the situation and what has occurred. We have been discussing these matters as late as 30 minutes ago. I do anticipate that we will have two short amendments that have been

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

discussed and we will be able to agree upon which will improve the bill. As a part of our understanding, there will be two letters from both advocates and opponents of this legislation to the White House on a couple matters that we believe are very important but that should first be addressed by the White House, such as the deemed export rule, which is a very complex matter that we believe should properly be handled by Executive order. So with those two amendments and those two letters, I think we are in a state of agreement with regard thereto.

The only other matter, as Senator SARBANES indicated, is the question of the commission. I anticipate that we will certainly know by 12 o'clock what the situation on that will be. We will either have a vote on that or not. But if we do, I would anticipate that would be the only rollcall vote that we would have, and we would be able to proceed forthwith to final passage.

Mr. ENZI. Will the Senator yield.

Mr. SARBANES. Certainly.

Mr. ENZI. I would add my thanks and appreciation for all the hard work, particularly of Senator THOMPSON and Senator KYL and their staffs and Senator GRAMM and his staff. The meetings and the work on this did go late into the evening last night and began this morning so we could have as little interruption and expedition of the business that needs to be done by the Senate. Their cooperation, their attention to detail, and their willingness to discuss throughout the whole process the last 3 years we have been working on it is very much appreciated, particularly the hours they and their staff put in last evening and early this morning.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the hour of 10:40 a.m. having arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 12 noon.

Thereupon, the Senate at 10:40 a.m., preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Jeri Thomson, and the Vice President, RICHARD B. CHENEY, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of Mexico, Vincente Fox.

(The address is printed in the Proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

At 12 noon, the Senate, having returned to its Chamber, reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. REID).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from the State of Nevada, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 149, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 149) to provide authority to control exports, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, as we debate our system of export controls in this new era, we hear an array of arguments that reflect America's preeminent role in the world, our military and economic power, and the absence of the threat of major war that has prevailed since the demise of the Soviet Union a decade ago. We hear proud claims that trade is the new currency of international politics; that the strength of our economy, now more than ever, underpins our national power and global influence; and that in the brave new world of the Information Age, most technological flows are uncontrollable, or controls are meaningless due to the availability of the same technology from foreign competitors.

The business of America is business, we are told, and those of us who believe national security controls exist to protect national security, rather than simply expedite American exports, are accused of old thinking, of living in a dangerous past rather than a prosperous and peaceful present. For many, the new definition of national security—in a haunting echo of the thinking that inaugurated the last century—predicates the safety and well-being of the American people upon the free flows of trade and finance that make our economy the envy of the world, and our business leaders a dominant force in our time.

I am an ardent free trader, and I believe economic dynamism is indeed a central pillar of national strength. But I do not believe our prosperity requires us to forego very limited and appropriate controls on goods and technologies that, in the wrong hands, could be used to attack our civilian population here at home, or against American troops serving overseas. Experts agree that both rogue regimes and hostile terrorist organizations are actively seeking components for weapons of mass destruction, many of which are included in the list of goods we control under our current export licensing system.

Unlike in the Cold War era, when we created our export control regime to keep sensitive technologies out of the hands of the Soviet Union, this era is characterized by an array of diverse threats emanating from both hostile nations and non-state actors. Hostile nations like Iran and North Korea are disturbingly close to developing multiple-stage ballistic missiles with the capability to target the United States. These and other nations, including Syria and Iraq, receive significant and continuing technical assistance and material support for their weapons development efforts from China and Russia, with whom much of our trade in dual-use items is conducted. The intelligence community has made startlingly clear the proliferation record of China and Russia, as well as North Korea, and the adverse consequences of their weapons development and technology transfers to American security interests.

I do not believe that S. 149 adequately addresses these threats. Unfortunately, the Senate yesterday rejected a reasonable amendment offered by Senator THOMPSON allowing the relevant national security agencies to receive a 60-day time extension to review particularly complex license applications. This reform, proposed by the Cox Commission, and a number of amendments adopted by the House International Relations Committee in its markup of the Export Administration Act, properly addressed some of the deficiencies in the current version of S. 149.

S. 149 has the strong support of the business community and the Bush Administration. In the short term, proponents of this legislation are correct: loosening our export controls will assist American businesses in selling advanced products overseas. In another age, proponents of free trade in sensitive goods with potentially hostile nations were also correct in asserting the commercial value of such enterprise: Britain's pre-World War I steel trade with Germany earned British plants substantial profits even as it allowed Germany to construct a world-class navy. Western sales of oil to Imperial Japan in the years preceding World War II similarly earned peaceful nations commercial revenues. In both cases, friendly powers caught on to the destructive potential of such sales and embargoed them, but it was too late. Such trade inflicted an immeasurable cost on friendly nations blinded by pure faith in the market, and in the power of commerce to overcome the ambitions of hostile powers that did not share their values.

I resolutely support free trade. But I cannot with a clear conscience support passage of legislation that weakens our national security controls on sensitive exports to a point that we may one day be challenged, or face attack, from weapons derived from the very technologies we have willingly contributed to the world. Our peaceable intentions, our love of prosperity and stability, are not shared by those who would do America harm, and whose hostile ambitions today may well be matched tomorrow by the ability to deliver on that threat. We should make it harder, not easier, for them to do so.

Our export control regime should undergo significant reform to address the challenges and opportunities of our time. Proponents of S. 149 focus on the opportunities this legislation affords American business. I have worked with Senators THOMPSON, KYL, SHELBY, HELMS, and WARNER to highlight the reality that this bill does not adequately address the national security challenges we face today. National security controls cover only a tiny fraction of total American exports; the overwhelming majority of export applications for dual-use items are approved by our government; limited controls properly exist to help prevent highly sensitive technologies from falling into the wrong hands; and such safeguards are more relevant than ever in the face of the multifaceted and unconventional threats to our country unleashed by the information revolution.

A number of proponents of S. 149 argue that American companies should not be straitjacketed by U.S. national security controls even as their foreign competitors remain free to peddle similar technologies to proliferators and rogue regimes. This argument overlooks the fact that America continues to lead the world in technological innovation; our products are often unique when compared with those produced by businesses in France, Germany, or Japan. More fundamentally, such an approach only emboldens potential enemies who seek access to our markets in sensitive goods. In concert with friends and allies, we should endeavor to shame foreign companies who sell dangerous items to rogue buyers by making their identities public—not scramble for market access in dangerous technologies at their expense, as if nothing more than corporate profits were at stake. We should also make it a diplomatic priority to construct a new multilateral export control regime, in concert with like-minded nations, to fill the vacuum created by the collapse of COCOM, which regulated Allied exports during the Cold War to keep critical technologies out of Soviet hands.

As a proud free-trader, I maintain that we should continue to carefully review our most sensitive exports; we can, in fact, exercise some control over their end use. I fear we shall one day reap the bitter harvest we sow in our neglect of the consequences to America's security of an overly complacent export licensing regime. As a nation, we may have to learn the hard way that winking at the proliferation threats we face today, in light of clear evidence that nations to which we export sensitive technologies continue to apply and share them with our enemies, diminishes our national security to a point for which no amount of corporate profits will compensate.

I thank Senator THOMPSON for his efforts on this legislation. I do not believe that his amendment yesterday should have been defeated. I thought it was a reasonable amendment. I think it is also another example of a compelling requirement for campaign finance reform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, S. 149 is, in fact, a balance that modernizes our export control laws to account for the geopolitical, commercial, and technological changes of this past decade.

This bill recognizes that on occasion exports must be controlled for national security and for foreign policy reasons. S. 149 substantially increases the President's authority to impose controls when in fact they are necessary.

I have great respect for the few opponents of this legislation. However, I believe it is a misstatement to suggest that this bill somehow diminishes our Nation's ability to control technology which needs to be controlled when in fact this legislation imposes greater controls where necessary and significantly increases penalties and decreases the likelihood of sales that are inappropriate.

At the same time this legislation acknowledges that a vibrant American economy is a critical component of our national security. Senator BENNETT, our friend from Utah, spoke eloquently to this point yesterday.

Advancements in high technology allow us to ''run faster'' than our enemies. To foster continued advancements, we must take great care not to punish American businesses by limiting unnecessarily their marketplace, if those same products will simply be provided by our foreign competitors.

The observation is made, well, what about unique American technology? This legislation takes that into account. It allows for strong limitations where it is truly unique and where those sales would, in fact, pose some jeopardy to our Nation's security.

S. 149 balances our national security interests and our commercial interests with a first and foremost concern for national security—appropriately so. But it does recognize that our prosperity and our security are, in fact, interrelated.

This has been a thoroughly bipartisan process—a process, frankly, that I would like to see more often the case on the floor of this body.

I have great gratitude for the work of Chairman SARBANES, ranking member GRAMM, Senator ENZI, and some others who have contributed in a constructive way to this legislation. And Senators THOMPSON and KYL have made valuable suggestions to enhance the bill. I thank them for their role and their sincere concern for our Nation's security. I thank Senators DAYTON and ROBERTS for their constructive input on this legislation as well.

I urge the House to move expeditiously to pass the EAA so the White House can sign this bill into law. This is a high priority for the White House.

For those who may have some concern about the expertise of the vast bipartisan majority of this Senate in support of this legislation out of national security concerns, I again remind the body that this legislation not only had the overwhelming bipartisan support of thoughtful Senators on both sides of the aisle but is urgently supported by President Bush, by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, Secretary of State Powell, Commerce Secretary Evans, and National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice. Certainly those in the White House have taken national security as a first and foremost concern. Any suggestion that somehow that issue has been taken lightly by the advocates of this bill is simply incorrect.

This has been, frankly, a model for how the Senate can work together for the good of our Nation. It is not a Republican bill. It is not a Democrat bill. But it is a bill put together across the aisle with the cooperation of the White House. It has been extremely gratifying, frankly, to have been so closely involved in the creation of this reauthorization.

To reject this legislation, to fall back on the Executive order, which is under legal challenge, and which extends far less authority to the White House to control the sales of high-tech items around the world, would be a tragic mistake. This Nation needs a modern dual-use technology trade regime. This legislation provides that.

Those in our Government who are given the great responsibility of national security have applauded this bill. It is the kind of balance our country needs. I believe the Senate has performed its work very ably to bring this bill to this point.

It is my hope we can conclude this debate very soon, work with our colleagues in the other body, and deliver this bill onto the desk of the President, who has urged us over and over again to pass this bill and to again have in place a strong, powerful, dual-use technology trade regime for our Nation.

Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1527

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON] proposes an amendment numbered 1527:

On page 197, line 15, strike ''substantially inferior'' and insert ''not of comparable quality''.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, this amendment addresses the issue of foreign availability. As all who have listened to our discussion up until now realize, one of the more important pieces of S. 149 has to do with foreign availability. Essentially, what this bill does is say if the Department of Commerce makes a determination that some item has foreign availability status, then that item is essentially decontrolled. It does not go through the licensing process anymore, the idea being that it is out there and anybody can get it, and why control it.

Frankly, I think it is not a good idea. I think that foreign availability should be taken into consideration, as we always have in our export policy taken foreign availability into consideration. We do not want to try to stop the export of items that are clearly out there in the domain, but it should not be an overriding consideration. We should not be deregulating whole categories of items, and not even being able to keep up with how much we are shipping to some country, and what kind of item we are sending to some country.

This foreign availability concept takes these large categories totally outside the regulatory process that we are fearful might contain something that might turn out to be harmful to our national security. We ought to have a way for the appropriate representatives in our Government to judge these matters, item by item, and case by case, to make a determination. It may take a few days, a few weeks in some cases perhaps, to make this determination, but it is well worth it because the reason for export control laws is not primarily commerce; it is primarily national security.

If you look at this bill, you will see that the purpose of the export control law is to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and things that are detrimental to our national security or things that potentially are. But, anyway, I am in the minority on that.

The administration supports this concept of foreign availability. The majority leadership supports this concept. So that being the case, we have attempted to enter into discussions whereby, hopefully, we could convince our colleagues on the other side of this issue that there is some validity to our concern and, hopefully, the idea being that they would make some accommodation to us on this concept.

I am happy to say that we have been able to reach some accommodation on this issue that addresses some of our concerns.

This amendment that I have just offered makes an important change to the definition of ''foreign availability.'' Under S. 149, items could be decontrolled and bypass any kind of review so long as similar items that were available from foreign countries were not substantially inferior to U.S. items. In other words, foreign availability would kick in and the decontrol would kick in under the bill as long as countries could get things that were not substantially inferior.

Our belief is that we ought to make sure, before we decontrol our items, they can really get items that are comparable to what we have. If they can get items that are inferior to what we have, then we should still maintain controls because we have something they cannot otherwise get. And they are sensitive matters or they would not have been on the control list. So we ought to be careful about that.

So this amendment changes that standard of ''not substantially inferior'' to ensure that the items are of ''comparable quality'' to U.S. items. It is a small but significant change that ensures that we will not decontrol superior American technology just because inferior items are available overseas.

So I think this strengthens this provision in an important way. It certainly does not address all of our concerns, but it does strengthen this provision in an important way to make sure if we are going to enter into this, what I consider to be a very large decontrol process, in a very dangerous time, to very dangerous countries, that we ought to at least make sure that if we are claiming they can get these items anyway, it is really the same kind of items we have, the same quality we have. I think this amendment would go a long way toward ensuring that.

I thank my colleagues on the other side of this issue for entering into real discussions with us on it. Hopefully, we have come to an agreement on this issue.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his contribution throughout this debate. As he said, we have listened and considered carefully. I am perfectly prepared to accept this amendment. And I think introducing this quality concept about which he spoke yesterday is an important improvement and addition to this bill. I am happy to be supportive of it.

Mr. ENZI. I, too, thank the Senator from Tennessee for his cooperation and diligence in the months of working on this bill with us, and with the 59 other changes in the bill as well, and for his willingness to work with us on this change. We are happy to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. SARBANES. I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If not the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1527.

The amendment (No. 1527) was agreed to.

Mr. SARBANES. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. ENZI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THOMPSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. SARBANES. I withhold the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I suggest that while we are waiting on another Senator, who I believe has one more amendment to consider, we discuss the matters of deemed exports and commodity classification. We have had some discussions about those subjects also. If I may, I will simply relate what my understanding is with regard to those issues.

First of all, on the deemed export issue, we have had concerns on this side that the legislation did not adequately address the problem of deemed exports. As most who follow this issue know, a deemed export comes about when, in a typical situation, sensitive information is passed to a foreign national who perhaps is working at one of our National Laboratories or working in one of our businesses on sensitive information, who may or may not have a government contract, the idea being that with regard to the physical exporting of an item, that information should then be controlled when giving it to a foreign national. That should be reported. We should go through a reasonable process to make sure no damage is being done.

We learned from hearings with regard to our National Laboratories, for example, that we were woefully behind as a government from even private industry; that we were not paying attention in our National Laboratories to the deemed export requirements. There were hardly any deemed export notifications or licenses issued by our laboratories. Our laboratories contain

probably the most sensitive matters that we have in this Nation, including the maintenance of our nuclear stockpile, our Stockpile Stewardship Program, including information concerning our most sensitive weapons.

We believed we should deal with the deemed export issue. The administration has said it would like to address this complex issue—and it is complex—through regulation rather than include it in the legislation. We have agreed that a letter will be sent to the administration from both supporters and opponents of this bill asking the administration to review existing regulations and address this issue.

Continued control of deemed exports is an essential component of our export control process. Right now there is substantial noncompliance, as I said. This letter is designed to urge the administration to develop new regulations that ensure understanding of and compliance with the responsibility to control deemed exports.

I understand there are some in the business community who do not like the concept of deemed exports at all. My understanding and intention, as far as this letter is concerned, is not to give the administration the option of continuing a deemed export policy or not; it is to tighten up the policy and make sure it is updated and clear in terms of what responsibilities are under that policy.

It is a reasonable request that they be given the opportunity to address it. It is a very complex issue. We don't want to create onerous requirements. These foreign students and scientists who come to America make valuable contributions in many different ways. But we simply have to exercise common sense and protect ourselves and go through an appropriate process when it comes to deemed exports.

I am happy. I believe we have reached some agreement that we write the administration and express generally those thoughts.

Could I get an amen on that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, again, I appreciate the care, concern, and detail in which the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Arizona, and others who have participated on this, have expressed their concerns about the deemed export controls. We do recognize that the problem is not primarily in the private sector; that it is primarily in the government and educational and health institutions. The private sector has some proprietary rights they try to preserve, but it would be a problem there, too, and we wanted it addressed in all those sectors.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 1529

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I have an amendment I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] proposes an amendment numbered 1529.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 296, strike line 1 through line 7 and insert the following:

''(3) REFUSAL BY COUNTRY.—If the country in which the end-user is located refuses to allow post-shipment verification of a controlled item, the Secretary may deny a license for the export of that item, any substantially identical or directly competitive item or class of items, any item that the Secretary determines to be of equal or greater sensitivity than the controlled item, or any controlled item for which a determination has not been made pursuant to section 211 to all end-users in that country until such post-shipment verification is allowed.''

Mr. KYL. Madam President, let me explain what this amendment does and indicate to my colleagues that I believe I have the concurrence of the chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the subcommittee and have met this morning with the ranking member of the Banking Committee who worked out the language with us. In fact, much of this is his language.

This is the amendment I spoke to yesterday regarding the post-shipment verification that sometimes has to occur when we say, in the granting of an export, we will grant the license to send the item overseas but for a peaceful purpose, for a commercial purpose, or research, or university, a business purpose; we don't want you to take this item and put it in your defense facility or a nuclear weapons facility, something of that kind. We are going to verify, after we ship it, that it went to the right place.

Remember these are dual-use items. They have two different uses. They may be very useful in a private way, business way. They may also be useful in a military way. Let me give an example.

Not too long ago, some folks in Germany developed a very important medical device called the lithotriptor which, with a high-energy beam, literally zaps kidney stones so they break up into a million little pieces and surgery is not necessary to remove them. It is a very important medical treatment now for people. It is nonintrusive, no surgery, and has a great success rate.

These are very sophisticated pieces of equipment. They have some special switching components in them. It turns out that Iraq has found that those switches are useful in their nuclear weapons program. This is a good example of a dual-use item. It was not invented for defense purposes. It has an item in it that can be used for weapons. We know that. We don't want that item to be used for that purpose.

Saddam Hussein has ordered 50 of these. I don't think there is a need for 50 lithotriptors in Iraq, frankly. We want to be careful about the export of items that are available on the market. Any hospital can buy a lithotriptor if they have enough money. They are available. By now I am sure there are more companies than just the one German company that make them. These are items that can be acquired. They have dual-use capabilities.

In the granting of an export license on this kind of product, you have to be careful that it is not used for military purposes.

It may be that the example I used isn't technically correct in the way the bill would work, but I think I make my point.

The bill has a provision in it which says that if a company to which you sell, let's say a company in China, uses this product improperly, or they don't let you inspect to see where they have used it to verify that the shipment went to where it was supposed to go, then the Secretary shall cut that company off from further exports; they can't buy anything else from the United States.

But since countries such as China have established a rather gray relationship between the Government and businesses, there also needs to be a way of making the same point with the Government of China or any other government.

I am not trying to pick on China. There happen to be some very egregious examples of the Government of China right now not living up to agreements or post-shipment verification. We need to have some kind of enforcement mechanism in a country such as China as well. I proposed that we have the same kind of provision and say if the Chinese Government won't permit a post-shipment verification, then the Secretary shall stop such exports until they begin to comply. Well, supporters of the bill said, ''That is too drastic; why don't you say 'may' so that the Secretary has total discretion?'' I was willing to do that. That would have been the simplest way to solve the problem.

That is something I would like to offer in the spirit of cooperation with my friend Phil Gramm, who said, ''Let's try to work a few of these things out; since we know the bill will pass, you can make it marginally better.'' So we sat down with him. Frankly, the language we are offering is not what I would have personally offered, but it is acceptable to him and it marginally

makes the bill better. I will read it and offer it. It is simple. It says: If the country in which the end user is located refuses to allow post-shipment verification of a controlled item, the Secretary may deny a license for the export of that item, any substantially identical or directly competitive item or class of items, any item that the Secretary determines to be of equal or greater sensitivity than the controlled item, or any controlled item for which a determination has not been made pursuant to section 211 to all end users in that country until such post-shipment verification is allowed.

That latter reference to section 211 has to do with the item subject to foreign availability. It would have been simpler to say the Secretary may deny a license for any item on the list until post-shipment verification is allowed by the country in question. Total discretion of the Secretary would have been easier. We have created jobs for lawyers now. I am not necessarily against that, but when we have terms such as this in the statute, we are going to have litigation on what it means. It would have been easier to do it the other way. But this is the language I will offer. The Secretary, at least with respect to some items on the control list, can say to a country such as China, for example: Until you are willing to allow post-shipment verification of items A and B, which you already have, then we are not going to grant a license on items X, Y, and Z. They can pick what those items are if they so choose.

In closing, I will give examples of what would happen to illustrate the need for this particular provision. In 1998, very recently, China agreed to allow post-shipment verification for all exports. They signed an agreement. But the Cox Commission issued its report and deemed the terms of the agreement wholly inadequate, from the U.S. point of view, to ensure that these verifications really occur.

The amendment I proposed is designed to try to fill a void the Cox Commission identified in the U.S.-China agreement. For example, the Commission's report discusses a number of weaknesses in the agreement as it relates to the export of high-performance computers. According to the Bureau of Export Administration, out of 857 high performance computers that have been shipped to China, only 132 post-shipment verifications have been performed. Some of these have been outstanding for a long time. First you get foot-dragging, and then you get a ''no.'' On other occasions they say: If you allow us to do the post-shipment verification, that ought to suffice. But, of course, it does not. These items would not necessarily be subject to the terms of this section, although they might. I think it illustrates the nature of the problem that exists if you don't have an enforcement mechanism. You have to have the will to enforce.

I think there will be great questions as to whether or not the Secretary, in the exercise of his discretion, is going to be willing to deny a license to an American company which, after all, hasn't done anything wrong and is simply trying to make a buck, in order to get China to enforce the limitation. Let me respond to that point.

Any American company which understands that the item it is wanting to export to a third-tier country, countries of concern here, has dual-use capability has to exercise some responsibility. I think it has to take some of the consequences of the person to whom it is exporting not being willing to guarantee that the item is going to be used for appropriate purposes.

So I don't think you can make the case that all we are doing here is potentially punishing American businesses that are totally innocent and therefore we should not really be very forward-leaning in the enforcement of this section.

The fact is that any American business worth its salt should want to ensure that the terms of the export license are being complied with. It doesn't want to sell dual-use technology to a country that could use it against us militarily. It ought to be willing to ensure that the verification of the end user has in fact been established and enforced.

So it seems to me there is no argument that all we are doing here is hurting American businesses. Any American business would have the same interest as the U.S. Government in ensuring that the end user is in fact who it is supposed to be, both from a national security standpoint and being able to make future exports.

There has even been an idea advanced, that I think has some merit, which would put all of the burden on American business. It would basically privatize this enforcement and say the Government is going to get out of this business; it cost a lot of money, and we have trouble getting in the door to verify these things. Private industry, in effect, has to certify that the item it sold abroad went to the user that filled out on the form the certificate. And if the company isn't willing to verify that, or isn't able to certify it under penalty of some financial detriment here in the United States, then it is going to become much more careful about to whom those items are sold and how the post-shipment verification is actually implemented.

So my suggestion to American businesses is, if you really want to continue to be able to export, then help us work out a system that ensures that these items you are exporting, which have a dangerous potential use, get to the proper people and are not misused. If you are not willing to help us do this and if you are going to argue against enforcement of a section such as this, then something worse could happen. You could have the enforcement responsibility put on your shoulders. And if you are not able to certify that it went to the right place, you are not going to be able to make exports in the future. Everybody should have an interest in making this work.

Let me close with a note about some testimony that verified the need for this. David Tarbell, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy, testified in July at a hearing before the House International Relations Committee regarding the right to perform post-shipment verifications. He very diplomatically said:

> The Chinese government has been unwilling to establish a verification regime and end-use monitoring regime that would get all of the security interests that we are interested in to ensure that items that are shipped are not diverted.

Impressed further by Chairman HYDE about whether the post-shipment verification regime is a failure, Secretary Tarbell delicately said:

> I am not sure I would characterize it as a complete failure, but it is close to it. It is not something I have a great deal of confidence in.

The point here is to create something that we do have confidence in, that we know would work, that we can enforce and ensure the safety and security of the United States in the future, knowing we have not allowed the wrong people to get the wrong things into their hands in a way that comes back against the United States in a military way.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment I have offered and which has the concurrence of Senators GRAMM and ENZI and, I believe, the Senator from Maryland, Mr. SARBANES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Again, we appreciate the participation in the 59 changes before and now this change. It shows the level of detail in which Senator THOMPSON and Senator KYL have approached this bill. We appreciate this change. We are willing to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1529) was agreed to.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GRAMM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I ask the Senator from Maryland if we may make a brief statement as to our understanding on the second letter we have discussed. That will complete our business, I believe.

Mr. SARBANES. Certainly.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, this has to do with commodity classification. We have had some concern that when people in the business of exporting items come into the Department of Commerce and they get a different classification for a commodity—in other words, something might be subject to license and they believe it should not be subject to license anymore—they can come in and get that consideration. That is appropriate. That needs to be done, but it needs to be done in a manner which protects the Government and the country's interest from a national security standpoint.

The executive branch has traditionally dealt with this issue through interagency agreements. We think they need to be updated. The existing agreement is 5 years old and needs to be updated to create an increased role for the Departments of Defense and State.

Both the opponents and supporters of this legislation will send a letter to the administration requesting the issuance of a new Executive order on commodity classification to ensure the participation of the National Security Agency. We believe that with regard to many of these issues, as the administration is trying to staff up and with our discussions with them and among each other, we have realized just how outdated the existing agreement is. We are going to send a letter to them to bring this to their attention further, and suggest they issue an Executive order.

We assume this will be done in an appropriate manner, and we will not have to take additional action. That option, of course, is always there. Pending that, we think this is an appropriate way to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee again for his emphasis. It is important that there be updates on the different procedures, particularly the ones that are done through memos of understanding between the agencies.

We appreciate the willingness of the Senator from Tennessee to allow that to continue to be done that way so there is more flexibility to react to current crises under that kind of ability. We have prepared a letter to that effect, and we will be sending it.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, one final note. We have had some discussion in this Chamber concerning the possibility of an amendment that would create a so-called blue ribbon commission to address additional concerns as to how our export policies might be affecting national security. I believe it is fair to say, not having heard from my other colleagues on this issue, that we have not been able to reach agreement with regard to that.

Without a doubt, we will continue to work together among ourselves to try to agree on the composition of such a commission. I think we all agree the concept is a good idea, and that we ought to take a long impassioned look at what we are doing. We will continue to work on that, but for right now I believe we can take that off the table.

That concludes our comments on the bill in terms of these amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his very positive and constructive contributions throughout.

AMENDMENT NO. 1530

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I send a managers' amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], for himself, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. JOHNSON, proposes an amendment numbered 1530.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 193, line 10, strike ''party'' and insert ''person''.

On page 193, line 16, strike ''party'' and insert ''person''.

On page 205, line 7, after ''competition'' insert '', including imports of manufactured goods''.

On page 222, line 6, strike ''Crime'' and insert ''In order to promote respect for fundamental human rights, crime''.

On page 223, line 3, strike ''The'' and insert ''Except as herein provided, the''.

On page 223, line 9, after the period, insert the following: ''The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to exports of any of the items identified in subsection (c).''.

On page 223, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(c) REPORT.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 602 or any other confidentiality requirements, the Secretary shall include in the annual report submitted to Congress pursuant to section 701 a report describing the aggregate number of licenses approved during the preceding calendar year for the export of any items listed in the following paragraphs identified by country and control list number:

(1) Serrated thumbcuffs, leg irons, thumbscrews, and electro-shock stun belts.

(2) Leg cuffs, thumbcuffs, shackle boards, restraint chairs, straitjackets, and plastic handcuffs.

(3) Stun guns, shock batons, electric cattle prods, immobilization guns and projectiles, other than equipment used exclusively to treat or tranquilize animals and arms designed solely for signal, flare, or saluting use.

(4) Technology exclusively for the development or production of electro-shock devices.

(5) Pepper gas weapons and saps.

(6) Any other item or technology the Secretary determines is a specially designed instrument of torture or is especially susceptible to abuse as an instrument of torture.

On page 226, line 8, insert ''and'' after ''title;''.

On page 226, strike lines 9 through 22 and insert the following:

(ii) upon receipt of completed application—

(I) ensure that the classification stated on the application for the export items is correct;

(II) refer the application, through the use of a common data-base or other means, and all information submitted by the applicant, and all necessary recommendations and analyses by the Secretary to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the heads of any other departments and agencies the Secretary considers appropriate; or

(III) return the application if a license is not required.

On page 296, line 13, strike ''parties'' and insert ''persons.''

On page 296, line 11, after ''necessary'' insert '', to be available until expended,''.

On page 296, line 20, after ''necessary'' insert '', to be available until expended,''.

On page 297, line 20, after ''$5,000,000'' insert '', to be available until expended,''.

On page 298, line 12, after ''necessary'' insert '', to be available until expended,''.

On page 300, line 12, after ''$2,000,000'' insert '', to be available until expended,''.

On page 300, line 14, after ''$2,000,000'' insert '', to be available until expended,''.

On page 311, strike lines 2 through 4 and insert the following:

''other export authorization (or recordkeeping or reporting requirement), enforcement activity, or other operations under the Export Administration Act of 1979, under this Act, or under the Export''

On page 311, line 14, insert ''by an employee or officer of the Department of Commerce'' after ''investigation''.

On page 315, strike lines 6 through 10 and insert the following: (1), except that no civil penalty may be imposed on an officer or employee of the United States, or any department or agency thereof, without the concurrence of the department or agency employing such officer or employee. Sections 503 (e), (g), (h), and (i) and 507 (a), (b), and (c) shall apply to actions to impose civil penalties under this paragraph. At the request of the Secretary, a department or agency employing an officer or employee found to have violated paragraph (1) shall deny that officer or employee access to information exempt from disclosure under this section. Any officer or employee who commits a violation of paragraph (1) may also be removed from office or employment by the employing agency.

On page 315, line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 603. AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, MEDICINE, MEDICAL DEVICES.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE SANCTIONS REFORM AND EXPORT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000.—Nothing in this Act authorizes the exercise of authority contrary to the provisions of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–387; 114 Stat. 1549, 549A–45) applicable to exports of agricultural commodities, medicine, or medical devices.

(b) TITLE II LIMITATION.—Title II does not authorize export controls on food.

(c) TITLE III LIMITATION.—Except as set forth in section 906 of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, title III does not authorize export controls on agricultural commodities, medicine, or medical devices unless the procedures set forth in section 903 of such Act are complied with.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''food'' has the same meaning as that term has under section 201(f) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(f)).

On page 318, on line 2, strike ''and''.

On page 318, on line 3, insert after ''(15)'' the following: ''a description of the assessment made pursuant to section 214, including any recommendations to ensure that the defense industrial base (including manufacturing) is sufficient to protect national security; and'' and redesignate paragraph 15 accordingly.

On page 324, strike lines 1 through 4 and redesignate paragraphs (14) and (15) accordingly.

Beginning on page 324, line 21, strike all through page 325, line 5, and insert the following:

(j) CIVIL AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any product that is standard equipment, certified by the Federal Aviation Administration, in civil aircraft, and is an integral part of such aircraft, shall be subject to export control only under this Act. Any such product shall not be subject to controls under section 38(b)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(b)).

On page 325, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

(k) CIVIL AIRCRAFT SAFETY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may authorize, on a case-by-case basis, exports and reexports of civil aircraft equipment and technology that are necessary for compliance with flight safety requirements for commercial passenger aircraft. Flight safety requirements are defined as airworthiness directives issued by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) or equipment manufacturers' maintenance instructions or bulletins approved or accepted by the FAA for the continued airworthiness of the manufacturers' products.

On page 325, line 6, strike ''(k)'' and insert ''(l)''.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, the managers' amendment consists of provisions intended to clarify, correct, and improve the bill.

Section 211: This provision amends the term ''interested party'' in Section 211 (foreign availability and mass market status) to ensure its consistency with terms used in the rest of the bill. Sections 205, 302, and 307 all refer to ''interested person(s)''. The managers' amendment corrects the references in Section 211 by replacing ''interested party'' with ''interested person''.

Sections 214 and 701: This provision clarifies the duties of the Office of Technology Evaluation. Section 214 of the bill establishes an Office of Technology Evaluation to analyze information and provide assessments for use in export control policy. The managers' amendment clarifies that when assessing the effect of foreign competition on critical US industrial sectors, the Office is to consider imports of manufactured goods. It also modifies Section 701 (annual report) to ensure that the Commerce Department's annual report to Congress includes a description of such assessments. The managers worked closely with Senator HOLLINGS to include this provision.

Section 311: The next provision modifies Section 311 (crime control instruments). Section 311 preserves authority contained in existing law (Section 6(n) of the Export Administration Act of 1979) to ensure that crime control and detection instruments and equipment may be exported only subject to an export license. The managers' amendment further provides that any item or technology that the Secretary of Commerce determines is a specially designed instrument of torture or is especially susceptible to abuse as an instrument of torture can be exported only pursuant to an individual export license. In addition, the Annual Report of the Bureau of Export Administration must describe the aggregate number of licenses approved during the preceding calendar year for the export of any such items by country and control list number. This provision was included in the Managers Amendment at the request of Senators LEAHY and BIDEN.

Section 401: The next provision makes a technical correction to Section 401 (export license procedures). Section 401 requires Commerce to take four actions—hold incomplete applications, refer applications to other agencies, confirm commodity classification, and return application—at the beginning of the license review process. As drafted, however, some of these actions are mutually incompatible (for example, Commerce cannot hold an incomplete application while simultaneously referring the application to another agency). The managers' amendment revises the language to correct this inadvertent incompatibility.

Section 506: This provision amends the term ''interested parties'' in Section 506 (enforcement) to ensure its consistency with terms used in the rest of the bill. Sections 205, 302, and 307 all refer to ''interested person(s)''. The managers' amendment corrects the references in Section 506 by replacing ''interested parties'' with ''interested person''.

Section 506: The next provision makes technical amendments to Section 506. Sections 506(h), (i), (l), and (o) all contain funding authorizations for personnel or activities of the Bureau of Export Administration. The managers' amendment clarifies that the funding is to remain available until expended.

Section 602: This provision clarifies a provision in Section 602 (confidentiality of information). Section 602 outlines the treatment of confidential information obtained after 1980. The managers' amendment clarifies that the provision applies to not only to information obtained through license applications, but to information obtained through enforcement activity or other EAA operations.

Section 602: This provision further clarifies Section 602 (confidentiality of information). Section 602 provides that information obtained through licenses, classification requests, investigations, treaty, or the foreign availability/mass-market process shall be kept confidential unless its release is in the national interest. It goes on to provide penalties against those who violate this prohibition. The managers' amendment makes three changes: it (1) clarifies the investigations referred to are those carried out by Department of Commerce officials; (2) ensures that penalties on violators are imposed with the agreement of the violators' employing agency; and (3) allows violators to be denied further access to confidential information and to be removed from office.

Section 603: The next provision adds a technical provision relating to the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (TSRA). TSRA established restrictions on sanctions dealing with agricultural commodities, medicine, and medical devices. The managers' amendment adds a new Section 603 that is intended to hold TSRA harmless by (1) ensuring that no authority in this Act may be exercised contrary to TSRA; (2) clarifying the limitations on national security controls; and (3) clarifying the application of TSRA procedures to foreign policy controls. Senators ROBERTS and DAYTON were instrumental in crafting this language, and worked with bill managers to perfect the text.

Section 702: This provision corrects a technical reference in Section 702 (technical and conforming amendments). As drafted, the reference would have affected the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990. The managers' amendment removes the reference and thus any inadvertent impact on the Forest Resources Act.

Section 702: The next provision corrects a drafting error in Section 702 (technical and conforming amendments). Section 702(j) preserves authority contained in existing law (Section 17(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979) to ensure that standard civil aircraft products remain subject to the EAA. As drafted, Section 702(j) inadvertently departed from current law by breaking the original paragraph into subparagraphs. Because this structure could cause confusion in interpretation, the managers' amendment returns the text to its original structure.

Section 702: This provision addresses a humanitarian issue. U.S. aircraft manufacturers cannot export critical aircraft safety parts to countries subject to U.S. embargo. Without those parts, the planes may crash, with terrible humanitarian implications. A presidential waiver to export such parts is available, but is rarely invoked and takes years. The managers' amendment provides that exports of civil aircraft equipment to comply with flight safety requirements for commercial passenger aircraft may be authorized on a case-by-case basis. Senators DODD,

BOND, MURRAY, and ROBERTS expressed particular interest in addressing this problem.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, the managers' amendment to S. 149 adds a new provision to address a pressing humanitarian issue: flight safety.

U.S. aircraft manufacturers have sold commercial passenger aircraft internationally since the 1950s. Moreover, some European-made commercial aircraft are made with U.S. components. As a result, U.S. aircraft are used widely around the world.

The safe operation of these aircraft depends on the replacement of worn parts, repair of unsafe components, and receipt of technical bulletins and airworthiness directives. These parts, services, and information are highly specialized, and often are available only from the original manufacturer.

Over the years, several nations that operate U.S.-made aircraft, or European-made aircraft that incorporate U.S. parts, have become subject to U.S. embargo. As a result, U.S.-made aircraft items cannot be exported to those countries. This poses a significant threat to the safe operation of those airplanes. Without replacement parts, repair, and technical information, the planes literally may fall out of the sky, with terrible humanitarian implications for passengers and those on the ground. We all remember with horror the terrible 1992 crash, resulting from a failed part, of an El–Al plane into an Amsterdam apartment complex. All 4 crew and an estimated 70 Amsterdam residents were killed. The risks are real for U.S. citizens traveling to embargoed countries, or making up part of United Nations delegations. Citizens of U.S. allies are at risk. And not least of all, innocent citizens of embargoed countries are particularly vulnerable.

Under current law, the administration has some flexibility to allow flight safety exports to nations such as Sudan and Syria. However, exports to Iran or Iraq require a presidential waiver—a process that takes years and is rarely invoked. The difficulty of obtaining such a waiver has meant that U.S. manufacturers cannot provide critical flight safety parts or information to those nations.

The managers' amendment addresses this humanitarian issue while retaining the integrity of the embargo. It provides that aircraft equipment exports to comply with safety requirements for commercial passenger aircraft may be authorized on a case-by-case basis. It is tightly circumscribed: it applies only to parts for civil aircraft used for commercial passengers, and it requires a case-by-case analysis.

Senators DODD, BOND, MURRAY, and ROBERTS are keenly interested in this provision and should be commended for addressing this critical humanitarian problem.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, this managers' amendment has been carefully worked over. I do not think there is any matter of controversy in it. I am prepared to go to adoption of the managers' amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1530.

The amendment (No. 1530) was agreed to.

Mr. SARBANES. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GRAMM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, we are prepared to go to third reading of the bill, and then there are going to be some comments. If we can go to third reading of the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I simply want to make a closing statement on this important bill. I begin by thanking the chairman of the committee, Senator SARBANES, for his leadership, and Senator JOHNSON for the work, they have done on the bill. I especially want to thank Senator ENZI for his indispensable leadership on this bill; it is no understatement to say that we would not be here today were it not for Senator ENZI's leadership on this bill for the past two years.

I have had the privilege of serving in the Senate now going into my 18th year, and I have never seen a Senator do the things Senator ENZI has done on this bill—in terms of being willing to meet the various agencies involved in export administration, sitting for endless hours and watching how the process works, and doing something we seldom do in this line of work: learn how the process works practically. We are often not willing to spend the time or get our hands dirty. The quality of the bill before us is due in very large part to Senator ENZI, and I want to publicly and personally thank him for his leadership. It sets a new standard for what a Senator ought to be in terms of hard work behind the scenes, getting the facts, understanding the mechanism. We like to deal with theory and leave the practical matters up to somebody else. That is not the way Senator ENZI does business.

I thank our two colleagues, Senator THOMPSON and Senator KYL. Maybe people listening to this debate wonder why I would thank them, given that we have some fundamental disagreements, but good law is made by basically trying to accommodate people who do not agree with you while maintaining your principles. I think, quite frankly, they have improved the bill.

Counting the two changes that Senator SARBANES, Senator ENZI and I agreed to this morning, we have made 61 changes in this bill in trying to build a consensus. I believe the product we have produced is a quality product, it will stand the test of time, and it will work.

The points I want to make are: In listening to some of the critics, one may have gotten the idea that somehow this bill lessens our commitment to national security. We have an apparent conflict in America between our desire to produce and sell items that embody high technology, and we want to produce and sell them because the country that develops new technology creates new jobs and creates the best jobs.

So, while we want to be the world leader in that technology, we have a conflicting goal in wanting to prevent would-be adversaries and dangerous people from getting technology that can be used to harm us or to harm our interests. That is what this bill is about.

Today, 99.4 percent of the applications for a license are granted. When a process is saying ''yes'' 99.4 percent of the time, it is a nonsense process.

We have about 10 times as many items on this controlled list as we should have. We need to build a higher fence around a smaller number of items, and when people knowingly violate the law and transfer this technology we ought to come down on them like a ton of bricks.

Under this bill, the penalties can run into the tens of millions of dollars and people can end up going to prison for life. Those are pretty stiff sentences.

We have put together an excellent bill. It represents a compromise between two competing national goals. It is legislation at its best. Many times we claim bipartisanship on bills when they really are not totally bipartisan. This bill is about as bipartisan as anything we have ever done on the Banking Committee since I have been in the Senate, and I think it represents good law.

It is supported by the President. We have some 80 Members of the Senate who have voted basically to maintain the position. I am very proud of it, and I commend it to my colleagues. This is a good bill we can be proud of.

I am ready to vote, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are now in agreement on the unanimous consent request I will now propound.

I ask unanimous consent that a vote on final passage of S. 149 occur at 4:00 p.m. today, with rule 12, paragraph 4 being waived; that no substitute

amendments be in order; that the committee substitute amendment be agreed to; the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that the time until 4:00 be divided between the majority and minority for morning business, with the exception of 8 minutes prior to the 4:00 p.m. vote, which would allow Senators ENZI, GRAMM, SARBANES, and THOMPSON each to have 2 minutes prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMPSON. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. REID. If the Senator would withhold, our able staff indicated I misread this. It is right before my eyes, so if I could just repeat this.

The vote will occur at 4:00 p.m. today, with rule 12, paragraph 4 being waived; that no other amendments be in order; that the committee substitute amendment be agreed to; the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; the time until 4:00 p.m. be divided between the majority and minority for morning business, with the final 8 minutes prior to 4:00 p.m. being allotted to Senators ENZI, GRAMM, SARBANES, and THOMPSON each allowed to speak 2 minutes prior to the vote on the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do believe it would be appropriate to divide the final few minutes equally between the proponents and the opponents.

Mr. REID. That would be very fine. So what we say is 4 minutes for the opposition and 4 minutes for those propounding passage of the legislation be divided equally.

Mr. THOMPSON. Further, I want to take a few minutes right now in morning business or as a part of this UC, either one.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend that will be certainly appropriate. We will get this unanimous consent request agreed to and the Senator can have lots of time. Senator TORRICELLI wants 15 minutes, but we will be glad to wait until the Senator from Tennessee has completed his statement.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request as modified? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee substitute, as amended, is agreed to and the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Export Administration Act of 2001 and urge its passage.

Congress has not reauthorized the Export Administration Act on a permanent basis since 1990, and for close to a decade the export of dual-use goods—items with both civilian and possible military applications—have been governed in an ad hoc way by the President using Executive orders under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and without a comprehensive regime in place to monitor exports.

Such an approach creates obvious problems in trying to assure that the proper balance is struck between the need of U.S. businesses to be competitive in the international economy and the need to prevent sensitive technologies that have military applications from falling into the wrong hands.

The Export Administration Act will allow the U.S. government to effectively focus attention and exert control over sensitive technologies that have military implications, improve the export control process, and enhance national security.

The major provisions of the Export Administration Act of 2001 will:

Give the President the power to establish and conduct export control policy, and direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish and maintain the Commerce Control List of items that could jeopardize U.S. national security and to oversee the licensing process for items on the Control list.

Authorize the President to impose national security controls to restrict items that would contribute to the military potential of countries in a manner detrimental to U.S. national security, directing the Secretary of Commerce, with the concurrence of the national security agencies and departments, to identify items to be included on a National Security Control List. This strengthens the hand of the national security agencies in the export licensing process by giving them for the first time a formal procedure by which to be involved in this process.

Provide specific control authority based on the end-use or end-user for any item that could contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Authorize the President to set aside ''foreign availability'' or ''mass-market'' determinations in the interests of national security, and establish an Office of Technology Evaluation to gather, coordinate and analyze information necessary to make to these determinations.

Establish procedures for the referral and processing of export license applications, and establish an interagency dispute resolution process to review all export license applications that are the subject of disagreement.

Declare it U.S. policy to seek and participate in existing multilateral export control regimes that support U.S. national security interests, and to seek to negotiate and enter into additional multilateral agreements. Given the wide availability of some of these dual-use items, multilateral agreements are critical to assure that they do not fall into the wrong hands.

Establish new criminal and civil penalties for knowing and willful violations of the export procedures.

By streamlining and bringing transparency to the licensing process this legislation, then, strikes a good balance between assuring that the export licensing process is good for trade, the U.S. economy, and jobs, and national security concerns.

This legislation is supported by the President and has been endorsed by the Secretary of Defense, by the Secretary of State, and by the President's National Security Adviser. It also has the support, I believe, of the majority of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to move forward with passage of the Export Administration Act.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I think it is important to state my reasons for voting against S. 149, the Export Administration Act. I do so because I think there is too much deference to commercial interests at the expense of limiting exports which may threaten national security.

I cast my vote late in the rollcall when there were 77 votes in favor of the bill, which eventually turned out to be an 85 to 14 vote, so that I knew the bill was going to pass by overwhelming numbers.

Legislation on this subject is of great importance and is long overdue. I was tempted to vote in favor of the bill on the proposition that the best frequently is the enemy of the good. Had my vote been decisive so that it might have been a matter of having a bill which vastly improved the current situation, which is the absence of legislation, then I might have voted differently. I think the number of negative votes are important as a protest signal that this subject should be monitored closely and perhaps reviewed sooner rather than later.

For example, my concerns about the elevation of commercial interests over potential national security risks are illustrated by the foreign availability and mass market status this Act provides controlled items. The foreign availability component of the act would make the U.S. Government unable to control the sale of items that are also manufactured by other countries. Such lack of control would allow U.S. firms to sell anthrax to Saddam Hussein because of anthrax's dual-use in vaccine production. Additionally, the mass-market status in this bill would enable export of controlled items without a license if the item were mass produced for different industrial uses. An example of this mass-market status would be glass and carbon fibers that can be used in the manufacture of both golf clubs and also ballistic missiles.

These are only illustrations of problems which, I believe, should yet be corrected in conference or in later legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am very pleased that S. 149, the Export Administration Act of 2001, passed the U.S. Senate by such an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 85–14. This important law reforms our export controls of dual-use items to reflect the vast geopolitical, technological and commercial changes that have occurred since the old law was enacted back in 1979. While we must remain ever-vigilant to protect our nation from security threats, we must at the same time recognize that our security depends in large measure on a vibrant economy, and in particular on our ability to continue innovating in the high technology sector. Ensuring that American producers have the ability to participate in the global marketplace is critical to this effort.

The hard work that contributed to the overwhelming support for S. 149 cannot be overstated, and I was especially gratified by the spirit of cooperation that dominated the discussion. This bill, and the quality of its provisions, owe a great deal to the thoughtful participation of a variety of players on both sides of the aisle. In some cases, too many cooks spoil the broth. In this case, however, a variety of players made very thoughtful improvements to the bill. I extend my thanks and gratitude to the core group of sponsors, which included Senator MIKE ENZI, Republican of Wyoming, Chairman PAUL SARBANES from Maryland, Senator PHIL GRAMM from Texas, and also to so many others contributed to an improved final product.

In particular, I would be remiss in not mentioning the important and dedicated efforts of Senator MARK DAYTON, my Democratic colleague from Minnesota. Senator DAYTON and his staff worked tirelessly to ensure that S. 149 protects the interests of the agricultural community relative to export controls. While there are many legitimate reasons to restrict the export of certain items abroad, especially where the export of such items could pose a threat to America's national security, there is to my mind absolutely no acceptable logic for imposing restrictions on the export of food.

The export of food can never pose a national security threat to this Nation, and Senator DAYTON, along with his Republican colleague from Kansas Senator PAT ROBERTS, put together an amendment that eliminated the possibility that this government ever restrict the export of food for a purported national security threat. I look forward to continuing to work with Senator DAYTON on agricultural issues, and I know that the farm community is grateful to the Senator for his work in this area. I also wish to commend Senator DAYTON's staff, in particular Jack Danielson, Sarah Dahlin and Lani Kawamura.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, a consensus emerged during the 1990s with regard to the national security of the United States. That consensus was and remains that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction—nuclear, chemical and biological—and their means of delivery constitute the most important threat to our national security. There is also widespread acknowledgment that a number of rogue nations, and particularly China, represent the new national security challenge for the United States.

Yet, this body, the U.S. Senate, is about to pass with overwhelming support a major piece of legislation that stands in direct contradiction to the objectives of U.S. national security policy—to limit the spread of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

This is not hyperbole; it is a simple statement of fact. I acknowledge that the administration has endorsed S. 149. A campaign pledge has been kept. But the long-term ramifications of the vote we are about to take should not be underestimated. S. 149 received the strong opposition of the former chairmen, now ranking members, of each committee and subcommittee with responsibility for national security. It can in no way be considered to represent a prudent balance between commerce and national security. It is, in fact, heavily weighted in favor of the former, with scant regard for the latter.

The list of exports with which we have traditionally been concerned, the Commerce Control List, has 2,400 items on it. It is important to note that exports of these items are licensed, not prohibited. Contrary to the rhetoric of some, it also is not the shopping list of someone making a Sunday trip to Radio Shack. It is, rather, a compilation of esoteric items that have military applications, including for the construction of nuclear weapons and ballistic and cruise missiles. The amount of commerce at issue is minuscule relative both to the amount of U.S. exports and to the size of the gross domestic product. Restrictions or limitations on the export of items on the Commerce Control List do not now, nor have they ever had a deleterious effect on the U.S. economy, or on U.S. competitiveness. They do, however, represent the regulatory manifestation of our national security requirements and the role our moral values should play in the conduct of foreign and trade policies.

Some of us who oppose this bill support permanent normal trade relations with China. And, yet, we oppose this bill. We oppose it because it will, by design, open the door to the export without government oversight of the very items and technologies that contribute to the threats to our security that justifies a defense budget of over $300 billion per year. When we debate national missile defense over the months ahead, we should not hesitate to reflect on the connection between what we do here today, and what those of us who support missile defenses hope to do tomorrow.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of S. 149, the Export Administration Act of 2001. From my perspective, consideration of this legislation is long overdue. Congress has extended the Export Administration Act on a temporary basis since 1984, and in doing so has completely ignored the extraordinary changes in technology that have occurred in that timeframe. Current export control policy, formulated during the Cold War several decades ago, no longer fits either the current global context or our specific national security needs. It is time to bring U.S. law into conformity with international reality.

Over the past year I have been involved in two high-level advisory panels that have carefully examined the existing U.S. export control regime. The first was a study group focusing on Enhancing Multilateral Export Controls for U.S. National Security, and was sponsored by the Henry L. Stimson Center and the Center for Strategic for International Studies. The second consisted of two study groups, one on Technology and Security in the 21st Century and one Computer Exports and National Security, sponsored entirely by the Center for Strategic for International Studies. Each of these groups concluded that existing export control policy and procedures are outdated, unsound, ineffective, unrealistic, and counterproductive. Taken as a whole, they impede coordination between the U.S. government agencies responsible for export control policy, they hinder our efforts to cooperate with our most important allies, they ignore the new threats and opportunities in the international system, they expend significant human and financial resources insulating easily available technologies, they limit the ability of our best companies to innovate and compete and, in the final analysis, they harm our military and commercial national security interests.

The studies I have mentioned offered a range of extremely important policy recommendations, but fundamental to them are three important overarching conclusions, all of which are relevant to the debate at hand.

The first conclusion is that globalization has resulted in what the Defense Science Board has previously called a ''leveling'' of access to technology and the capacity of the United States to obtain and control technologies critical to its national interest. This concept suggests that access to commercial technology is now universal, and its use for both commercial and military ends is largely unconstrained. Enabling technologies necessary for modern warfare, examples

being semiconductors, computer hardware and software, simulation and surveillance devices, advanced telecommunications, and so on, are available to nearly any country that wishes to access them, ally and adversary alike. The result of these changes is an export control regime that is, to quote the Defense Science Board, ''for all practical purposes ineffective at manipulating global access to dual-use technology and . . . only marginally more successful in the conventional weapons arena.'' This is the context within which we debate export control reform today, and these are the changes that the proposed legislation is trying to address.

The second overarching conclusion is that is that we need to put higher fences around much smaller, but more critical, sets of technologies. Because access to advanced technology and technical capabilities have spread so widely and because research and development is now global in nature, it is time that we focus our efforts at export control on limited technologies that directly affect our national security. In particular, we should concentrate on protecting and developing the software and databases that sustain and strengthen our military superiority. The primary objective in the current export control regime is to prevent potential adversaries from obtaining technological components that would allow them to develop weapons systems and manage warfare in a more effective fashion. Unfortunately, this objective is still considered rational, this in spite of the radical changes that have occurred in the international political economic environment. Commercial computers that can be obtained online or through retail outlets can now perform the vast majority of battlefield applications. As a result, a coherent and compelling argument can be made that we need to concentrate on controlling the technologies that will allow advanced components to be integrated into effective systems. This should be one of our primary considerations as we reconsider export control, and this is one of the goals the proposed legislation is trying to achieve.

The final overarching conclusion is that it is time that we begin creating a new international framework that will allow more effective export control between the United States and its allies. Changes in advanced technology and the global environment has undercut or weakened existing agreements, and we must begin creating a foundation upon which new cooperative mechanisms can be established. In the recent past, much of this required change has been blocked by the United States, the primary reason being that its export control system was based on measures, computer MTOPS being the most salient example, that are no longer relevant in the current international environment and are not adhered to by our allies. Regulatory reform in the United States must occur before new international frameworks can be established, and this is one of the goals the proposed legislation is trying to address.

There are those among my colleagues who would argue that even if the international system has changed to this extent, even if globalization has changed the international equation, the United States has a moral obligation to limit access to certain key technologies for a specific group of countries. The example used most frequently on the Senate floor is China, but certainly other countries could be inserted in its place.

Let me state here that I would not disagree that certain countries should be singled out as potential threats to the United States and technology limited to the extent that it is feasible to do so. But the proposed legislation accomplishes this objective. The arguments on the Senate floor that the proposed legislation somehow diminishes our capacity to control sensitive and critical technologies is specious at best. On the contrary, many levels of restrictions remain in place to protect U.S. national security interests. What the proposed legislation does do is provide the U.S. government with the flexibility and focus to address concerns over advanced technology and adapt to changes in the current international environment.

It is time that we change our anachronistic system of export control. This legislation reflects several years of hard work on the part of my colleagues, and I believe it represents a balanced and strategic approach to the problems at hand. The legislation was voted out of the Banking Committee by a 19–1 vote. As the statements on the floor will attest, the legislation has the bi-partisan support of most of the Members of the Senate. President Bush supports it, as does all the relevant officials in his Administration. President Clinton supported it, as did all the relevant officials in his Administration. It is supported by a broad range of organizations, many of which are led by key officials from previous Democratic and Republican Administrations.

However, with that said, I find it disappointing that the legislation has not addressed the important issue of U.S. commercial satellites and space-related component exports. The Defense Authorization Act for FY 1999 moved responsibility for export licensing of these items from the Department of Commerce to the Department of State. By doing so, communications satellite and space-related items were placed on the U.S. Munitions List, effecting a crippling blow to the U.S. aerospace industry. It makes timely deliveries to overseas customers and our allies nearly impossible, and excludes commercial satellite sales from competitive rate financing offered by the Export-Import Bank. While our U.S. companies may find themselves hard-pressed to find institutions to provide reasonable financing for foreign customers, their competitors may not. Last year, the Aerospace Industries Association claimed satellite exports had fallen over 40 percent in the period from late 1999 to early 2000, and the forecast was for the trend to get continually worse. I certainly hope this issue is addressed in the upcoming conference.

We have examined the issue of export control many times over. It is time to recognize the importance of export control reform to the national interest of the United States and pass this legislation.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to express my support for S. 149, the Export Administration Act of 2001. I want to commend Senators SARBANES, GRAMM, JOHNSON, and ENZI for crafting a balanced, bipartisan bill that brings long-overdue clarity to the regulation of dual-use exports. This bill removes several unnecessary restrictions on exports that only hinder international trade, puts in place a system to track and license those technologies that have the potential to impact national security, and establishes realistic penalties and sanctions for violations of these regulations.

I am pleased that the managers of the bill have accepted the amendment that Senator BIDEN and I proposed that will place controls on the export of items that are used to perpetrate acts of torture. The ''torture trade'' is a critical problem that has received too little attention from policymakers, the public, and the press. Too often, companies have exported items, apparently designed for security or crime control purposes, that are actually used to torture people by some of the most inhumane methods imaginable. Amnesty International reports that, over the past decade, more than 80 U.S. companies have been involved in the manufacture, marketing, and export of these types of items, like thumbscrews and electro-shock stun belts, which have been used to commit human rights abuses around the world.

The Leahy-Biden amendment is a modest step to improve the transparency, oversight, and accountability associated with the trade in these items. It builds on existing regulations and requires a license, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and the concurrence of the Secretary of State, before such items can be exported. It also contains an annual reporting requirement to disclose the aggregate number of licenses to export these items that were granted during the previous year.

This amendment is designed to make sure that certain goods and technologies are not used to commit acts of

torture and other human rights abuses. While our amendment moves us in the right direction, I recognize that more can and should be done. Representatives HYDE and LANTOS have included an amendment in their version of the bill which contains additional protections that could be very helpful in curtailing the torture trade. I strongly urge the conferees to take a serious look at the Hyde-Lantos amendment when determining the final outcome of the Export Administration Act.

Finally, I believe that the Administration should work with other nations to develop strict standards of export controls for these items. I understand that the European Union is in the process of doing this, and our government should encourage and support that effort.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will oppose the pending legislation to reauthorize the Export Administration Act. I agree with the bill's proponents and with the Administration that we should have a statutory export control process. I am concerned, however, that the process provided for in this legislation is far too relaxed and could be harmful to our national security—the very security that the EAA is supposed to protect.

I commend the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON, and the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, for their leadership on this important issue.

It is troubling that the debate on this important piece of national security legislation has revolved around what is good for American business rather than on what is necessary to protect the national security interests of this country.

As a number of our colleagues have said during this debate, the purpose of the EAA is not to promote U.S. exports. The purpose of the EAA is to protect the national security of the United States, which may mean barring certain types of sensitive technology from being exported. I fear that this bill tips the scale dangerously in favor of expanded commerce at the expense of our national security.

I disagree with the argument put forth by some during this debate that the foreign availability and mass market provisions included in this bill are key to ensuring that American companies can compete in the foreign market. Just because other countries choose to make a dual-use product available to international buyers does not mean the United States should as well. We should do everything we can to stem the flow of potentially dangerous dual-use technology around the world. We should not use the questionable export decisions of other countries to justify selling products that could be used to harm our country.

There is nothing wrong with having a deliberative process for considering applications to export dual-use technologies. I disagree with the contention that so many in the affected industries have advanced—that the licensing process puts them at a disadvantage because they have to wait for the licensing process to be completed before they can export the technology. This is not a race. And the object of the EAA is not to unduly delay the approval of export licenses. We should consider carefully each license application. I fear that this bill, and in particular its provisions regarding mass market and foreign availability determinations and the export of high performance computers, will have the practical effect of rendering our export control process meaningless.

Supporters of this bill argue that American businesses need the relaxed controls included in this bill in order to compete in the international marketplace. That is not the case. The vast majority of export license applications submitted to the Department of Commerce are approved. The purpose is to ensure that sensitive technology does not fall into the wrong hands.

Other countries look to the United States for guidance on such issues as export controls and non-proliferation efforts. If we relax controls on dual-use items because other countries are selling them, we are following, not leading. Just last week, the United States imposed sanctions on a Chinese company that transferred missile technology to Pakistan. The administration reportedly has told the Chinese Government that one of the conditions to having these sanctions lifted is for the Chinese to develop a system of export controls to regulate the transfer of sensitive technology. It is curious that the Senate is debating relaxing U.S. control of dual-use technology—a move the administration supports—at the same time the administration is calling on the Chinese Government to implement export controls.

I think we have to examine closely all sides of this issue, and again I want to thank Senator KYL and Senator THOMPSON for the outstanding work they have done to bring concerns about this legislation to the fore.

The fact is that there is a great deal of pressure from the super computer industry to pass this legislation. I don't say that to impugn the motives of any Member who supports this bill, because we are having an honest debate here about different points of view. But I do think it's important for the American people to understand who some of the strong supporters of this legislation are, so I would like to take a moment to Call the Bankroll on this issue.

The computer industry has a huge stake in the passage of EAA. They want a relaxation of the export controls on supercomputers, and they are lobbying hard for their cause. And, as is usually the case, lobbying means donating big money, and that means donating soft money to the party committees. In this case, the computer industry gave $20.5 million in soft money during the 2000 election cycle. The industry ranked seventh in overall donations in the last cycle, a meteoric rise for an industry that ranked 55th in donations a decade earlier. This is clearly an industry that has learned how to play the soft money game, and play it well.

I'll just name three soft money donors in the industry who are pushing for passage of EAA:

Unisys Corporation and its executives gave more than $142,000 in soft money in the 2000 election cycle;

Sun Microsystems gave more than $24,000 in soft money during the last cycle; and

United Technologies and its subsidiaries gave a whopping $338,300 in soft money in the 2000 election cycle.

As I said, this is in no way a comprehensive list, since the industry gave more than $20 million in soft money during the last cycle. But I point out these donations now because they are relevant to this debate—and relevant to the way many Americans view this debate, and so many others like it here on the Senate floor.

When wealthy interests are allowed to give an unlimited amount of money to a political party, it makes the American people question us and the work we do. And I can think of few issues where the public might be more disturbed by the potential influence of soft money than an issue like this one, where national and international security are at stake. Whether or not soft money clouds our own judgment, it clouds the public's judgement of each and every one of us.

I want to reiterate my opposition to this legislation. We can and should do more to protect the national security interests of the United States.

I will vote against this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, it has been 16 years since the United States Congress last enacted re-authorizing legislation governing our controls on the export of dual-use technology, those items suited for both civilian and military uses. For much of the past 7 years, the President has been forced to exercise emergency powers to maintain dual-use export controls following the expiration of the 1979 Export Administration Act. This temporary exercise of authority has limited the penalties the Federal Government can enforce on export control violators and has opened up existing export controls to a series of legal challenges.

It is high time, therefore, that the Senate act on S. 149, a bill to re-authorize the Export Administration Act. I look forward to the passage of this bill and the creation of a modern system of export controls.

We owe this to U.S. companies, which deserve a rational and predictable

framework of export controls. We owe this to our friends and allies, who look to the U.S. export control system as a model in devising their own systems. And, most importantly, we owe this to our national security, we cannot rely forever on an ad hoc system that metes out insufficient penalties and is based on shaky legal ground.

Export controls exist, first and foremost, for reasons of national security. The United States must not export items when the item or the end-user may contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, strengthen the military capabilities of those who would oppose us, or otherwise endanger U.S. national security. A comprehensive export control system is just as important to preserving America's freedom and security as a strong military.

But export controls also exist to facilitate the free trade of goods and services, an essential building block of our international economy. The future growth of our economy and a leading global role for U.S. industry require a vital export market.

I think all of us can agree that national security considerations must always come first in devising export controls. We can all agree that such controls should not be so arbitrary as to stifle legitimate trade. We may differ, however, on where we draw the line in balancing these two opposing considerations.

Export controls can also serve another purpose. They can help reaffirm America's global leadership on human rights. Let me take this opportunity to commend Senators SARBANES and ENZI for accepting an amendment proposed by Senator LEAHY and me in this regard. The managers' amendment to S. 149 will tighten the controls on the export of items expressly designed for torture or especially susceptible to use in torture.

We are talking about items such as stun guns and shock batons, leg cuffs and restraint chairs. Yes, some of these items can have legitimate law enforcement uses and are in fact employed in a manner that does not abuse human rights. That is why this amendment would continue to allow their export, but make them subject to the licensing process and require the specific concurrence of the State Department as well as the approval of the Commerce Department.

The items covered by this amendment are devices that governments around the world too often use in suppressing political dissidents and ethnic opposition. This amendment requires the U.S. government to license each and every export of such items. It will help ensure that the United States does not indirectly contribute to the torture of individuals by engaging in the unlicensed trade of items used for torture. It is my hope that the Commerce and State Departments, working together, will see to it that licensed exports of these items are permitted only to those countries whose governments carry unblemished human rights records.

I once again thank Senators SARBANES and ENZI for accepting this amendment, and especially Senator LEAHY, who is once again a champion of human rights and with whom I am always delighted to work.

During this debate, a group of Senators, led by my good friends Senator THOMPSON and Senator KYL, has led an intense effort against S. 149. They argue that this bill fundamentally favors commercial equities over our national security interests. They are skeptical that the Commerce Department, which is responsible for cultivating U.S. business interests around the world, can play an impartial role in weighing national security considerations.

Truth be told, I have shared some of their concerns. That's why I am pleased that the floor managers have reached a compromise with Senators THOMPSON and KYL. This compromise includes amendments to S. 149 to: 1. enhance the discretionary authority of the Commerce Department to deny export licenses to another country when it is blocking legitimate post-shipment verifications of sensitive exports and 2. tighten the definition of foreign availability determinations which can exempt items from export controls. These changes to S. 149 approved today offer real improvements to this bill.

I plan to vote for S. 149. On the whole, this bill takes the right steps to bring our export controls for dual-use technologies into the 21st century. Is it a perfect bill? No. The House International Relations Committee, in marking up this bill last month, approved dozens of amendments, on a bipartisan basis. I would hope, therefore, to see further improvement of this bill in conference.

But now is not the time for delay on S. 149. The Senate has a duty to pass this legislation and to restore stability and predictability to our export control system for sensitive dual-use technologies.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to address an issue that is critical to the national security of our Nation: the adequate control of the export of sensitive technologies. I have been active in this debate for the past 2 years, together with Senators HELMS, SHELBY, MCCAIN, THOMPSON, and KYL. We have worked with our colleagues on the Banking Committee, particularly Senators GRAMM, SARBANES, and ENZI, to craft a bill that protects our Nation's security, while at the same time allowing for appropriate commercial activity.

In April, I reluctantly objected to the motion to proceed to S.149, the Export Administration Act. At that time, I thought it was premature for the Senate to consider this bill until we had received detailed information from the Administration on this issue. I believe the Senate is now in a position to act on this important legislation.

I have tried for the past 2 years to work in a conscientious way with all parties to resolve the differences over this legislation. These differences have cut to the very essence of how the United States plans to protect its national security in an era of rapid globalization and proliferation of technology.

My goal in this debate has been to strike the proper balance between national security and commercial interests. As we all know, the high tech industry in the United States is currently second to none. We must ensure our domestic industry remains competitive without limiting access to new markets. Considering the rate at which technology becomes obsolete, being the first to deliver a product to a market is crucial. And while we cannot completely abandon national security concerns in favor of industry, we must not unnecessarily hinder the ability of our high tech companies to compete on the world stage. That is what I believe we have accomplished with this bill.

This is a complicated issue that cuts across the jurisdiction of six Senate Committees. Five Committee Chairmen with responsibility for national security matters in the U.S. Senate have continuously worked to improve this bill—myself as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator SHELBY of the Intelligence Committee, Senator THOMPSON of the Governmental Affairs Committee, Senator HELMS of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator MCCAIN of the Commerce Committee. In addition, Senator KYL has been a leading participant in our discussions with the Banking Committee, the committee of primary jurisdiction.

The higher penalties and increased enforcement authority, the authority to require enhanced controls on items that need to be controlled for national security reasons, the requirement for the Department of Commerce to notify the Department of Defense of all commodity classifications are examples of progress made on the national security front.

I have great respect for the tireless efforts and dedication of my distinguished Banking committee colleagues, Senator GRAMM and Senator ENZI, in creating the EAA of 2001. I thank them for meeting with me and others several times throughout the past two years to listen to our concerns with balancing national security matters with economic interests. I hope these concerns will remain a priority for all of us.

In this year's version of the EAA, the Banking Committee has included additional national security protections at

the urging of the administration. As the debate on these issues has shown, there were concerns about the last administration's record in protecting some of our vital technology. A new administration is able to look at old problems with a fresh approach. It is in that context that the administration reviewed this bill at the request of myself, Senators MCCAIN, SHELBY, THOMPSON, HELMS and KYL. The National Security Advisor and three cabinet Secretaries were intimately involved in this review. As a result, the administration proposed a series of legislative changes that the Banking Committee has included in the bill that is before us.

Once these changes were made and the administration was actively engaged on the issue, the question then became a technical matter of how the administration would implement the statute. When the Senators expressing concerns regarding this bill were briefed on the results of the administration's review, we were informed that an interagency agreement had been achieved on how the administration would enhance national security controls during the course of implementing the EAA. Under the administration's proposal, we were informed that some national security protection that we had sought in the past would be included in the executive order that implements S. 149. Thus began a dialogue with the administration to come up with a better understanding of how this bill would be implemented.

My past concerns with earlier versions of EAA were based on concerns expressed by the Department of Defense. Last year, DOD provided the Senate Armed Services Committee with specific legislative changes that were necessary in their judgement to fix last year's EAA bill. This included addressing issues related to a national security carve-out or enhanced controls, commodity classifications, the enhanced proliferation control initiative, and deemed exports.

The Bush administration shares the concerns of the previous administration but has chosen to pursue some needed changes administratively. In this regard, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter I received from Secretary of Commerce Evans be made a part of the legislative record. This letter provides some insight into the administration's interpretation of the bill language and commits the administration to implementing, for example, a ''disciplined and transparent process for escalating and deciding disputes'' on commodity classifications.

I am satisfied with the response that the administration has given me that they can work within the confines of this statute to protect national security. I trust that this administration will be able to do so. The Congress will, however, need to provide diligent oversight to ensure that this administration will conform to the high national security standards that they have set for themselves. When the EAA comes up for renewal in three years time, we may have to be more stringent in putting explicit national security protections in statute rather than leaving it to the discretion of the administration.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Intelligence, Foreign Relations, Commerce and Governmental Affairs Committees. These Members have worked over the last two years to improve this bill and ensure that our national security interests are protected. I know the job isn't finished yet. It has just begun and I will stand with my colleagues to ensure that our export control process is designed and operated to ensure that weapons of mass destruction do not get into the wrong hands.

It is time for the Congress to act on this bill. There is a need to reauthorize the EAA. The national security protections such as the national security carve out, increased penalties for export control violations, and greater visibility for the DOD over commodity classifications are positive steps. We need to lock in these improvements and work to ensure that nonproliferation concerns are protected and strengthened and that vital technology is protected. And we need to allow our domestic industry to compete in the world market without unnecessary and outmoded restrictions.

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

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2001.

Hon. JOHN WARNER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: In light of our mutual interest in the Export Administration Act of 2001 (S. 149), I would like to address several issues related to S. 149 that I understand were raised by your staff in a recent discussion with Administration officials.

As you know, the Administration carefully reviewed S. 149. As a result of that review, the Administration recommended a number of amendments to the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs which were incorporated into the bill. Accordingly, the Administration strongly supports S. 149. We believe that the bill provides the proper framework for regulating the export of sensitive items consistent with our national security, foreign policy, and economic interests. For your convenience, I have enclosed an analysis that addresses in detail the issues raised by your staff.

I also understand that your staff asked about the Department's response to a recent report by the General Accounting Office (GAO) regarding controls on exports to Canada of items that could contribute to missile proliferation. The Department will shortly issue a proposed rule amending the licensing requirements applicable to exports to Canada. This new rule will address the issue raised by the GAO.

I appreciate your continued interest in the Export Administration Act of 2001. I look forward to working on the passage of this bill to ensure that the protection of national security is given the highest priority in the dual-use export control system process.

If you have any further questions, please call me or Brenda Becker, Assistant Secretary for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, at (202) 482–3663.

Warm regards,

DONALD L. EVANS.

Enclosure.

ADMINISTRATION VIEW ON NATIONAL SECURITY ASPECTS OF S. 149

The Administration supports S. 149 because it sustains the President's broad authority to protect national security. S. 149 actually provides greater authority for the President to control dual-use exports than current law, the Export Administration Act of 1979 (EAA). S. 149 significantly raises the penalties for export control violations and contains other provisions that enhance the U.S. government's ability to enforce the law effectively. Higher penalties and increased enforcement authority will deter those who might otherwise endanger U.S. national security through illicit exports.

FOREIGN AVAILABILITY/MASS MARKET AND PARTS AND COMPONENTS

The bill does give exporters the right to ask the government to determine whether items are foreign or mass market available. However, the bill also gives the President several ways to continue controls on such items, if necessary, for national security reasons. In addition, S. 149 provides more authority than the existing law to require enhanced controls on such parts and components as needed to protect national security.

ROLE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

The bill provides a significant role for the Department of Defense in the licensing process, including:

—giving the Secretary of Defense concurrence authority in identifying items to be controlled for national security reasons. This is a greater role than Defense has under existing law because the scope of the national security control list under the bill is significantly greater than under current law.

—requiring the Secretary of Commerce to refer all license applications to the Secretaries of Defense and State for their review and recommendations. The bill also authorizes all reviewing departments, for the first time in statute, to escalate a proposed licensing decision to the President.

—requiring the Department of Commerce, for the first time in statute, to notify the Department of Defense of all commodity classification requests.

—requiring the Department of Commerce, for the first time in statute, to fully consider any intelligence information relevant to a proposed export when considering a license application.

—enabling the President to continue the longstanding procedure whereby the Office of Management and Budget ensures the concurrence of the Departments of State and Defense, and other agencies as appropriate, on regulations issued by Commerce pursuant to the act. This procedure allows the Departments of State and Defense to concur on regulations affecting their interests without requiring concurrence on regulations those departments may not wish to review.

—continuing the President's authority to require a license for transfers of controlled items to foreign nationals within the United States and requiring State and Defense's concurrence on such licenses.

Regarding restrictions on the President's delegation of authority, such restrictions are

limited and apply only to those areas not appropriately delegated to any one agency. Restricting decisionmaking authority to the President, in these very limited circumstances, ensures that all interests—including national security—will be fully considered.

As officials from the Departments of State and Defense testified at the House International Relations Committee on July 11, the provisions of S. 149 protect the President's authority to safeguard U.S. national security.

PROPOSED EXECUTIVE ORDER

Interagency review of export license applications is conducted under Executive Order 12981, as amended. Under this executive order, the Departments of Defense, State and Energy have the right to review all license applications submitted to the Department of Commerce. The only applications that these departments do not review are those they choose not to, such as applications to export crude oil.

S. 149 partially codifies Executive Order 12981 and provides the Administration the flexibility to structure an appeals process that will preserve the existing authorities of both the Departments of Defense and State. For example, the current executive order establishes an assistant secretary-level interagency working group to hear appeals of decisions made at lower levels. This group already is an integral part of the licensing process and the Administration plans to keep it so. Any new executive order promulgated after the passage of a new EAA would not alter Defense's current ability to review and object to license applications.

S. 149 also requires Commerce, for the first time in statute, to notify Defense of all commodity classification requests Commerce receives. The Administration has committed to implement by executive order a process by which all these commodity classification requests will be reviewed by Defense, with a disciplined and transparent process for escalating and deciding disputes. The Administration will brief Congress about all of the processes provided for in S. 149 as they are implemented.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today in order to reiterate my concerns over the Export Administration Act of 2001.

There is little doubt that this bill will pass. The writing is on the wall. However, with all due respect to the administration and to my colleagues on the Banking Committee, I have and will continue to oppose S. 149.

Neither I nor Senators THOMPSON, KYL, HELMS or MCCAIN desire to impede American business entities in their pursuit of new markets. I for one tend to agree with President Calvin Coolidge, who said that, ''The chief business of the American people is business.'' Every Senator here today is an advocate for enhanced trade and for helping U.S. industry to export its goods and services. Exports bring prosperity to this Nation's companies and work to its citizens. If my advocacy for the U.S. technology industry were the sole basis upon which my decision on this legislation was to be based, I could easily change my past position and support passage of the Export Administration Act, or EAA as it is known. However, the other basis upon which the EAA should be measured is its effect upon the national security of the United States.

Earlier this summer, I was inspired when I listened as one of my colleagues, who had not previously supported my position on the EAA, publicly and emphatically stated, and I paraphrase, that when it comes to the difficult question of promoting trade or preserving national security, we must err on the side of national security.

That balance is the crux of this week's debate. We should not support a measure that could, as written, result in harm to Americans by technology developed and sold by Americans.

The pending bill addresses the control of ''dual use'' technology, that is, technology that has both commercial and military applications. Most commonly, our current export controls entail a licensing process for the export of most dual use technologies. Rather than prohibit exports outright, we generally ensure that we can determine which countries are receiving technology and keep track of anomalies in exporting so that we can measure whether technology is being put to military use. The EAA also regulates which countries will be permitted to import U.S. dual-use technologies. Generally, U.S. companies are not permitted to export dual use products to countries like Iran and Iraq.

This bill is an attempt to rewrite our export control laws to make them more rational. I too believe that this nation needs new export laws to meet today's trade realities. However, this effort must not open the floodgates for our dual use technology to be exported, without the ability for the U.S. Government to follow where that technology goes and its ultimate application.

For an export control regime to function properly, it must provide for a balancing of the commercial benefits involved—which are generally obvious, easily-quantified, concentrated, and immediate—with the national security concerns, which are typically shrouded in secrecy, difficult to quantify, diffuse, and long-term in nature. In this equation, national security can easily get the short end of the stick.

Not everything is shrouded in secrecy. In accordance with Section 721 of the 1997 Intelligence Authorization Act, twice a year the Director of Central Intelligence submits a report on trends in the proliferation of weapons technologies. Part of the report is unclassified. The report identifies key suppliers of dual use missile, nuclear, and conventional arms technologies, as well as dual-use biotechnology and chemical technology. Nations such as China and Russia are identified as key suppliers. They export their technology to the likes of Iraq, Iran, Libya, Syria, Sudan, Pakistan and India. The report received last winter detailed a continuing and significant problem.

Regarding Iran, the report states, and I quote:

Tehran expanded its efforts to seek considerable dual use biotechnical materials, equipment, and expertise from abroad—primarily from entities in Russia and Western Europe—ostensibly for civilian uses. We judge that this equipment and know-how could be applied to Iran's biological warfare program. Outside assistance is both important and difficult to prevent, given the dual-use nature of the materials, the equipment being sought, and the many legitimate end uses for these items.

Regarding Iraq, the report indicates that Saddam Hussein is utilizing all means to acquire dual-use technology. The report states:

Iraq has attempted to purchase numerous dual-use items for, or under the guise of, legitimate civilian use. This equipment, in principle subject to UN scrutiny, also could be diverted for weapons of mass destruction purposes. In addition, Iraq appears to be installing or repairing dual-use equipment at chemical weapons related facilities.

With respect to India, ''India continues to rely on foreign assistance for key missile and dual-use technologies where it still lacks engineering or production expertise in ballistic missile development.'' The report goes on to cite Russia and Western Europe as the primary conduits of India's missile related technology.

As stated in the Report, Pakistan received significant assistance from Communist China for its ballistic missile program in the early part of last year. As recently as this past weekend, the administration was forced to impose sanctions on the China Metallurgical Equipment Corporation for selling missile technology to Pakistan. The corporate entity in Pakistan which received the technology was also sanctioned. I know this has been and continues to be an issue of great concern to Senator THOMPSON. I commend him for his efforts to publicize Communist China's blatant disregard for its pledge not to support foreign nuclear missile programs.

The report did contain one note of optimism, which I believe is also directly applicable to today's debate. Nations such as Libya and Iran continued to attempt to acquire needed materials for weapons of mass destruction in Western Europe. They had some success in the first half of 2000, but the CIA report states that, ''Increasingly rigorous and effective export controls and cooperation among supplier countries have led the other foreign WMD programs to look elsewhere for many controlled dual-use goods.'' The point is, that while we cannot stop all proliferation, a rigorous export control regime can be effective in diffusing the spread of potentially threatening dual-use technology.

Mr. President, the problem is real. I believe it is a significant statement

when the Chairmen and now Ranking Members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, the Intelligence Committee, the Committee on Governmental Affairs and the Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism and Government Information, have serious issues with the protections this legislation provides our national security. I am deeply disappointed that the new administration was not able to support reasonable amendments which would address the national security equities which we have highlighted. I am concerned that the interests of the high tech business community have replaced reasonable consideration of our dual use export control regime.

Technologies which are exported today can and will have to be dealt with by this Nation's national security apparatus. Consequently, I urge my colleagues to support the amendments of Senators THOMPSON, KYL, HELMS, and others, which will strengthen S. 149 with respect to national security. They are only a handful of the changes which should be made to this bill but they will serve to give the Defense Department and the State Department a more level playing field in the export control process from which to protect national security.

There is a proper balance between promoting business and preserving the national security. This bill does not strike that balance. As a conferee, I am hopeful that in conference, I can work with the members of the House, especially Chairman HYDE and continue these efforts to tilt the balance in favor of national security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD entitled ''Report to Congress on the Acquisition of Technology Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction and Advanced Conventional Munitions, 1 January through 30 June 2000.''

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

UNCLASSIFIED REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE ACQUISITION OF TECHNOLOGY RELATING TO WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND ADVANCED CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS, 1 JANUARY THROUGH 30 JUNE 2000

The Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) hereby submits this report in response to a Congressionally directed action in Section 721 of the FY 97 Intelligence Authorization Act, which requires:

''(a) Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter, the Director of Central Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report on

(1) the acquisition by foreign countries during the preceding 6 months of dual-use and other technology useful for the development or production of weapons of mass destruction (including nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, and biological weapons) and advanced conventional munitions; and

(2) trends in the acquisition of such technology by such countries.''

At the DCI's request, the DCI Nonproliferation Center (NPC) drafted this report and coordinated it throughout the Intelligence Community. As directed by Section 721, subsection (b) of the Act, it is unclassified. As such, the report does not present the details of the Intelligence Community's assessments of weapons of mass destruction and advanced conventional munitions programs that are available in other classified reports and briefings for the Congress.

ACQUISITION BY COUNTRY

As required by Section 721 of the FY 97 Intelligence Authorization Act, the following are summaries by country of acquisition activities (solicitations, negotiations, contracts, and deliveries) related to weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and advanced conventional weapons (ACW) that occurred from 1 January through 30 June 2000. We excluded countries that already have substantial WMD programs, such as China and Russia, as well as countries that demonstrated little WMD acquisition activity of concern.

Iran

Iran remains one of the most active countries seeking to acquire WMD and ACW technology from abroad. In doing so, Tehran is attempting to develop an indigenous capability to produce various types of weapons—chemical, biological, and nuclear—and their delivery systems. During the reporting period, the evidence indicates reflections of determined Iranian efforts to acquire WMD- and ACW-related equipment, materials, and technology focused primarily on entities in Russia, China, North Korea, and Western Europe.

Iran, a Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) party, already has manufactured and stockpiled several thousand tons of chemical weapons, including blister, blood, and choking agents, and the bombs and artillery shells for delivering them. During the first half of 2000, Tehran continued to seek production technology, training, expertise, equipment, and chemicals that could be used as precursor agents in its chemical warfare (CW) program from entities in Russia and China.

Tehran expanded its efforts to seek considerable dual-use biotechnical materials, equipment, and expertise from abroad—primarily from entities in Russia and Western Europe—ostensibly for civilian uses. We judge that this equipment and know-how could be applied to Iran's biological warfare (BW) program. Iran probably began its offensive BW program during the Iran-Iraq war, and it may have some limited capability for BW deployment. Outside assistance is both important and difficult to prevent, given the dual-use nature of the materials, the equipment being sought, and the many legitimate end uses for these items.

Iran sought nuclear-related equipment, material, and technical expertise from a variety of sources, especially in Russia. Work continues on the construction of a 1,000-megawatt nuclear power reactor at Bushehr that will be subject to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. In addition, Russian entities continued to interact with Iranian research centers on various activities. These projects will help Iran augment its nuclear technology infrastructure, which in turn would be useful in supporting nuclear weapons research and development. The expertise and technology gained, along with the commercial channels and contacts established—even from cooperation that appears strictly civilian in nature—could be used to advance Iran's nuclear weapons research and development program.

Beginning in January 1998, the Russian Government took a number of steps to increase its oversight of entities involved in dealings with Iran and other states of proliferation concern. In 1999, it pushed a new export control law through the Duma. Russian firms, however, faced economic pressures to circumvent these controls and did so in some cases. The Russian Government, moreover, failed to enforce its export controls in some cases regarding Iran.

China pledged in October 1997 not to engage in any new nuclear cooperation with Iran but said it would complete cooperation on two nuclear projects: a small research reactor and a zirconium production facility at Esfahan that Iran will use to produce cladding for reactor fuel. As a party to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), Iran is required to apply IAEA safeguards to nuclear fuel, but safeguards are not required for the zirconium plant or its products.

Iran claims that it is attempting to establish fuel-cycle capabilities to support its civilian energy program. In that guise, it seeks to obtain turnkey facilities, such as a uranium conversion facility that, in fact, could be used in any number of ways to support fissile material production needed for a nuclear weapon. We suspect that Tehran most likely is interested in acquiring foreign fissile material and technology for weapons development as part of its overall nuclear weapons program.

During the first half of 2000, entities in Russia, North Korea, and China continued to supply the largest amount of ballistic missile—related goods, technology, and expertise to Iran. Tehran is using this assistance to support current production programs and to achieve its goal of becoming self-sufficient in the production of ballistic missiles. Iran already is producing Scud short-range ballistic missiles (SRBMs) and has built and publicly displayed prototypes for the Shahab–3 medium-range ballistic missile (MRBM). In addition, Iran's Defense Minister in 1999 publicly acknowledged the development of a Shahab–4, originally calling it a more capable ballistic missile than the Shahab–3 but later categorizing it as solely a space launch vehicle with no military applications. Iran's Defense Minister also has publicly mentioned a ''Shahab 5,'' although he said that development had not yet begun. Such statements, made against the backdrop of sustained cooperation with Russian, North Korean, and Chinese entities, strongly suggest that Tehran intends to develop a longer range ballistic missile capability.

Iran continues to acquire conventional weapons and production technologies from Russia and China. During the first half of 2000, Iran received five Mi–171 utility helicopters from Russia under a 1999 contract, and it began licensed production of Russian Konkurs (AT–5) antitank guided missiles. Iran also claims to be producing a new manportable surface-to-air missile knows as Misagh–1, which resembles China's QW–1 MANPAD system. Tehran also has been able to keep operational at least part of its existing fleet of Western-origin aircraft and helicopters supplied before the 1979 Iranian Revolution and continues to develop limited capabilities to produce armor, artillery, tactical missiles, munitions, and aircraft with foreign assistance.

Iraq

Since Operation Desert Fox in December 1998, Baghdad has refused to allow United Nations' inspectors into Iraq as required by Security Council Resolution 687. In spite of ongoing UN efforts to establish a follow-on

inspection regime comprising the UN Monitoring, Verification, and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) and the IAEA's Iraq Action Team, no UN inspections occurred during this reporting period. Moreover, the automated video monitoring system installed by the UN at known and suspect WMD facilities in Iraq is no longer operating. Having lost this on-the-ground access, it is more difficult for the UN or the US to accurately assess the current state of Iraq's WMD programs.

We do not have any direct evidence that Iraq has used the period since Desert Fox to reconstitute its WMD programs, although given its past behavior, this type of activity must be regarded as likely. We assess that since the suspension of UN inspections in December of 1998, Baghdad has had the capability to reinitiate both its CW and BW programs within a few weeks to months. Without an inspection monitoring program, however, it is more difficult to determine if Iraq has done so.

Since the Gulf war, Iraq has rebuilt key portions of its chemical production infrastructure for industrial and commercial use, as well as its missile production facilities. It has attempted to purchase numerous dual-use items for, or under the guise of, legitimate civilian use. This equipment—in principle subject to UN scrutiny—also could be diverted for WMD purposes. Since the suspension of UN inspections in December 1998, the risk of diversion has increased. Following Desert Fox, Baghdad again instituted a reconstruction effort on those facilities destroyed by the US bombing, including several critical missile production complexes and former dual-use CW production facilities. In addition, Iraq appears to be installing or repairing dual-use equipment at CW-related facilities. Some of these facilities could be converted fairly quickly for production of CW agents.

UNSCOM reported to the Security Council in December 1998 that Iraq also continued to withhold information related to its CW program. For example, Baghdad seized from UNSCOM inspectors an Air Force document discovered by UNSCOM that indicated that Iraq had not consumed as many CW munitions during the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980s as had been declared by Baghdad. This discrepancy indicates that Iraq may have hidden an additional 6,000 CW munitions.

In 1995, Iraq admitted to having an offensive BW program and submitted the first in a series of Full, Final, and Complete Disclosures (FFCDs) that were supposed to reveal the full scope of its BW program. According to UNSCOM, these disclosures are incomplete and filled with inaccuracies. Since the full scope and nature of Iraq's BW program was not verified, UNSCOM assessed that Iraq continues to maintain a knowledge base and industrial infrastructure that could be used to produce quickly a large amount of BW agents at any time, if needed.

Iraq has continued working on its L–29 unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) program, which involves concerting L–29 jet trainer aircraft originally acquired from Eastern Europe. It is believed that Iraq may have been conducting flights of the L–29, possibly to test system improvements or to train new pilots. These refurbished trainer aircraft are believed to have been modified for delivery of chemical or, more likely, biological warfare agents.

We believe that Iraq has probably continued low-level theoretical R&D associated with its nuclear program. A sufficient source of fissile material remains Iraq's most significant obstacle to being able to produce a nuclear weapon.

Iraq continues to pursue development of SRBM systems that are not prohibited by the United Nations and may be expanding to longer range systems. Authorized pursuit of UN-permitted missiles continues to allow Baghdad to develop technological improvements and infrastructure that could be applied to a longer-range missile program. We believe that development of the liquid propellant Al-Samoud SRBM probably is maturing and that a low-level operational capability could be achieved in the near team. The solid-propellant missile development program may now be receiving a higher priority, and development of the Ababil-100 SRBM and possibly longer range systems may be moving ahead rapidly. If economic sanctions against Iraq were lifted, Baghdad probably would increase its attempts to acquire missile-related items from foreign sources, regardless of any future UN monitoring and continuing restrictions on long-range ballistic missile programs. Iraq probably retains a small, covert force of Scud-type missiles.

North Korea

P'yongyang continues to acquire raw materials from out-of-country entitles needed for its WMD and ballistic missile programs. During this time fame, North Korea continued procurement of raw materials and components for its ballistic missile programs from various foreign sources, especially through firms in China. We assess the North Korea is capable of producing and delivering via munitions a wide variety of chemical and biological agents.

During the first half of 2000, P'yongyang sought to procure technology worldwide that could have applications in its nuclear program, but we do not know of any procurement directly linked to the nuclear weapons program. We assess that North Korea has produced enough plutonium for at least one, and possibly two, nuclear weapons. The United States and North Korea are nearing completion on the joint project of canning spent fuel from the Yongbyon complex for long-term storage and ultimate shipment out of the North in accordance with the 1994 Agreed Framework. That reacher fuel contains enough plutonium for several more weapons.

North Korea continues to seek conventional arms. It signed a contract with Russia during this reporting period.

Libya

Libya has continued its efforts to obtain ballistic missile-related equipment, materials, technology, and expertise from foreign sources. Outside assistance is critical to its ballistic missile development programs, and the suspension of UN sanctions last year has allowed Tripoli to expand its procurement effort. Libya's current capability remains limited to its aging Scud B missiles, but with continued foreign assistance it may achieve an MRBM capability—a long-desired goal.

Libya remains heavily dependent on foreign suppliers for precursor chemicals and other key CW-related equipment. Following the suspension of UN sanctions in April 1999, Tripoli reestablished contacts with sources of expertise, parts, and precursor chemicals abroad, primarily with Western Europe. Libya still appears to have a goal of establishing an offensive CW capability and an indigenous production capability for weapons. Evidence suggests Libya also is seeking to acquire the capability to develop and produce BW agents.

Libya continues to develop its nascent nuclear research and development program but still requires significant foreign assistance to advance to a nuclear weapons option. The suspension of sanctions has accelerated the pace of procurement efforts in Libya's drive to rejuvenate its ostensibly civilian nuclear program. In early 2000, for example, Tripoli and Moscow renewed talks on cooperation at the Tajura Nuclear Research Center and discussed a potential power reactor deal. Should such civil-sector work come to fruition, Libya could gain opportunities to conduct weapons-related R&D.

Following the suspension of UN sanctions, Libya has negotiated deals—reported to be worth up to $100 million, according to Russian press—with Russian firms for conventional weapons, munitions, and upgrades and refurbishment for its existing inventory of Soviet-era weapons.

Syria

Syria sought CW-related precursors and expertise from foreign sources during the reporting period. Damascus already has a stockpile of the nerve agent sarin, and it would appear that Syria is trying to develop more toxic and persistent nerve agents. Syria remains dependent on foreign sources for key elements of its CW program, including precursor chemicals and key production equipment. It is highly probable that Syria also is developing an offensive BW capability.

We will continue to monitor the potential for Syria's embryonic nuclear research and development program to expand.

During the first half of 2000, Damascus continued work on establishing a solid-propellant rocket motor development and production capability with help from outside countries. Foreign equipment and assistance to its liquid-propellant missile program, primarily from North Korean entities, but also from firms in Russia, have been and will continue to be essential for Syria's effort. Damascus also continued its efforts to assemble—probably with considerable North Korean assistance—liquid fueled Scud C missiles.

Syria continues to acquire ACW—mainly from Russia and other FSU suppliers—although at a reduced level from the early 1990s. During the past few years, Syria has received Kornet-E (AT–14), Metis-M (AT–13), Konkurs (AT–5), and Bastion-M (AT–10B) antitank guided missiles, RPG–29 rocket launchers, and small arms, according to Russian press reports. Damascus has expressed interest in acquiring Russian Su–27 and MiG–29 fighters and air defense systems, but its outstanding debt to Moscow and inability to fund large purchases have hampered negotiations, according to press reports.

Sudan

During the reporting period, Sudan sought to acquire a variety of military equipment from various sources. Khartoum is seeking older, less expensive weapons that nonetheless are advanced compared with the capabilities of the weapons possessed by its opponents and their supporters in neighboring countries in the long-running civil war.

In the WMD arena, Sudan has been developing the capability to produce chemical weapons for many years. In this pursuit, it has obtained help from entities in other countries, principally Iraq. Given its history in developing chemical weapons and its close relationship with Iraq, Sudan may be interested in a BW program as well.

India

India continues its nuclear weapons development program, for which its underground nuclear tests in May 1998 were a significant

milestone. The acquisition of foreign equipment could benefit New Delhi in its efforts to develop and produce more sophisticated nuclear weapons. India obtained some foreign assistance for its civilian nuclear power program during the first half of 2000, primarily from Russia.

India continues to rely on foreign assistance for key missile and dual-use technologies, where it still lacks engineering or production expertise in ballistic missile development. Entities in Russia and Western Europe remained the primary conduits of missile-related technology transfers during the first half of 2000. New Delhi Flight-tested three short-range ballistic missiles between January and June 2000—the Prithvi–II in February and June, and the Dhanush in April.

India continues an across-the-board modernization of its armed forces through ACW, mostly from Russia, although many of its key programs have been plagued by delays. During the reporting period, New Delhi continued negotiations with Moscow for 310 T–90S main battle tanks Su–30 fighter aircraft production, A–50 Airborne Early Warning and Control (AWACS) aircraft, Tu–22M Backfire maritime strike bombers, and an aircraft carrier, according to press reports. India also continues to explore options for leasing or purchasing several AWACS systems from other entities. India has also received its first delivery of Russian Krasnopol laser-guided artillery rounds to be used in its Swedish-build FH–77 155-mm howitzers, negotiated the purchase of unmanned aerial vehicles form Israel, and considered offers for jet trainer aircraft from France and the United Kingdom.

Pakistan

Chinese entities continued to provide significant assistance to Pakistan's ballistic missile program during the first half of 2000. With Chinese assistance, Pakistan is rapidly moving toward serial production of solid-propellant SRBMs. Pakistan's development of the two-state Shaheen-II MRBM also requires continued Chinese assistance. The impact of North Korea's assistance throughout the reporting period is less clear.

Pakistan continued to acquire nuclear-related and dual-use equipment and materials from various sources—principally in Western Europe. Islamabad has a well-developed nuclear weapons program, as evidence by its first nuclear weapons tests in late May 1998. Acquisition of nuclear-related goods form foreign sources will remain important if Pakistan chooses to develop more advanced nuclear weapons. China, which has provided extensive support in the past to Islamabad's nuclear weapons and ballistic missile programs, in May 1996 pledged that it would not provide assistance to unsafeguarded nuclear facilities in any state, including Pakistan. We cannot rule out, however, some continued contacts between Chinese entities and entities involved in Pakistan's nuclear weapons development.

Pakistan continues to rely on China and France for its ACW requirements. Pakistan received eight upgraded Mirage III/V fighters from France and continued negotiations to purchase an additional 50 F–7 fighters from China.

Egypt

Egypt continues its effort to develop and produce ballistic missiles with the assistance of North Korea. This activity is part of a long-running program of ballistic missile cooperation between these two countries.

KEY SUPPLIERS

Russia

Despite overall improvements in Russia's economy, the state-run defense and nuclear industries remain strapped for funds, even as Moscow looks to them for badly needed foreign exchange through exports. We remain very concerned about the nonproliferation implications of such sales in several areas. Monitoring Russian proliferation behavior, therefore, will remain a very high priority.

Russian entities during the reporting period continued to supply a variety of ballistic missile-related goods and technical know-how to countries such as Iran, India, China, and Libya. Iran's earlier success in gaining technology and materials from Russian entities accelerated Iranian development of the Shahab–3 MRBM, which was first flight-tested in July 1998. Russian entities during the first six months of 2000 have provided substantial missile-related technology, training, and expertise to Iran that almost certainly will continue to accelerate Iranian efforts to develop new ballistic missile systems.

Russia also remained a key supplier for civilian nuclear programs in Iran, primarily focused on the Bushehr Nuclear Power Plant project. With respect to Iran's nuclear infrastructure, Russian assistance enhances Iran's ability to support a nuclear weapons development effort. By its very nature, even the transfer of civilian technology may be of use in Iran's nuclear weapons program. We remain concerned that Tehran is seeking more than a buildup of its civilian infrastructure, and the Intelligence Community will be closely monitoring the relationship with Moscow for any direct assistance in support of a military program.

In January, Russia's cabinet approved a draft cooperative program with Syria that included civil use of nuclear power. Broader access to Russian scientists could provide opportunities to solicit fissile material production expertise if Syria decided to pursue a nuclear weapons option. In addition, Russia supplied India with material for its civilian nuclear program during this reporting period. President Putin in May amended the presidential decree on nuclear exports to allow the export in exceptional cases of nuclear materials, technology, and equipment to countries that do not have full-scope IAEA safeguards, according to press reports. The move could clear the way for expanding nuclear exports to certain countries that do not have full-scope safeguards, such as India.

During the first half of 2000, Russian entities remained a significant source of dual-use biotechnology, chemicals, production technology, and equipment for Iran. Russia's biological and chemical expertise make it an attractive target for Iranians seeking technical information and training on BW- and CW-agent production processes.

Russia continues to be a major supplier of conventional arms. It is the primary source of ACW for China and India, it continues to supply ACW to Iran and Syria, and it has negotiated new contracts with Libya and North Korea, according to press reports.

The Russian Government's commitment, willingness, and ability to curb proliferation-related transfers remain uncertain. The export control bureaucracy was reorganized again as part of President Putin's broader government reorganization in May. The Federal Service for Currency and Export Controls (VEK) was abolished and its functions assumed by a new department in the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade. VEK had been tasked with drafting the implementing decrees for Russia's July 1999 export control law; the status of these decrees is not known. Export enforcement continues to need improvement. In February 2000, Sergey Ivanov, Secretary of Russia's Security Council, said that during 1998–99 the government had obtained convictions for unauthorized technology transfers in only three cases. The Russian press has reported on cases where advanced equipment is simply described as something else in the export documentation and is exported. Enterprises sometimes falsely declare goods just to avoid government taxes.

North Korea

Throughout the first half of 2000, North Korea continued to export significant ballistic missile—related equipment and missile components, materials, and technical expertise to countries in the Middle East, South Asia, and North Africa. P'yongyang attaches a high priority to the development and sale of ballistic missiles, equipment, and related technology. Exports of ballistic missiles and related technology are one of the North's major sources of hard currency, which fuel continued missile development and production.

China

During this reporting period, the Chinese have continued to take a very narrow interpretation of their bilateral nonproliferation commitments with the United States. In the case of missile-related transfers, Beijing has repeatedly pledged not to sell Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) Category I systems but has not recognized the regime's key technology annex. China is not a member of the MTCR.

Chinese missile-related technical assistance to Pakistan continued to be substantial during this reporting period. With Chinese assistance, Pakistan is rapidly moving toward serial production of solid-propellant SRBMs. Pakistan's development of the two-stage Shaheen–II MRBM also requires continued Chinese assistance. In addition, firms in China provided missile-related items, raw materials, and/or assistance to several other countries of proliferation concern—such as Iran, North Korea, and Libya.

Chinese entities have provided extensive support in the past to Pakistan's safeguarded and unsafeguarded nuclear programs. In May 1996, Beijing pledged that it would not provide assistance to unsafeguarded nuclear facilities. We cannot rule out some continued contacts between Chinese entities and entities associated with Pakistan's nuclear weapons program. China's involvement with Pakistan will continue to be monitored closely.

With regard to Iran, China confirmed that work associated with two remaining nuclear projects—a small research reactor and a zirconium production facility—would continue until the projects were completed. The intelligence Community will continue to monitor carefully Chinese nuclear cooperation with Iran.

Prior to the reporting period, Chinese firms had supplied CW-related production equipment and technology to Iran. The US sanctions imposed in May 1997 on seven Chinese entities for knowingly and materially contributing to Iran's CW program remain in effect. Evidence during the current reporting period shows Iran continues to seek such assistance from Chinese entities, but it is unclear to what extent these efforts have succeeded. In June 1998, China announced that it had expanded its CWC-based chemical export controls to include 10 of the 20 Australia

Group chemicals not listed on the CWC schedules.

Western Countries

As was the case in 1998 and 1999, entities in Western countries in 2000 were not as important as sources for WMD-related goods and materials as in past years. However, Iran and Libya continue to recruit entities in Western Europe to provide needed acquisitions for their WMD programs. Increasingly rigorous and effective export controls and cooperation among supplier countries have led the other foreign WMD programs to look elsewhere for many controlled dual-use goods. Machine tools, spare parts for dual-use equipment, and widely available materials, scientific equipment, and specialty metals were the most common items sought. In addition, several Western countries announced their willingness to negotiate ACW sales to Libya.

TRENDS

As in previous reports, countries determined to maintain WMD and missile programs over the long term have been placing significant emphasis on insulating their programs against interdiction and disruption, as well as trying to reduce their dependence on imports by developing indigenous production capabilities. Although these capabilities may not always be a good substitute for foreign imports—particularly for more advanced technologies—in many cases they may prove to be adequate. In addition, as their domestic capabilities grow, traditional recipients of WMD and missile technology could emerge as new suppliers of technology and expertise. Many of these countries—such as India, Iran and Pakistan—do not adhere to the export restraints embodied in such supplier groups as the Nuclear Suppliers Group and the Missile Technology Control Regime.

Some countries of proliferation concern are continuing efforts to develop indigenous designs for advanced conventional weapons and expand production capabilities, although most of these programs usually rely heavily on foreign technical assistance. Many of these countries—unable to obtain newer or more advanced arms—are pursuing upgrade programs for existing inventories.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now be in a period for morning business.

The Senator from Tennessee.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, before my colleague from Texas leaves the Chamber, I want to congratulate him on what I consider to be another major achievement of his career. He can add this legislation to the long list of legislation he has either been primarily responsible for or substantially responsible for. While we have disagreements on the legislation, this is something I have seen him work tirelessly on for at least a couple of years now, and certainly Senator ENZI carried a large share of the work, as Senator GRAMM said.

This is another one of those instances where Senator GRAMM took an issue like a dog taking to a bone and did not turn it loose until he got it done. I must say it is another impressive performance, and I want to congratulate my good friend for adding another important legislative victory to his long legacy.

I want to discuss the legislation for a minute in response to my good friend. We talked of two goals. This bill has been put to bed now, as it were. We are going to be voting on it shortly. We have made some modest improvement to it. The Senators opposite are correct in saying we have been talking about this a long time.

I do not know whether we can take credit for 59 changes or not. They say 59 changes have been made, but I guess we can take credit for some changes that have been made along the way to improve the bill.

We still have problems with the basic concept, and right before we go off into this good night, we need to lodge at least one summary statement with regard to the nature of our concern and where we hopefully will go from here.

The nature of our concern simply is this: It is a more dangerous world out there than ever before, and we have to be more careful than ever we do not export dangerous items to dangerous people that will turn around and hurt this country. The risk of that is greater than ever before.

We do not have two equal goals of trade and commerce on the one hand and national security on the other. The interest of national security dwarfs the interest of trade and commerce, although they are discussed in this Chamber somehow in equipoise. That is not the case. It should not be the case. It is not even set out that way in the bill if one looks to the purposes of the bill. The purposes of the bill are to protect this country. That is why we have an export law, not to facilitate business.

A great majority of the time I am with my business friends, but when it comes to national security I must depart with those who would weigh too heavily the interests of trade. I suggest those who are interested in trade get about giving the President fast track, giving the President trade promotion authority. That will do more for trade and industry and to help the economy of this Nation than exporting dual-use high tech items to China and Russia that may find their way to Iran and Iraq. So that is what we ought to be doing if we are concerned about trade in this country. So those two goals are not equal.

We need to understand what we are doing once again on these issues. Call it a balance, if you will. No matter how you weigh the factors involved, we are giving the Secretary of Commerce and those within the department responsibility for national security. The Secretary, who I have the greatest confidence in—and I think he is a great man doing a great job—should not have the responsibility for national security. That is not supposed to be his job.

We are once again giving the Commerce Department, which we greatly criticized during the Clinton administration for some of their laxness, the life or death decisionmaking power in terms of these regulations or policies, in many important instances—not all instances, not always unilaterally, but many of them in some very important areas. We are deregulating entire categories of exports.

Foreign availability has always been something we considered in terms of whether or not we would export something or grant a license for something, and I think properly so. We do not want to foolishly try to control things not controllable. So foreign availability ought to be a consideration. We are moving light-years away from that, letting someone over at the Department of Commerce categorize entire areas of foreign availability that takes it totally out of the licensing process, so you do not have a license, and our Government cannot keep up with what is being exported to China or Russia. That is a major move. It is not a good move.

With regard to the enhanced penalties, what sanction is there to be imposed upon an exporter when he is not even required to have a license? It is saying: We will raise the penalty for your conduct, but we will make your conduct legal. That is not very effective in terms of export control, to say the least.

Finally, when I hear the proponents of this legislation say 99.6 percent of these exports are approved anyway, they are arguing against themselves. They use it to make the point this is kind of a foolish process anyway. So if the great majority of them are going to be approved, why even have the process? I assume that is the logical conclusion of their position.

My question is: What about the .4 percent that don't make it? Do we not have to look at the body of exports taking place in order to determine what that .4 is? Or if we didn't have a process, would that .4 be more like 3.4 if people knew there wasn't such a process? The .4 is the important thing to look at. Besides, if all the exports are being approved anyway, why is it so onerous to go through a process that will take a few days and get a clean bill of health so there is no question?

Therein lies the basis of our concern. It is a fundamental disagreement as to how far we should be going in this dangerous time. As the world is becoming

more dangerous, as technology proliferates, as we see those we are sending technology to using that technology for their military purposes, then passing it on to rogue nations, and we see our agencies and our committees—like the Cox committee—saying 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 continuing to work with the administration 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 respond 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 Senator 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. Indeed, holding the conference itself in South Africa was a tribute to the people 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 discrimination continue to affect hundreds 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 because 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 rhetoric. The United States and Israel have walked out of the conference. It appears 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 racism around the globe has instead destroyed itself because of old hatreds and the resurrection of discredited agendas. The insistence of Israel's enemies on using this conference to launch vile attacks on Israel, to attempt to equate Zionism with racism, has fully and completely justified the Bush administration's decision to withdraw from the conference.

I take the floor today because on a bipartisan basis I believe it should be clear this Senate supports the Bush administration'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 happening in Durban today is not new. The tragedy is the lesson has not been learned. In 1975, with the support of the so-called nonaligned nations, these regimes 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. bias against Israel and called for the normalization of Israel's status within the U.N. Indeed, normalization has been acquired.

For 40 years, Arab and Muslim nations 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 European and Others Group.

Despite the Secretary General's leadership in trying to improve U.N. resolutions regarding Israel, we are now forced to fight these old battles again, those seeking to defend not only anti-Israel but indeed anti-Semitism for their own political purposes. While the anti-Semitic rhetoric being shouted by demonstrators in the streets of Durban is alarming enough, it is more appalling to see 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 program of action 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 declaration, 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 dedicated to peace is now promoting language, 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 withdrawal 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 organization 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 action; it was a principled action. I fully endorse it.

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

While I support this decision, I believe there are larger problems involved that deserve our attention. The forces that compelled us to withdraw from the conference—anti-westernism, anti-Americanism—have come together in the U.N. before and may represent a growing challenge to our country. So the decision to withdraw because of anti-Semitism was proper. But it may not be the only justifiable reason. There are others.

Only a few months ago, in May of this year, we had another debacle involving 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 has not committed 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 have our Nation measured against the highest standard. But for the United States of America to be removed from the Human Rights Commission upon

the votes of an organization which includes Iraq, Libya, and Cuba is an outrage.

So while I take the floor today in light of the current acts designed against Israel, I do so in the context of the actions of the United Nations on a continuing basis with regard to many countries, including our own.

The United States has had a seat on the Human Rights Commission continuously since 1947. We have been a clear leader on the Commission, enforcing investigations of human rights abuses around the world. Indeed, U.N. High Commissioner Mary Robinson has said that the United States has made a ''historic contribution'' to the Commission. Indeed, I see no need to justify the actions of the United States with regard to human rights. Indeed, it is not because we don't defend human rights that we were removed from the Commission; it is because we do defend human rights that we were removed from the Commission. Had we not taken actions against Cuba, had we not spoken up against atrocities in North Korea and China, had we been silent about actions in Africa and Latin America, there is no doubt the United States would have remained on the Commission. We are victims because of what we have done right, not because of what we have done wrong.

I have no doubt that our standing up against anti-Semitism and in defense of Israel will now strengthen the case against the United States as an advocate of human rights. So be it. Let the nations of the world balance the actions of the United Nations and their own regimes against the historic role of the United States, considering our historic difficulties, and let history be the judge. Which institution, the U.S. Government or the United Nations itself, has been the more consistent and dependable defender of the weak and the vulnerable, with a principled stand for human rights? I will accept that judgment of history, and there is no need to wait for the result; it is clear. The U.S. Government has had no peer in defending the rights of peoples around the globe.

I take the floor as a partisan Democrat involved throughout my career in the fight for human rights and an active involvement in foreign policy to salute this administration. Secretary Powell did not go to Durban. He made the right decision. When the administration withdrew from the Durban conference, President Bush made the right decision. Durban is not our place. If we must fight the fight against racism, the fight against anti-Semitism, alone, without the United Nations, from the perch of Washington rather than the perch of the U.N. conferences in New York or regional conferences in Durban or Switzerland or anywhere else, we may fight alone but we fight in good company.

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 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 on the Senate floor at least a dozen times.

I see little point in repeating facts that the Commerce Department and independent observers on both sides of the border have long acknowledged. 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 Subsides, 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 changes 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 the underlying subsidies.

This arrangement broke down when Canada unilaterally—and without explanation—withdrew 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 export duty aimed at offseting 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 commission—made up of representatives of the forest industry from both countries, representatives of organized labor from both countries, and representatives of the environmental community form 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.

In addition to providing a fair and thorough evaluation of proposals for change, this group could be a watchdog against backsliding. And it could provide a forum to discuss cross-border cooperation on sustainable forestry practices, joint positions for international negotiations on trade and forestry issues, and joint approaches to problems, such as protection of endangered species.

I believe such non-binding oversight could ensure real progress toward a final and lasting solution to this difficult trade problem.

I have read in the Canadian press some statements that Canadian officials—or perhaps the U.S. lawyers that represent them—that Canada should pursue no such deal until after the issue is fully litigated before the World Trade Organization and perhaps the NAFTA.

But the central fallacy of this position is that the U.S. would negotiate after it has turned back challenges. And there is no reason to believe that Canada would succeed in such litigation. Despite the rhetoric of some, Canada's record in past complaints is mixed, and U.S. law and practice has been refined to avoid past problems. If challenged, I believe the U.S. actions on softwood lumber will survive international scrutiny.

Obviously, Canadian officials will choose whatever strategy they see fit, but such a litigate-at-all-costs strategy would result in the duty being in place for most of a year—at minimum.

The bottom line is this: Out-of-court settlements are struck when neither party is certain of the outcome of litigation; no one settles after they have won the final appeal.

If the U.S. duties survive Canadian challenges, I would then oppose any effort to settle the dispute along the lines I have laid out. If the U.S. is forced to litigate and succeeds, there will be no domestic support for a settlement, no export duty, and no compromise. A compromise is possible now, not later.

Again, I congratulate the Commerce Department—and particularly the hard work of Secretary Don Evans, Undersecretary Grant Aldonas, and Assistant Secretary Faryar Shirzad—for decisive action in this case.

Lumber mills and their workers in Montana and across the country have suffered because of Canadian lumber subsidies. I plan to work with the Commerce Department to ensure that the suffering is over so that efficient, environmentally sound U.S. mills can compete on a level playing field—one way or another.

EXHIBIT 1

CUTTING SUBSIDIES, OR SUBSIDIZED CUTTING?

Report Commissioned by BC Coalition for Sustainable Forestry Solutions, July 12, 2001.

Prepared by: Tom L. Green, M.A., Ecological Economist; Lisa Matthaus, MSc, Resource Economist, Sierra Club of BC

FOREWARD

(By Dr. Michael M'Gonigle)

Textiles, dairy products, newsmagazines, steel, airplanes, fish plants, forest products—throughout the world, subsidies exist for every industry imaginable. Talk of reducing these subsidies dominates for daily news with seemingly endless rounds of bilateral and multilateral trade talks. But despite the hype, and the rhetoric, the topic is rarely treated in the thoughtful manner it deserves.

There are, of course, many good reasons for government subsidies. In today's increasingly homogenized mass-market world, it makes sense to protect a nation's ballet and local newspapers. So too it is important to keep the rural base vital by maintaining support for family farms,and even encouraging new organic producers. Indeed, subsidies are most useful in helping fledging industries make inroads against the predatory behaviour of much larger, and often inefficient, older industries.

But subsidies are all too frequently destructive and unsustainable. Such subsidies can be the most difficult to undo because they are deeply embedded, hidden from view, and reward the most powerful interests in society.

As Tom Green and Lisa Matthaus demonstrate in this paper, such is the case with the BC forest industry. Here is an industry that from its inception to the present day is supported by a raft of subsidies. Once designed as a way to develop the province, many of these subsidies are today almost completely invisible, propping up an industry against all economic and social logic, and determining the potential for good public policy. This paper only addresses this situation in British Columbia, but many of their arguments apply to the industry worldwide.

The phrase ''perverse subsidies'' captures the situation admirably, perverse because government is spending money, or not collecting rents in a fashion that undermines economic as well as social (and environmental) interests. Take, for example, the hundreds of millions of dollars that have gone to prop up outdated mills in northern BC. These subsidies seemingly respond to the social need of keeping remote communities afloat. In fact, this money undercuts other, more efficient communities by artificially depressing their markets, while it robs even the host communities of the opportunity to direct that money, and the local industry, into creating new value-added industries that would foster more stable, longer-term, employment.

Many subsidies are not so high profile, however. Undoubtedly, the most pernicious subsidy exists in the lax environmental standards that have long existed in BC. This situation permits the industry as a whole to shift a vast array of costs out of its own production processes, and impose them instead on logged out salmon streams, disrupted caribou habitat, and clearcut coastal watersheds. In such cases, the fishing industry, First Nations, and tourism operators pay the costs of this industry.

The authors are self-described ''ecological economists.'' To many readers, this will be an unfamiliar phrase. But it signifies a new type of economic analysis, a critically important analysis if society is to weed out our landscape of perverse subsidies. As our common sense tells us, the human economic system is a subset of our natural ecological system. Creating a sustainable future means re-embedding our over-extended economy in the natural world.

That challenge is, as the authors makes clear, structural. The forest industry is underpinned by a land tenure system that blankets the province. These long-term tenures artificially depress prices (through lack of market competition) while they discriminate against innovative new entrants (through exclusion from access to timber). Indeed, this is the very sort of state-chartered, state-protected, and bloated industry that, 200 years ago, Adam Smith railed against in his classic text, The Wealth of Nations. Only by taking away their privileged position, Smith argued, could the natural abilities of the citizenry to innovate, and prosper, be set loose.

Smith's radical argument applies equally in British Columbia today. Indeed, in a thoughtful addition to the discussion of structural subsidies, the authors turn our attention to the failure to pay due regard to aboriginal entitlements to the resource base. As any economist will explain, market values reflect the existing distribution of wealth between sellers and buyers. In British Columbia today, a whole group of buyers (the forest industry) secures its products well below its potential costs because the seller (the provincial government) excludes another legitimate interest (First Nations) from the bargain. This situation dramatically skews the whole forest products market, drastically reducing the obligations of the corporate sector.

The authors have bravely raised the flag on a critical topic for the new Liberal government in British Columbia. This paper is only a beginning, however. Much work remains to be done to ferret out the true costs of an industry that has for too long gotten by without public scrutiny. Despite its avowed commitment to the ''magic of the marketplace'', the new government will quickly find that it is easier to continue with the status quo than to challenge it fully and transparently.

Forestry is a powerful industry in BC, its power coming from exactly those subsidies that must now be uncovered, re-examined and withdrawn. Remove the subsidies, and you transform the industry.

This is no small task. But the future health of the BC economy, and the sustainability of its endangered ecosystems, depends upon our doing it.

---

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Following his recent election victory, Premier Campbell has repeatedly asked British Colombians to hold him accountable to the Liberal Party election promises. For a party generally perceived as pro-business, one of the boldest promises was to eliminate corporate subsidies. The Liberals also committed to developing a ''leading edge forest industry that is globally recognized for its productivity and environmental stewardship.'' Together, these two commitments provide an opportunity for structural reform of the forest industry that could have far-reaching consequences for the future of British Columbia's environment and economy.

However, to fulfill its commitments, the new government must phase out the subsidies that have inhibited the logging industry from developing into an innovative, diverse and sustainable industry. The elimination of subsidies is necessary to create that ''leading edge forest industry'', because existing subsidies encourage economic inefficiency and the depletion of resources. Existing subsidies inhibit change, innovation and investment. They also hinder the development of value-added industry.

This report focuses on subsidies to the BC forest industry. Subsidies occur when public resources are available to private interests at less than their true cost. Resource industries are frequently heavily subsidized, often receiving ''perverse subsidies''—subsidies that hurt both the economy and the environment. As a result, subsidies to the logging industry deserve special attention in the BC government's drive to eliminate business subsidies.

The report examines five main categories of subsidies:

Stumpage: The fee charged by government to companies for harvesting trees from public land is called stumpage. This report concludes that flaws in the calculation methodology result in the BC government charging companies stumpage rates below market stumpage. The failure to ensure that the rules for calculating stumpage are equitably implemented and enforced provided a potential subsidy of about $350 million over a two and a half year period. Comparing BC's stumpage to competitively driven stumpage rates in similar timber regions in the US demonstrated total subsidies to the BC forest industry resulting from undervaluing of public timber at $2.8 billion for one year.

Bailouts and Handouts: Direct payment of cash to forest companies is the most readily understandable of forest industry subsidies. Although sometimes public investment may be justifiable to meet broader societal objectives, the $329 million bailout of the antiquated Skeena Cellulose mill is a textbook example of a perverse subsidy. Handouts are endemic in BC. The report documents ongoing efforts of the Job Protection Commissioner to find ways to reduce company costs through the use of public monies and through regulatory waivers.

Waiver of Environmental Protection. When government allows industry to operate without full compliance with environmental legislation, industry is able to transfer the cost of bad environmental practices onto the public, resulting in a substantial subsidy. In BC, neither provincial nor federal environmental rules related to forestry are being fully implemented or enforced, allowing companies to financially benefit from lack of regulatory compliance. It is estimated that this amounts to a subsidy of $950 million annually.

Non-recognition and Infringement of Aboriginal Title. First Nations traditional territories include virtually all of BC's commercial forests. Although Aboriginal Title is constitutionally protected right, logging activities—that would amount to infringements of Aboriginal Title—routinely occur in BC without consent of or meaningful consultation with affected First Nations. Compensation will ultimately be required for both the extraction of First Nations' resources and for restoration of traditional territories damaged by logging. This burden will fall on taxpayers, not the companies who have profited, resulting in a subsidy. In 1999 this subsidy is estimated at between $233 million and $1.163 billion.

Tenure, BC logging companies operate predominantly on public land and under government licenses, or tenures. Because of BC government consistently undervalues the stumpage rate, tenures have acquired a market value related to the ongoing stumpage subsidy. Furthermore, the BC government has allowed corporate interests to shut down mills in violation of obligations in tenure agreement yet retain secure supplies of timber, thus providing further corporate benefits.

While the BC Liberal Party has made the general promise to eliminate business subsidies, it has also other more specific promises that directly bear on the subsidies outlined above. These promises include:

Create a market-based stumpage system that reflects global market realities and local harvesting costs;

Cut the forestry regulatory burden by one third within three years;

Introduce a legislative framework for legally respecting Aboriginal Rights and Title and work to expedite interim measures agreement with First Nations;

Develop a working forest land base on public land and fully protect private property rights and resource tenure rights.

Depending on how these promises are implemented, they could help reduce subsidies, but they could also dramatically increase the subsidies to the BC forest industry.

The Liberals also made other specific election promises that speak to other potential subsidies to the forest industry, including:

Apply 1% of all direct forest revenues, not including ''super stumpage'' to global marketing of BC's forest practices and products;

Increase the Allowable Annual Cut over time through incentives to promote enhanced silviculture.

A high level of vigilance will therefore be required to ensure that subsidies to the BC forest industry do not persist or even increase under the Liberal watch.

The elimination of subsidies in any sector causes economic change and human displacement. As one researcher commented,

Obstacles to removing subsidies tend to be highly political. Opposition of vested interests, local businesses and segments of the workforce can be very powerful. Once payments are in place then a type of addiction follows, and there may be uncertainty and fear over the consequences of subsidy removal.

This report therefore recommends that subsidies to the BC logging industry be phased out gradually and carefully.

Taken as a whole, the federal and provincial government subsidies of the BC forest industry are considerable and counter-productive. The amount of subsidies coming from the provincial government alone (including those proposed by the Liberals) is between $3 billion and $6 billion each year. These subsidies represent a significant cost to the taxpayers of British Columbia, while encouraging over-exploitation of forest and hindering the development of a modern, competitive forest industry. British Columbians deserve better.

U.S.-JORDAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 643, which implements the agreement between the United States and Jordan establishing a Free Trade Area. The legislation passed the Finance Committee and is now on the Senate calendar.

Jordan has been one of the few Arab states to actively work with the United States to establish a real and lasting peace in the Middle East. The U.S.-Jordan FTA represents a solid trade agreement as well as a strong signal of support to a valued ally. Although Jordan is not currently a major trading partner of the United States, this agreement should open the door for increased trade and commerce between the U.S. and Jordan. More importantly, it is my sincere hope it will help to bring peace to the region through economic stability.

The principal feature of the U.S.-Jordan FTA is the mutual elimination of tariffs within 10 years. Modeled after the U.S.-Israel FTA, it also limits other non-tariff trade barriers and establishes a mechanism for the settlement of disputes. The agreement is also unique. Most notably, it specifically states that each country shall strive to maintain and enforce its respective labor and environmental laws.

I recognize that these particular provisions have sparked some debate. However, I see them as historic progress on a vexing issue. Not only have they established a reasonable standard that we should expect from any of our trading partners, they also have catapulted this Congress and this administration into a real dialogue toward defining a new international trade consensus. The Jordan agreement aside, I find it completely reasonable that we should expect our trading partners to maintain their labor and environmental standards. That's simply good business. To weaken such standards solely to gain a trade advantage would undermine a country's credibility—not to mention destabilize the very trade relationship the FTA was intended to benefit.

The U.S.-Jordan FTA has been negotiated and signed. The Bush Administration supports it and has no intention or renegotiating a new agreement. The Jordanian Parliament ratified the Agreement last May. Our colleagues in the House have already approved the implementing legislation for the agreement. Jordan's King Abdullah II visits the U.S. next week to urge passage of the agreement.

I hope his visit will encourage potential detractors to recognize the importance for swift action and agree not to stand in the way of immediate consideration of this vital legislation.

Simply put, this is a good trade agreement. The time is right for the Senate to take up and pass it without amendment.

MONTANA WILDFIRES

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the loss of life battling catastrophic wildlife is a tremendous tragedy that lends us perspective. With the loss of four fighters in less than one week in my home

State, the fire season in Montana again reminds us that we must be deeply grateful for the hard and dangerous work these firefighters do, work that takes them away from their homes and their families to protect the people of Montana and the West.

Let me honor the four firefighters who lost their lives battling fires in Montana.

On August 31, 2001, three men died in a helicopter crash near the Fridley Fire just south of Livingston, MT. The pilot was Rich Hernandez, 37, originally from Florida. His copilot, Santi Arovitx, only 28, was originally from Spain and had been living in Hillsboro, OR. Their crew chief was Kip Krigbaum, 45, of Emmett, ID.

On September 3, David Ray Rendek, just 24 years old, was killed when struck by a falling snag while working on a small fire in Bitterroot National Forest, near Hamilton, MT.

David graduated from high school in Victor, MT, and attended classes at the University of Montana, in Missoula with his sister. I have been told he was a passionate advocate about the outdoors and was a dedicated firefighter. I am very sorry his family and Montana have lost such a promising young man.

My deepest sympathies and condolences go out to the family and friends of these four men. We in Congress honor their memory and the ultimate sacrifice they made for the people of Montana. We are very sorry for their loss.

Unfortunately, the fires in Montana continue. Dedicated fire crews continue to battle hostile weather conditions and high winds.

Montana fires have consumed over 90,000 acres. The largest fires are the Fridley Fire near Livingston and the Moose Fire burning in and around Glacier National Park.

The Fridley Fire has burned over 26,800 acres, and it is approaching the Gallatin Divide, increasing the threat to the Bozeman water supply. Over 1,000 people are fighting this fire.

As of September 5, the Moose fire has burned more than 58,000 acres. There are 35 20-person crews currently battling the Moose Fire.

Fourteen are Montana crews and several crews come from Montana's Indiana Country—the Rosebud Sioux, Ronan, Blackfeet Nation and Northern Cheyenne. Air Support includes 9 helicopters and 3 air tankers. Other Montana crews include: Glacier Park, Bitterroot Hot Shot Crew, Trapper Creek Job Corps, Kootenai National Forest and Flathead National Forest.

The force of the Moose Fire is tremendous, as it burns on Forest Service, private, and Glacier National Park lands. People have reported to me they can smell the smoke as far away as Chester, another even suggested as far away as Minot.

For those listening who may not know those distances, Minot is in North Dakota, 700, 800 miles away.

All of our fire crews are working long days and long hours battling these blazes, and I just can't praise them enough. They have contained several fires and they are winning the struggle with the dangerous Fridley and Moose fires.

Also, our Indian country firefighters are again great heroes on our fire lines in northwest Montana. Although wildfires are devastating, our tribal neighbors continually step up to the plate and meet this challenge full on. I intend to work closely with the tribes to better incorporate them in the National Fire Policy planning process.

I also intend to continue to work hard for funding for fire rehabilitation efforts. Many people tend to forget that the devastating effects of wildfire remain long after the last flame has been put out.

The terrible mudslides that occurred after heavy rains in the Bitterroot National Forest in Montana in June are a sober reminder of that fact. These mudslides destroy property, soil cover, and can devastate watersheds. We must make sure that the appropriate Federal agencies have the resources they need to restore burned areas and to deal with the long-term effects of fire on the ground.

Again, I express my deepest gratitude to all of the men and women who put themselves in harm's way on the fire lines in Montana, and my deepest sorrow and regret that they lost four of their comrades in the line of duty.

I will continue to do everything I can to make sure our crews have the manpower and equipment they need on the ground. The quicker our firefighters can contain these fires, the sooner we can take their lives out of danger.

Mr. President, I appreciate your attention. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MEXICAN PROGRESS IN THE DRUG WAR

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I have come to this Chamber because I want to make a few comments of welcome to President Vicente Fox. I had the pleasure of speaking with him at Secretary Powell's lunch yesterday and listening to him in the House of Representatives in the joint session this morning.

Because I have been critical of Mexico's efforts to stop drug trafficking, their unwillingness to arrest cartel leaders, to vigorously prevent the laundering of drug money, their refusal to extradite a single Mexican national on drugs charges, and because of the widespread corruption within the ranks of Mexican law enforcement, I thought I should come to the Chamber today while President Fox is in our country to say recent reports I have had indicate there has been truly a dramatic change in Mexico.

I believe he is to be commended for that. It looks as if he is responsible for an entirely new attitude on the part of his country in the fight against drugs. I wish to take a few moments to commend him and to say how important this is to the United States and to the people of this country.

We all recognize that we have a demand problem in this country. In fact, there is even a growing demand problem in Mexico today as well. But, nevertheless, the flood of narcotics across the border represents a major problem for both our nations. It brings with it also collateral problems in the United States and in Mexico: violence, corruption, and even, as we have seen, the brutal torture and murder of literally hundreds of public officials, judges, prosecutors, journalists, and any who dare either to cross the cartels or stand in their way.

It is fair to say that these major consequences of the drug trade require that we solve the problem together. Simply put, the Fox administration has made more progress in the war against drugs over the last 6 months than the Government of Mexico made over the previous 9 years.

I would like to share some examples, some specifics, if you will, of the progress made by Mexico through the leadership of this brave new President.

Prior to the Fox administration, not one major Mexican national drug cartel member had ever been extradited to the United States on drug charges—not one, ever—despite a whole list of pending requests.

Since President Fox took office, however, this has changed dramatically. In fact, I had the privilege, at the Davos World Economic Summit, in January, to meet briefly with President Fox. At that time I handed to him directly a list of requested extraditions, prepared by our Drug Enforcement Administration. He said he would take action. I did not really believe him at the time, but he has.

After years of court battles, earlier this year the Mexican Supreme Court ruled that Mexican nationals could, indeed, be extradited to the United States.

Since January, 14 fugitives have been extradited to our country from Mexico. Four of these were Mexican nationals, and three of the four, for the first time, were Mexican nationals extradited on major drug charges. That may not sound like much, but I can assure you it is a big deal, because many of us who

have worked in this area for years believe extradition is a major deterrent to the cartel leadership.

The defendant in the Supreme Court case, Everardo Arturo Paez Martinez, is a key member of the Arellano Felix cartel. The United States has been requesting his extradition for years. He was extradited to the United States to stand trial. He is here today.

Miguel Angel Martinez-Martinez, an accused drug trafficker, was extradited and is awaiting trial in San Diego. Martinez is a principal figure in the Joaquin ''Chapo'' Guzman Organization. This Sinaloa-based cartel is believed responsible for smuggling tons of cocaine and other illicit narcotics into the United States over many years, and for trying to build a 1,400-foot tunnel from Tijuana to Otay Mesa in California.

Rafael Camarena Marcias has also been extradited to the United States. He was responsible for successfully building a tunnel between Agua Prieta, Senora, and Douglas, AZ, through which up to 2 tons of cocaine flowed every day.

Extradition has always been the most visible and effective sign of how seriously the Mexican Government is taking the fight against drug cartels. I am very proud to say thank you to President Fox and to the Government of Mexico for their cooperation in this regard.

It is not easy for Mexico to target these individuals and send them to the United States for trial. It is politically difficult, for many in Mexico do not believe that Mexican citizens should face trial in the United States, and it is difficult for personal safety reasons as well.

Let me give an example. The lawyer who represented Everardo Arturo Paez in opposing extradition for 3 years and who failed to prevent his extradition was found murdered. That is the reward for not succeeding with a cartel. I am told that others may well be in personal jeopardy as well.

President Fox's leadership has given the entire country new courage to stand against the cartels, their killers, and their traffickers.

In addition to extraditing those already under arrest, the Mexican Government has also made new arrests of certain leaders of Mexican cartels. Adan Amezcua, one of the three Amezcua brothers, was arrested in 1997, but he was freed by a corrupt judge who has since been fired from the bench. Amezcua was rearrested by Mexican officials this past May.

Why are they important? The Amezcua brothers are major methamphetamine traffickers. They are responsible single-handedly for the introduction of methamphetamine throughout this country. Indeed, the cartel and its nationals still run meth labs throughout the United States.

In cooperation, the Governor of Quintana Roo, Mario Villaneuva, who was arrested while he was still Governor, asked to serve out his term of Governor of Quintana Roo, and then he disappeared the day after he left office and has been gone. Well, he was arrested in May for major drug crimes in Cancun, and today he is in a maximum security prison in Mexico.

In February, the Government dismantled an entire cell of the Arellano Felix cartel, perhaps the most vicious cartel operating right out of Tijuana. They arrested 7 of its leaders. They seized 8 houses, 18 vehicles, 19 firearms, and communication devices.

Seizures of illegal drugs have been on the rise. Some of them are at an all-time high. In February, the Mexican Government seized 14 tons of marijuana in cookie boxes; in April, another 131 tons. In February, they seized 8.8 tons of cocaine aboard the fishing vessel Forever My Friend, and the 10 crew members have been transported to San Diego; in May, another 12 tons of cocaine aboard a vessel flying a Belize flag. Overall, this past year, 24 tons of cocaine have been seized from fishing vessels as a result of cooperation between Mexico and the United States.

The Mexican Government has also addressed the serious issue of internal corruption. The captain of the Mexican Army, Luis Rey Abundis Murga, was sentenced to 17 years in prison for assisting the Carillo Fuentes cartel. Retired general, Jorge Mariano Maldanado Vega was sentenced to 26 years for aiding the same organization. And Mario Silva Calderon, former agent of Mexico's national police, was sentenced to 36 years in prison for similar activity.

As Donnie Marshall, former head of the DEA, testified before the drug caucus earlier this year, no one country can possibly combat the wealth and sophistication of these major drug trafficking organizations. Only by cooperating and sharing locally gathered intelligence and assets can we hope to succeed.

That is why I am so encouraged by the progress being made by the Fox administration.

In the past I know that American law enforcement and even Mexican law enforcement felt that the other side could not be trusted. Now finally that is changing. A new 117-member Mexican organized crime unit, which works hand in hand with our DEA, has fostered new relationships and trust between the law enforcement agencies of our two nations. It is only with this type of cooperation that we can hope to defeat the drug cartels and stem the flow of illegal drugs onto the streets.

Before I yield the floor, I would like to address one request President Fox made earlier today regarding passage of S. 219, the Dodd certification legislation.

Let me be clear: I continue to support the certification process. We have nothing to replace it. I happen to believe it has some salutary value. Because President Fox has asked, I would be prepared to support a suspension of the certification process with regard to Mexico for the 3 years as requested by President Fox. I would do so because he asks and in the new spirit of cooperation between our two nations. I would be very pleased to work with my colleagues to pass such legislation immediately.

I am not, however, prepared to abandon the process entirely with respect to all countries, as S. 219 would do. There are many places in the world where progress has not been made. Syria, Iran, Burma, and Afghanistan are just a few examples of continuing major problem countries. Only a robust certification process gives Congress and the President the tools we need to encourage change in these nations.

I hope the Senator from Connecticut would work with me on a compromise that would address only Mexico so we can move forward on this issue.

In closing, I again welcome President Fox to the United States. We look forward to working with him in our continuing mutual fight against the drug cartels. I personally, deeply, say thank you and salute this brave and courageous new President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for her fine words. It was a superb speech President Fox gave today in joint session.

MAGDALENA MEDIO

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, sometimes one speaks in the Senate Chamber and is not sure what exactly the effect of it all is—maybe more than sometimes.

I am speaking today on behalf of a lot of the human rights workers and social service workers and community development workers, civil society people in Colombia. I am hoping—I will be very straightforward about it; I don't think this is illusion—that the words of a Senator on the floor of the Senate about a priest and about a very important organization, of which two members have been brutally murdered in the last 35, 40 days, communicates a message that our Government cares deeply about human rights in Colombia and about the importance of the Government and the military defending civil society individuals.

I rise today to speak out on behalf of many defenseless human rights workers, social service providers and community economic development workers, in our neighbor Colombia, who are besieged by the growing paramilitary

violence in their county. These individuals, some of whom I have come to know personally, all of whom I greatly respect, are heros for their contributions to democracy and peace in Colombia. They deserve to be heard and to be aided by the United States government.

I have traveled twice to the city of Barrancabermeja, sometimes called ''the Sarajevo of Colombia.'' During those visits, I have come to know the extraordinary and courageous work of a Colombian non-profit program based in a largely rural region of oil refineries, rivers, and mountains. In many hamlets and towns it provides the only hope amidst so much despair.

The Program of Development and Peace of the Magdalena Medio, located in Barranca, is lead by the Jesuit Father Francisco De Roux. The Program's name gives away their mission—sustainable, locally based social and economic development in the context of an inclusive community at peace. They stand for democracy, civil rights, and human rights. They are against the war, and have no enemies in the conflict.

They strive for an inclusive community where disputes are settled by civil authorities and not by armed gangs. They want to provide opportunity for all in their community to work and raise they families in peace and dignity. But paramilitaries are taking over their region and extrajudicial killings are a daily threat.

Recently, they have been beset by tragedy. Two defenseless staff members have been killed and multilated. Ms. Alma Rosa Jaramillo was a volunteer attorney, a dedicated mother and courageous member of her community. Her dismembered body was found in the community of Morales on July first of this year. On July 17, another brutal assassination took the life of Eduardo Estrada. He was murdered right in front of his family, after a family reunion. He was a respected leader in the community of San Pablo, working as the coordinator of the Program of Development and Peace.

Why are these innocent people, who are doing such good work, being targeted? Lamentably, these are just two more examples of paramilitary impunity in Colombia.

As the Plan Colombia debate has unfolded in the U.S. Senate, we have come to know the terrible reality of the last few decades for the people of Columbia—kidnaappings, assassinations, disappearances and terror by the guerrilla and the paramilitary organizations. I am no defender of the guerrilla organizations. They are vicious in their treatment of the civilian population and publicly renounce universally accepted human rights standards.

But the paramilitary organizations, because of their open association with the Colombian military, also must be held to the highest standards of human rights. They cannot be allowed to justify their human rights abuses by equating the laudable civic involvement of those they persecute, with sympathy for the guerrillas. The paramilitary organizations have penetrated ever deeper into Colombian civil society, bringing their terror to communities all across Colombia. In many cases, they do so with the acquiescense of the Colombian military and government, at the local and even national level.

The Colombian government must find a way to respond to the paramilitary threat. It is a threat to the rights of free speech, free assembly, and moreover, the rule of law in Colombia. We must send a message to all violent actors in Colombia, especially parammilitary groups: ''The targeting of the civilian population with murder, extortion, kidnapping, torture and multilation is unacceptable!''

The United States has an obligation to nurture and defennd civil society efforts in Columbia. The Program of Development and Peace of the Magdalena Medio is doing critically important work, helping Colombians find a way out of the labyrinth of war and terror. They need and deserve our thanks and our encouragement; for they represent the future of hope and peace for Colombia.

In my view, a peaceful, prosperous Colombia is a better neightor and partner of the United States. We must defend these courageous people who daily risk their lives for human rights, democracy and peace. Given our deep involvement in Colombia, we have an opportunity, and a duty, to defend Colombian civil society against the abuses of guerrillas and paramilitaries alike.

Mr. President, I traveled twice to the city of Barrancabermeja, sometimes called the ''Sarajevo of Colombia.'' During the visits, I have come to know a very courageous priest who is in charge of an organization, a nonprofit organization, that does the economic and social development work in a largely rural region of oil refineries, rivers, and mountains. For many hamlets and towns, this organization is the only hope for people.

The name of the organization is the Program of Development and Peace of the Magdalena Medio located in Barranca, led by a Jesuit priest named Francisco de Roux, also called Father Poncho. The program's name gives away its mission. The occupant of the Chair would love it as a businessperson and a Senator from New Jersey. They do the most credible local sustainable economic development work. They stand for democracy, civil rights, and human rights. They are against the war. They are not aligned with the FARC, ELN, or any of the left groups—the paramilitary—and they should have no enemies in this conflict.

This organization has been beset by tragedy. Two defenseless staff members have been killed and mutilated. Ms. Alma Rosa Jaramillo was a volunteer attorney, a dedicated mother and a courageous member of her community. Her dismembered body was found in the community of Morales on July 1 of this year. On July 17, another brutal murder took place. This assassination took the life of Eduardo Estrada. He was murdered right in front of his family after a family reunion. He was a respected leader of the community in San Pablo, working as the coordinator of the Program of Development and Peace headed up by Father Francisco de Roux.

Why are these innocent people, doing this economic development work—who have done such good work—why are they being targeted? Lamentably, these are just two more examples of paramilitary impunity in Colombia.

I intend for this statement not only to be made on the floor of the Senate, but I hope it is sent out throughout Colombia. As the Plan Colombia debate has unfolded in the Senate, we have come to know the terrible reality of the last few decades for the people of Colombia—kidnappings, assassinations, disappearances, and terror by the guerrilla and paramilitary organizations.

I am no defender of the guerrilla organizations. The FARC and ELN are involved in narcotrafficking up to their eyeballs. They have been vicious in their treatment of the civilian population. They publicly renounce universally accepted human rights standards. But the paramilitary organizations, the AUC, because of their open association, because of their extrajudicial killings and open association, especially at the brigade level with the Colombia military, must be held to the highest standard of human rights. They cannot be allowed to justify their human rights abuses by equating the laudable civic involvement of those they persecute with the sympathy for the guerrillas. The paramilitary organizations penetrated ever deeper into Colombian civil society and brought terror to many of the communities—in many cases, with the acquiescence of the military.

I rise as a U.S. Senator on the floor of the Senate to communicate a message to the Colombian Government that the paramilitary should not be allowed to murder civil society people, defenders of human rights, people doing good work, as the men and women in Father Francisco de Roux's organization do, with impunity. We must send a message to all the violent actors in Colombia, especially the paramilitary groups: The targeting of the civilian population with murder, extortion, kidnapping, torture, and mutilation is unacceptable. Our Government has an obligation to nurture and defend civil society efforts in Colombia. The Program of Development

and Peace of the Magdalena Medio is doing critically important work. They need and deserve our thanks and encouragement. They represent hope and peace for Colombia.

Before you came to the chair, Mr. President, I was saying this organization is doing the best, by all accounts, social and economic development work. This priest is beloved and highly respected. Two members of his organization have been brutally murdered in the last 40 days. Their plea, and the plea from many civil society people in Colombia, is: Please, U.S. Government, please U.S. Senate, call on the Government and the military and the police to defend us. That is what I am doing. That is supposed to be part of Plan Colombia.

We have a deep involvement in Colombia. Therefore, we have an opportunity and a duty to defend Colombian civil society against the abuses of the guerrillas and the paramilitaries alike. The message needs to be communicated to the military in Colombia that with the Blackhawk helicopters and the military assistance come human rights conditions you have to live up to. Otherwise, we are going to continue to see the murder of innocent people with impunity.

I want this statement to certainly be sent out to Colombia because I want the paramilitary forces and others to know we are paying attention to Father Francisco de Roux and his organization, the Program for Development and Peace, and their work, and that we mean to defend civil society people.

Again, I want to point out that the Colombian Government has an obligation to defend civil society people from the violence both from the guerrilla left and the paramilitary right. Up to date, they have not defended people from violence in Barranca, which I have visited twice now. The paramilitary cut the telephone wires, isolated the people. They have no phone service. They took away their cell phones and moved into their homes. They control the city. With the exception of the bishop and the priest and his organization, and a few others, hardly anybody can speak up any longer without the real risk that they will be murdered.

Francisco de Roux's organization, widely credited for this great economic development work, has had two members—a woman and a man—dismembered, brutally murdered. It is time for our Government to make clear to the Colombian Government and police and military that they have to defend these civil society people.

UNIONS UNDER SIEGE IN COLOMBIA

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to also address the disturbing level of violence perpetrated against Colombia's union leaders.

As another Labor Day passes, I could not in good conscience neglect to mention the plight of our brothers and sisters in the Colombian labor movement. There has been a dramatic escalation in violations against them and the response by the Colombian authorities in the face of this crisis has been negligible.

For the past 15 years, Colombia has been in the midst of an undeclared war on union leaders. Colombia has long been the most dangerous country in the world for union members, with nearly 4,000 murdered in that period. Today, three out of every five trade unionists killed in the world are Colombian.

Union members and activists are among the main targets of human rights violations—including murders, disappearances and threats—in the escalating conflict in Colombia. Paramilitary groups, who are linked with Colombian security forces, are responsible for most of these attacks, although guerrilla groups have also targeted activists.

The right-wing AUC has been especially brutal, killing hundreds simply because they view union organizers as subversives. One of the most recent killings occurred on June 21, when the leader of Sinaltrainal, the union that represents Colombian Coca-Cola workers, Oscar Dario Soto was gunned down. His murder brings to seven the number of unionists who worked for Coca-Cola and were targeted and killed by paramilitaries. Earlier this summer, the International Labor Rights Fund and the United Steelworkers of America brought a suit against the Coca-Cola company alleging that the Colombian managers had colluded with paramilitary security forces to murder, torture and silence trade union leaders.

According to a recent New York Times report by Juan Forero, the number of union workers at Coke plants in Colombia has dropped to 450 from 1,300 in 1993. Total Sinaltrainal membership has dropped to 2,400 from 5,800 five years ago.

Regardless of the outcome of this particular legal case, U.S. companies with subsidiaries in Colombia have an obligation to address the upsetting trend of violence against workers, particularly union representatives. It is clear that some companies regularly hire out paramilitary gunmen to intimidate and kill in order to break labor unions. Last year alone, at least 130 Colombian labor leaders were assassinated. Four times as many union workers have been killed this year as during the same time last year. That's more than 80 unionists killed since the beginning of this year.

Colombia, like the United States, guarantees workers a legal right to organize. However, when they do, they face grave threats. This is a serious violation of human rights, under Article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Colombian government must take an active role in protecting and ensuring that these rights are enjoyed by all its citizens.

Likewise, the Senate should bear in mind the deteriorating plight of union membership in Colombia before sending additional military aid to a government that can't—or won't—crack down on paramilitary forces.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask I be given an opportunity to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

BUDGET SURPLUS NUMBERS ARE NOT GOOD

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, while the Senate was in recess for the month of August, the Congressional Budget Office released its projections as to the size of the Nation's surplus. As we expected, the numbers were not good.

For fiscal year 2001, the CBO indicates the Federal Government will not only not have an on-budget surplus for the first time since 1999 but that Washington will actually dip into the Social Security surplus to the tune of $9 billion in order to cover spending.

The Office of Management and Budget says we will have a $1 billion surplus, but, in my view, that is effectively no surplus. So our financial situation this year is basically somewhere between a negligible surplus at best and a $9 billion deficit.

Some of my colleagues might look at the CBO midterm budget review and see the problem of on-budget deficits as a short-term phenomena since CBO projects a return to consistent on-budget surpluses after 2004.

This belief is misplaced. I remind my colleagues that CBO's forecast is based on the dubious assumption that spending in the outyears will increase only at the rate of inflation, which is roughly 2½ percent. To say that level of spending is unrealistic is an understatement, and anyone in this Chamber who honestly thinks Congress can keep spending at the level of inflation just does not live in the real world.

I remind my colleagues, around this time last year, Congress increased nondefense discretionary spending 14.3 percent and overall spending was increased by more than 8 percent over

fiscal year 2000. Had we not spent money like drunken sailors in the fiscal year 2001 budget, even with the economic turndown and the needed tax cut for the American people, Congress would not have invaded the Social Security this year. The problem is we just spend too much money. If we had increased overall spending in fiscal year 2001 by only 6 percent, we would have saved tens of billions of dollars and we would not be dipping into the Social Security surplus and we would not have a problem in the 2001 budget.

The concern now is, what will happen in fiscal year 2002? As it is, we are on track to increase 2002 discretionary spending by at least 6 percent over last year. The President originally talked about 4 percent, and we came out of the Senate with roughly a 5-percent increase. Based on the current demand for money in Washington and based on our past performance, spending in fiscal year 2002 will likely grow faster than that anticipated by CBO. That means next year we will not have an on-budget surplus and we are going to spend Social Security surplus funds to cover the growth in spending. That is where we are.

Alarm bells should be going off all over Capitol Hill because we are getting ready to do something Senators and Representatives from both parties have vowed not to do, and that is spend the Social Security surplus. I often say ''there is always some good that blows in an ill wind.'' In this case, the ''ill wind'' is Congress's potential use of the Social Security surplus. The ''good'' is the hope that it will force Congress to control spending, prioritize, and make hard choices—what the Presiding Officer and I had to do when we were Governors of our respective States. We had to prioritize, we had to make those tough choices and live within a budget limit.

We didn't do that in fiscal years 1999 and 2000 here in Washington. We had a combined on-budget surplus of $88 billion and Congress and the previous administration did not believe they had to make hard choices.

Well, things are different today, and now we must make the hard choices. The first thing we have to do is avoid spending the Social Security surplus. The second thing we have to do is not increase taxes. According to a national poll released by CBS news just yesterday, more than 70 percent of Americans opposed using the Social Security surplus to fund general government spending; 66 percent of Americans oppose using the Social Security surplus even in the event of a recession. Our constituents are making it pretty clear where they stand. They stand against spending the Social Security surplus.

Some of my colleagues and the media say we should spend the Social Security surplus to stimulate the economy. I say to that, ''hogwash,'' and so do the American people. For me, spending the Social Security surplus is black and white. It is simply wrong. The fact of the matter is there is a difference between income taxes and payroll taxes. Just ask the people who count, the hard-working men and women who pay those payroll taxes, if there is a difference. More people pay higher payroll taxes in this country today than they do income taxes. They expect that money will be used for their Social Security benefits and not for general government spending.

As my colleagues know, there are only two things we should legitimately spend the Social Security surplus on: Social Security benefits or paying down the debt. It is that simple. If we are not spending it on Social Security, we have a moral responsibility to use it to pay down the national debt.

One of the primary reasons I wanted to serve as a U.S. Senator was to have an opportunity to bring fiscal responsibility to our Nation and help eliminate the terrific debt we have accumulated. As my colleagues know, for years successive Congresses and Presidents have spent money on things that, while important, they were unwilling to pay for; or in the alternative, do without. In the process, Washington ran up a staggering debt and mortgaged this country's future, my children's future, and my grandchildren's future.

We have been reaping all the benefits and putting the future of our children and grandchildren in jeopardy. In other words, ''we buy now, you pay later.''

I cannot convey how wrong I think it is to saddle them with such an excessive financial burden, something this Congress should correct. Using the Social Security surplus to repay the publicly held national debt will make it easier for the Government to meet its obligation to pay Social Security benefits in the future. At this point, the vast majority of projected debt reductions—some 75 percent over the next 10 years—will be out of that Social Security surplus.

In testimony before the Senate Budget Committee last year, Dan Crippen, the CBO Director, stated ''most economists agree saving the surpluses and paying down the debt held by the public is probably the best thing we can do relative to the economy.''

It was true then and it is true today. If the Government has little or no publicly held debt when the baby boomers begin to retire, it will be more manageable for the Government to borrow money, the money that it will need to meet its obligations if Congress has not reformed Social Security by that time.

The baby boomers will retire. We will either take care of their situation by raising payroll taxes or raising income taxes or having to borrow the money. We ought to at least anticipate that.

Everyone knows that the lockbox we are talking about is nothing more than a slew of IOUs that must be repaid when the baby boomers start to retire. As I mentioned, either higher payroll taxes or higher income taxes or borrowing the money, those bills will be paid, one way or another.

Moreover, by reserving the Social Security surplus to help repay that $3.1 trillion publicly held debt, money currently invested in U.S. Treasury bonds will be released to be invested more productively in the private sector. More private investment means more capital formation and a more robust economy now and in the future, which is precisely what we need most to meet the demands of our retiring baby boomers. We have to have a growing economy. That is the most important thing we have.

Reserving the Social Security surplus to reduce the publicly held debt has the effect of reducing interest rates by reducing the overall demand for savings. In short, reserving the Social Security surplus to lower the debt sends a positive signal to Wall Street and Main Street that encourages more investment, which in turn fuels productivity and economic growth. It also lessens our cost of servicing interest on the Federal debt.

Currently, we pay 11 cents out of every dollar—I don't think a lot of people realize this—11 cents out of every dollar is used to pay the interest on our debt. Lower the debt and you lower the interest burdens, and that frees more money for other priorities.

It was not until 1999 that we got to a point where the Social Security surplus was no longer used to offset spending—being used for debt reduction instead—and members of each party in both the Senate and House swore they would not go back to using the Social Security surplus for spending. In addition, many of us who supported the President's tax reduction package did so because the President promised he would limit spending and he would use all of the Social Security surplus to pay down debt.

I refer to that as a three-legged stool: No. 1, it allows meaningful tax reductions; No. 2, it restrains the growth of spending; and No. 3, it reduces debt.

That was the promise and I expect the President to keep his promise. I know many of us who supported the tax reduction will keep our promise to limit spending, and we are not going to spend the Social Security surplus.

So far in the appropriations process we look like we are on track to maintain a semblance of fiscal discipline because we are basically sticking with the budget resolution. Those appearances are deceiving because we are holding off the toughest bills for last, instead of tackling them first. We all know the way things are going, we are likely to increase spending for defense and education far beyond the levels anticipated when the budget resolution

was passed. Like my colleagues, I support a strong national defense and funding for true educational responsibilities. However, I think we must offset increases in these programs by making reductions in other areas, understanding the President is not going to get everything he wants and Members of this body are not going to get everything they want.

Unfortunately, that is not what we are doing. I agree with President Bush that the responsible course of action for the Congress is to immediately move up the two biggest appropriations bills, Defense and Labor-HHS: Consider them first. We need to get everything on the table and reallocate resources in order to stay within the budget limits, just as I did when I was Mayor of Cleveland and Governor of the State of Ohio.

If we were in this kind of situation in a county, or in a city or at the State level, we would get everything on the table, we would look at all the things that need to be done, and say we have to reallocate these resources. But not in the U.S. Senate. Not in the U.S. Congress. We do these appropriations bills, No. 1 with blinders on, No. 2 with blinders on, No. 3 with blinders on—we go all the way to the end and just keep ratcheting it up a little bit until we get to the biggest ones at the end, and then we say: Holy smoke, we don't have the money; and then Katie bar the door. That is what has happened in the last 2 years I have been here.

I urge the President and urge the Senate leadership, let's get real. Let's look at what we are doing and understand we cannot do everything for everyone, and try to figure out how we can live within the limits we have set. We can do that. I think it would be the finest thing we could do for this country. It hasn't been done around here—I don't remember if it has ever been done since I have been watching government, and I have been watching it as a mayor and as a Governor for 20 years. I would like to see that happen.

The other thing I am going to try to do to guarantee we do not end up spending the Social Security surplus is offer two amendments in the near future, with colleagues from both sides of the aisle, that will force the Senate and House to make the necessary hard choices that will bring fiscal discipline to the Government and keep the Social Security surplus from being used.

My first amendment I will introduce will address Congress's perpetual irresponsible spending and budget gimmicks, gimmicks that Congress used in 1999 to avoid the appearance of using Social Security. There are a lot of them out there. We have to make sure we are honest with the public about what we are doing and not try to pull the wool over their eyes.

The second amendment I will be offering is an amendment to guarantee Social Security funds will not be spent and instead will be used to reduce debt. It is my hope, as we proceed through the appropriations process, these amendments will be given favorable consideration by my colleagues and not turned aside on a procedural vote. We ought to have an up-or-down vote on some of these issues that are really going to clarify the process and make what we do in the Senate more transparent. We owe the American people nothing less.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business.

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

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I will take this opportunity to speak for a few minutes on the work that is currently underway in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee on which the Presiding Officer serves with great distinction. We are making an effort in that committee to develop a comprehensive and balanced energy policy. I want to inform my colleagues about the likely steps we will be following in the near future.

As I see it, Congress has a real opportunity this fall to set an energy policy that will sustain our economic prosperity as we move into this new 21st century. The Senate has a key role to play in seeing this opportunity does not slip through our grasp.

A great deal has changed since 1992, which is the last time Congress enacted major energy legislation. We have seen energy markets become more competitive and more dynamic. But we have also seen some significant bumps along the way.

First of all, consumers are more vulnerable to the vagaries of the energy markets than they ever were before. I think the evidence we have of what happened in California with electricity prices is one example.

Second, gasoline supplies are increasingly subject to local crises and price spikes due to the proliferation of inflexible local fuel specifications.

Third, we rely more heavily each year on natural gas—natural gas to heat our homes and to produce electricity. But our system for producing and transporting that natural gas is showing signs that it is reaching its limits.

Fourth, the need to address the fundamental connection between energy and global warming is something that is becoming a major concern of many of us, and I think rightly so.

So I am pleased most of my colleagues in the Senate recognize these challenges. I believe there is a bipartisan consensus in favor of a sensible energy policy that will smooth out the bumps in the market by increasing energy efficiency, by boosting our energy supplies, by modernizing our energy infrastructure.

Technology and policy innovations will be key to achieving this balanced outcome so Americans can have reliable and affordable energy choices that are sustainable over the long term. Our energy problems cannot be effectively addressed by packaging up a collection of tired old wish lists and passing that through the Senate floor in a day or two. Energy consumers and producers, and several committees here in the Senate, will need to focus on new energy approaches if we are to protect our national economic prosperity and do so through smarter ways to produce and use energy.

For this reason, as the Senate takes up and considers energy legislation this fall, we will be talking about the need for proactive policies, about the need for technology-driven approaches to our energy problems. We have made a good start already in the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. We began our markup in July, before the August recess—a markup of comprehensive energy legislation.

The first part of the bill that we have substantially completed at this point is a comprehensive revitalization of the national capabilities for energy research and development. Putting research and development first reflects a broad consensus that new science and new technology are at the core of any solution to our national energy challenges. Despite the importance of energy R&D, our recent commitment to it leaves a great deal to be desired. The level of effort we are making today in Federal energy technology research and development is equivalent in constant dollars to what we were making in 1966. Yet our economy is three times larger today than it was in 1966. It is very hard to see how we can build a 21st century energy system on a 1960s level of effort in the research and development budgets.

The committee will begin its deliberations beginning this next week and its effort to mark up a bill this next week. Major topic areas before the committee as we move forward in this markup will include policy proposals to improve energy efficiency, to improve our ability to produce energy from a great diversity of sources, and to tackle the tough issues related to electricity restructuring.

Today I am releasing a detailed description of the proposed chairman's mark in these various areas. I am also releasing the text of the major portions of the bill we will be working on in committee—the next major portion of the bill. This part of the bill will deal with electricity, and it will provide a

framework to integrate new technologies into electricity markets to provide high-quality, efficient electricity generation in every community and to give consumers new ways to manage and control energy use and energy costs.

I would like to take an opportunity to describe some of the key proposals in the mark that we will be considering in a little more detail. With respect to energy efficiency, the chairman's mark that we will be considering for the energy policy bill will contain provisions that will improve energy efficiency in household appliances—also provisions that will improve energy efficiency in Federal and other facilities and industry itself.

Let me state my belief, though, that increasing vehicle fuel efficiency is one of the highest legislative priorities that the Senate should have in energy legislation. In addition to our growing dependence on foreign imported oil, we have reached the limits of our current infrastructure to refine and distribute fuels. A policy of simply continuing to increase the demand for gasoline is not sustainable. Fortunately, advanced technology in a variety of areas to improve automotive fuel efficiency offers a better answer, and we need to move in that direction.

The National Academy of Sciences has given us some very useful ways of thinking how to reformulate the CAFE program. Clearly, consumers want the option to choose the type of vehicle that suits their needs and preferences. They also want to be able to count on reliable and affordable fuel supplies.

While CAFE standards are not in the Energy Committee's jurisdiction, a number of other mechanisms to encourage greater fuel efficiency in cars and trucks are in our jurisdiction. The mark will contain purchase requirements for Federal fleets that will provide greater incentive to automobile and truck manufacturers to produce more highly efficient vehicles.

A topic closely allied to vehicle fuel efficiency is the question of the fuels that we will need in the future to power cars and trucks. Here, the Congress has a clear duty to address the growing multiplicity of fuel specifications around the country. Part of the solution to this problem will be provided by a bill in the Committee on Environment and Public Works, sponsored by Senators SMITH and REID. I hope that these provisions find their way into our overall energy bill in the Senate.

The Chairman's mark will include a number of energy efficiency provisions relating to appliances. Perhaps the most visible proposal in this regard will be one that enacts a 13 Seasonal Energy Efficiency Rating for central air-conditioning units. Such a standard was finalized earlier this year, but since then the Bush Administration has attempted to withdraw it and substitute a lesser standard. The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources held hearings on this topic and the record before the committee has persuaded me that the administration based its decision on economic information that was outdated and inaccurate.

A 13 SEER rating for central air-conditioning units can do a lot to help avoid summer blackouts and brownouts when high temperatures send electricity demand soaring. During the intense heat wave we had in early August, which was felt nationwide, peak demand from air-conditioning did, in fact, lead to problems in electricity availability in some parts of the country, while others were uncomfortably close to the margin. We need to build more efficiency into this part of our system over the long term, and a higher standard for these large air-conditioning units will help.

The Chairman's mark will also require the Federal government to purchase Energy Star or other efficient products designated by the Federal Energy Management Program. This is a requirement that, again, makes eminent sense. Taxpayers save money, and the cost of energy-efficient appliances to consumers comes down, when the Federal government takes a leadership role in purchasing highly energy efficient computers, office machines, and other appliances.

The mark also authorizes a grant program to help build energy-efficient schools. School districts can ill afford to waste taxpayer funds on excessive energy bills because of the inefficiency of school buildings.

With respect to new energy sources, it is important that the Senate look to policies that will truly improve our supplies of domestic energy security, including measures to improve our supply of natural gas and to diversify our energy mix to include a greater reliance on domestic renewable resources. These are the types of provisions that I will include in the Chairman's mark.

I will not be including in the mark any provisions relating to drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The debate over oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—a long-standing bone of contention in energy policy—is in many ways a distraction from more important opportunities to bolster our domestic energy security. Oil produced from the arctic refuge is not likely to influence the world price of oil, or the prices that U.S. consumers pay for gasoline. I plan to focus attention in the Energy Committee mark-up on a number of issues that will have a greater impact on our domestic production of oil and gas and a larger near-term impact than drilling in the Arctic.

The first such issue is another Arctic resource that could be brought to U.S. markets—natural gas. The exploration for oil in the Prudhoe Bay region of Alaska has resulted in the discovery of abundant supplies of natural gas, but there is now no way to bring that gas to markets in the lower 48 States that could benefit from it. The projection of growing demand for natural gas has reawakened interest in building a pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Alberta, Canada, where it would join with existing gas pipelines that serve the United States. That pipeline would be an enormous construction project on the part of the private sector, requiring perhaps 2,000 miles of steel pipe and costing $20 billion. A lot of spurious job numbers have been floated about drilling in the Arctic Refuge. The gas pipeline would be the real thing as far as job creation is concerned.

If we do not act while there is substantial private-sector interest in building the Arctic gas pipeline, we will lose an important opportunity to bolster our national energy security in natural gas. If we do not bring the Alaska gas to market, then our growing demand for gas will be met by large-scale import of liquefied natural gas. At $3 or less per million BTU, imported LNG will be cheaper than Alaska gas. But it would be foolhardy to look at the issue solely through the prism of short-term economics. We are already more than 50 percent dependent on foreign oil. If we do nothing about the Arctic gas, we could wind up being similarly dependent on foreign natural gas, from many of the same OPEC countries from which we import oil. That is an economic and national security issue.

We face a clear moment of decision. The Chairman's mark that I will bring before the Committee will contain authorizing provisions to streamline the regulatory approval process to move forward with the pipeline. We may find a mechanism to ensure that the domestic option for a pipeline route is chosen. I hope to be able to work with my colleague from Alaska during the mark-up to help make that happen.

The second key initiative for domestic production is to undertake a top-to-bottom review of both federal and State royalty and tax policy on domestic oil and gas production. Our current policies were put in place when the U.S. had abundant and easily accessible reserves. We have fewer such reserves now, and while technology for finding oil has continued to improve, we should consider whether the financial structure we have in place should change to one that enhances the economics of exploring for oil and gas in more challenging geological formations. It should also take into account the boom-and-bust nature of the industry, and provide incentives to maintain domestic production when prices are low.

The third proposal is to provide adequate funding for the federal programs

that actually make new leases for oil and gas available to domestic producers. For all the rhetoric from the administration about the need to boost production, it has not asked for enough money in order to bring this about. The result is likely to be further delays and frustration on the part of U.S. oil and gas producers. In the mark that I will present to the committee, we will authorize a higher level of funding for the necessary personnel to make the decisions and to process applications for domestic production.

The area of electricity, as I mentioned earlier in these remarks, is the next major topic that we will take up in the markup. We do need to provide for reliable and diverse electric power generation and distribution sources in the country. Electricity is a central part of modern life. Yet our electric system largely operates on a design that is nearly a century old. There are many problems in our electricity markets that need to be addressed. The problems faced by California and the West earlier this year should be a wakeup call to all of us.

What the electricity crisis in California showed is that the institutions that developed in the last century have not evolved enough to ensure reliable and affordable supplies of electricity. We face a crucial turning point. During the next few years, billions of dollars of investment will be planned and committed to electric generation and transmission. Those investments will have a 30- to 50-year lifespan. Will we put in place a structure to maximize the chances that investments will go to new technologies that will give consumers real choices over their energy use or will Congress, by its inaction, perpetuate obsolete frameworks for managing electricity markets, with the result that we wind up with little improvement in the status quo?

I believe that we in Congress and the President have a great opportunity to be visionary about the future of electricity. A transmission grid that is open to a wide variety of generation options, including distributed generation, will ensure the power quality and efficiency that our 21st century society will need in order to sustain our economic prosperity.

That opportunity creates a great duty on the part of Congress and the President to focus on electricity as a major part of comprehensive energy legislation. Our task must be to build a regulatory structure that has adequate authority to resolve market defects, without interfering unduly in those markets.

I believe we need to move forward now with a legislative solution to these problems. To leave electricity legislation for another day would be to perpetuate an obsolete system that will not provide the reliability, quality, affordability, and choice that consumers will want and need.

The changes that I believe are needed, and that we are going to be trying to address in the chairman's mark, include the following:

First, we will try to clarify who has jurisdiction over regulating electricity transmission in interstate commerce. That is a key part of what the legislation will do. That role is assigned to the Federal energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC. FERC will be given authority to ensure that all electric transmitting organizations in interstate commerce play by a consistent set of fair rules.

Second, the chairman's mark will give FERC the responsibility for taking the current voluntary system for promoting reliability in electric transmission and making adherence to reliability rules mandatory.

Third, the chairman's mark will give the FERC the tools to ensure that competitive markets work well to provide customers with affordable electricity.

Fourth, the chairman's mark will address the tough issue of siting new transmission facilities. This is something the President has indicated his support for. A national transmission grid is a necessity, but cannot occur without a new approach to transmission planning, expansion, and siting. Federal eminent domain, by itself, is not likely to lead to an effective approach to meeting this need. What is needed is to use federal eminent domain as a backstop to a more cooperative, regionally based approach to transmission and siting issues. Thus, the chairman's mark will rely on regional transmission organizations to do the bulk of transmission planning, expansion and siting. Only if those regional entities are stymied will a federal eminent domain authority be invoked, and that authority will be used only to implement the decisions taken regionally.

The chairman's mark will include a repeal of the 1935 Public Utility Holding Company Act, or PUHCA, but the protections in that act will be replaced by giving FERC jurisdiction over mergers of holding companies that own utilities and over acquisitions of generation assets.

Finally, the chairman's mark will ensure that there is transparent information on market transactions.

As part of a balanced and comprehensive legislative solution, the chairman's mark also includes numerous benefits and protections for consumers, so that we don't repeat the mistakes of telecommunications deregulation. These include an emphasis on ensuring future access by rural, remote, and Indian communities to electricity; protection of consumers from unfair trade practices; and a Public Benefits Fund to ensure that there is a way to fund electricity programs in the public interest.

The chairman's mark also includes a series of provisions to ensure that we have a greater role in our electricity generating system of the future for renewables and distributed generation, while maintaining the contribution made by existing sources of baseload generation, such as hydropower and nuclear. Among the important tools for making sure we have diversity in our sources of electricity is a renewable portfolio standard, uniform interconnection standards to the electric grid, greater flexibility and predictability to the process of relicensing hydroelectric dams, and a reauthorization of parts of the Price-Anderson Act.

Finally, a common thread among may of the provisions that I have mentioned in this chamber today and that we will be considering in the bill is perhaps the most important public policy challenges of the 21st century, and that is climate change. Climate change policy and energy policy are inseparably linked, because energy production and the use of energy are leading sources of greenhouse gases that affect the atmosphere. The Senate must ensure that the energy legislation it passes makes a meaningful, positive contribution to dealing with this issue. Many of the provisions that I have already discussed—energy efficiency, the focus on more renewables—make a contribution to this goal. The mark that we will be considering in committee will contain some additional provisions to promote better information and policy on greenhouse gas emissions.

Energy policy is a difficult and complex topic. Getting to a solution that gives America a vibrant energy infrastructure and the right policies for the 21st century will require careful work on complicated issues. Our Nation's future economic prosperity, and the jobs of millions of Americans, are at stake. I hope that the approach taken in the Senate combines a thoughtful analysis of our current energy challenges with a willingness to take some bold policy steps to address those challenges. That certainly is the spirit in which I will be making proposals before the committee.

I look forward to working with all my colleagues in the Senate to produce constructive legislation for the future of our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDWARDS). The Senator from Ohio.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO ENGAGEMENT: AN UNPRECEDENTED OPPORTUNITY FOR COOPERATION

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, earlier today we welcomed to the historic House Chamber President Vicente Fox, the President of Mexico. At this moment, President Bush and President Fox are in my home State of Ohio. They traveled to Toledo, OH, making several visits there. So we welcome both Presidents to our home State.

As an opposition candidate, President Fox's election and inauguration last year overturned 71 years of one-party rule in Mexico, one-party rule domination of the executive branch by the Institutional Revolutionary Party, PRI. That election made history. And today, with his Presidency, and with President Bush in office, we are continuing to make history, as our nations have the unprecedented opportunity to implement positive changes and to create lasting progress for our entire hemisphere.

I say to my colleagues, it is important that we not squander this opportunity, that we not squander this chance. Because of Mexico's critical importance to our Nation and our hemisphere, it was not at all surprising that President Bush chose to travel to Mexico for his first official foreign trip as President.

This week we welcome President Fox to our country. These historic meetings demonstrate the vital nature of our relationship with Mexico and the importance of bilateral cooperation.

I commend both leaders on their ongoing commitment to hemispheric partnership, and look forward to even greater cooperation stemming from this week's meetings.

No one can deny the importance of our involvement with Mexico—our neighbor—a nation with which we share an over 2,000-mile common border.

Additionally, over 21 million Americans living in this country are of Mexican heritage; that is 67 percent, two-thirds of our total U.S.-Hispanic population. Indeed, many people and many issues bind our nations together. It is in the interest of both Mexico and the United States that we make that bond even stronger.

That is why we want to see President Fox succeed. He is off to a good start.

President Fox's election was received as a positive step in Mexico's maturing economy and has fueled new investment in the country, raising expectations for better economic opportunities for the Mexican people. At the same time, Mr. Fox also has raised expectations here in Washington for better opportunities to improve U.S.-Mexico bilateral cooperation on a wide range of issues.

As an advocate of free trade in the Americas, Mr. Fox recognizes that a strong, steady economy in Mexico can be the foundation to help solve many of our shared challenges and advance our mutual interests.

I am confident that President Fox's visit to the United States will advance our growing and strengthening partnership and that both leaders will engage in constructive dialog to promote cooperation, enhance the security and prosperity of both nations, and enable each country to establish mutually agreed-upon goals in at least four areas: First, economic development and trade; two, the environment; three, immigration; and four, law enforcement and counterdrug policy.

In each of these four areas, both countries should seek to implement realistic and practical steps that will build confidence in our partnership and help set the stage for continued discussions and further progress.

A good demonstration of our relationship's success is the economic cooperation spearheaded by the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA.

Thanks to this partnership, trade between the United States and Mexico now amounts to over $250 billion annually, making our neighbor to the south now our second largest trading partner behind Canada.

In the last decade, U.S. exports to Mexico have increased over 200 percent, and today 85 percent of Mexico's entire exports go to the United States. However, progress in our partnership cannot occur absent continued progress in Mexico's economy.

Although Mexico is in its fifth consecutive year of recovery following the 1994–1995 peso crisis, improved living standards and economic opportunities have not been felt nationwide in Mexico. In fact, as could be expected, the slowdown in the U.S. economy has also had an impact on Mexico. Lack of jobs and depressed wages are particularly acute in the interior of the country, once you get away from the U.S.-Mexican border in the north. That is even true in President Fox's home state of Guanajuato.

As long as enormous disparities in wages and living conditions exist between Mexico and the United States, our Nation will simply not fully realize the potential of Mexico as an export market, nor will we be able to deal adequately with the resulting problems that come about because of that poor economy, because of that great disparity in wealth that brings about illegal immigration, border crime, drug trafficking, and other problems.

In keeping with the market-oriented approach that we started with NAFTA, the United States can take a number of constructive steps to continue economic progress in Mexico and secure its support for a free trade agreement with the Americas, which is something that clearly this administration and this Congress must push.

First, we can bring to Mexico the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, a loan program that also assists U.S. small business investments in many other countries.

Second, we can encourage entrepreneurship in Mexico through increased U.S. funding of microcredit and microenterprise programs, which will encourage small business development.

Third, we should expand the mandate of the North American Development Bank beyond the current situation where it only extends to the U.S.-Mexico border.

This bank has been a successful source of private-public financing of infrastructure projects along our borders. Extending its authority inland not only would bring good jobs into the interior of Mexico but also would help to develop and further nationalize a transportation and economic infrastructure.

Continued investments in the NADBank also would facilitate greater environmental cooperation between the United States and Mexico through projects geared toward advancing the environmental goals and objectives set forth in NAFTA and also would enhance the overall protection of U.S. and Mexican natural resources.

Both nations need to pursue a joint immigration policy that takes into account the realities of the economic conditions of our countries. At a minimum, President Bush should continue to evaluate the temporary visa program for unskilled workers, which has proven burdensome for U.S. farmers and small business men and women. Any liberalization of this program should be linked to concrete programs to reduce illegal immigration into the United States. This is not going to be an easy issue. We have heard discussion from President Fox and President Bush over the last several days about this. Many Members of Congress have very strong opinions about it. I believe it is important for us to deal with this issue in a practical and rational way.

Additionally, in a quick and simple fix, the administration should eliminate the annual cap on the number of visas issued to Mexican business executives who enter the United States. Currently, the cap stands at 5,500. And under current law, it will be phased out in the year 2004. The United States does not have such a cap for Canada. Repealing the cap now would send a very positive signal to President Fox and to the Mexican people about their nation's value to us as an economic partner.

Further, it is important for the United States to be seen as a partner and resource, as President Fox undertakes his pledge to reform Mexico's entire judicial system.

I have had the opportunity, as I know many Members of the Senate have, to travel to Mexico and see the problems, the inherent problems, historic problems, problems of long standing in regard to the police and the judicial system. It was very insightful and important that today, when President Fox spoke to the Congress, he talked about the need for judicial reform. This is an area where, frankly, for all the problems of this country, we do it very well.

We have the ability to help Mexico. We have the ability to help them in this area. We should continue to do so.

With the law enforcement system in Mexico plagued with inherent corruption and institutional and financial deterioration, President Fox will face numerous challenges.

It is in our interest to help Mr. Fox in his quest, if needed, whether it be through financial or technical assistance. It is in our own interest in the United States that Mexico succeed in this reform because our country cannot reverse effectively the flow of drugs across our common border without the full cooperation and support of our Mexican law enforcement friends. The relationship between our law enforcement—our DEA, FBI, Border Patrol, and their counterparts in Mexico—is so very important. I have watched this over the years, and that relationship has been problematic. But I will say this: I believe it is improving. I believe clearly President Vicente Fox has made this a top priority of his administration. It will not be easy, but we can help.

The issues that impact the United States and Mexico are numerous. It is not going to be easy to resolve these problems. All are important, and each is, in a sense, interrelated with the other. Together they present an enormous task for the Presidents of both countries. Perhaps most important, they are evidence of the enormous importance of Mexico to the future prosperity and security of our country, as well as our entire hemisphere.

I commend President Bush and President Fox for the many advancements they have achieved so far. I encourage them to continue this cooperation and this effort. Together, our nations can, in this historic time, redefine the United States-Mexican relationship and protect and promote prosperity throughout our shared hemisphere.

In conclusion, President Fox mentioned a topic which has been debated on this floor many times and which we have taken up and looked at, and we have thought a lot about it; that is, the drug certification process that we go through as a country every year, where we basically say how well other countries are doing in their antidrug effort and whether they are cooperating with the United States. I think the time is here for us to re-evaluate our law. I think the time is here for us to put a temporary moratorium on this certification process. I think it will help our relationship with Mexico. I think it would help our relationship with other countries. I think the time is appropriate to do this.

Mexico has a new President. Mexico has a President who has stated that one of his main objectives is the reform of the judicial system, to do away with the corruption in the judiciary, to do away with the problems they have had in the law enforcement realm. So I think the time is right. If we are ever going to do this, the time is right to do it. I don't think we have a great deal to lose. The current system has not worked very well. It has not accomplished a great deal. So I think the time is ripe now for us to put a temporary moratorium on the certification process.

President Fox, throughout his speech, talked about trust. I think that is the right word. We have to have trust between our two countries. That does not mean we are not going to have disputes. It doesn't mean we are not going to have problems. It doesn't mean these problems are going to be easy to resolve. We know they are not—the immigration problem and the drug problem, just to name a few. We know they are not easy.

I think the right tone was set in today's speech by President Fox.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 2001—Continued

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, we are entering the period where we make a few last minute comments before the 4 o'clock vote regarding the Export Administration Act, a process we have been working on for 3 years, a law that expired in 1994, and we have had 12 attempts at change since that time. The last time the law was revised, people were wearing bell bottoms and polyester suits and Jimmy Carter was in office.

It has been time for a change and recognition of that. I ask unanimous consent a letter from the National Association of Manufacturers endorsing the bill and recognizing the need for this be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
Washington, DC, September 4, 2001.

Hon. THOMAS A. DASCHLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: I am writing on behalf of the 14,000 member companies of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) to seek your active support for the passage of S. 149, the Export Administration Act of 2001, without inappropriate amendments that would upset the careful balance in the legislation.

NAM member companies are some of the leading exporters of high-technology products, including computers, telecommunications equipment semiconductors, chemicals and aerospace equipment. The Export Administration Act, which establishes broad-ranging exports controls on dual-use products and technologies, will have a direct impact on their business activities in countries around the world.

Our companies take seriously their obligation to protect national security. They devote substantial resources to maintaining internal compliance programs and keeping up to date on the latest export control regulations. In an increasingly competitive global economy, however, Congress should not require excessively burdensome controls that hurt U.S. industry but do little, if anything to enhance national security.

The NAM supports S. 149, as reported by the Banking Committee, because it provides a good balance between U.S. national security and global trade interests. The bill has strong bipartisan support, having been approved by the Banking Committee on a vote of 19 to 1. President Bush has endorsed S. 149, as reported, and his national security advisor has indicated repeatedly that the Administration opposes amendments which would upset the careful balance achieved in the Banking Committee bill.

I strongly urge you to play a leadership role in supporting passage of S. 149 and opposing inappropriate amendments.

Sincerely,

JERRY JASMOWSKI,
President.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent a letter received from many of the computer folks, including Dell Computer, IBM Corporation, Intel, Hewlett-Packard, NCR, Motorola, and Unisys, pointing out the need for this legislation, and the fact they are happy with it, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEPTEMBER 5, 2001.

Hon. MICHAEL B. ENZI,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: As the Senate begins debate on S. 149, the Export Administration Act of 2001, we strongly urge you to support the bill as it was reported out 19–1 by the Senate Banking Committee and to oppose all restrictive amendments during its floor consideration. Passage of S. 149 will represent an important step forward in the development of an export control system that more effectively accounts for modern developments in technology and international market conditions, while protecting national security.

S. 149 enjoys broad, bipartisan support in Congress, as well as the endorsement of President Bush and his national security team, which opposes amendments that would upset the careful balance achieved in the Banking Committee bill.

Among S. 149's many provisions is one of critical importance to the U.S. computer industry. Section 702(k) would eliminate those provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for 1998 that lock the President into using a specific metric, known as MTOPS (millions of theoretical operations per second), to establish export control thresholds for computers. Section 702(k) would not eliminate current restrictions on computer exports, but would give the President the authority and flexibility needed to review the MTOPS control system and develop a more modern, effective framework for computer exports. The need for Presidential flexibility in this area is especially clear in light of recent reports by the Center

for Strategic and International Studies, the Department of Defense, the Henry Stimson Center, the General Accounting Office, and the Defense Science Board, which have all concluded that the MTOPS-based approach is obsolete and fails to advance U.S. national security.

The U.S. computer industry needs new export control policies that take into account the global, technological and economic realities of the 21st century. As a result, we urge you to support S. 149, as reported, and oppose any amendments that would delay the implementation of the important reforms contained in the bill.

Sincerely,

Michael S. Dell, Dell Computer; Louis V. Gerstner, Jr., IBM Corporation; Andy Grove, Intel Corporation; Carleton Florina, Hewlett-Packard; Michael Capellas, Compaq Computer; Christopher B. Galvin, Motorola; Lars Nyberg, NCR Corporation; Lawrence Weinbach, Unisys Corporation.

Mr. ENZI. I take this time to thank Senators GRAMM and SARBANES for their tremendous leadership and for entrusting Senator JOHNSON and I to do some of the background work before the legislation reached this stage. It is very important.

I thank Marty Gruenberg on Senator SARBANES's staff; Katherine McGuire, my legislative director; and Joel Oswald, now a Texas A&M student who worked for 3 years on the bill; Mary O'Brien; Kara Calvert; on Senator JOHNSON's staff, Naomi Camper and Paul Nash; from the staff of Senator HAGEL, Dave Dorman; and the staff of Senator BAYH, Catherine Wojtasik; and other staff includes Jim Jochum who previously worked for Senator GRAMM.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the summary of the EAA discussions we have had to this point that have been contributed on a number of people's behalf to make the bill come together and be successful.

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

SUMMARY OF EAA DISCUSSIONS, 1999–2000

January 20, 1999, 10 a.m.: Subcommittee on International Trade and Finance—Hearing on the Reauthorization of the Export Administration Act.

January 28, 1999, 3:30 p.m.: Enzi staff meets with Thompson staff to discuss issues regarding reauthorization of EAA.

February 8, 1999, 10 a.m.: Enzi staff meet with Gary Milhollin, Wisconsin Nuclear Arms Control Project.

February 8, 1999, 2 p.m.: Enzi staff meet with NSA staff.

February 9, 1999, 10 a.m.: Enzi staff meet with Senate Intelligence Committee staff member (Joan).

March 16, 1999, 9:30 a.m.: Subcommittee on International Trade and Finance—Hearing on the Reauthorization of the Export Administration Act and Managing Security Risks for High Tech Exports.

March 18, 1999, 3 p.m.: Enzi staff meet with WMD Commission staff.

April 14, 1999, 10 a.m.: Subcommittee on International Trade and Finance—Hearing on the Export Control Process.

April 28, 1999, 1 p.m.: Enzi staff meet with Kyl staff.

June 7, 1999, 9 a.m.: Banking staff meet with Cox Commission investigator.

June 10, 1999, 10 a.m.: Banking Committee Hearing on Export Control Issues in the Cox Report.

June 17, 1999, 10 a.m.: Banking Committee Hearing on Emerging Technology Issues and Reauthorization of the Export Administration Act.

June 22, 1999, 10:30 a.m.: Enzi staff meets with John Barker, State Department.

June 23, 1999, 10 a.m.: Banking Committee Hearing on Reauthorization of the Export Administration Act: Government Agency Views.

June 24, 1999, 10 a.m.: Banking Committee Hearing on Reauthorization of the Export Administration Act: Private Sector Views.

June 28, 1999, 4 p.m.: Enzi staff meet with Mack staff.

June 29, 1999, 9:30 a.m.: Enzi staff meet with Kyl staff.

June–July/September, 1999: Numerous meetings with Administration (BXA, State, Defense, intelligence), industry, Senators and staff to discuss draft EAA.

September 16, 1999, 9 a.m.: Banking Committee staff meet with AIPAC staff.

September 23, 1999, 10 a.m.: Banking Committee Votes 20–0 to Approve Export Administration Act of 1999.

September 27, 1999, 11 a.m.: Banking Committee meets with DoD staff to discuss S. 1712 issues.

October 6, 1999, 10 a.m.: Banking Committee meets with AIPAC staff.

October 10, 1999, 10 a.m.: Enzi meets with Cochran. Cochran says he will not hold up consideration of the bill.

October 20, 1999, 11:30 a.m.: Enzi meets with Kyl.

October 25, 1999, 4:15 p.m.: Warner meets with Gramm/Enzi. Warner staff (SASC Joan) says she has not seen the reported bill. Warner commits that his staff will review the bill and get back to us.

October 28, 1999, 4 p.m.: Gramm/Enzi meet with Lott to discuss consideration of bill. Lott says window is narrow. Will consider if it will only take one or two days.

November 1, 1999, 6 p.m.: Banking Committee staff meet with SFRC staff (Marshall Billingslea). He provides us with extensive list of concerns, mostly jurisdictional in nature.

November 4, 1999, 3 p.m.: Banking Committee staff meet with SASC staff. SASC says they don't know how the bill will impact military since military now incorporates more off the shelf commercial items.

November 5, 1999, 1:30 p.m.: Banking Committee staff meet with SASC staff, Hamre, NSA.

December 14, 1999, 11 a.m.: Banking Committee staff meet with Thompson staff (Curt Silvers introduces Chris Ford, new staff).

Friday, January 21, 12:30 a.m.: Banking Committee staff to meet with Marshall Billingslea.

Wednesday, February 2, 10 a.m.: Banking staff meets with SASC staff.

Wednesday, February 9: Senators Warner, Helms, Shelby, and Thompson send a letter to Sen. Lott expressing concerns with S. 1712 and requesting referral to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Relations, Governmental Affairs, and Intelligence.

Wednesday, February 9, 3 p.m.: Senators Gramm and Enzi meet with Senator Lott in the Leader's office.

Thursday, February 10, 5 p.m.: Senators Gramm and Enzi meet with business community in Senator Gramm's office.

Friday, February 11, 10 a.m.: Lott staff holds meeting with Gramm, Enzi, Warner, Helms, Shelby, and Thompson staff in Approps Cmte room [3 hours].

Tuesday, February 15, 11 a.m.: Lott staff schedules staff meeting/canceled by Lott Staff.

Wednesday, February 16, 12 p.m.: Lott staff holds second meeting with Gramm, Enzi, Warner, Helms, Shelby, Thompson, and Kyl staff in Leader's office [2.5 hours].

Thursday, February 17, 3 p.m.: Banking staff hold informational briefing re S. 1712 for all Senate staff in Banking hearing room.

Friday, February 18, 1 p.m.: Lott staff hosts third meeting with Gramm, Enzi, Warner, Helms, Shelby, Thompson, and Kyl staff in Leader's office; Gramm/Enzi staff provide document outlining provisions that may be accepted. [45 minutes].

Tuesday, February 22, 9:30 a.m.: Senator Lott meets with Senators Gramm, Enzi, Warner, Kyl, Shelby, and Thompson in Leader's office; Senators Gramm and Enzi identify three key issues in contention; agree to provide Managers' Amdt.

Wednesday, February 23: Gramm and Enzi staff provide Managers' Amdt CRA00.098 to other senators' staff.

Friday, February 25: Gramm and Enzi staff provide pullout CRA00.120 regarding three issues to other senators' staff.

Friday, February 25: Senator Thompson sends a letter to Senators Gramm and Enzi, cc'd to Senator Lott and the other senators, expressing ''grave concerns'' about S. 1712.

Monday, February 28, 4 p.m.: Senator Warner holds SASC hearing on EAA; Senators Enzi and Johnson among witnesses.

Monday, February 28, 6 p.m.: Warner staff host impromptu meeting with DOD and DOC officials and Enzi and Johnson staff in SASC hearing room; walk through differences [4 hours].

Tuesday, February 29, 10 a.m.: Warner staff host meeting with DOD and DOC officials and Gramm, Enzi, Sarbanes, Johnson, Levin staff in SASC hearing room [2.5 hours].

Tuesday, February 29: Senators Warner, Helms, Shelby, Kyl, Thompson, Roberts, Inhofe, and B. Smith send a letter to Senator Lott to express ''continuing concerns'' with S. 1712, stating that ''even with its proposed managers' amendment'' the bill fails to address concerns, and objecting to its consideration.

Tuesday, February 29: Senators Abraham and Bennett send a letter to Senators Lott and Daschle urging that they make Senate consideration of S. 1712 a priority.

Wednesday, March 1, 2 p.m.: Gramm, Enzi, Sarbanes, Johnson staff meet with business community in Banking hearing room.

Friday, March 3, 2 p.m.: Senators Gramm and Enzi meet with Senators Warner, Helms, Kyl, and Thompson in Senator Gramm's office; walk through their concerns [3.5 hours.]

Monday, March 6, 11 a.m.: Senator Gramm meets with Sen. Kyl in Senator Gramm's office to discuss concerns [1 hour].

Monday, March 6, 1 p.m.: Senators Gramm, Enzi, Johnson, with Sarbanes staff, meet in Senator Gramm's office to discuss concerns raised [1 hour].

Monday, March 6, 3:30 p.m.: Senators Gramm and Enzi meet with Senators Warner, Helms, Shelby, Kyl, and Thompson in Sen. Gramm's office; finish walking through their concerns [2 hours].

Tuesday, March 7, 8 a.m.: Senators Gramm and Enzi meet with business community in Banking hearing room to discuss ongoing member negotiations.

Tuesday, March 7, 4:30 p.m.: Gramm and Enzi staff meet with Warner, Helms, Kyl, Thompson, and Shelby staff: walk through 4-page Managers' Amdt document [1.5 hours].

Tuesday, March 7, 5:45 p.m.: Senator Lott brings up EAA by unanimous consent Senator Thompson raises concerns on floor but does not object).

Wednesday, March 8, 11 a.m.: Senators Gramm and Enzi meet with Senators Warner, Helms, Shelby, Kyl, and Thompson at those senators' request. Members agree to suspend floor consideration of EAA until details agreed; Gramm/Enzi provide revised 4-page Managers' Amdt document and ask for comments by the end of the day [1 hour].

Wednesday, March 8, 12:30 p.m.: Senator Gramm takes EAA off floor via special UC agreement among Senators Lott, Daschle, Thompson, Reid, and others.

Wednesday, March 8, 4 p.m.: Gramm and Enzi staff provide other senators' staff with revised Managers' Amdmt CRA00.262.

Thursday, March 9, 3 p.m.: Senator Warner gives Senators Gramm and Enzi misdated letter with attachment of proposed amendments to Managers' Amendment.

Thusday, March 9: Senators Warner, Helms, Shelby, Kyl, and Thompson send another letter to Senator Lott expressing ''continuing concerns'' with S. 1712 and objecting to moving to its consideration.

Friday, March 10, 12 p.m.: Senator Gramm meets with Senator Warner (other senators represented by staff); gives him Gramm/Enzi final response document; asks for final decision from senators.

Week of March 13–17: Gramm/Enzi staff wait for response re 3/10 document.

Thursday, March 16: Senator Gramm schedules members' meeting for 10 a.m. Friday 17th to get response to 3/10 document; postpones to following week after being told that Kyl/Helms/Shelby not in town and Warner and his staff both ''unable to attend''.

Monday, March 20: Senator Gramm schedules members' meeting for 2 p.m. Tuesday 21st to get response to 3/10 document; postpones to later same week after being told that Shelby not back until Tuesday night and that the senators first need to meet to confer.

Week of March 20–23: Gramm/Enzi staff continue to wait for response re 3/10 document.

Tuesday, March 21: Senator Warner announces sudden SASC hearing for Thursday 23rd; cites ''considerable differences'' remaining between Banking and other senators.

Wednesday, March 22, 1 p.m.: House International Relations Subcommittee on Economic Policy reluctantly removes Senators Gramm and Enzi from their witness list, and instead holds hearing solely with industry witnesses; hints at marking up narrow EAA bills.

Wednesday, March 22: [Other senators apparently hold meeting to confer].

Thursday, March 23, 10 a.m.: Senator Warner holds second SASC hearing, at which he presses GAO witness to say S. 1712 ''must'' be strengthened, and states that ''the four chairmen have not received some legislative language which we feel is essential to making our decisions on this''.

Thursday, March 23: Senator Reid gives floor statement urging Senate passage of S. 1712, noting that its sponsors ''tried to move a bill . . . but frankly, the majority is unable to join with us to allow us to move this bill forward''.

Friday, March 24: Two weeks from the date on which they gave the other senators their final offer, Senators Gramm and Enzl receive a letter dated March 23 from Senators Warner, Helms, Shelby, Kyl, and Thompson. The letter stated:

''As you know, on March 6 [sic], 2000, we provided you with a package describing the issues that we consider critical to reaching an agreement on the proposed reauthorization of S. 1712 [sic], the Export Administration Act. We were disappointed that you were only able to agree to at most four of the eighteen issues we identified, and were unable to agree to some issues on which we believed we had previously reached agreement in principle. Accordingly, we cannot agree at this time to return the bill to the Senate floor under the terms of the unanimous consent agreement field on March 8.

''There are important issues remaining to be resolved, and we feel that negotiations should continue in order to for there being hope for achieving an Export Administration Act that successfully balances the needs of industry and national security.''

Week of March 27–31: Gramm/Enzi staff do not hear from other senators' staff.

Week of April 3: Gramm/Enzi staff do not hear from other senators' staff.

Tuesday, April 4: Senator McCain holds hearing on S. 1712, at which he expresses concern that the bill does not adequately protect national security; Senators Thompson and Enzi testify.

Tuesday, April 11: Gramm staff call the staff of other senators to alert them that Senator Lott planned to make a pro forma effort to bring up S. 1712 by UC on Wednesday, at which point Senator Gramm would object pursuant to the gentleman's agreement made with the other senators on March 8; and that Senators Lott and Gramm then would file cloture on a motion to proceed to S. 1712.

Wednesday, April 12: At Senator Lott's requests, Senators Gramm and Enzi give Senator Lott two cloture petitions (one on a motion to proceed to S. 1712, and one on S. 1712); both were signed by 16 Republicans representing a broad diversity of states and of Senate Committees (including SASC, SFRC, SGAC, and SCST).

Wednesday, April 12: Senator Thompson holds SGAC hearing on multilateral export controls.

April, May: Gramm/Enzi staff do not hear from other senators' staff.

Thursday, May 25: Senators Thompson and Torricelli hold a press conference on S. 2645. According to press reports, Senator Thompson said that in his opinion, legislation to reauthorize the Export Administration Act is probably dead as a stand-alone measure in 2000; when asked whether he was partly responsible, he replied ''Let's just say that truth and justice were served''.

Friday, May 26: Senator Thompson holds SGAC hearing on mass market/foreign availability; no Administration witnesses are invited.

Mr. ENZI. I will make a few remarks after the vote particularly to thank Senator SARBANES for his understanding of the bill.

I yield the floor to Senator SARBANES.

Mr. SARBANES. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute for the proponent and 4 minutes for the opponent.

Mr. SARBANES. I will take the 1 minute at this point. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It has been hard work. We think it is good, balanced legislation. I join with Senator ENZI in thanking the staff: Steve Harris, Marty Gruenberg, and Laurie Better of my staff; Katherine McGuire has done a wonderful job; and Joel Oswald and Kara Calvert of Senator ENZI's staff; Naomi Camper and Paul Nash of Senator JOHNSON's staff; and Wayne Abernathy and Amy Dunathan from Senator GRAMM's staff. I thank Senator GRAMM. We worked very closely on this bill. I pay tribute to Senator ENZI and Senator JOHNSON who worked together so assiduously, so skillfully, in helping to develop and evolve this legislation.

I would be less than fair if I did not take a moment to say to Senator ENZI I think his dedication in working this legislation through and his very strong commitment and willingness to talk to everyone at great length, over and over and over again, contributed significantly to shaping legislation that we are finally going to be able to move through the Senate, with a very sizable consensus.

I say to the opponents, I think we engaged this in a proper Senate fashion in terms of our debate and our efforts to respond to some concerns. We consulted with everyone—the administration, of course, perhaps first and foremost. My own view is we have brought together a good package. I urge my colleagues to support it when we go to the vote at 4 o'clock.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes unless any of my colleagues appear and want part of that.

I, too, think congratulations are in order. Senator ENZI has worked so hard on this bill, Senator GRAMM and Senator SARBANES have taken the matter of leadership in this area, and Senator JOHNSON did an excellent job in shepherding it through over a long period of time. It has taken a long time primarily because some Members have seen to it that it took a longer period of time than it otherwise would have.

I still must respectfully oppose this bill. This bill is going to pass by a large margin. I understand that. The business community is strongly behind it. The administration supports it. The majority of both sides of the aisle support it. I believe they are in error. I believe it is a mistake. I think we should recognize exactly what we are doing. I will say it one more time; that is, in an era of increased technological proliferation, with the world becoming a more dangerous place, where rogue nations are developing technology that will enable them to endanger this country and a world where these rogue nations are getting their technology from countries such as China and Russia, for which this bill will liberalize export trade, in this environment, in this era, we are loosening our export controls.

At a time when we know that some of those to whom we will be sending more high-tech sensitive exports have in times past used them for military purposes, and that committees such as the Cox committee have reported to us that part of their increased capabilities have come about due to our lax export laws, this is the environment in which we pass a bill that gives the Department of Commerce substantial powers to make decisions concerning national security. The Department of Commerce is rightfully engaged in the considerations of trade and commerce. They should not be given the responsibility of national security.

We are going to pass a bill that will have broad categories of subjects that are deemed to be mass marketed or have foreign availability status. If someone over in the bowels of the Department of Commerce decides these items belong in those categories, then they are taken out of the regulatory process altogether, and you don't even have to have a license.

I do not think it is too much to ask for a few days of a license process with officials of the U.S. Government who are concerned about matters of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and matters of national security, it is not too much to ask that they be given a few days to make sure, as in times past, that we are not exporting something we should not be exporting. We give the President some override authority, but it is almost as if to say, ''Catch me if you can.'' We are greatly liberalizing things on this end and giving the President some power—which cannot be delegated, incidentally—giving the President some power to catch something here and there and stop it if he deems it necessary.

At a time that we are trying to persuade the world we need a missile defense system, which I believe we need because of the dangers posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, we are liberalizing export rules which I fear will contribute toward the ability of the countries with which we are trading, and in turn these rogue nations with which they are trading, to increase their weapons of mass destruction capabilities.

It is not that we want to hamper trade. It is not that we want to be obstructionist—because our friends on the other side of this issue are very well-meaning and make very good points. It is not those factors at all that motivate the few of us who remain on this side. It is that we can afford to be wrong. If our concerns are too great, it will mean that a few companies are held up a few extra days before they can export goods. But if our friends on the other side of this issue are wrong, I fear it could cause serious harm.

We are doing this in an environment where, even though the law has required us in times past to do a national security assessment of the decontrol of these laws, we have never done so. That is the basis of our concern. That is why, although we have had a wonderful, responsible, senatorial debate and discussion and vote, both on the floor and off, and think it has produced a better bill than we had originally, I must respectfully oppose it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. SARBANES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. JOHNSON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 275 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Akaka	Domenici	Lincoln
Allard	Dorgan	Lott
Allen	Durbin	Lugar
Baucus	Edwards	McConnell
Bayh	Ensign	Mikulski
Bennett	Enzi	Miller
Biden	Feinstein	Murray
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Graham	Nickles
Breaux	Gramm	Reed
Brownback	Grassley	Reid
Bunning	Gregg	Roberts
Burns	Hagel	Rockefeller
Campbell	Harkin	Santorum
Cantwell	Hatch	Sarbanes
Carnahan	Hollings	Schumer
Carper	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Chafee	Hutchison	Snowe
Cleland	Inouye	Stabenow
Clinton	Jeffords	Stevens
Collins	Johnson	Thomas
Conrad	Kennedy	Torricelli
Corzine	Kerry	Voinovich
Craig	Kohl	Warner
Crapo	Landrieu	Wellstone
Daschle	Leahy	Wyden
Dayton	Levin	
Dodd	Lieberman	

NAYS—14

Byrd	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Kyl	Specter
DeWine	McCain	Thompson
Feingold	Sessions	Thurmond
Helms	Shelby	

NOT VOTING—1

Murkowski

The bill (S. 149) was passed, as follows:

S. 149

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Export Administration Act of 2001''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—GENERAL AUTHORITY

Sec. 101. Commerce Control List.
Sec. 102. Delegation of authority.
Sec. 103. Public information; consultation requirements.
Sec. 104. Right of export.
Sec. 105. Export control advisory committees.
Sec. 106. President's Technology Export Council.
Sec. 107. Prohibition on charging fees.

TITLE II—NATIONAL SECURITY EXPORT CONTROLS

Subtitle A—Authority and Procedures

Sec. 201. Authority for national security export controls.
Sec. 202. National Security Control List.
Sec. 203. Country tiers.
Sec. 204. Incorporated parts and components.
Sec. 205. Petition process for modifying export status.

Subtitle B—Foreign Availability and Mass-Market Status

Sec. 211. Determination of foreign availability and mass-market status.
Sec. 212. Presidential set-aside of foreign availability status determination.
Sec. 213. Presidential set-aside of mass-market status determination.
Sec. 214. Office of Technology Evaluation.

TITLE III—FOREIGN POLICY EXPORT CONTROLS

Sec. 301. Authority for foreign policy export controls.
Sec. 302. Procedures for imposing controls.
Sec. 303. Criteria for foreign policy export controls.
Sec. 304. Presidential report before imposition of control.
Sec. 305. Imposition of controls.
Sec. 306. Deferral authority.
Sec. 307. Review, renewal, and termination.
Sec. 308. Termination of controls under this title.
Sec. 309. Compliance with international obligations.
Sec. 310. Designation of countries supporting international terrorism.
Sec. 311. Crime control instruments.

TITLE IV—PROCEDURES FOR EXPORT LICENSES AND INTERAGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Sec. 401. Export license procedures.
Sec. 402. Interagency dispute resolution process.

TITLE V—INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS; FOREIGN BOYCOTTS; SANCTIONS; AND ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 501. International arrangements.
Sec. 502. Foreign boycotts.
Sec. 503. Penalties.
Sec. 504. Missile proliferation control violations.
Sec. 505. Chemical and biological weapons proliferation sanctions.
Sec. 506. Enforcement.
Sec. 507. Administrative procedure.

TITLE VI—EXPORT CONTROL AUTHORITY AND REGULATIONS

Sec. 601. Export control authority and regulations.
Sec. 602. Confidentiality of information.
Sec. 603. Agricultural commodities, medicine, medical devices.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 701. Annual report.
Sec. 702. Technical and conforming amendments.

Sec. 703. Savings provisions.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AFFILIATE.—The term ''affiliate'' includes both governmental entities and commercial entities that are controlled in fact by the government of a country.

(2) CONTROL OR CONTROLLED.—The terms ''control'' and ''controlled'' mean any requirement, condition, authorization, or prohibition on the export or reexport of an item.

(3) CONTROL LIST.—The term ''Control List'' means the Commerce Control List established under section 101.

(4) CONTROLLED COUNTRY.—The term ''controlled country'' means a country with respect to which exports are controlled under section 201 or 301.

(5) CONTROLLED ITEM.—The term ''controlled item'' means an item the export of which is controlled under this Act.

(6) COUNTRY.—The term ''country'' means a sovereign country or an autonomous customs territory.

(7) COUNTRY SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.—The term ''country supporting international terrorism'' means a country designated by the Secretary of State pursuant to section 310.

(8) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of Commerce.

(9) EXPORT.—

(A) The term ''export'' means—

(i) an actual shipment, transfer, or transmission of an item out of the United States;

(ii) a transfer to any person of an item either within the United States or outside of the United States with the knowledge or intent that the item will be shipped, transferred, or transmitted to an unauthorized recipient outside the United States; or

(iii) a transfer of an item in the United States to an embassy or affiliate of a country, which shall be considered an export to that country.

(B) The term includes a reexport.

(10) FOREIGN AVAILABILITY STATUS.—The term ''foreign availability status'' means the status described in section 211(d)(1).

(11) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ''foreign person'' means—

(A) an individual who is not—

(i) a United States citizen;

(ii) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(iii) a protected individual as defined in section 274B(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. (8 U.S.C. 1324b(a)(3));

(B) any corporation, partnership, business association, society, trust, organization, or other nongovernmental entity created or organized under the laws of a foreign country or that has its principal place of business outside the United States; and

(C) any governmental entity of a foreign country.

(12) ITEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''item'' means any good, technology, or service.

(B) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

(i) GOOD.—The term ''good'' means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, including source code, and excluding technical data.

(ii) TECHNOLOGY.—The term ''technology'' means specific information that is necessary for the development, production, or use of an item, and takes the form of technical data or technical assistance.

(iii) SERVICE.—The term ''service'' means any act of assistance, help or aid.

(13) MASS-MARKET STATUS.—The term ''mass-market status'' means the status described in section 211(d)(2).

(14) MULTILATERAL EXPORT CONTROL REGIME.—The term ''multilateral export control regime'' means an international agreement or arrangement among two or more countries, including the United States, a purpose of which is to coordinate national export control policies of its members regarding certain items. The term includes regimes such as the Australia Group, the Wassenaar Arrangement, the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), and the Nuclear Suppliers' Group Dual Use Arrangement.

(15) NATIONAL SECURITY CONTROL LIST.—The term ''National Security Control List'' means the list established under section 202(a).

(16) PERSON.—The term ''person'' includes—

(A) any individual, or partnership, corporation, business association, society, trust, organization, or any other group created or organized under the laws of a country; and

(B) any government, or any governmental entity, including any governmental entity operating as a business enterprise.

(17) REEXPORT.—The term ''reexport'' means the shipment, transfer, transshipment, or diversion of items from one foreign country to another.

(18) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce.

(19) UNITED STATES.—The term ''United States'' means the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, and includes the outer Continental Shelf, as defined in section 2(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (42 U.S.C. 1331(a)).

(20) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(A) any United States citizen, resident, or national (other than an individual resident outside the United States who is employed by a person other than a United States person);

(B) any domestic concern (including any permanent domestic establishment of any foreign concern); and

(C) any foreign subsidiary or affiliate (including any permanent foreign establishment) of any domestic concern which is controlled in fact by such domestic concern, as determined under regulations prescribed by the President.

TITLE I—GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 101. COMMERCE CONTROL LIST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under such conditions as the Secretary may impose, consistent with the provisions of this Act, the Secretary—

(1) shall establish and maintain a Commerce Control List (in this Act referred to as the ''Control List'') consisting of items the export of which are subject to licensing or other authorization or requirement; and

(2) may require any type of license, or other authorization, including recordkeeping and reporting, appropriate to the effective and efficient implementation of this Act with respect to the export of an item on the Control List or otherwise subject to control under title II or III of this Act.

(b) TYPES OF LICENSE OR OTHER AUTHORIZATION.—The types of license or other authorization referred to in subsection (a)(2) include the following:

(1) SPECIFIC EXPORTS.—A license that authorizes a specific export.

(2) MULTIPLE EXPORTS.—A license that authorizes multiple exports in lieu of a license for each export.

(3) NOTIFICATION IN LIEU OF LICENSE.— A notification in lieu of a license that authorizes a specific export or multiple exports subject to the condition that the exporter file with the Department advance notification of the intent to export in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(4) LICENSE EXCEPTION.—Authority to export an item on the Control List without prior license or notification in lieu of a license.

(c) AFTER-MARKET SERVICE AND REPLACEMENT PARTS.—A license to export an item under this Act shall not be required for an exporter to provide after-market service or replacement parts in order to replace on a one-for-one basis parts that were in an item that was lawfully exported from the United States, unless—

(1) the Secretary determines that such license is required to export such parts; or

(2) the after-market service or replacement parts would materially enhance the capability of an item which was the basis for the item being controlled.

(d) INCIDENTAL TECHNOLOGY.—A license or other authorization to export an item under this Act includes authorization to export technology related to the item, if the level of the technology does not exceed the minimum necessary to install, repair, maintain, inspect, operate, or use the item.

(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 102. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b) and subject to the provisions of this Act, the President may delegate the power, authority, and discretion conferred upon the President by this Act to such departments, agencies, and officials of the Government as the President considers appropriate.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) DELEGATION TO APPOINTEES CONFIRMED BY SENATE.—No authority delegated to the President under this Act may be delegated by the President to, or exercised by, any official of any department or agency the head of which is not appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(2) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—The President may not delegate or transfer the President's power, authority, or discretion to overrule or modify any recommendation or decision made by the Secretary, the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of State under this Act.

SEC. 103. PUBLIC INFORMATION; CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) PUBLIC INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall keep the public fully informed of changes in export control policy and procedures instituted in conformity with this Act.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH PERSONS AFFECTED.—The Secretary shall consult regularly with representatives of a broad spectrum of enterprises, labor organizations, and citizens interested in or affected by export controls in order to obtain their views on United States export control policy and the foreign availability or mass-market status of controlled items.

SEC. 104. RIGHT OF EXPORT.

No license or other authorization to export may be required under this Act, or under regulations issued under this Act, except to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 105. EXPORT CONTROL ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

(a) APPOINTMENT.—Upon the Secretary's own initiative or upon the written request of representatives of a substantial segment of any industry which produces any items subject to export controls under this Act or being considered for such controls, the Secretary may appoint export control advisory committees with respect to any such items. Each such committee shall consist of representatives of United States industry and Government officials, including officials from the Departments of Commerce, Defense, and State, and other appropriate departments and agencies of the Government. The Secretary shall permit the widest possible participation by the business community on the export control advisory committees.

(b) FUNCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Export control advisory committees appointed under subsection (a) shall advise and assist the Secretary, and any other department, agency, or official of the Government carrying out functions under this Act, on actions (including all aspects of controls imposed or proposed) designed to carry out the provisions of this Act concerning the items with respect to which such export control advisory committees were appointed.

(2) OTHER CONSULTATIONS.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall prevent the United States Government from consulting, at any time, with any person representing an industry or the general public, regardless of whether such person is a member of an export control advisory committee. Members of the public shall be given a reasonable opportunity, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to present information to such committees.

(c) REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.—Upon the request of any member of any export control advisory committee appointed under subsection (a), the Secretary may, if the Secretary determines it to be appropriate, reimburse such member for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by such member in connection with the duties of such member.

(d) CHAIRPERSON.—Each export control advisory committee appointed under subsection (a) shall elect a chairperson, and shall meet at least every 3 months at the call of the chairperson, unless the chairperson determines, in consultation with the other members of the committee, that such a meeting is not necessary to achieve the purposes of this section. Each such committee shall be terminated after a period of 2 years, unless extended by the Secretary for additional periods of 2 years each. The Secretary shall consult with each such committee on such termination or extension of that committee.

(e) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—To facilitate the work of the export control advisory committees appointed under subsection (a), the Secretary, in conjunction with other departments and agencies participating in the administration of this Act, shall disclose to each such committee adequate information, consistent with national security and intelligence sources and methods, pertaining to the reasons for the export controls which are in effect or contemplated for the items or policies for which that committee furnishes advice. Information provided by the export control advisory committees shall not be subject to disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and such information shall not be published or disclosed unless the Secretary determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest.

SEC. 106. PRESIDENT'S TECHNOLOGY EXPORT COUNCIL.

The President may establish a President's Technology Export Council to advise the President on the implementation, operation, and effectiveness of this Act.

SEC. 107. PROHIBITION ON CHARGING FEES.

No fee may be charged in connection with the submission or processing of an application for an export license under this Act.

TITLE II—NATIONAL SECURITY EXPORT CONTROLS

Subtitle A—Authority and Procedures

SEC. 201. AUTHORITY FOR NATIONAL SECURITY EXPORT CONTROLS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to carry out the purposes set forth in subsection (b), the President may, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, prohibit, curtail, or require a license, or other authorization for the export of any item subject to the jurisdiction of the United States or exported by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. The President may also require recordkeeping and reporting with respect to the export of such item.

(2) EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—The authority contained in this subsection shall be exercised by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the intelligence agencies, and such other departments and agencies as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of national security export controls are the following:

(1) To restrict the export of items that would contribute to the military potential of countries so as to prove detrimental to the national security of the United States, its allies or countries sharing common strategic objectives with the United States.

(2) To stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the means to deliver them, and other significant military capabilities by—

(A) leading international efforts to control the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons, nuclear explosive devices, missile delivery systems, key-enabling technologies, and other significant military capabilities;

(B) controlling involvement of United States persons in, and contributions by United States persons to, foreign programs intended to develop weapons of mass destruction, missiles, and other significant military capabilities, and the means to design, test, develop, produce, stockpile, or use them; and

(C) implementing international treaties or other agreements or arrangements concerning controls on exports of designated items, reports on the production, processing, consumption, and exports and imports of such items, and compliance with verification programs.

(3) To deter acts of international terrorism.

(c) END USE AND END USER CONTROLS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, controls may be imposed, based on the end use or end user, on the export of any item, that could contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or the means to deliver them.

(d) ENHANCED CONTROLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the President may determine that applying the provisions of section 204 or 211 with respect to an item on the National Security Control List would constitute a significant threat to the national security of the United States and that such item requires enhanced control. If the President determines that enhanced control should apply to such item, the item may be excluded from the provisions of section 204, section 211, or both, until such time as the President shall determine that such enhanced control should no longer apply to such item. The President may not delegate the authority provided for in this subsection.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The President shall promptly report any determination described in paragraph (1), along with the specific reasons for the determination, to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 202. NATIONAL SECURITY CONTROL LIST.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF LIST.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish and maintain a National Security Control List as part of the Control List.

(2) CONTENTS.—The National Security Control List shall be composed of a list of items the export of which is controlled for national security purposes under this title.

(3) IDENTIFICATION OF ITEMS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY CONTROL LIST.—The Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense and in consultation with the head of any other department or agency of the United States that the Secretary considers appropriate, shall identify the items to be included on the National Security Control List provided that the National Security Control List shall, on the date of enactment of this Act, include all of the items on the Commerce Control List controlled on the day before the date of enactment of this Act to protect the national security of the United States, to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them, and to deter acts of international terrorism. The Secretary shall review on a continuing basis and, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense and in consultation with the head of any other department or agency of the United States that the Secretary considers appropriate, adjust the National Security Control List to add items that require control under this section and to remove items that no longer warrant control under this section.

(b) RISK ASSESSMENT.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—In establishing and maintaining the National Security Control List, the risk factors set forth in paragraph (2) shall be considered, weighing national security concerns and economic costs.

(2) RISK FACTORS.—The risk factors referred to in paragraph (1), with respect to each item, are as follows:

(A) The characteristics of the item.

(B) The threat, if any, to the United States or the national security interest of the United States from the misuse or diversion of such item.

(C) The effectiveness of controlling the item for national security purposes of the United States, taking into account mass-market status, foreign availability, and other relevant factors.

(D) The threat to the national security interests of the United States if the item is not controlled.

(E) Any other appropriate risk factors.

(c) REPORT ON CONTROL LIST.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress which lists all items on the Commerce Control List controlled on the day before the date of enactment of this Act to protect the national security of the United

States, to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them, and to deter acts of international terrorism, not included on the National Security Control List pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 203. COUNTRY TIERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND ASSIGNMENT.—In administering export controls for national security purposes under this title, the President shall, not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) establish and maintain a country tiering system in accordance with subsection (b); and

(B) based on the assessments required under subsection (c), assign each country to an appropriate tier for each item or group of items the export of which is controlled for national security purposes under this title.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The establishment and assignment of country tiers under this section shall be made after consultation with the Secretary, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the intelligence agencies, and such other departments and agencies as the President considers appropriate.

(3) REDETERMINATION AND REVIEW OF ASSIGNMENTS.—The President may redetermine the assignment of a country to a particular tier at any time and shall review and, as the President considers appropriate, reassign country tiers on an on-going basis. The Secretary shall provide notice of any such reassignment to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE OF TIER ASSIGNMENT.—An assignment of a country to a particular tier shall take effect on the date on which notice of the assignment is published in the Federal Register.

(b) TIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish a country tiering system consisting of not less than 3 tiers for purposes of this section.

(2) RANGE.—Countries that represent the lowest risk of diversion or misuse of an item on the National Security Control List shall be assigned to the lowest tier. Countries that represent the highest risk of diversion or misuse of an item on the National Security Control List shall be assigned to the highest tier.

(3) OTHER COUNTRIES.—Countries that fall between the lowest and highest risk to the national security interest of the United States with respect to the risk of diversion or misuse of an item on the National Security Control List shall be assigned to a tier other than the lowest or highest tier, based on the assessments required under subsection (c).

(c) ASSESSMENTS.—The President shall make an assessment of each country in assigning a country tier taking into consideration risk factors including the following:

(1) The present and potential relationship of the country with the United States.

(2) The present and potential relationship of the country with countries friendly to the United States and with countries hostile to the United States.

(3) The country's capabilities regarding chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons and the country's membership in, and level of compliance with, relevant multilateral export control regimes.

(4) The country's capabilities regarding missile systems and the country's membership in, and level of compliance with, relevant multilateral export control regimes.

(5) Whether the country, if a NATO or major non-NATO ally with whom the United States has entered into a free trade agreement as of January 1, 1986, controls exports in accordance with the criteria and standards of a multilateral export control regime as defined in section 2(14) pursuant to an international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(6) The country's other military capabilities and the potential threat posed by the country to the United States or its allies.

(7) The effectiveness of the country's export control system.

(8) The level of the country's cooperation with United States export control enforcement and other efforts.

(9) The risk of export diversion by the country to a higher tier country.

(10) The designation of the country as a country supporting international terrorism under section 310.

(d) TIER APPLICATION.—The country tiering system shall be used in the determination of license requirements pursuant to section 201(a)(1).

SEC. 204. INCORPORATED PARTS AND COMPONENTS.

(a) EXPORT OF ITEMS CONTAINING CONTROLLED PARTS AND COMPONENTS.—Controls may not be imposed under this title or any other provision of law on an item solely because the item contains parts or components subject to export controls under this title, if the parts or components—

(1) are essential to the functioning of the item,

(2) are customarily included in sales of the item in countries other than controlled countries, and

(3) comprise 25 percent or less of the total value of the item,

unless the item itself, if exported, would by virtue of the functional characteristics of the item as a whole make a significant contribution to the military or proliferation potential of a controlled country or end user which would prove detrimental to the national security of the United States, or unless failure to control the item would be contrary to the provisions of section 201(c), section 201(d), or section 309 of this Act.

(b) REEXPORTS OF FOREIGN-MADE ITEMS INCORPORATING UNITED STATES CONTROLLED CONTENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No authority or permission may be required under this title to reexport to a country an item that is produced in a country other than the United States and incorporates parts or components that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, if the value of the controlled United States content of the item produced in such other country is 25 percent or less of the total value of the item; except that in the case of reexports of an item to a country designated as a country supporting international terrorism pursuant to section 310, controls may be maintained if the value of the controlled United States content is more than 10 percent of the total value of the item.

(2) DEFINITION OF CONTROLLED UNITED STATES CONTENT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''controlled United States content'' of an item means those parts or components that—

(A) are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;

(B) are incorporated into the item; and

(C) would, at the time of the reexport, require a license under this title if exported from the United States to a country to which the item is to be reexported.

SEC. 205. PETITION PROCESS FOR MODIFYING EXPORT STATUS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a process for interested persons to petition the Secretary to change the status of an item on the National Security Control List.

(b) EVALUATIONS AND DETERMINATIONS.—Evaluations and determinations with respect to a petition filed pursuant to this section shall be made in accordance with section 202.

Subtitle B—Foreign Availability and Mass-Market Status

SEC. 211. DETERMINATION OF FOREIGN AVAILABILITY AND MASS-MARKET STATUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(1) on a continuing basis,

(2) upon a request from the Office of Technology Evaluation, or

(3) upon receipt of a petition filed by an interested person,

review and determine the foreign availability and the mass-market status of any item the export of which is controlled under this title.

(b) PETITION AND CONSULTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a process for an interested person to petition the Secretary for a determination that an item has a foreign availability or mass-market status. In evaluating and making a determination with respect to a petition filed under this section, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, and other appropriate Government agencies and with the Office of Technology Evaluation (established pursuant to section 214).

(2) TIME FOR MAKING DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall, within 6 months after receiving a petition described in subsection (a)(3), determine whether the item that is the subject of the petition has foreign availability or mass-market status and shall notify the petitioner of the determination.

(c) RESULT OF DETERMINATION.—In any case in which the Secretary determines, in accordance with procedures and criteria which the Secretary shall by regulation establish, that an item described in subsection (a) has—

(1) a foreign availability status, or

(2) a mass-market status,

the Secretary shall notify the President (and other appropriate departments and agencies) and publish the notice of the determination in the Federal Register. The Secretary's determination shall become final 30 days after the date the notice is published, the item shall be removed from the National Security Control List, and a license or other authorization shall not be required under this title with respect to the item, unless the President makes a determination described in section 212 or 213, or takes action under section 309, with respect to the item in that 30-day period.

(d) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING FOREIGN AVAILABILITY AND MASS-MARKET STATUS.—

(1) FOREIGN AVAILABILITY STATUS.—The Secretary shall determine that an item has foreign availability status under this subtitle, if the item (or a substantially identical or directly competitive item)—

(A) is available to controlled countries from sources outside the United States, including countries that participate with the United States in multilateral export controls;

(B) can be acquired at a price that is not excessive when compared to the price at which a controlled country could acquire such item from sources within the United States in the absence of export controls; and

(C) is available in sufficient quantity so that the requirement of a license or other authorization with respect to the export of such item is or would be ineffective.

(2) MASS-MARKET STATUS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In determining whether an item has mass-market status under this subtitle, the Secretary shall consider the following criteria with respect to the item (or a substantially identical or directly competitive item):

(i) The production and availability for sale in a large volume to multiple potential purchasers.

(ii) The widespread distribution through normal commercial channels, such as retail stores, direct marketing catalogues, electronic commerce, and other channels.

(iii) The conduciveness to shipment and delivery by generally accepted commercial means of transport.

(iv) The use for the item's normal intended purpose without substantial and specialized service provided by the manufacturer, distributor, or other third party.

(B) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—If the Secretary finds that the item (or a substantially identical or directly competitive item) meets the criteria set forth in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall determine that the item has mass-market status.

(3) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this subtitle—

(A) SUBSTANTIALLY IDENTICAL ITEM.—The determination of whether an item in relation to another item is a substantially identical item shall include a fair assessment of end-uses, the properties, nature, and quality of the item.

(B) DIRECTLY COMPETITIVE ITEM.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The determination of whether an item in relation to another item is a directly competitive item shall include a fair assessment of whether the item, although not substantially identical in its intrinsic or inherent characteristics, is substantially equivalent for commercial purposes and may be adapted for substantially the same uses.

(ii) EXCEPTION.—An item is not directly competitive with a controlled item if the item is not of comparable quality to the controlled item with respect to characteristics that resulted in the export of the item being controlled.

SEC. 212. PRESIDENTIAL SET-ASIDE OF FOREIGN AVAILABILITY STATUS DETERMINATION.

(a) CRITERIA FOR PRESIDENTIAL SET-ASIDE.—

(1) GENERAL CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President determines that—

(i) decontrolling or failing to control an item constitutes a threat to the national security of the United States, and export controls on the item would advance the national security interests of the United States,

(ii) there is a high probability that the foreign availability of an item will be eliminated through international negotiations within a reasonable period of time taking into account the characteristics of the item, or

(iii) United States controls on the item have been imposed under section 309,

the President may set aside the Secretary's determination of foreign availability status with respect to the item.

(B) NONDELEGATION.—The President may not delegate the authority provided for in this paragraph.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The President shall promptly—

(A) report any set-aside determination described in paragraph (1), along with the specific reasons for the determination, to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives; and

(B) publish the determination in the Federal Register.

(b) PRESIDENTIAL ACTION IN CASE OF SET-ASIDE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) NEGOTIATIONS.—In any case in which export controls are maintained on an item because the President has made a determination under subsection (a), the President shall actively pursue negotiations with the governments of the appropriate foreign countries for the purpose of eliminating such availability.

(B) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than the date the President begins negotiations, the President shall notify in writing the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives that the President has begun such negotiations and why the President believes it is important to the national security that export controls on the item involved be maintained.

(2) PERIODIC REVIEW OF DETERMINATION.—The President shall review a determination described in subsection (a) at least every 6 months. Promptly after each review is completed, the Secretary shall submit to the committees of Congress referred to in paragraph (1)(B) a report on the results of the review, together with the status of international negotiations to eliminate the foreign availability of the item.

(3) EXPIRATION OF PRESIDENTIAL SET-ASIDE.—A determination by the President described in subsection (a)(1)(A) (i) or (ii) shall cease to apply with respect to an item on the earlier of—

(A) the date that is 6 months after the date on which the determination is made under subsection (a), if the President has not commenced international negotiations to eliminate the foreign availability of the item within that 6-month period;

(B) the date on which the negotiations described in paragraph (1) have terminated without achieving an agreement to eliminate foreign availability;

(C) the date on which the President determines that there is not a high probability of eliminating foreign availability of the item through negotiation; or

(D) the date that is 18 months after the date on which the determination described in subsection (a)(1)(A) (i) or (ii) is made if the President has been unable to achieve an agreement to eliminate foreign availability within that 18-month period.

(4) ACTION ON EXPIRATION OF PRESIDENTIAL SET-ASIDE.—Upon the expiration of a Presidential set-aside under paragraph (3) with respect to an item, the Secretary shall not require a license or other authorization to export the item.

SEC. 213. PRESIDENTIAL SET-ASIDE OF MASS-MARKET STATUS DETERMINATION.

(a) CRITERIA FOR PRESIDENTIAL SET-ASIDE.—

(1) GENERAL CRITERIA.—If the President determines that—

(A)(i) decontrolling or failing to control an item constitutes a serious threat to the national security of the United States, and

(ii) export controls on the item would advance the national security interests of the United States, or

(B) United States controls on the item have been imposed under section 309,

the President may set aside the Secretary's determination of mass-market status with respect to the item.

(2) NONDELEGATION.—The President may not delegate the authority provided for in this subsection.

(b) PRESIDENTIAL ACTION IN CASE OF SET-ASIDE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which export controls are maintained on an item because the President has made a determination under subsection (a), the President shall promptly report the determination, along with the specific reasons for the determination, to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, and shall publish notice of the determination in the Federal Register not later than 30 days after the Secretary publishes notice of the Secretary's determination that an item has mass-market status.

(2) PERIODIC REVIEW OF DETERMINATION.—The President shall review a determination made under subsection (a) at least every 6 months. Promptly after each review is completed, the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of the review to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 214. OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY EVALUATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—The Secretary shall establish in the Department of Commerce an Office of Technology Evaluation (in this section referred to as the ''Office''), which shall be under the direction of the Secretary. The Office shall be responsible for gathering, coordinating, and analyzing all the necessary information in order for the Secretary to make determinations of foreign availability and mass-market status under this Act.

(2) STAFF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that the Office include persons to carry out the responsibilities set forth in subsection (b) of this section that have training, expertise, and experience in—

(i) economic analysis;

(ii) the defense industrial base;

(iii) technological developments; and

(iv) national security and foreign policy export controls.

(B) DETAILEES.—In addition to employees of the Department of Commerce, the Secretary may accept on nonreimbursable detail to the Office, employees of the Departments of Defense, State, and Energy and other departments and agencies as appropriate.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Office shall be responsible for—

(1) conducting foreign availability assessments to determine whether a controlled item is available to controlled countries and whether requiring a license, or denial of a license for the export of such item, is or would be ineffective;

(2) conducting mass-market assessments to determine whether a controlled item is available to controlled countries because of the mass-market status of the item;

(3) monitoring and evaluating worldwide technological developments in industry sectors critical to the national security interests of the United States to determine foreign availability and mass-market status of controlled items;

(4) monitoring and evaluating multilateral export control regimes and foreign government export control policies and practices that affect the national security interests of the United States;

(5) conducting assessments of United States industrial sectors critical to the United States defense industrial base and how the sectors are affected by technological developments, technology transfers, and foreign competition, including imports of manufactured goods; and

(6) conducting assessments of the impact of United States export control policies on—

(A) United States industrial sectors critical to the national security interests of the United States; and

(B) the United States economy in general.

(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall make available to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate as part of the Secretary's annual report required under section 701 information on the operations of the Office, and on improvements in the Government's ability to assess foreign availability and mass-market status, during the fiscal year preceding the report, including information on the training of personnel, and the use of Commercial Service Officers of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service to assist in making determinations. The information shall also include a description of determinations made under this Act during the preceding fiscal year that foreign availability or mass-market status did or did not exist (as the case may be), together with an explanation of the determinations.

(d) SHARING OF INFORMATION.—Each department or agency of the United States, including any intelligence agency, and all contractors with any such department or agency, shall, consistent with the need to protect intelligence sources and methods, furnish information to the Office concerning foreign availability and the mass-market status of items subject to export controls under this Act.

TITLE III—FOREIGN POLICY EXPORT CONTROLS

SEC. 301. AUTHORITY FOR FOREIGN POLICY EXPORT CONTROLS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to carry out the purposes set forth in subsection (b), the President may, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, prohibit, curtail, or require a license, other authorization, recordkeeping, or reporting for the export of any item subject to the jurisdiction of the United States or exported by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(2) EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—The authority contained in this subsection shall be exercised by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and such other departments and agencies as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of foreign policy export controls are the following:

(1) To promote the foreign policy objectives of the United States, consistent with the purposes of this section and the provisions of this Act.

(2) To promote international peace, stability, and respect for fundamental human rights.

(3) To use export controls to deter and punish acts of international terrorism and to encourage other countries to take immediate steps to prevent the use of their territories or resources to aid, encourage, or give sanctuary to those persons involved in directing, supporting, or participating in acts of international terrorism.

(c) FOREIGN PRODUCTS.—No authority or permission may be required under this title to reexport to a country an item that is produced in a country other than the United States and incorporates parts or components that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, except that in the case of reexports of an item to a country designated as a country supporting international terrorism pursuant to section 310, controls may be maintained if the value of the controlled United States content is more than 10 percent of the value of the item.

(d) CONTRACT SANCTITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may not prohibit the export of any item under this title if that item is to be exported—

(A) in performance of a binding contract, agreement, or other contractual commitment entered into before the date on which the President reports to Congress the President's intention to impose controls on that item under this title; or

(B) under a license or other authorization issued under this Act before the earlier of the date on which the control is initially imposed or the date on which the President reports to Congress the President's intention to impose controls under this title.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition contained in paragraph (1) shall not apply in any case in which the President determines and certifies to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives that—

(A) there is a serious threat to a foreign policy interest of the United States;

(B) the prohibition of exports under each binding contract, agreement, commitment, license, or authorization will be instrumental in remedying the situation posing the serious threat; and

(C) the export controls will be in effect only as long as the serious threat exists.

SEC. 302. PROCEDURES FOR IMPOSING CONTROLS.

(a) NOTICE.—

(1) INTENT TO IMPOSE FOREIGN POLICY EXPORT CONTROL.—Except as provided in section 306, not later than 45 days before imposing or implementing an export control under this title, the President shall publish in the Federal Register—

(A) a notice of intent to do so; and

(B) provide for a period of not less than 30 days for any interested person to submit comments on the export control proposed under this title.

(2) PURPOSES OF NOTICE.—The purposes of the notice are—

(A) to provide an opportunity for the formulation of an effective export control policy under this title that advances United States economic and foreign policy interests; and

(B) to provide an opportunity for negotiations to achieve the purposes set forth in section 301(b).

(b) NEGOTIATIONS.—During the 45-day period that begins on the date of notice described in subsection (a), the President may negotiate with the government of the foreign country against which the export control is proposed in order to resolve the reasons underlying the proposed export control.

(c) CONSULTATION.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The President shall consult with the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives regarding any export control proposed under this title and the efforts to achieve or increase multilateral cooperation on the issues or problems underlying the proposed export control.

(2) CLASSIFIED CONSULTATION.—The consultations described in paragraph (1) may be conducted on a classified basis if the Secretary considers it necessary.

SEC. 303. CRITERIA FOR FOREIGN POLICY EXPORT CONTROLS.

Each export control imposed by the President under this title shall—

(1) have clearly stated and specific United States foreign policy objectives;

(2) have objective standards for evaluating the success or failure of the export control;

(3) include an assessment by the President that—

(A) the export control is likely to achieve such objectives and the expected time for achieving the objectives; and

(B) the achievement of the objectives of the export control outweighs any potential costs of the export control to other United States economic, foreign policy, humanitarian, or national security interests;

(4) be targeted narrowly; and

(5) seek to minimize any adverse impact on the humanitarian activities of United States and foreign nongovernmental organizations in the country subject to the export control.

SEC. 304. PRESIDENTIAL REPORT BEFORE IMPOSITION OF CONTROL.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Before imposing an export control under this title, the President shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives a report on the proposed export control. The report may be provided on a classified basis if the Secretary considers it necessary.

(b) CONTENT.—The report shall contain a description and assessment of each of the criteria described in section 303. In addition, the report shall contain a description and assessment of—

(1) any diplomatic and other steps that the United States has taken to accomplish the intended objective of the proposed export control;

(2) unilateral export controls imposed, and other measures taken, by other countries to achieve the intended objective of the proposed export control;

(3) the likelihood of multilateral adoption of comparable export controls;

(4) alternative measures to promote the same objectives and the likelihood of their potential success;

(5) any United States obligations under international trade agreements, treaties, or other international arrangements, with which the proposed export control may conflict;

(6) the likelihood that the proposed export control could lead to retaliation against United States interests;

(7) the likely economic impact of the proposed export control on the United States economy, United States international trade and investment, and United States agricultural interests, commercial interests, and employment; and

(8) a conclusion that the probable achievement of the objectives of the proposed export control outweighs any likely costs to United States economic, foreign policy, humanitarian, or national security interests, including any potential harm to the United States agricultural and business firms and to the international reputation of the United States as a reliable supplier of goods, services, or technology.

SEC. 305. IMPOSITION OF CONTROLS.

The President may impose an export control under this title after the submission of the report required under section 304 and publication in the Federal Register of a notice of the imposition of the export control .

SEC. 306. DEFERRAL AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The President may defer compliance with any requirement contained in section 302(a), 304, or 305 in the case of a proposed export control if—

(1) the President determines that a deferral of compliance with the requirement is in the national interest of the United States; and

(2) the requirement is satisfied not later than 60 days after the date on which the export control is imposed under this title.

(b) TERMINATION OF CONTROL.—An export control with respect to which a deferral has been made under subsection (a) shall terminate 60 days after the date the export control is imposed unless all requirements have been satisfied before the expiration of the 60-day period.

SEC. 307. REVIEW, RENEWAL, AND TERMINATION.

(a) RENEWAL AND TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any export control imposed under this title shall terminate on March 31 of each renewal year unless the President renews the export control on or before such date. For purposes of this section, the term ''renewal year'' means 2003 and every 2 years thereafter.

(2) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to an export control imposed under this title that—

(A) is required by law;

(B) is targeted against any country designated as a country supporting international terrorism pursuant to section 310; or

(C) has been in effect for less than 1 year as of February 1 of a renewal year.

(b) REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1 of each renewal year, the President shall review all export controls in effect under this title.

(2) CONSULTATION.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Before completing a review under paragraph (1), the President shall consult with the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representative regarding each export control that is being reviewed.

(B) CLASSIFIED CONSULTATION.—The consultations may be conducted on a classified basis if the Secretary considers it necessary.

(3) PUBLIC COMMENT.—conducting the review of each export control under paragraph (1), the President shall provide a period of not less than 30 days for any interested person to submit comments on renewal of the export control. The President shall publish notice of the opportunity for public comment in the Federal Register not less than 45 days before the review is required to be completed.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Before renewing an export control imposed under this title, the President shall submit to the committees of Congress referred to in subsection (b)(2)(A) a report on each export control that the President intends to renew.

(2) FORM AND CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report may be provided on a classified basis if the Secretary considers it necessary. Each report shall contain the following:

(A) A clearly stated explanation of the specific United States foreign policy objective that the existing export control was intended to achieve.

(B) An assessment of—

(i) the extent to which the existing export control achieved its objectives before renewal based on the objective criteria established for evaluating the export control; and

(ii) the reasons why the existing export control has failed to fully achieve its objectives and, if renewed, how the export control will achieve that objective before the next renewal year.

(C) An updated description and assessment of—

(i) each of the criteria described in section 303, and

(ii) each matter required to be reported under section 304(b) (1) through (8).

(3) RENEWAL OF EXPORT CONTROL.—The President may renew an export control under this title after submission of the report described in paragraph (2) and publication of notice of renewal in the Federal Register.

SEC. 308. TERMINATION OF CONTROLS UNDER THIS TITLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President—

(1) shall terminate any export control imposed under this title if the President determines that the control has substantially achieved the objective for which it was imposed; and

(2) may terminate at any time any export control imposed under this title that is not required by law.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) do not apply to any export control imposed pursuant to section 310.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE OF TERMINATION.—The termination of an export control pursuant to this section shall take effect on the date notice of the termination is published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 309. COMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act setting forth limitations on authority to control exports and except as provided in section 304, the President may impose controls on exports to a particular country or countries—

(1) of items listed on the control list of a multilateral export control regime, as defined in section 2(14); or

(2) in order to fulfill obligations or commitments of the United States under resolutions of the United Nations and under treaties, or other international agreements and arrangements, to which the United States is a party.

SEC. 310. DESIGNATION OF COUNTRIES SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.

(a) LICENSE REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act setting forth limitations on the authority to control exports, a license shall be required for the export of any item to a country if the Secretary of State has determined that—

(1) the government of such country has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism; and

(2) the export of the item could make a significant contribution to the military potential of such country, including its military logistics capability, or could enhance the ability of such country to support acts of international terrorism.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary and the Secretary of State shall notify the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate at least 30 days before issuing any license required by subsection (a).

(c) DETERMINATIONS REGARDING REPEATED SUPPORT.—Each determination of the Secretary of State under subsection (a)(1), including each determination in effect on the date of the enactment of the Antiterrorism and Arms Export Amendments Act of 1989, shall be published in the Federal Register.

(d) LIMITATIONS ON RESCINDING DETERMINATION.—A determination made by the Secretary of State under subsection (a)(1) may not be rescinded unless the President submits to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate—

(1) before the proposed rescission would take effect, a report certifying that—

(A) there has been a fundamental change in the leadership and policies of the government of the country concerned;

(B) that government is not supporting acts of international terrorism; and

(C) that government has provided assurances that it will not support acts of international terrorism in the future; or

(2) at least 45 days before the proposed rescission would take effect, a report justifying the rescission and certifying that—

(A) the government concerned has not provided any support for international terrorism during the preceding 6-month period; and

(B) the government concerned has provided assurances that it will not support acts of international terrorism in the future.

(e) INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary and the Secretary of State shall include in the notification required by subsection (b)—

(1) a detailed description of the item to be offered, including a brief description of the capabilities of any item for which a license to export is sought;

(2) the reasons why the foreign country or international organization to which the export or transfer is proposed to be made needs the item which is the subject of such export or transfer and a description of the manner in which such country or organization intends to use the item;

(3) the reasons why the proposed export or transfer is in the national interest of the United States;

(4) an analysis of the impact of the proposed export or transfer on the military capabilities of the foreign country or international organization to which such export or transfer would be made;

(5) an analysis of the manner in which the proposed export would affect the relative military strengths of countries in the region to which the item which is the subject of such export would be delivered and whether other countries in the region have comparable kinds and amounts of the item; and

(6) an analysis of the impact of the proposed export or transfer on the United States relations with the countries in the region to which the item which is the subject of such export would be delivered.

SEC. 311. CRIME CONTROL INSTRUMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to promote respect for fundamental human rights, crime control and detection instruments and equipment shall be approved for export by the Secretary only pursuant to an individual export license. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) any determination by the Secretary of what goods or technology shall be included on the list established pursuant to this subsection as a result of the export restrictions imposed by this section shall be made with

the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and

(2) any determination by the Secretary to approve or deny an export license application to export crime control or detection instruments or equipment shall be made in concurrence with the recommendations of the Secretary of State submitted to the Secretary with respect to the application pursuant to section 401 of this Act,

except that, if the Secretary does not agree with the Secretary of State with respect to any determination under paragraph (1) or (2), the matter shall be referred to the President for resolution.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Except as herein provided, the provisions of this section shall not apply with respect to exports to countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or to Japan, Australia, or New Zealand, or to such other countries as the President shall designate consistent with the purposes of this section and section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304). The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to exports of any of the items identified in subsection (c).

(c) REPORT.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 602 or any other confidentiality requirements, the Secretary shall include in the annual report submitted to Congress pursuant to section 701 a report describing the aggregate number of licenses approved during the preceding calendar year for the export of any items listed in the following paragraphs identified by country and control list number:

(1) Serrated thumbcuffs, leg irons, thumbscrews, and electro-shock stun belts.

(2) Leg cuffs, thumbcuffs, shackle boards, restraint chairs, straitjackets, and plastic handcuffs.

(3) Stun guns, shock batons, electric cattle prods, immobilization guns and projectiles, other than equipment used exclusively to treat or tranquilize animals and arms designed solely for signal, flare, or saluting use.

(4) Technology exclusively for the development or production of electro-shock devices.

(5) Pepper gas weapons and saps.

(6) Any other item or technology the Secretary determines is a specially designed instrument of torture or is especially susceptible to abuse as an instrument of torture.

TITLE IV—PROCEDURES FOR EXPORT LICENSES AND INTERAGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION

SEC. 401. EXPORT LICENSE PROCEDURES.

(a) RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All applications for a license or other authorization to export a controlled item shall be filed in such manner and include such information as the Secretary may, by regulation, prescribe.

(2) PROCEDURES.—In guidance and regulations that implement this section, the Secretary shall describe the procedures required by this section, the responsibilities of the Secretary and of other departments and agencies in reviewing applications, the rights of the applicant, and other relevant matters affecting the review of license applications.

(3) CALCULATION OF PROCESSING TIMES.—In calculating the processing times set forth in this title, the Secretary shall use calendar days, except that if the final day for a required action falls on a weekend or holiday, that action shall be taken no later than the following business day.

(4) CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING APPLICATIONS.—In determining whether to grant an application to export a controlled item under this Act, the following criteria shall be considered:

(A) The characteristics of the controlled item.

(B) The threat to—

(i) the national security interests of the United States from items controlled under title II of this Act; or

(ii) the foreign policy of the United States from items controlled under title III of this Act.

(C) The country tier designation of the country to which a controlled item is to be exported pursuant to section 203.

(D) The risk of export diversion or misuse by—

(i) the exporter;

(ii) the method of export;

(iii) the end-user;

(iv) the country where the end-user is located; and

(v) the end-use.

(E) Risk mitigating factors including, but not limited to—

(i) changing the characteristics of the controlled item;

(ii) after-market monitoring by the exporter; and

(iii) post-shipment verification.

(b) INITIAL SCREENING.—

(1) UPON RECEIPT OF APPLICATION.—Upon receipt of an export license application, the Secretary shall enter and maintain in the records of the Department information regarding the receipt and status of the application.

(2) INITIAL PROCEDURES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 9 days after receiving any license application, the Secretary shall—

(i) contact the applicant if the application is improperly completed or if additional information is required, and hold the application for a reasonable time while the applicant provides the necessary corrections or information, and such time shall not be included in calculating the time periods prescribed in this title; and

(ii) upon receipt of completed application—

(I) ensure that the classification stated on the application for the export items is correct;

(II) refer the application, through the use of a common data-base or other means, and all information submitted by the applicant, and all necessary recommendations and analyses by the Secretary to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the heads of any other departments and agencies the Secretary considers appropriate; or

(III) return the application if a license is not required.

(B) REFERRAL NOT REQUIRED.—In the event that the head of a department or agency determines that certain types of applications need not be referred to the department or agency, such department or agency head shall notify the Secretary of the specific types of such applications that the department or agency does not wish to review.

(3) WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION.—An applicant may, by written notice to the Secretary, withdraw an application at any time before final action.

(c) ACTION BY OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—

(1) REFERRAL TO OTHER AGENCIES.—The Secretary shall promptly refer a license application to the departments and agencies under subsection (b) to make recommendations and provide information to the Secretary.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY OF REFERRAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the heads of other reviewing departments and agencies shall take all necessary actions in a prompt and responsible manner on an application. Each department or agency reviewing an application under this section shall establish and maintain records properly identifying and monitoring the status of the matter referred to the department or agency.

(3) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTS.—Each department or agency to which a license application is referred shall specify to the Secretary any information that is not in the application that would be required for the department or agency to make a determination with respect to the application, and the Secretary shall promptly request such information from the applicant. The time that may elapse between the date the information is requested by that department or agency and the date the information is received by that department or agency shall not be included in calculating the time periods prescribed in this title.

(4) TIME PERIOD FOR ACTION BY REFERRAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—Within 30 days after the Secretary refers an application under this section, each department or agency to which an application has been referred shall provide the Secretary with a recommendation either to approve the license or to deny the license. A recommendation that the Secretary deny a license shall include a statement of reasons for the recommendation that are consistent with the provisions of this title, and shall cite both the specific statutory and regulatory basis for the recommendation. A department or agency that fails to provide a recommendation in accordance with this paragraph within that 30-day period shall be deemed to have no objection to the decision of the Secretary on the application.

(d) ACTION BY THE SECRETARY.—Not later than 30 days after the date the application is referred, the Secretary shall—

(1) if there is agreement among the referral departments and agencies to issue or deny the license—

(A) issue the license and ensure all appropriate personnel in the Department (including the Office of Export Enforcement) are notified of all approved license applications; or

(B) notify the applicant of the intention to deny the license; or

(2) if there is no agreement among the referral departments and agencies, notify the applicant that the application is subject to the interagency dispute resolution process provided for in section 402.

(e) CONSEQUENCES OF APPLICATION DENIAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a determination is made to deny a license, the applicant shall be informed in writing, consistent with the protection of intelligence information sources and methods, by the Secretary of—

(A) the determination;

(B) the specific statutory and regulatory bases for the proposed denial;

(C) what, if any, modifications to, or restrictions on, the items for which the license was sought would allow such export to be compatible with export controls imposed under this Act, and which officer or employee of the Department would be in a position to discuss modifications or restrictions with the applicant and the specific statutory and regulatory bases for imposing such modifications or restrictions;

(D) to the extent consistent with the national security and foreign policy interests

of the United States, the specific considerations that led to the determination to deny the application; and

(E) the availability of appeal procedures.

(2) PERIOD FOR APPLICANT TO RESPOND.—The applicant shall have 20 days from the date of the notice of intent to deny the application to respond in a manner that addresses and corrects the reasons for the denial. If the applicant does not adequately address or correct the reasons for denial or does not respond, the license shall be denied. If the applicant does address or correct the reasons for denial, the application shall be considered in a timely manner.

(f) APPEALS AND OTHER ACTIONS BY APPLICANT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish appropriate procedures for an applicant to appeal to the Secretary the denial of an application or other administrative action under this Act. In any case in which the Secretary proposes to reverse the decision with respect to the application, the appeal under this subsection shall be handled in accordance with the interagency dispute resolution process provided for in section 402(b)(3).

(2) ENFORCEMENT OF TIME LIMITS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which an action prescribed in this section is not taken on an application within the time period established by this section (except in the case of a time period extended under subsection (g) of which the applicant is notified), the applicant may file a petition with the Secretary requesting compliance with the requirements of this section. When such petition is filed, the Secretary shall take immediate steps to correct the situation giving rise to the petition and shall immediately notify the applicant of such steps.

(B) BRINGING COURT ACTION.—If, within 20 days after a petition is filed under subparagraph (A), the processing of the application has not been brought into conformity with the requirements of this section, or the processing of the application has been brought into conformity with such requirements but the Secretary has not so notified the applicant, the applicant may bring an action in an appropriate United States district court for an order requiring compliance with the time periods required by this section.

(g) EXCEPTIONS FROM REQUIRED TIME PERIODS.—The following actions related to processing an application shall not be included in calculating the time periods prescribed in this section:

(1) AGREEMENT OF THE APPLICANT.—Delays upon which the Secretary and the applicant mutually agree.

(2) PRELICENSE CHECKS.—A prelicense check (for a period not to exceed 60 days) that may be required to establish the identity and reliability of the recipient of items controlled under this Act, if—

(A) the need for the prelicense check is determined by the Secretary or by another department or agency in any case in which the request for the prelicense check is made by such department or agency;

(B) the request for the prelicense check is initiated by the Secretary within 5 days after the determination that the prelicense check is required; and

(C) the analysis of the result of the prelicense check is completed by the Secretary within 5 days.

(3) REQUESTS FOR GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES.—Any request by the Secretary or another department or agency for government-to-government assurances of suitable end-uses of items approved for export, when failure to obtain such assurances would result in rejection of the application, if—

(A) the request for such assurances is sent to the Secretary of State within 5 days after the determination that the assurances are required;

(B) the Secretary of State initiates the request of the relevant government within 10 days thereafter; and

(C) the license is issued within 5 days after the Secretary receives the requested assurances.

(4) EXCEPTION.—Whenever a prelicense check described in paragraph (2) or assurances described in paragraph (3) are not requested within the time periods set forth therein, then the time expended for such prelicense check or assurances shall be included in calculating the time periods established by this section.

(5) MULTILATERAL REVIEW.—Multilateral review of a license application to the extent that such multilateral review is required by a relevant multilateral regime.

(6) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Such time as is required for mandatory congressional notifications under this Act.

(7) CONSULTATIONS.—Consultation with foreign governments, if such consultation is provided for by a relevant multilateral regime as a precondition for approving a license.

(h) CLASSIFICATION REQUESTS AND OTHER INQUIRIES.—

(1) CLASSIFICATION REQUESTS.—In any case in which the Secretary receives a written request asking for the proper classification of an item on the Control List or the applicability of licensing requirements under this title, the Secretary shall promptly notify the Secretary of Defense and the head of any department or agency the Secretary considers appropriate. The Secretary shall, within 14 days after receiving the request, inform the person making the request of the proper classification.

(2) OTHER INQUIRIES.—In any case in which the Secretary receives a written request for information under this Act, the Secretary shall, within 30 days after receiving the request, reply with that information to the person making the request.

SEC. 402. INTERAGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All license applications on which agreement cannot be reached shall be referred to the interagency dispute resolution process for decision.

(b) INTERAGENCY DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCESS.—

(1) INITIAL RESOLUTION.—The Secretary shall establish, select the chairperson of, and determine procedures for an interagency committee to review initially all license applications described in subsection (a) with respect to which the Secretary and any of the referral departments and agencies are not in agreement. The chairperson shall consider the positions of all the referral departments and agencies (which shall be included in the minutes described in subsection (c)(2)) and make a decision on the license application, including appropriate revisions or conditions thereto.

(2) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The analytic product of the intelligence community should be fully considered with respect to any proposed license under this title.

(3) FURTHER RESOLUTION.—The President shall establish additional levels for review or appeal of any matter that cannot be resolved pursuant to the process described in paragraph (1). Each such review shall—

(A) provide for decision-making based on the majority vote of the participating departments and agencies;

(B) provide that a department or agency that fails to take a timely position, citing the specific statutory and regulatory bases for a position, shall be deemed to have no objection to the pending decision;

(C) provide that any decision of an interagency committee established under paragraph (1) or interagency dispute resolution process established under this paragraph may be escalated to the next higher level of review at the request of an official appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, or an officer properly acting in such capacity, of a department or agency that participated in the interagency committee or dispute resolution process that made the decision; and

(D) ensure that matters are resolved or referred to the President not later than 90 days after the date the completed license application is referred by the Secretary.

(c) FINAL ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Once a final decision is made under subsection (b), the Secretary shall promptly—

(A) issue the license and ensure that all appropriate personnel in the Department (including the Office of Export Enforcement) are notified of all approved license applications; or

(B) notify the applicant of the intention to deny the application.

(2) MINUTES.—The interagency committee and each level of the interagency dispute resolution process shall keep reasonably detailed minutes of all meetings. On each matter before the interagency committee or before any other level of the interagency dispute resolution process in which members disagree, each member shall clearly state the reasons for the member's position and the reasons shall be entered in the minutes.

TITLE V—INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS; FOREIGN BOYCOTTS; SANCTIONS; AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 501. INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) MULTILATERAL EXPORT CONTROL REGIMES.—

(1) POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to seek multilateral arrangements that support the national security objectives of the United States (as described in title II) and that establish fairer and more predictable competitive opportunities for United States exporters.

(2) PARTICIPATION IN EXISTING REGIMES.—Congress encourages the United States to continue its active participation in and to strengthen existing multilateral export control regimes.

(3) PARTICIPATION IN NEW REGIMES.—It is the policy of the United States to participate in additional multilateral export control regimes if such participation would serve the national security interests of the United States.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON MULTILATERAL EXPORT CONTROL REGIMES.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the President shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives a report evaluating the effectiveness of each multilateral export control regime, including an assessment of the steps undertaken pursuant to subsections (c) and (d). The report, or any part of this report, may be submitted in classified form to the extent the President considers necessary.

(c) STANDARDS FOR MULTILATERAL EXPORT CONTROL REGIMES.—The President shall take

steps to establish the following features in any multilateral export control regime in which the United States is participating or may participate:

(1) FULL MEMBERSHIP.—All supplier countries are members of the regime, and the policies and activities of the members are consistent with the objectives and membership criteria of the multilateral export control regime.

(2) EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE.—The regime promotes enforcement and compliance with the regime's rules and guidelines.

(3) PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING.—The regime makes an effort to enhance public understanding of the purpose and procedures of the multilateral export control regime.

(4) EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES.—The multilateral export control regime has procedures for the uniform and consistent interpretation and implementation of its rules and guidelines.

(5) ENHANCED COOPERATION WITH REGIME NONMEMBERS.—There is agreement among the members of the multilateral export control regime to—

(A) cooperate with governments outside the regime to restrict the export of items controlled by such regime; and

(B) establish an ongoing mechanism in the regime to coordinate planning and implementation of export control measures related to such cooperation.

(6) PERIODIC HIGH-LEVEL MEETINGS.—There are regular periodic meetings of high-level representatives of the governments of members of the multilateral export control regime for the purpose of coordinating export control policies and issuing policy guidance to members of the regime.

(7) COMMON LIST OF CONTROLLED ITEMS.—There is agreement on a common list of items controlled by the multilateral export control regime.

(8) REGULAR UPDATES OF COMMON LIST.—There is a procedure for removing items from the list of controlled items when the control of such items no longer serves the objectives of the members of the multilateral export control regime.

(9) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—There is agreement to prevent the export or diversion of the most sensitive items to countries whose activities are threatening to the national security of the United States or its allies.

(10) HARMONIZATION OF LICENSE APPROVAL PROCEDURES.—There is harmonization among the members of the regime of their national export license approval procedures, practices, and standards.

(11) UNDERCUTTING.—There is a limit with respect to when members of a multilateral export control regime—

(A) grant export licenses for any item that is substantially identical to or directly competitive with an item controlled pursuant to the regime, where the United States has denied an export license for such item, or

(B) approve exports to a particular end user to which the United States has denied export license for a similar item.

(d) STANDARDS FOR NATIONAL EXPORT CONTROL SYSTEMS.—The President shall take steps to attain the cooperation of members of each regime in implementing effective national export control systems containing the following features:

(1) EXPORT CONTROL LAW.—Enforcement authority, civil and criminal penalties, and statutes of limitations are sufficient to deter potential violations and punish violators under the member's export control law.

(2) LICENSE APPROVAL PROCESS.—The system for evaluating export license applications includes sufficient technical expertise to assess the licensing status of exports and ensure the reliability of end users.

(3) ENFORCEMENT.—The enforcement mechanism provides authority for trained enforcement officers to investigate and prevent illegal exports.

(4) DOCUMENTATION.—There is a system of export control documentation and verification with respect to controlled items.

(5) INFORMATION.—There are procedures for the coordination and exchange of information concerning licensing, end users, and enforcement with other members of the multilateral export control regime.

(6) RESOURCES.—The member has devoted adequate resources to administer effectively the authorities, systems, mechanisms, and procedures described in paragraphs (1) through (5).

(e) OBJECTIVES REGARDING MULTILATERAL EXPORT CONTROL REGIMES.—The President shall seek to achieve the following objectives with regard to multilateral export control regimes:

(1) STRENGTHEN EXISTING REGIMES.—Strengthen existing multilateral export control regimes—

(A) by creating a requirement to share information about export license applications among members before a member approves an export license; and

(B) harmonizing national export license approval procedures and practices, including the elimination of undercutting.

(2) REVIEW AND UPDATE.—Review and update multilateral regime export control lists with other members, taking into account—

(A) national security concerns;

(B) the controllability of items; and

(C) the costs and benefits of controls.

(3) ENCOURAGE COMPLIANCE BY NONMEMBERS.—Encourage nonmembers of the multilateral export control regime—

(A) to strengthen their national export control regimes and improve enforcement;

(B) to adhere to the appropriate multilateral export control regime; and

(C) not to undermine an existing multilateral export control regime by exporting controlled items in a manner inconsistent with the guidelines of the regime.

(f) TRANSPARENCY OF MULTILATERAL EXPORT CONTROL REGIMES.—

(1) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION ON EACH EXISTING REGIME.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, for each multilateral export control regime, to the extent that it is not inconsistent with the arrangements of that regime (in the judgment of the Secretary of State) or with the national interest, publish in the Federal Register and post on the Department of Commerce website the following information with respect to the regime:

(A) The purposes of the regime.

(B) The members of the regime.

(C) The export licensing policy of the regime.

(D) The items that are subject to export controls under the regime, together with all public notes, understandings, and other aspects of the agreement of the regime, and all changes thereto.

(E) Any countries, end uses, or end users that are subject to the export controls of the regime.

(F) Rules of interpretation.

(G) Major policy actions.

(H) The rules and procedures of the regime for establishing and modifying any matter described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) and for reviewing export license applications.

(2) NEW REGIMES.—Not later than 60 days after the United States joins or organizes a new multilateral export control regime, the Secretary shall, to the extent that it is not inconsistent with arrangements under the regime (in the judgment of the Secretary of State) or with the national interest, publish in the Federal Register and post on the Department of Commerce website the information described in subparagraphs (A) through (H) of paragraph (1) with respect to the regime.

(3) PUBLICATION OF CHANGES.—Not later than 60 days after a multilateral export control regime adopts any change in the information published under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the extent not inconsistent with the arrangements under the regime or the national interest, publish such changes in the Federal Register and post such changes on the Department of Commerce website.

(g) SUPPORT OF OTHER COUNTRIES' EXPORT CONTROL SYSTEMS.—The Secretary is encouraged to continue to—

(1) participate in training of, and provide training to, officials of other countries on the principles and procedures for implementing effective export controls; and

(2) participate in any such training provided by other departments and agencies of the United States.

SEC. 502. FOREIGN BOYCOTTS.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are as follows:

(1) To counteract restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States or against any United States person.

(2) To encourage and, in specified cases, require United States persons engaged in the export of items to refuse to take actions, including furnishing information or entering into or implementing agreements, which have the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against a country friendly to the United States or against any United States person.

(b) PROHIBITIONS AND EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) PROHIBITIONS.—In order to carry out the purposes set forth in subsection (a), the President shall issue regulations prohibiting any United States person, with respect to that person's activities in the interstate or foreign commerce of the United States, from taking or knowingly agreeing to take any of the following actions with intent to comply with, further, or support any boycott fostered or imposed by a foreign country against a country that is friendly to the United States and is not itself the object of any form of boycott pursuant to United States law or regulation:

(A) Refusing, or requiring any other person to refuse, to do business with or in the boycotted country, with any business concern organized under the laws of the boycotted country, with any national or resident of the boycotted country, or with any other person, pursuant to an agreement with, or requirement of, or a request from or on behalf of the boycotting country (subject to the condition that the intent required to be associated with such an act in order to constitute a violation of the prohibition is not indicated solely by the mere absence of a business relationship with or in the boycotted country, with any business concern organized under the laws of the boycotted country, with any national or resident of the boycotted country, or with any other person).

(B) Refusing, or requiring any other person to refuse, to employ or otherwise discriminate against any United States person on the basis of the race, religion, sex, or national origin of that person or of any owner, officer, director, or employee of such person.

(C) Furnishing information with respect to the race, religion, sex, or national origin of any United States person or of any owner, officer, director, or employee of such person.

(D) Furnishing information (other than furnishing normal business information in a commercial context, as defined by the Secretary) about whether any person has, has had, or proposes to have any business relationship (including a relationship by way of sale, purchase, legal or commercial representation, shipping or other transport, insurance, investment, or supply) with or in the boycotted country, with any business concern organized under the laws of the boycotted country, with any national or resident of the boycotted country, or with any other person that is known or believed to be restricted from having any business relationship with or in the boycotting country.

(E) Furnishing information about whether any person is a member of, has made a contribution to, or is otherwise associated with or involved in the activities of any charitable or fraternal organization which supports the boycotted country.

(F) Paying, honoring, confirming, or otherwise implementing a letter of credit which contains any condition or requirement the compliance with which is prohibited by regulations issued pursuant to this paragraph, and no United States person shall, as a result of the application of this paragraph, be obligated to pay or otherwise honor or implement such letter of credit.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (1) shall provide exceptions for—

(A) compliance, or agreement to comply, with requirements—

(i) prohibiting the import of items from the boycotted country or items produced or provided, by any business concern organized under the laws of the boycotted country or by nationals or residents of the boycotted country; or

(ii) prohibiting the shipment of items to the boycotting country on a carrier of the boycotted country or by a route other than that prescribed by the boycotting country or the recipient of the shipment;

(B) compliance, or agreement to comply, with import and shipping document requirements with respect to the country of origin, the name of the carrier and route of shipment, the name of the supplier of the shipment, or the name of the provider of other services, except that, for purposes of applying any exception under this subparagraph, no information knowingly furnished or conveyed in response to such requirements may be stated in negative, blacklisting, or similar exclusionary terms, other than with respect to carriers or route of shipment as may be permitted by such regulations in order to comply with precautionary requirements protecting against war risks and confiscation;

(C) compliance, or agreement to comply, in the normal course of business with the unilateral and specific selection by a boycotting country, or a national or resident thereof, or carriers, insurers, suppliers of services to be performed within the boycotting country, or specific items which, in the normal course of business, are identifiable by source when imported into the boycotting country;

(D) compliance, or agreement to comply, with export requirements of the boycotting country relating to shipment or transshipment of exports to the boycotted country, to any business concern of or organized under the laws of the boycotted country, or to any national or resident of the boycotted country;

(E) compliance by an individual, or agreement by an individual to comply, with the immigration or passport requirements of any country with respect to such individual or any member of such individual's family or with requests for information regarding requirements of employment of such individual within the boycotting country; and

(F) compliance by a United States person resident in a foreign country, or agreement by such a person to comply, with the laws of the country with respect to the person's activities exclusively therein, and such regulations may contain exceptions for such resident complying with the laws or regulations of the foreign country governing imports into such country of trademarked, tradenamed, or similarly specifically identifiable products, or components of products for such person's own use, including the performance of contractual services within that country.

(3) LIMITATION ON EXCEPTIONS.—Regulations issued pursuant to paragraphs (2)(C) and (2)(F) shall not provide exceptions from paragraphs (1)(B) and (1)(C).

(4) ANTITRUST AND CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to supersede or limit the operation of the antitrust or civil rights laws of the United States.

(5) EVASION.—This section applies to any transaction or activity undertaken by or through a United States person or any other person with intent to evade the provisions of this section or the regulations issued pursuant to this subsection. The regulations issued pursuant to this section shall expressly provide that the exceptions set forth in paragraph (2) do not permit activities or agreements (expressed or implied by a course of conduct, including a pattern of responses) that are otherwise prohibited, pursuant to the intent of such exceptions.

(c) ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS AND REPORTS.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—In addition to the regulations issued pursuant to subsection (b), regulations issued pursuant to title III shall implement the purposes set forth in subsection (a).

(2) REPORTS BY UNITED STATES PERSONS.—The regulations shall require that any United States person receiving a request to furnish information, enter into or implement an agreement, or take any other action referred to in subsection (a) shall report that request to the Secretary, together with any other information concerning the request that the Secretary determines appropriate. The person shall also submit to the Secretary a statement regarding whether the person intends to comply, and whether the person has complied, with the request. Any report filed pursuant to this paragraph shall be made available promptly for public inspection and copying, except that information regarding the quantity, description, and value of any item to which such report relates may be treated as confidential if the Secretary determines that disclosure of that information would place the United States person involved at a competitive disadvantage. The Secretary shall periodically transmit summaries of the information contained in the reports to the Secretary of State for such action as the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary, considers appropriate to carry out the purposes set forth in subsection (a).

(d) PREEMPTION.—The provisions of this section and the regulations issued under this section shall preempt any law, rule, or regulation that—

(1) is a law, rule, or regulation of any of the several States or the District of Columbia, or any of the territories or possessions of the United States, or of any governmental subdivision thereof; and

(2) pertains to participation in, compliance with, implementation of, or the furnishing of information regarding restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries.

SEC. 503. PENALTIES.

(a) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—

(1) VIOLATIONS BY AN INDIVIDUAL.—Any individual who willfully violates, conspires to violate, or attempts to violate any provision of this Act or any regulation, license, or order issued under this Act shall be fined up to 10 times the value of the exports involved or $1,000,000, whichever is greater, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both, for each violation.

(2) VIOLATIONS BY A PERSON OTHER THAN AN INDIVIDUAL.—Any person other than an individual who willfully violates, conspires to violate, or attempts to violate any provision of this Act or any regulation, license, or order issued under this Act shall be fined up to 10 times the value of the exports involved or $5,000,000, whichever is greater, for each violation.

(b) FORFEITURE OF PROPERTY INTEREST AND PROCEEDS.—

(1) FORFEITURE.—Any person who is convicted under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall, in addition to any other penalty, forfeit to the United States—

(A) any of that person's security or other interest in, claim against, or property or contractual rights of any kind in the tangible items that were the subject of the violation;

(B) any of that person's security or other interest in, claim against, or property or contractual rights of any kind in the tangible property that was used in the export or attempt to export that was the subject of the violation; and

(C) any of that person's property constituting, or derived from, any proceeds obtained directly or indirectly as a result of the violation.

(2) PROCEDURES.—The procedures in any forfeiture under this subsection, and the duties and authority of the courts of the United States and the Attorney General with respect to any forfeiture action under this subsection, or with respect to any property that may be subject to forfeiture under this subsection, shall be governed by the provisions of chapter 46 of title 18, United States Code (relating to criminal forfeiture), to the same extent as property subject to forfeiture under that chapter.

(c) CIVIL PENALTIES; ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTIONS.—

(1) CIVIL PENALTIES.—The Secretary may impose a civil penalty of up to $500,000 for each violation of a provision of this Act or any regulation, license, or order issued under this Act. A civil penalty under this paragraph may be in addition to, or in lieu of, any other liability or penalty which may be imposed for such a violation.

(2) DENIAL OF EXPORT PRIVILEGES.—The Secretary may deny the export privileges of any person, including the suspension or revocation of the authority of such person to export or receive United States-origin items subject to this Act, for a violation of a provision of this Act or any regulation, license, or order issued under this Act.

(3) EXCLUSION FROM PRACTICE.—The Secretary may exclude any person acting as an attorney, accountant, consultant, freight forwarder, or in any other representative capacity from participating before the Department with respect to a license application or any other matter under this Act.

(d) PAYMENT OF CIVIL PENALTIES.—

(1) PAYMENT AS CONDITION OF FURTHER EXPORT PRIVILEGES.—The payment of a civil penalty imposed under subsection (c) may be made a condition for the granting, restoration, or continuing validity of any export license, permission, or privilege granted or to be granted to the person upon whom such penalty is imposed. The period for which the payment of a penalty may be made such a condition may not exceed 1 year after the date on which the payment is due.

(2) DEFERRAL OR SUSPENSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The payment of a civil penalty imposed under subsection (c) may be deferred or suspended in whole or in part for a period no longer than any probation period (which may exceed 1 year) that may be imposed upon the person on whom the penalty is imposed.

(B) NO BAR TO COLLECTION OF PENALTY.—A deferral or suspension under subparagraph (A) shall not operate as a bar to the collection of the penalty concerned in the event that the conditions of the suspension, deferral, or probation are not fulfilled.

(3) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—Any amount paid in satisfaction of a civil penalty imposed under subsection (c) shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(e) REFUNDS.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, in the Secretary's discretion, refund any civil penalty imposed under subsection (c) on the ground of a material error of fact or law in imposition of the penalty.

(B) LIMITATION.—A civil penalty may not be refunded under subparagraph (A) later than 2 years after payment of the penalty.

(2) PROHIBITION ON ACTIONS FOR REFUND.—Notwithstanding section 1346(a) of title 28, United States Code, no action for the refund of any civil penalty referred to in paragraph (1) may be maintained in any court.

(f) EFFECT OF OTHER CONVICTIONS.—

(1) DENIAL OF EXPORT PRIVILEGES.—Any person convicted of a violation of—

(A) a provision of this Act or the Export Administration Act of 1979,

(B) a provision of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.),

(C) section 793, 794, or 798 of title 18, United States Code,

(D) section 4(b) of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 783(b)),

(E) section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778),

(F) section 16 of the Trading with the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 16),

(G) any regulation, license, or order issued under any provision of law listed in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), or (F),

(H) section 371 or 1001 of title 18, United States Code, if in connection with the export of controlled items under this Act or any regulation, license, or order issued under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, or the export of items controlled under the Arms Export Control Act,

(I) section 175 of title 18, United States Code,

(J) a provision of the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.),

(K) section 831 of title 18, United States Code, or

(L) section 2332a of title 18, United States Code,

may, at the discretion of the Secretary, be denied export privileges under this Act for a period not to exceed 10 years from the date of the conviction. The Secretary may also revoke any export license under this Act in which such person had an interest at the time of the conviction.

(2) RELATED PERSONS.—The Secretary may exercise the authority under paragraph (1) with respect to any person related through affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility to a person convicted of any violation of a law set forth in paragraph (1) upon a showing of such relationship with the convicted person. The Secretary shall make such showing only after providing notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(g) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a proceeding in which a civil penalty or other administrative sanction (other than a temporary denial order) is sought under subsection (c) may not be instituted more than 5 years after the later of the date of the alleged violation or the date of discovery of the alleged violation.

(2) EXCEPTION.—

(A) TOLLING.—In any case in which a criminal indictment alleging a violation under subsection (a) is returned within the time limits prescribed by law for the institution of such action, the limitation under paragraph (1) for bringing a proceeding to impose a civil penalty or other administrative sanction under this section shall, upon the return of the criminal indictment, be tolled against all persons named as a defendant.

(B) DURATION.—The tolling of the limitation with respect to a defendant under subparagraph (A) as a result of a criminal indictment shall continue for a period of 6 months from the date on which the conviction of the defendant becomes final, the indictment against the defendant is dismissed, or the criminal action has concluded.

(h) VIOLATIONS DEFINED BY REGULATION.—Nothing in this section shall limit the authority of the Secretary to define by regulation violations under this Act.

(i) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (c), (d), (e), (f), or (g) limits—

(1) the availability of other administrative or judicial remedies with respect to a violation of a provision of this Act, or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act;

(2) the authority to compromise and settle administrative proceedings brought with respect to any such violation; or

(3) the authority to compromise, remit, or mitigate seizures and forfeitures pursuant to section 1(b) of title VI of the Act of June 15, 1917 (22 U.S.C. 401(b)).

SEC. 504. MISSILE PROLIFERATION CONTROL VIOLATIONS.

(a) VIOLATIONS BY UNITED STATES PERSONS.—

(1) SANCTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President determines that a United States person knowingly—

(i) exports, transfers, or otherwise engages in the trade of any item on the MTCR Annex, in violation of the provisions of section 38 (22 U.S.C. 2778) or chapter 7 of the Arms Export Control Act, title II or III of this Act, or any regulations or orders issued under any such provisions,

(ii) conspires to or attempts to engage in such export, transfer, or trade, or

(iii) facilitates such export, transfer, or trade by any other person,

then the President shall impose the applicable sanctions described in subparagraph (B).

(B) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions which apply to a United States person under subparagraph (A) are the following:

(i) If the item on the MTCR Annex involved in the export, transfer, or trade is missile equipment or technology within category II of the MTCR Annex, then the President shall deny to such United States person, for a period of 2 years, licenses for the transfer of missile equipment or technology controlled under this Act.

(ii) If the item on the MTCR Annex involved in the export, transfer, or trade is missile equipment or technology within category I of the MTCR Annex, then the President shall deny to such United States person, for a period of not less than 2 years, all licenses for items the export of which is controlled under this Act.

(2) DISCRETIONARY SANCTIONS.—In the case of any determination referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary may pursue any other appropriate penalties under section 503.

(3) WAIVER.—The President may waive the imposition of sanctions under paragraph (1) on a person with respect to an item if the President certifies to Congress that—

(A) the item is essential to the national security of the United States; and

(B) such person is a sole source supplier of the item, the item is not available from any alternative reliable supplier, and the need for the item cannot be met in a timely manner by improved manufacturing processes or technological developments.

(b) TRANSFERS OF MISSILE EQUIPMENT OR TECHNOLOGY BY FOREIGN PERSONS.—

(1) SANCTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (3) through (7), if the President determines that a foreign person, after the date of enactment of this section, knowingly—

(i) exports, transfers, or otherwise engages in the trade of any MTCR equipment or technology that contributes to the design, development, or production of missiles in a country that is not an MTCR adherent and would be, if it were United States-origin equipment or technology, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States under this Act,

(ii) conspires to or attempts to engage in such export, transfer, or trade, or

(iii) facilitates such export, transfer, or trade by any other person,

or if the President has made a determination with respect to a foreign person under section 73(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, then the President shall impose on that foreign person the applicable sanctions under subparagraph (B).

(B) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions which apply to a foreign person under subparagraph (A) are the following:

(i) If the item involved in the export, transfer, or trade is within category II of the MTCR Annex, then the President shall deny, for a period of 2 years, licenses for the transfer to such foreign person of missile equipment or technology the export of which is controlled under this Act.

(ii) If the item involved in the export, transfer, or trade is within category I of the MTCR Annex, then the President shall deny, for a period of not less than 2 years, licenses for the transfer to such foreign person of items the export of which is controlled under this Act.

(iii) If, in addition to actions taken under clauses (i) and (ii), the President determines that the export, transfer, or trade has substantially contributed to the design, development, or production of missiles in a country that is not an MTCR adherent, then the

President shall prohibit, for a period of not less than 2 years, the importation into the United States of products produced by that foreign person.

(2) INAPPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO MTCR ADHERENTS.—Paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to—

(A) any export, transfer, or trading activity that is authorized by the laws of an MTCR adherent, if such authorization is not obtained by misrepresentation or fraud; or

(B) any export, transfer, or trade of an item to an end user in a country that is an MTCR adherent.

(3) EFFECT OF ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS BY MTCR ADHERENTS.—Sanctions set forth in paragraph (1) may not be imposed under this subsection on a person with respect to acts described in such paragraph or, if such sanctions are in effect against a person on account of such acts, such sanctions shall be terminated, if an MTCR adherent is taking judicial or other enforcement action against that person with respect to such acts, or that person has been found by the government of an MTCR adherent to be innocent of wrongdoing with respect to such acts.

(4) ADVISORY OPINIONS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, may, upon the request of any person, issue an advisory opinion to that person as to whether a proposed activity by that person would subject that person to sanctions under this subsection. Any person who relies in good faith on such an advisory opinion which states that the proposed activity would not subject a person to such sanctions, and any person who thereafter engages in such activity, may not be made subject to such sanctions on account of such activity.

(5) WAIVER AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(A) WAIVER.—In any case other than one in which an advisory opinion has been issued under paragraph (4) stating that a proposed activity would not subject a person to sanctions under this subsection, the President may waive the application of paragraph (1) to a foreign person if the President determines that such waiver is essential to the national security of the United States.

(B) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—In the event that the President decides to apply the waiver described in subparagraph (A), the President shall so notify Congress not less than 20 working days before issuing the waiver. Such notification shall include a report fully articulating the rationale and circumstances which led the President to apply the waiver.

(6) ADDITIONAL WAIVER.—The President may waive the imposition of sanctions under paragraph (1) on a person with respect to a product or service if the President certifies to the Congress that—

(A) the product or service is essential to the national security of the United States; and

(B) such person is a sole source supplier of the product or service, the product or service is not available from any alternative reliable supplier, and the need for the product or service cannot be met in a timely manner by improved manufacturing processes or technological developments.

(7) EXCEPTIONS.—The President shall not apply the sanction under this subsection prohibiting the importation of the products of a foreign person—

(A) in the case of procurement of defense articles or defense services—

(i) under existing contracts or subcontracts, including the exercise of options for production quantities to satisfy requirements essential to the national security of the United States;

(ii) if the President determines that the person to which the sanctions would be applied is a sole source supplier of the defense articles and services, that the defense articles or services are essential to the national security of the United States, and that alternative sources are not readily or reasonably available; or

(iii) if the President determines that such articles or services are essential to the national security of the United States under defense coproduction agreements or NATO Programs of Cooperation;

(B) to products or services provided under contracts entered into before the date on which the President publishes his intention to impose the sanctions; or

(C) to—

(i) spare parts,

(ii) component parts, but not finished products, essential to United States products or production,

(iii) routine services and maintenance of products, to the extent that alternative sources are not readily or reasonably available, or

(iv) information and technology essential to United States products or production.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MISSILE.—The term ''missile'' means a category I system as defined in the MTCR Annex, and any other unmanned delivery system of similar capability, as well as the specially designed production facilities for these systems.

(2) MISSILE TECHNOLOGY CONTROL REGIME; MTCR.—The term ''Missile Technology Control Regime'' or ''MTCR'' means the policy statement, between the United States, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Canada, and Japan, announced on April 16, 1987, to restrict sensitive missile-relevant transfers based on the MTCR Annex, and any amendments thereto.

(3) MTCR ADHERENT.—The term ''MTCR adherent'' means a country that participates in the MTCR or that, pursuant to an international understanding to which the United States is a party, controls MTCR equipment or technology in accordance with the criteria and standards set forth in the MTCR.

(4) MTCR ANNEX.—The term ''MTCR Annex'' means the Guidelines and Equipment and Technology Annex of the MTCR, and any amendments thereto.

(5) MISSILE EQUIPMENT OR TECHNOLOGY; MTCR EQUIPMENT OR TECHNOLOGY.—The terms ''missile equipment or technology'' and ''MTCR equipment or technology'' mean those items listed in category I or category II of the MTCR Annex.

(6) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ''foreign person'' means any person other than a United States person.

(7) PERSON.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''person'' means a natural person as well as a corporation, business association, partnership, society, trust, any other nongovernmental entity, organization, or group, and any governmental entity operating as a business enterprise, and any successor of any such entity.

(B) IDENTIFICATION IN CERTAIN CASES.—In the case of countries where it may be impossible to identify a specific governmental entity referred to in subparagraph (A), the term ''person'' means—

(i) all activities of that government relating to the development or production of any missile equipment or technology; and

(ii) all activities of that government affecting the development or production of aircraft, electronics, and space systems or equipment.

(8) OTHERWISE ENGAGED IN THE TRADE OF.—The term ''otherwise engaged in the trade of'' means, with respect to a particular export or transfer, to be a freight forwarder or designated exporting agent, or a consignee or end user of the item to be exported or transferred.

SEC. 505. CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS PROLIFERATION SANCTIONS.

(a) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) DETERMINATION BY THE PRESIDENT.—Except as provided in subsection (b)(2), the President shall impose both of the sanctions described in subsection (c) if the President determines that a foreign person, on or after the date of enactment of this section, has knowingly and materially contributed—

(A) through the export from the United States of any item that is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States under this Act, or

(B) through the export from any other country of any item that would be, if it were a United States item, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States under this Act,

to the efforts by any foreign country, project, or entity described in paragraph (2) to use, develop, produce, stockpile, or otherwise acquire chemical or biological weapons.

(2) COUNTRIES, PROJECTS, OR ENTITIES RECEIVING ASSISTANCE.—Paragraph (1) applies in the case of—

(A) any foreign country that the President determines has, at any time after the date of enactment of this Act—

(i) used chemical or biological weapons in violation of international law;

(ii) used lethal chemical or biological weapons against its own nationals; or

(iii) made substantial preparations to engage in the activities described in clause (i) or (ii);

(B) any foreign country whose government is determined for purposes of section 310 to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism; or

(C) any other foreign country, project, or entity designated by the President for purposes of this section.

(3) PERSONS AGAINST WHICH SANCTIONS ARE TO BE IMPOSED.—Sanctions shall be imposed pursuant to paragraph (1) on—

(A) the foreign person with respect to which the President makes the determination described in that paragraph;

(B) any successor entity to that foreign person;

(C) any foreign person that is a parent or subsidiary of that foreign person if that parent or subsidiary knowingly assisted in the activities which were the basis of that determination; and

(D) any foreign person that is an affiliate of that foreign person if that affiliate knowingly assisted in the activities which were the basis of that determination and if that affiliate is controlled in fact by that foreign person.

(b) CONSULTATIONS WITH AND ACTIONS BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENT OF JURISDICTION.—

(1) CONSULTATIONS.—If the President makes the determinations described in subsection (a)(1) with respect to a foreign person, Congress urges the President to initiate consultations immediately with the government with primary jurisdiction over that foreign person with respect to the imposition of sanctions pursuant to this section.

(2) ACTIONS BY GOVERNMENT OF JURISDICTION.—In order to pursue such consultations with that government, the President may delay imposition of sanctions pursuant to this section for a period of up to 90 days. Following the consultations, the President shall

impose sanctions unless the President determines and certifies to Congress that government has taken specific and effective actions, including appropriate penalties, to terminate the involvement of the foreign person in the activities described in subsection (a)(1). The President may delay imposition of sanctions for an additional period of up to 90 days if the President determines and certifies to Congress that government is in the process of taking the actions described in the preceding sentence.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The President shall report to Congress, not later than 90 days after making a determination under subsection (a)(1), on the status of consultations with the appropriate government under this subsection, and the basis for any determination under paragraph (2) of this subsection that such government has taken specific corrective actions.

(c) SANCTIONS.—

(1) DESCRIPTION OF SANCTIONS.—The sanctions to be imposed pursuant to subsection (a)(1) are, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the following:

(A) PROCUREMENT SANCTION.—The United States Government shall not procure, or enter into any contract for the procurement of, any goods or services from any person described in subsection (a)(3).

(B) IMPORT SANCTIONS.—The importation into the United States of products produced by any person described in subsection (a)(3) shall be prohibited.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The President shall not be required to apply or maintain sanctions under this section—

(A) in the case of procurement of defense articles or defense services—

(i) under existing contracts or subcontracts, including the exercise of options for production quantities to satisfy United States operational military requirements;

(ii) if the President determines that the person or other entity to which the sanctions would otherwise be applied is a sole source supplier of the defense articles or services, that the defense articles or services are essential, and that alternative sources are not readily or reasonably available; or

(iii) if the President determines that such articles or services are essential to the national security under defense coproduction agreements;

(B) to products or services provided under contracts entered into before the date on which the President publishes his intention to impose sanctions;

(C) to—

(i) spare parts,

(ii) component parts, but not finished products, essential to United States products or production, or

(iii) routine servicing and maintenance of products, to the extent that alternative sources are not readily or reasonably available;

(D) to information and technology essential to United States products or production; or

(E) to medical or other humanitarian items.

(d) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—The sanctions imposed pursuant to this section shall apply for a period of at least 12 months following the imposition of sanctions and shall cease to apply thereafter only if the President determines and certifies to the Congress that reliable information indicates that the foreign person with respect to which the determination was made under subsection (a)(1) has ceased to aid or abet any foreign government, project, or entity in its efforts to acquire chemical or biological weapons capability as described in that subsection.

(e) WAIVER.—

(1) CRITERION FOR WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of any sanction imposed on any person pursuant to this section, after the end of the 12-month period beginning on the date on which that sanction was imposed on that person, if the President determines and certifies to Congress that such waiver is important to the national security interests of the United States.

(2) NOTIFICATION OF AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.—If the President decides to exercise the waiver authority provided in paragraph (1), the President shall so notify the Congress not less than 20 days before the waiver takes effect. Such notification shall include a report fully articulating the rationale and circumstances which led the President to exercise the waiver authority.

(f) DEFINITION OF FOREIGN PERSON.—For the purposes of this section, the term ''foreign person'' means—

(1) an individual who is not a citizen of the United States or an alien admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(2) a corporation, partnership, or other entity which is created or organized under the laws of a foreign country or which has its principal place of business outside the United States.

SEC. 506. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY AND DESIGNATION.—

(1) POLICY GUIDANCE ON ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the heads of other departments and agencies that the Secretary considers appropriate, shall be responsible for providing policy guidance on the enforcement of this Act.

(2) GENERAL AUTHORITIES.—

(A) EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—To the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of this Act, officers and employees of the Department designated by the Secretary, officers and employees of the United States Customs Service designated by the Commissioner of Customs, and officers and employees of any other department or agency designated by the head of a department or agency exercising functions under this Act, may exercise the enforcement authority under paragraph (3).

(B) CUSTOMS SERVICE.—In carrying out enforcement authority under paragraph (3), the Commissioner of Customs and employees of the United States Customs Service designated by the Commissioner may make investigations within or outside the United States and at ports of entry into or exit from the United States where officers of the United States Customs Service are authorized by law to carry out law enforcement responsibilities. Subject to paragraph (3), the United States Customs Service is authorized, in the enforcement of this Act, to search, detain (after search), and seize items at the ports of entry into or exit from the United States where officers of the United States Customs Service are authorized by law to conduct searches, detentions, and seizures, and at the places outside the United States where the United States Customs Service, pursuant to agreement or other arrangement with other countries, is authorized to perform enforcement activities.

(C) OTHER EMPLOYEES.—In carrying out enforcement authority under paragraph (3), the Secretary and officers and employees of the Department designated by the Secretary may make investigations within the United States, and may conduct, outside the United States, pre-license and post-shipment verifications of controlled items and investigations in the enforcement of section 502. The Secretary and officers and employees of the Department designated by the Secretary are authorized to search, detain (after search), and seize items at places within the United States other than ports referred to in subparagraph (B). The search, detention (after search), or seizure of items at the ports and places referred to in subparagraph (B) may be conducted by officers and employees of the Department only with the concurrence of the Commissioner of Customs or a person designated by the Commissioner.

(D) AGREEMENTS AND ARRANGEMENTS.—The Secretary and the Commissioner of Customs may enter into agreements and arrangements for the enforcement of this Act, including foreign investigations and information exchange.

(3) SPECIFIC AUTHORITIES.—

(A) ACTIONS BY ANY DESIGNATED PERSONNEL.—Any officer or employee designated under paragraph (2), in carrying out the enforcement authority under this Act, may do the following:

(i) Make investigations of, obtain information from, make inspection of any books, records, or reports (including any writings required to be kept by the Secretary), premises, or property of, and take the sworn testimony of, any person.

(ii) Administer oaths or affirmations, and by subpoena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both. In the case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to, any such person, a district court of the United States, on request of the Attorney General and after notice to any such person and a hearing, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. The attendance of witnesses and the production of documents provided for in this clause may be required from any State, the District of Columbia, or in any territory of the United States at any designated place. Witnesses subpoenaed under this subsection shall be paid the same fees and mileage allowance as paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

(B) ACTIONS BY OFFICE OF EXPORT ENFORCEMENT AND CUSTOMS SERVICE PERSONNEL.—

(i) OFFICE OF EXPORT ENFORCEMENT AND CUSTOMS SERVICE PERSONNEL.—Any officer or employee of the Office of Export Enforcement of the Department of Commerce (in this Act referred to as ''OEE'') who is designated by the Secretary under paragraph (2), and any officer or employee of the United States Customs Service who is designated by the Commissioner of Customs under paragraph (2), may do the following in carrying out the enforcement authority under this Act:

(I) Execute any warrant or other process issued by a court or officer of competent jurisdiction with respect to the enforcement of this Act.

(II) Make arrests without warrant for any violation of this Act committed in his or her presence or view, or if the officer or employee has probable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed, is committing, or is about to commit such a violation.

(III) Carry firearms.

(ii) OEE PERSONNEL.—Any officer or employee of the OEE designated by the Secretary under paragraph (2) shall exercise the authority set forth in clause (i) pursuant to guidelines approved by the Attorney General.

(C) OTHER ACTIONS BY CUSTOMS SERVICE PERSONNEL.—Any officer or employee of the United States Customs Service designated by the Commissioner of Customs under paragraph (2) may do the following in carrying out the enforcement authority under this Act:

(i) Stop, search, and examine a vehicle, vessel, aircraft, or person on which or whom the officer or employee has reasonable cause to suspect there is any item that has been, is being, or is about to be exported from or transited through the United States in violation of this Act.

(ii) Detain and search any package or container in which the officer or employee has reasonable cause to suspect there is any item that has been, is being, or is about to be exported from or transited through the United States in violation of this Act.

(iii) Detain (after search) or seize any item, for purposes of securing for trial or forfeiture to the United States, on or about such vehicle, vessel, aircraft, or person or in such package or container, if the officer or employee has probable cause to believe the item has been, is being, or is about to be exported from or transited through the United States in violation of this Act.

(4) OTHER AUTHORITIES NOT AFFECTED.—The authorities conferred by this section are in addition to any authorities conferred under other laws.

(b) FORFEITURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any tangible items lawfully seized under subsection (a) by designated officers or employees shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States.

(2) APPLICABLE LAWS.—Those provisions of law relating to—

(A) the seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of property for violations of the customs laws;

(B) the disposition of such property or the proceeds from the sale thereof;

(C) the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures; and

(D) the compromise of claims,

shall apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this subsection, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with this Act.

(3) FORFEITURES UNDER CUSTOMS LAWS.—Duties that are imposed upon a customs officer or any other person with respect to the seizure and forfeiture of property under the customs laws may be performed with respect to seizures and forfeitures of property under this subsection by the Secretary or any officer or employee of the Department that may be authorized or designated for that purpose by the Secretary (or by the Commissioner of Customs or any officer or employee of the United States Customs Service designated by the Commissioner), or, upon the request of the Secretary, by any other agency that has authority to manage and dispose of seized property.

(c) REFERRAL OF CASES.—All cases involving violations of this Act shall be referred to the Secretary for purposes of determining civil penalties and administrative sanctions under section 503 or to the Attorney General for criminal action in accordance with this Act or to both the Secretary and the Attorney General.

(d) UNDERCOVER INVESTIGATION OPERATIONS.—

(1) USE OF FUNDS.—With respect to any undercover investigative operation conducted by the OEE that is necessary for the detection and prosecution of violations of this Act—

(A) funds made available for export enforcement under this Act may be used to purchase property, buildings, and other facilities, and to lease equipment, conveyances, and space within the United States, without regard to sections 1341 and 3324 of title 31, United States Code, the third undesignated paragraph under the heading of ''miscellaneous'' of the Act of March 3, 1877, (40 U.S.C. 34), sections 3732(a) and 3741 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 11(a) and 22), subsections (a) and (c) of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254 (a) and (c)), and section 305 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 255);

(B) funds made available for export enforcement under this Act may be used to establish or to acquire proprietary corporations or business entities as part of an undercover operation, and to operate such corporations or business entities on a commercial basis, without regard to sections 1341, 3324, and 9102 of title 31, United States Code;

(C) funds made available for export enforcement under this Act and the proceeds from undercover operations may be deposited in banks or other financial institutions without regard to the provisions of section 648 of title 18, United States Code, and section 3302 of title 31, United States Code; and

(D) the proceeds from undercover operations may be used to offset necessary and reasonable expenses incurred in such operations without regard to the provisions of section 3302 of title 31, United States Code,

if the Director of OEE (or an officer or employee designated by the Director) certifies, in writing, that the action authorized by subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) for which the funds would be used is necessary for the conduct of the undercover operation.

(2) DISPOSITION OF BUSINESS ENTITIES.—If a corporation or business entity established or acquired as part of an undercover operation has a net value of more than $250,000 and is to be liquidated, sold, or otherwise disposed of, the Director of OEE shall report the circumstances to the Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States as much in advance of such disposition as the Director of the OEE (or the Director's designee) determines is practicable. The proceeds of the liquidation, sale, or other disposition, after obligations incurred by the corporation or business enterprise are met, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Any property or equipment purchased pursuant to paragraph (1) may be retained for subsequent use in undercover operations under this section. When such property or equipment is no longer needed, it shall be considered surplus and disposed of as surplus government property.

(3) DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.—As soon as the proceeds from an OEE undercover investigative operation with respect to which an action is authorized and carried out under this subsection are no longer needed for the conduct of such operation, the proceeds or the balance of the proceeds remaining at the time shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(4) AUDIT AND REPORT.—

(A) AUDIT.—The Director of OEE shall conduct a detailed financial audit of each closed OEE undercover investigative operation and shall submit the results of the audit in writing to the Secretary. Not later than 180 days after an undercover operation is closed, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the audit.

(B) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit annually to Congress a report, which may be included in the annual report under section 701, specifying the following information:

(i) The number of undercover investigative operations pending as of the end of the period for which such report is submitted.

(ii) The number of undercover investigative operations commenced in the 1-year period preceding the period for which such report is submitted.

(iii) The number of undercover investigative operations closed in the 1-year period preceding the period for which such report is submitted and, with respect to each such closed undercover operation, the results obtained and any civil claims made with respect to the operation.

(5) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (4)—

(A) the term ''closed'', with respect to an undercover investigative operation, refers to the earliest point in time at which all criminal proceedings (other than appeals) pursuant to the investigative operation are concluded, or covert activities pursuant to such operation are concluded, whichever occurs later; and

(B) the terms ''undercover investigative operation'' and ''undercover operation'' mean any undercover investigative operation conducted by the OEE—

(i) in which the gross receipts (excluding interest earned) exceed $25,000, or expenditures (other than expenditures for salaries of employees) exceed $75,000, and

(ii) which is exempt from section 3302 or 9102 of title 31, United States Code, except that clauses (i) and (ii) shall not apply with respect to the report to Congress required by paragraph (4)(B).

(e) WIRETAPS.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Interceptions of communications in accordance with section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, are authorized to further the enforcement of this Act.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2516(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(q)(i) any violation of, or conspiracy to violate, the Export Administration Act of 2001 or the Export Administration Act of 1979.''.

(f) POST-SHIPMENT VERIFICATION.—The Secretary shall target post-shipment verifications to exports involving the greatest risk to national security.

(g) REFUSAL TO ALLOW POST-SHIPMENT VERIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an end-user refuses to allow post-shipment verification of a controlled item, the Secretary shall deny a license for the export of any controlled item to such end-user until such post-shipment verification occurs.

(2) RELATED PERSONS.—The Secretary may exercise the authority under paragraph (1) with respect to any person related through affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility, to any end-user refusing to allow post-shipment verification of a controlled item.

(3) REFUSAL BY COUNTRY.—If the country in which the end-user is located refuses to allow post-shipment verification of a controlled item, the Secretary may deny a license for the export of that item, any substantially identical or directly competitive item or class of items, any item that the Secretary determines to be of equal or greater sensitivity than the controlled item, or

any controlled item for which a determination has not been made pursuant to section 211 to all end-users in that country until such post-shipment verification is allowed.

(h) FREIGHT FORWARDERS BEST PRACTICES PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Commerce $3,500,000 and such sums as may be necessary, to be available until expended, to hire 20 additional employees to assist United States freight forwarders and other interested persons in developing and implementing, on a voluntary basis, a ''best practices'' program to ensure that exports of controlled items are undertaken in compliance with this Act.

(i) END-USE VERIFICATION AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Commerce $4,500,000 and such sums as may be necessary, to be available until expended, to hire 10 additional overseas investigators to be posted in the People's Republic of China, the Russian Federation, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the Republic of India, Singapore, Egypt, and Taiwan, or any other place the Secretary deems appropriate, for the purpose of verifying the end use of high-risk, dual-use technology.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Department shall, in its annual report to Congress on export controls, include a report on the effectiveness of the end-use verification activities authorized under subsection (a). The report shall include the following information:

(A) The activities of the overseas investigators of the Department.

(B) The types of goods and technologies that were subject to end-use verification.

(C) The ability of the Department's investigators to detect the illegal transfer of high risk, dual-use goods and technologies.

(3) ENHANCEMENTS.—In addition to the authorization provided in paragraph (1), there is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Commerce $5,000,000, to be available until expended, to enhance its program for verifying the end use of items subject to controls under this Act.

(j) ENHANCED COOPERATION WITH UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE.—Consistent with the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to undertake, in cooperation with the United States Customs Service, such measures as may be necessary or required to enhance the ability of the United States to detect unlawful exports and to enforce violations of this Act.

(k) REFERENCE TO ENFORCEMENT.—For purposes of this section, a reference to the enforcement of this Act or to a violation of this Act includes a reference to the enforcement or a violation of any regulation, license, or order issued under this Act.

(l) AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPORT LICENSING AND ENFORCEMENT COMPUTER SYSTEM.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department $5,000,000 and such other sums as may be necessary, to be available until expended, for planning, design, and procurement of a computer system to replace the Department's primary export licensing and computer enforcement system.

(m) AUTHORIZATION FOR BUREAU OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary may authorize, without fiscal year limitation, the expenditure of funds transferred to, paid to, received by, or made available to the Bureau of Export Administration as a reimbursement in accordance with section 9703 of title 31, United States Code (as added by Public Law 102–393). The Secretary may also authorize, without fiscal year limitation, the expenditure of funds transferred to, paid to, received by, or made available to the Bureau of Export Administration as a reimbursement from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund in accordance with section 524 of title 28, United States Code. Such funds shall be deposited in an account and shall remain available until expended.

(n) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 31.—

(1) Section 9703(a) of title 31, United States Code (as added by Public Law 102–393) is amended by striking ''or the United States Coast Guard'' and inserting '', the United States Coast Guard, or the Bureau of Export Administration of the Department of Commerce''.

(2) Section 9703(a)(2)(B)(i) of title 31, United States Code is amended (as added by Public Law 102–393)—

(A) by striking ''or'' at the end of subclause (I);

(B) by inserting ''or'' at the end of subclause (II); and

(C) by inserting at the end, the following new subclause:

''(III) a violation of the Export Administration Act of 1979, the Export Administration Act of 2001, or any regulation, license, or order issued under those Acts;''.

(3) Section 9703(p)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as added by Public Law 102–393) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''In addition, for purposes of this section, the Bureau of Export Administration of the Department of Commerce shall be considered to be a Department of the Treasury law enforcement organization.''.

(o) AUTHORIZATION FOR LICENSE REVIEW OFFICERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce $2,000,000, to be available until expended, to hire additional license review officers.

(2) TRAINING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce $2,000,000, to be available until expended, to conduct professional training of license review officers, auditors, and investigators conducting post-shipment verification checks. These funds shall be used to—

(A) train and certify, through a formal program, new employees entering these positions for the first time; and

(B) the ongoing professional training of experienced employees on an as needed basis.

(p) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce to carry out the purposes of this Act—

(A) $72,000,000 for the fiscal year 2002, of which no less than $27,701,000 shall be used for compliance and enforcement activities;

(B) $73,000,000 for the fiscal year 2003, of which no less than $28,312,000 shall be used for compliance and enforcement activities;

(C) $74,000,000 for the fiscal year 2004, of which no less than $28,939,000 shall be used for compliance and enforcement activities;

(D) $76,000,000 for the fiscal year 2005, of which no less than $29,582,000 shall be used for compliance and enforcement activities; and

(E) such additional amounts, for each such fiscal year, as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, other employee benefits authorized by law, and other nondiscretionary costs.

(2) LIMITATION.—The authority granted by this Act shall terminate on September 30, 2004, unless the President carries out the following duties:

(A) Provides to Congress a detailed report on—

(i) the implementation and operation of this Act; and

(ii) the operation of United States export controls in general.

(B)(i) Provides to Congress legislative reform proposals in connection with the report described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) certifies to Congress that no legislative reforms are necessary in connection with such report.

SEC. 507. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE.

(a) EXEMPTIONS FROM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE.—Except as provided in this section, the functions exercised under this Act are excluded from the operation of sections 551, 553 through 559, and 701 through 706 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) PROCEDURES RELATING TO CIVIL PENALTIES AND SANCTIONS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES.—Any administrative sanction imposed under section 503 may be imposed only after notice and opportunity for an agency hearing on the record in accordance with sections 554 through 557 of title 5, United States Code. The imposition of any such administrative sanction shall be subject to judicial review in accordance with sections 701 through 706 of title 5, United States Code, except that the review shall be initiated in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, which shall have jurisdiction of the review.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF CHARGING LETTER.—Any charging letter or other document initiating administrative proceedings for the imposition of sanctions for violations of the regulations issued under section 502 shall be made available for public inspection and copying.

(c) COLLECTION.—If any person fails to pay a civil penalty imposed under section 503, the Secretary may ask the Attorney General to commence a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States to recover the amount imposed (plus interest at currently prevailing rates from the date of the final order). No such action may be commenced more than 5 years after the order imposing the civil penalty becomes final. In such an action, the validity, amount, and appropriateness of such penalty shall not be subject to review.

(d) IMPOSITION OF TEMPORARY DENIAL ORDERS.—

(1) GROUNDS FOR IMPOSITION.—In any case in which there is reasonable cause to believe that a person is engaged in or is about to engage in any act or practice which constitutes or would constitute a violation of this Act, or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act, including any diversion of goods or technology from an authorized end use or end user, and in any case in which a criminal indictment has been returned against a person alleging a violation of this Act or any of the statutes listed in section 503, the Secretary may, without a hearing, issue an order temporarily denying that person's United States export privileges (hereafter in this subsection referred to as a ''temporary denial order''). A temporary denial order shall be effective for such period (not in excess of 180 days) as the Secretary specifies in the order, but may be renewed by the Secretary, following notice and an opportunity for a hearing, for additional periods of not more than 180 days each.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.—The person or persons subject to the issuance or renewal of a temporary denial order may appeal the issuance or renewal of the temporary denial order, supported by briefs and other material, to an administrative law judge who

shall, within 15 working days after the appeal is filed, issue a decision affirming, modifying, or vacating the temporary denial order. The temporary denial order shall be affirmed if it is shown that—

(A) there is reasonable cause to believe that the person subject to the order is engaged in or is about to engage in any act or practice that constitutes or would constitute a violation of this Act, or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act; or

(B) a criminal indictment has been returned against the person subject to the order alleging a violation of this Act or any of the statutes listed in section 503.

The decision of the administrative law judge shall be final unless, within 10 working days after the date of the administrative law judge's decision, an appeal is filed with the Secretary. On appeal, the Secretary shall either affirm, modify, reverse, or vacate the decision of the administrative law judge by written order within 10 working days after receiving the appeal. The written order of the Secretary shall be final and is not subject to judicial review, except as provided in paragraph (3). The materials submitted to the administrative law judge and the Secretary shall constitute the administrative record for purposes of review by the court.

(3) COURT APPEALS.—An order of the Secretary affirming, in whole or in part, the issuance or renewal of a temporary denial order may, within 15 days after the order is issued, be appealed by a person subject to the order to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, which shall have jurisdiction of the appeal. The court may review only those issues necessary to determine whether the issuance of the temporary denial order was based on reasonable cause to believe that the person subject to the order was engaged in or was about to engage in any act or practice that constitutes or would constitute a violation of this title, or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act, or whether a criminal indictment has been returned against the person subject to the order alleging a violation of this Act or of any of the statutes listed in section 503. The court shall vacate the Secretary's order if the court finds that the Secretary's order is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.

(e) LIMITATIONS ON REVIEW OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Any classified information that is included in the administrative record that is subject to review pursuant to subsection (b)(1) or (d)(3) may be reviewed by the court only on an ex parte basis and in camera.

TITLE VI—EXPORT CONTROL AUTHORITY AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 601. EXPORT CONTROL AUTHORITY AND REGULATIONS.

(a) EXPORT CONTROL AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise reserved to the President or a department (other than the Department) or agency of the United States, all power, authority, and discretion conferred by this Act shall be exercised by the Secretary.

(2) DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary may delegate any function under this Act, unless otherwise provided, to the Under Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration or to any other officer of the Department.

(b) UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE; ASSISTANT SECRETARIES.—

(1) UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.—There shall be within the Department an Under Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration (in this section referred to as the ''Under Secretary'') who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Under Secretary shall carry out all functions of the Secretary under this Act and other provisions of law relating to national security, as the Secretary may delegate.

(2) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES.—In addition to the number of Assistant Secretaries otherwise authorized for the Department of Commerce, there shall be within the Department of Commerce the following Assistant Secretaries of Commerce:

(A) An Assistant Secretary for Export Administration who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall assist the Secretary and the Under Secretary in carrying out functions relating to export listing and licensing.

(B) An Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall assist the Secretary and the Under Secretary in carrying out functions relating to export enforcement.

(c) ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President and the Secretary may issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act. Any such regulations the purpose of which is to carry out title II or title III may be issued only after the regulations are submitted for review to such departments or agencies as the President considers appropriate. The Secretary shall consult with the appropriate export control advisory committee appointed under section 105(a) in formulating regulations under this title. The second sentence of this subsection does not require the concurrence or approval of any official, department, or agency to which such regulations are submitted.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO REGULATIONS.—If the Secretary proposes to amend regulations issued under this Act, the Secretary shall report to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives on the intent and rationale of such amendments. Such report shall evaluate the cost and burden to the United States exporters of the proposed amendments in relation to any enhancement of licensing objectives. The Secretary shall consult with the appropriate export control advisory committees appointed under section 105(a) in amending regulations issued under this Act.

SEC. 602. CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.

(a) EXEMPTIONS FROM DISCLOSURE.—

(1) INFORMATION OBTAINED ON OR BEFORE JUNE 30, 1980.—Except as otherwise provided by the third sentence of section 502(c)(2) and by section 507(b)(2), information obtained under the Export Administration Act of 1979, or any predecessor statute, on or before June 30, 1980, which is deemed confidential, including Shipper's Export Declarations, or with respect to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information, shall not be subject to disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and such information shall not be published or disclosed, unless the Secretary determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest.

(2) INFORMATION OBTAINED AFTER JUNE 30, 1980.—Except as otherwise provided by the third sentence of section 502(c)(2) and by section 507(b)(2), information obtained under this Act, under the Export Administration Act of 1979 after June 30, 1980, or under the Export Administration regulations as maintained and amended under the authority of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1706), may be withheld from disclosure only to the extent permitted by statute, except that information submitted, obtained, or considered in connection with an application for an export license or other export authorization (or recordkeeping or reporting requirement), enforcement activity, or other operations under the Export Administration Act of 1979, under this Act, or under the Export Administration regulations as maintained and amended under the authority of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1706), including—

(A) the export license or other export authorization itself,

(B) classification requests described in section 401(h),

(C) information or evidence obtained in the course of any investigation by an employee or officer of the Department of Commerce,

(D) information obtained or furnished under title V in connection with any international agreement, treaty, or other obligation, and

(E) information obtained in making the determinations set forth in section 211 of this Act,

and information obtained in any investigation of an alleged violation of section 502 of this Act except for information required to be disclosed by section 502(c)(2) or 507(b)(2) of this Act, shall be withheld from public disclosure and shall not be subject to disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, unless the release of such information is determined by the Secretary to be in the national interest.

(b) INFORMATION TO CONGRESS AND GAO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title shall be construed as authorizing the withholding of information from Congress or from the General Accounting Office.

(2) AVAILABILITY TO THE CONGRESS—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any information obtained at any time under this title or under any predecessor Act regarding the control of exports, including any report or license application required under this title, shall be made available to any committee or subcommittee of Congress of appropriate jurisdiction upon the request of the chairman or ranking minority member of such committee or subcommittee.

(B) PROHIBITION ON FURTHER DISCLOSURE.—No committee, subcommittee, or Member of Congress shall disclose any information obtained under this Act or any predecessor Act regarding the control of exports which is submitted on a confidential basis to the Congress under subparagraph (A) unless the full committee to which the information is made available determines that the withholding of the information is contrary to the national interest.

(3) AVAILABILITY TO THE GAO.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), information described in paragraph (2) shall, consistent with the protection of intelligence, counterintelligence, and law enforcement sources, methods, and activities, as determined by the agency that originally obtained the information, and consistent with the provisions of section 716 of title 31, United States Code, be made available only by the agency, upon request, to the Comptroller General of the United States or to any officer or employee of the General Accounting Office authorized by the Comptroller General to have access to such information.

(B) PROHIBITION ON FURTHER DISCLOSURES.—No officer or employee of the General Accounting Office shall disclose, except to Congress in accordance with this paragraph, any such information which is submitted on a confidential basis and from which any individual can be identified.

(c) INFORMATION EXCHANGE.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary and the Commissioner of Customs shall exchange licensing and enforcement information with each other as necessary to facilitate enforcement efforts and effective license decisions.

(d) PENALTIES FOR DISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—

(1) DISCLOSURE PROHIBITED.—No officer or employee of the United States, or any department or agency thereof, may publish, divulge, disclose, or make known in any manner or to any extent not authorized by law any information that—

(A) the officer or employee obtains in the course of his or her employment or official duties or by reason of any examination or investigation made by, or report or record made to or filed with, such department or agency, or officer or employee thereof; and

(B) is exempt from disclosure under this section.

(2) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Any such officer or employee who knowingly violates paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than $50,000, imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both, for each violation of paragraph (1). Any such officer or employee may also be removed from office or employment.

(3) CIVIL PENALTIES; ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTIONS.—The Secretary may impose a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each violation of paragraph (1), except that no civil penalty may be imposed on an officer or employee of the United States, or any department or agency thereof, without the concurrence of the department or agency employing such officer or employee. Sections 503 (e), (g), (h), and (i) and 507 (a), (b), and (c) shall apply to actions to impose civil penalties under this paragraph. At the request of the Secretary, a department or agency employing an officer or employee found to have violated paragraph (1) shall deny that officer or employee access to information exempt from disclosure under this section. Any officer or employee who commits a violation of paragraph (1) may also be removed from office or employment by the employing agency.

SEC. 603. AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, MEDICINE, MEDICAL DEVICES.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE SANCTIONS REFORM AND EXPORT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000.—Nothing in this Act authorizes the exercise of authority contrary to the provisions of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–387; 114 Stat. 1549, 549A–45) applicable to exports of agricultural commodities, medicine, or medical devices.

(b) TITLE II LIMITATION.—Title II does not authorize export controls on food.

(c) TITLE III LIMITATION.—Except as set forth in section 906 of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, title III does not authorize export controls on agricultural commodities, medicine, or medical devices unless the procedures set forth in section 903 of such Act are complied with.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''food'' has the same meaning as that term has under section 201(f) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(f)).

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the administration of this Act during the fiscal year ending September 30 of the preceding calendar year. All Federal agencies shall cooperate fully with the Secretary in providing information for each such report.

(b) REPORT ELEMENTS.—Each such report shall include in detail—

(1) a description of the implementation of the export control policies established by this Act, including any delegations of authority by the President and any other changes in the exercise of delegated authority;

(2) a description of the changes to and the year-end status of country tiering and the Control List;

(3) a description of the petitions filed and the determinations made with respect to foreign availability and mass-market status, the set-asides of foreign availability and mass-market status determinations, and negotiations to eliminate foreign availability;

(4) a description of any enhanced control imposed on an item pursuant to section 201(d);

(5) a description of the regulations issued under this Act;

(6) a description of organizational and procedural changes undertaken in furtherance of this Act;

(7) a description of the enforcement activities, violations, and sanctions imposed under this Act;

(8) a statistical summary of all applications and notifications, including—

(A) the number of applications and notifications pending review at the beginning of the fiscal year;

(B) the number of notifications returned and subject to full license procedure;

(C) the number of notifications with no action required;

(D) the number of applications that were approved, denied, or withdrawn, and the number of applications where final action was taken; and

(E) the number of applications and notifications pending review at the end of the fiscal year;

(9) summary of export license data by export identification code and dollar value by country;

(10) an identification of processing time by—

(A) overall average, and

(B) top 25 export identification codes;

(11) an assessment of the effectiveness of multilateral regimes, and a description of negotiations regarding export controls;

(12) a description of the significant differences between the export control requirements of the United States and those of other multilateral control regime members, and the specific differences between United States requirements and those of other significant supplier countries;

(13) an assessment of the costs of export controls;

(14) a description of the progress made toward achieving the goals established for the Department dealing with export controls under the Government Performance Results Act;

(15) a description of the assessment made pursuant to section 214, including any recommendations to ensure that the defense industrial base (including manufacturing) is sufficient to protect national security; and

(16) any other reports required by this Act to be submitted to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

(c) FEDERAL REGISTER PUBLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Whenever information under this Act is required to be published in the Federal Register, such information shall, in addition, be posted on the Department of Commerce or other appropriate government website.

SEC. 702. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) REPEAL.—The Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT.—

(1) Section 103 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6212) is repealed.

(2) Section 251(d) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6271(d)) is repealed.

(c) ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION ACT.—Section 12 of the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 719j) is repealed.

(d) MINERAL LEASING ACT.—Section 28(u) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185(u)) is repealed.

(e) EXPORTS OF ALASKAN NORTH SLOPE OIL.—Section 28(s) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185(s)) is repealed.

(f) DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE PRODUCTS.—Section 7430(e) of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(g) OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT.—Section 28 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1354) is repealed.

(h) ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.—

(1) Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking ''subsections (c)'' and all that follows through ''12 of such Act,'' and inserting ''subsections (b), (c), (d) and (e) of section 503 of the Export Administration Act of 2001, by subsections (a) and (b) of section 506 of such Act, and by section 602 of such Act,''; and

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking ''11(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979'' and inserting ''503(c) of the Export Administration Act of 2001''; and

(B) in subsection (g)(1)(A)(ii), by inserting ''or section 503 of the Export Administration Act of 2001'' after ''1979''.

(2) Section 39A(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2779a(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''subsections (c),'' and all that follows through ''12(a) of such Act'' and inserting ''subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 503, section 507(c), and subsections (a) and (b) of section 506, of the Export Administration Act of 2001''; and

(B) by striking ''11(c)'' and inserting ''503(c)''.

(3) Section 40(k) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780(k)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''11(c), 11(e), 11(g), and 12(a) of the Export Administration Act of 1979'' and inserting ''503(b), 503(c), 503(e), 506(a), and 506(b) of the Export Administration Act of 2001''; and

(B) by striking ''11(c)'' and inserting ''503(c)''.

(i) OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—

(1) Section 5(b)(4) of the Trading with the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 5(b)(4)) is amended by striking ''section 5 of the Export Administration Act of 1979, or under section 6 of that Act to the extent that such controls promote the nonproliferation or antiterrorism policies of the United States'' and inserting ''titles II and III of the Export Administration Act of 2001''.

(2) Section 502B(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(a)(2)) is amended in the second sentence—

(A) by striking ''Export Administration Act of 1979'' the first place it appears and inserting ''Export Administration Act of 2001''; and

(B) by striking ''Act of 1979)'' and inserting ''Act of 2001)''.

(3) Section 140(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (22 U.S.C. 2656f(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting ''or section 310 of the Export Administration Act of 2001'' after ''Act of 1979''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''or 310 of the Export Administration Act of 2001'' after ''6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979''.

(4) Section 40(e)(1) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2712(e)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 6(j)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1979'' and inserting ''section 310 of the Export Administration Act of 2001''.

(5) Section 205(d)(4)(B) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 305(d)(4)(B)) is amended by striking ''section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979'' and inserting ''section 310 of the Export Administration Act of 2001''.

(6) Section 110 of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 2778a) is amended by striking ''Act of 1979'' and inserting ''Act of 2001''.

(7) Section 203(b)(3) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 5 of the Export Administration Act of 1979, or under section 6 of such Act to the extent that such controls promote the nonproliferation or antiterrorism policies of the United States'' and inserting ''the Export Administration Act of 2001''.

(8) Section 1605(a)(7)(A) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(j))'' and inserting ''section 310 of the Export Administration Act of 2001''.

(9) Section 2332d(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405)'' and inserting ''section 310 of the Export Administration Act of 2001''.

(10) Section 620H(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(j))'' and inserting ''section 310 of the Export Administration Act of 2001''.

(11) Section 1621(a) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262p–4q(a)) is amended by striking ''section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(j))'' and inserting ''section 310 of the Export Administration Act of 2001''.

(12) Section 1956(c)(7)(D) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 11 (relating to violations) of the Export Administration of 1979'' and inserting ''section 503 (relating to penalties) of the Export Administration Act of 2001''.

(13) Section 904(2)(B) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 is amended by striking ''Export Administration Act of 1979'' and inserting ''Export Administration Act of 2001''.

(14) Section 983(i)(2) of title 18, United States Code (as added by Public Law 106–185), is amended—

(A) by striking the ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (D);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(F) the Export Administration Act of 2001.''.

(j) CIVIL AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any product that is standard equipment, certified by the Federal Aviation Administration, in civil aircraft, and is an integral part of such aircraft, shall be subject to export control only under this Act. Any such product shall not be subject to controls under section 38(b)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(b)).

(k) CIVIL AIRCRAFT SAFETY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may authorize, on a case-by-case basis, exports and reexports of civil aircraft equipment and technology that are necessary for compliance with flight safety requirements for commercial passenger aircraft. Flight safety requirements are defined as airworthiness directives issued by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) or equipment manufacturers' maintenance instructions or bulletins approved or accepted by the FAA for the continued airworthiness of the manufacturers' products.

(l) REPEAL OF CERTAIN EXPORT CONTROLS.—Subtitle B of title XII of division A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (50 U.S.C. App. 2404 note) is repealed.

SEC. 703. SAVINGS PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All delegations, rules, regulations, orders, determinations, licenses, or other forms of administrative action which have been made, issued, conducted, or allowed to become effective under—

(1) the Export Control Act of 1949, the Export Administration Act of 1969, the Export Administration Act of 1979, or the International Emergency Economic Powers Act when invoked to maintain and continue the Export Administration regulations, or

(2) those provisions of the Arms Export Control Act which are amended by section 702,

and are in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue in effect according to their terms until modified, superseded, set aside, or revoked under this Act or the Arms Export Control Act.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS.—

(1) EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT.—This Act shall not affect any administrative or judicial proceedings commenced or any application for a license made, under the Export Administration Act of 1979 or pursuant to Executive Order 12924, which is pending at the time this Act takes effect. Any such proceedings, and any action on such application, shall continue under the Export Administration Act of 1979 as if that Act had not been repealed.

(2) OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—This Act shall not affect any administrative or judicial proceeding commenced or any application for a license made, under those provisions of the Arms Export Control Act which are amended by section 702, if such proceeding or application is pending at the time this Act takes effect. Any such proceeding, and any action on such application, shall continue under those provisions as if those provisions had not been amended by section 702.

(c) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DETERMINATIONS.—Any determination with respect to the government of a foreign country under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, or Executive Order 12924, that is in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall, for purposes of this title or any other provision of law, be deemed to be made under section 310 of this Act until superseded by a determination under such section 310.

(d) LAWFUL INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—The prohibitions otherwise applicable under this Act do not apply with respect to any transaction subject to the reporting requirements of title V of the National Security Act of 1947. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, nothing shall affect the responsibilities and authorities of the Director of Central Intelligence under section 103 of the National Security Act of 1947.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall make any revisions to the Export Administration regulations required by this Act no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. NICKLES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 15 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Wyoming.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, what I would like to do is take some time, because I did not have an opportunity just before the vote, to thank all the people who worked on and participated in this bill that we have just completed, and that includes the people who are both for the bill and against the bill. Everybody made a contribution on this one.

As I mentioned before, all 100 Senators are interested in national security—deeply interested, deathly interested in national security. That has been demonstrated by the work that has been put in on this bill. They are also extremely interested that the economy of the country advance. We just passed a bill that will allow both of those things to happen, and happen safely.

We have been without the kind of a bill that we have needed for a long period of time. We just passed one that is considerably better than what we had in place, and is even better than the

1979 act when it was extended. So we are in a position now where we can go, with some real credibility, to the House side to ask them to move the bill forward and to join with the White House in getting this passed quickly, as the White House asked. And, of course, we will be asking for all the people who have an interest in this bill to also help work on the House side. We know they will take quick action and that we will get this huge problem to the United States solved.

I would like to particularly thank those people who have worked closely on the bill. I will start with Senator GRAMM, who allowed me to be the subcommittee chairman and get this assignment.

I have to tell you, when I first got the assignment, I thought, this has failed about 12 times so I assume this is one of those tasks that freshman Senators get. I didn't expect much to happen on it, but we began the process of learning about it, and the Cox commission report came out. Of course, it was just a secret report at first, but it still got publicity that brought to the attention of the American people the problem of secrets being stolen from the United States.

That raised the level of this bill so that I and Senator JOHNSON of South Dakota could work through our subcommittee to really find out what was happening with it, to see how those things in the Cox commission and other reports, as they came out, fit into this bill. We put them into that bill, worked together to find solutions, met—''interminably'' might not be the right word, but it feels like the right word sometimes—with a number of groups and anybody who was interested in the bill and worked hard to heighten the interest of those people in the bill.

Fortunately, Senator JOHNSON and I got to work under the direction of Senator GRAMM and Senator SARBANES, two vastly different personalities with different ways of working. I have to say that working under those two people on any piece of legislation is an education. They are very considerate in everything they do. They both study it to a very deep knowledge. They ask penetrating questions, and they have that ability and sense of when to move forward and when to hold back. Particularly when you have the combination of Senator SARBANES and Senator GRAMM, you have these two personalities that cover all aspects of the spectrum of dealing with people.

Of course, with both of them, you have vast years of knowledge of doing this kind of work, which is different than any other job I think anybody can have.

They recognize the ways to work with people and the mechanisms to do it and have just been tremendous in guidance as we have gone through this.

I would be real remiss if I did not place some special thanks on all of the staff people who worked on this. Again, staff do a lot of the preparation, a lot of the study. They do meetings among themselves and then bring the results of those meetings to us for resolution. There were some real experts involved in this, people who really know how to network. And I would be surprised if there has been any other bill that had the kind of trust between staff and between Senators that this bill has had.

We worked on it for a long time. Of course, that built up the trust as we slowly got to the point where we had a draft to put through.

During that time, we did find out that it was an issue that affected everybody in the country. So then, of course, it affects both sides of the aisle. This is one of those examples of bipartisan effort. It results in a bipartisan vote and gives us some real strength as we continue this process.

Again, I thank my fellow Senator, Mr. JOHNSON, for his efforts on this bill and all of the different presentations we had to give over the course of time to different groups as we got them to buy in. Everybody had to come to the middle on this one because previous efforts had gone too far in one direction or the other. As a result, it picked up a majority in opposition.

One thing about passing a bill is that to pass it, you have to get it through all of the different steps. A ''no'' vote at any one of those steps kind of stops it dead in its tracks and sends you back to ground zero.

We are at the halfway point on this one now. We have gotten it through several votes successfully. It is much easier sometimes to create confusion and pick up the votes on the other side. I appreciate the Senators who helped to promote and to clarify this. Again, the clarification came from both sides.

Senator THOMPSON and Senator KYL particularly are to be congratulated for their tenacity at bringing up different points. You will find on the list of meetings that we put in that a lot of those meetings were with those two individuals. And as I mentioned numerous times, we put in 59 changes. One of the biggest changes, of course, is the override that the President has. We gave a trump to the President on everything in the bill.

We put in some new sections, and we said that the President has the right to set those aside in specific instances. It makes a huge difference in how this bill will work. It really will allow the limited resources that we have—and we are increasing those resources, but they are still limited—to concentrate on the worst situations and to make them better. That is what we are trying to achieve with the bill.

I would also like to thank the Majority Leader, Senator DASCHLE, for his strong support and willingness to bring the bill to the floor for debate. Senator REID was also instrumental in negotiating the bill to the floor for debate. His support and guidance was very much appreciated.

Again, I thank everybody who worked on the bill. I particularly appreciate all of the hours Senator SARBANES has spent on the floor this week, not only in debate, in clarifying things, which showed his vast depth of knowledge of the bill, but particularly with the administrative work he did as he helped to get people together who needed to talk about different parts of this bill. His steady hand certainly played a big role in the kind of vote we received.

I again thank everybody who worked on the bill and congratulate everybody who worked on the bill. That is both those who were for and those who were against. We will see everybody on the House side.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we are in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. DORGAN. I understand the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, are going to seek recognition. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized in morning business for 15 minutes following their presentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Kentucky.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCONNELL and Mrs. FEINSTEIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1409 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. DORGAN. Of course, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator DASCHLE, there will be no more votes tonight. The majority leader indicated in the morning he is going to move forward on some legislation. It is not for sure what it is. We are hopeful we will move to an appropriations bill. Senator DASCHLE has an important meeting tonight to see if that can be done. Senator DASCHLE asked I advise everyone there is a possibility of votes in the morning. Everyone should be prepared in that regard. There will be no more votes tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

SENATE BUSINESS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, with respect to the announcement by my colleague from Nevada, I am a bit confused what is happening in the Senate. We have the month of September to finish our appropriations bills. We have had no conferences on any appropriations bill at this point. We have 13 of them to do. We have a very short period of time in which to finish the work of the appropriations committees in the House and the Senate.

It is inexplicable to me that we are at this moment at 5 o'clock in the afternoon unable to go to another appropriations bill. They are ready to come to the floor. We are being blocked. There are objections to the motion to proceed to an appropriations bill. It makes no sense to me. This Senate must do its work and pass the appropriations bills. It will have to be sooner or later. It is much better if it is sooner. This is the work of the American people passing appropriations bills that contain the money for essentially the operation of Government. We have so much work to do and so little time in which to get it done.

The appropriations bills and the question of whether this fiscal policy adds up is very important for everyone. This town and, in ways, the country are asking a lot of questions these days about a softening economy, a surplus that used to exist that has now largely vanished, and a fiscal policy that was put in place when it was expected there would be nothing but surpluses as far as the eye could see that now does not add up at all.

I want to show a quote on a chart from Mr. Mitch Daniels, the head of the Office of Management and Budget in a statement he made on Sunday on ''Meet the Press'' because it is central to this question about fiscal policy. What are the resources? How many resources do we have? How do we use those resources? Mr. Daniels says we have the second largest surplus in the history of the country. We are ''awash in cash,'' he says. But, of course, what he is talking about is the Social Security trust fund and the money in the trust fund.

There used to be $125 billion expected above that, which indeed is a surplus, but that is now gone. That has evaporated. What is left belongs to the Social Security trust fund. When he says we are ''awash in cash,'' he is talking about Social Security trust fund moneys. Mr. Russert, the moderator of ''Meet the Press,'' said:

> The surplus is money that you got through payroll taxes, which are designated towards Social Security. And to tap into that is a violation of what George Bush pledged during the campaign.

To which Mr. Daniels replied:

> Well, it's not designated for Social Security, Tim.

It is not designated for Social Security. That is from the head of the Office of Management and Budget from this administration who says that the trust funds are not in the trust fund. The taxes that come out of all the workers' paychecks in this country, called Social Security taxes, that are put into a dedicated trust fund, we are told now by the head of the Office of Management and Budget that this money is not designated for Social Security.

He could not be more wrong or more unsuited for that job if he really believes that. It is possible this is a mistake. It is not a mistake in transcription. That is what he said, but it is possible he misspoke. If he did, let's hear that. If he did not misspeak, if this is what he believes, he is sadly mistaken.

This is a big, big issue. This is a $162 billion issue in this year alone. It is a half-a-trillion-dollar issue in the next 5 years. It is essential to the construct of a fiscal policy that works to understand that this money does not belong to them; it does not belong to the Government; it belongs to the American workers. They paid it. It is their taxes, and they were told it was going to go into a trust fund.

The message ought to be: Keep your hands off those trust funds.

All of us face difficulty as a result of a softening economy. I am not here pointing fingers at who is to blame and who is not to blame. The fact is, we have had an economy that always has had a business cycle: an expansion side and a contraction side. Nobody has ever changed that.

We suffered a contraction. We went through a period when everybody thought the stock market would always go up and never go down. That is not the case. We went through a period when everybody thought there was one way the economy moves: upward, steadily, relentlessly.

Now they are experiencing what we learned in economics. I actually taught economics for a while, and I have overcome that, as I often say. We taught the business cycle. The business cycle is inevitable. There is an expansion and a contraction. It all has to do with people's confidence in the future. Sometimes there is more confidence and sometimes less confidence.

The point is, we all now inherit this economy that has softened. It is incumbent on us all to get together and work together; that the President and the Congress understand the plan that existed before, anticipating surpluses forever, is a plan that now does not add up. It is desperately short of the resources to do that which the President wants to do. It would make good sense, in my judgment, for the President to join us in an economic summit of sorts to work through a new plan that represents an understanding that there is a new reality to this economy and the numbers in the current plan do not add up.

Let's create a plan together that makes sense for the American people, one that invests in the American people's future and one that tries to provide the stimulus and incentive to help promote confidence and start this economy, once again, on an upward trend. That is what we have a responsibility to do.

Fingers that are pointed mean very little at this point. We are all in this ship of state together. It is not as if there is an engine room with dials, knobs, gauges, and levers so that if we can just get Alan Greenspan, or someone in charge of fiscal policies, to move these gauges and levers just right so the ship of state will move. That is not the way the economic engine behaves.

This ship of state moves forward and the economy grows when people have confidence in the future. The American people, the bond markets, and stock markets do not have confidence in a fiscal plan they know does not add up. That is why it is important for the President to recognize that reality and work with us to construct a new plan.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to speak about a different subject, international trade. I will do it briefly because I understand my colleague, Senator BYRD, wishes to address the Senate. I certainly do not want to disadvantage him. If my colleague, Senator BYRD, will indulge me for a few more minutes, I want to make a comment about international trade.

Mr. BYRD. Please.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my colleague, as always, is gracious, and I deeply appreciate that.

Congress Daily today says:

> Vote on trade negotiating authority suffers another delay.

This is a story about the House of Representatives deciding to delay a vote on what we normally call fast track. They have delayed it because the Speaker of the House says they need time to get all their ''ducks in a row.''

I simply point out to those who are working to get their ''ducks in a row'' in the House of Representatives to pass fast track trade authority, that when it comes to the Senate, there are not going to be ducks in a row to pass fast track trade authority for our President.

I would not support it for President Clinton and I will not support it for this President, and I want to explain why. I believe a band of Senators who feel as passionately as I do about our trade policy believe it is not only undemocratic to cede to someone else the ability to go to negotiated trade agreements with the promise that no Senator has the opportunity to offer a change to that agreement when it comes to the floor of the Senate. But I

also want to explain why I think those who have negotiated our trade agreements are not entitled to be given a blank check for trade negotiation authority by this Congress.

Let me give a couple of examples to describe why. Here is what has happened to our merchandise trade deficit. It has ballooned from $132 billion in 1993 to $449 billion last year. It is exploding. We are exporting manufacturing jobs at a rapid pace, and this is a trade debt that we must repay in the future with a lower standard of living in the United States. This is serious. It is trouble and we must get it under control.

We have had a trade deficit with Mexico. Let us look at what has happened with Mexico. In 1993, we passed the North American Free Trade Agreement. Before the agreement, we had small deficits with Mexico, $5 billion, and then $2 billion or $3 billion. Then, a few years before the agreement, we had a surplus with Mexico.

What has happened since NAFTA was passed? We are drowning in red ink with the country of Mexico.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes, of course, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD. What are those figures representing our drowning?

Mr. DORGAN. Their the current accounts deficit. With Mexico alone, it is over $30 billion a year. In fact, our aggregate merchandise trade deficit is over a billion and a quarter a day, every single day. It is many trade partners including Japan, China, Canada, Mexico and Europe. It's a huge growing dangerous debt.

How does all of this happen? Let me give a few examples. Vehicles in Korea. In 2000, Korea shipped 570,000 vehicles to the United States of America. How many vehicles did we produce and ship to Korea? Only 1,700.

Is it because we do not make automobiles? No, that is not the reason. It is because if Ford makes a car and ships it to Korea, by the time it gets through all of their taxes, tariffs and other obstructions, it costs thousands more than it ought to cost. Therefore the Koreans do not buy it.

First of all, one has trouble getting it, but if they get it in the country they do not buy it because it is thousands more than it should be. So the result is our automobile trade with Korea is extremely unbalanced. They send us 570,000 vehicles a year and we send them 1,700. That is vehicles to Korea.

How about T-bone steak to Tokyo, beef to Japan? Do my colleagues know that every single pound of American beef we send to Japan has a 38.5 percent tariff on it, every single pound? To buy a T-bone steak in Tokyo is very expensive. Do you know why? Because they restrict the amount of beef coming in. We reached a beef agreement with Japan and our negotiators celebrated it. Twelve years later we still have a 38.5 percent tariff on every single pound of beef going to Japan. T-bones to Tokyo, that is unfair trade; cars from Korea. How about high-fructose corn syrup to Mexico? Here they levy the equivalent of a 43 percent to 73 percent tariff on corn syrup, despite being in violation of NAFTA. Or how about durum wheat to this country from Canada? Fundamentally unfair trade. There are millions of bushels coming across in 18-wheel trucks. The Canadians have a monopoly that would be illegal in this country called the Canadian Wheat Board. They ship wheat to this country at secret prices. When we say to them, ''open up your records,'' they simply thumb their nose at us and say, ''We do not intend to shed one bit of light on this. We do not intend to share any data with you at all.'' That is the way trade is.

So I say to those in the House who are getting their ducks in a row to pass fast track trade authority, ''Well, go ahead and get your ducks in a row. But you should understand that ducks are not going to be in a row when that gets to the U.S. Senate.''

I did not believe President Clinton ought to have this authority, and he did not get it. I do not believe this President ought to have this authority, and, in my judgment, he is not going to get it.

The first step, and I have said this to the Commerce Secretary: ''Do you want to talk about fast track? I will tell you what you ought to fast track. Why don't you put on the fast track a few trade solutions.'' I say to the trade negotiator and others, ''Get some good negotiators. Fit them with jerseys, just like we do with the Olympics. Make sure the jerseys have a big ''USA'' on the front so that occasionally our negotiators can look down at their chests and see who they are representing and for whom they are negotiating.'' Send them over to the negotiating table and say, ''Stand up for this country's interests.''

Do not build walls and keep things out of here. But our negotiators need to say, ''We expect fair trade.'' We expect them to stand up for this country's interests. Stand up for the American worker. Stand up for American business. Stand up for American products. We are sick and tired of unfair trade bargains that put us in a sea of red ink and put our employees and businesses at a disadvantage.

That is true with Japan. It is true with China. I have not spoken about China. I should, but out of respect for my colleague who is waiting to speak, I will do that at a later time.

Japan, China, Korea, Canada, Mexico, Europe. This country is drowning in a sea of red ink, in international trade deficits, and it ought to stop. I will not be a part of a Senate that is going to try to give fast track authority to a President.

There will be a group of Senators who believe, as I do, that it is worth the passion, energy, and time to see that the priority in this country, and the priority in trade policy, is not to grant fast track authority to the Administration so they can go off and negotiate new trade agreements. Rather, we need to get some people who know how to negotiate solutions to the problems in the old trade agreements.

Let us fix the problems they have already created instead of running off and trying to create new trade agreements. This is especially true when we have this trade deficit that is becoming an albatross around the neck of our children. A trade deficit that will and must be repaid. One that must be repaid with a lower standard of living in this country. That is why it is important now to solve this problem. It will not be solved by more trade if it is unfair.

I am for expanded trade. I am for more trade. I am for all the things that people want to do to engage around the world in commerce, but I demand on behalf of this country, and on behalf of American workers and businesses, that trade agreements be fair to America for a change.

Trade agreements with Japan, China, and others have been negotiated in an incompetent way. You can put a blindfold on. It does not matter whether it is Republicans or Democrats in office.

Will Rogers once said the United States of America has never lost a war and never won a conference. He certainly must have been thinking about our trade negotiators. We can do a whole lot better than that.

My point very simply is, on fast track, get your ducks in the row in the House, but understand when it gets to the Senate it is not going any further. There are plenty of us who are going to see that fast track is not passed in the U.S. Senate.

Yes, we are for trade, but we are for fair trade. It is time to insist on fair trade and get rid of these ballooning trade deficits.

Let me thank my colleague, Senator BYRD, from West Virginia. He is, as is always the case, most gracious to allow me to continue beyond the time allotted.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD. Sign me up. Sign me up as one of those who will stand with the Senator to defeat fast track. We have seen too many American jobs take a fast track out of this country. We have seen what happened to pottery in my State. We have seen what happened to glass, what happened to leather goods, what has happened to textiles, what is

happening to steel, what is happening to chemicals.

I will be with my colleague. I am opposed to fast track. I am for free trade but fair trade.

Next year will be my 50th year in Congress, and I see one administration after another, Republican and Democrat, go down this same fast track, and I am tired of it. I have been against it. I do not stand here today and propose we ought to deliberate on putting a duty on every toothbrush or every fiddle or fiddle string or every paint brush that comes into this country, but there are a few major questions that we should be allowed to debate and offer amendments on when that measure comes before the Senate. What's wrong with that? I wouldn't mind, half a dozen, six, three, but why should we go along with our eyes closed and continue to join in this fast track of American jobs and American industries across the seas?

Getting our ducks in a row, we have become sitting ducks. These are the ducks that our forefathers gave us to put in a row. Section 8, article I, the U.S. Constitution:

> The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States * * *

It doesn't say anything about getting our ducks in a row. It doesn't say anything about fast track. It doesn't say anything about binding and gagging ourselves when it comes to trade legislation. It says the Congress shall have power to regulate commerce.

Let's exercise that power. Let's exercise our rights as Members of the Senate, elected by a free people. Count me, register me, make me a first lieutenant in the ranks. I am ready. I volunteer.

I thank the Senator for his contributions. I thank him very much for his leadership on this issue.

Is the Senate in a period for morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Are there any limitations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Each Senator is restricted to 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 45 minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank the Chair.

U.S. IMMIGRATION POLICY

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, the inscription on the base of the Statue of Liberty that has welcomed immigrants for generations can be found in the poem, ''The New Colossus,'' by Emma Lazarus:

> Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,
> With conquering limbs astride from land to land;
> Here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand
> A mighty woman with a torch, whose flame
> Is the imprisoned lightning, and her name
> Mother of Exiles. From her beacon-hand
> Glows world-wide welcome; her mild eyes command
> The air-bridged harbor that twin cities frame.
> ''Keep ancient lands, your storied pomp!'' cries she
> With silent lips. ''Give me your tired, your poor,
> Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
> The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
> Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
> I lift my lamp beside the golden door!''

The United States has a proud history of welcoming immigrants fleeing religious persecution, political oppression, and economic hardship. My own forebear on my father's side came to these shores in 1657, settled on the banks of the Rappahannock River where all—with the exception of possibly one in this Chamber—are children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and great-great-grandchildren of immigrants. The magnanimous promise of a better life that is inscribed in the base of the Statue of Liberty has deep roots in both the American mind and American law. George Washington captured that promise in his dictum two centuries ago that the United States should be ''a country which may afford an asylum, if we are wise enough to pursue the paths which lead to virtue and happiness, to the oppressed and needy of the Earth.''

I understand the American dream that has lured immigrants here for more than 200 years. I have a son-in-law who is an immigrant from Iran. He is a physicist. I have a grandson who is married to an immigrant from Korea. My own State of West Virginia has benefitted from the many contributions made by our foreign-born citizens. West Virginia's coal miner population in the early part of the 20th Century reads like a United Nations roster: British—English, Welch, Scottish—Irish, Italian, Hungarian, Lithuanian, Swedish, Austrian, Russian, Greek, Syrian, Romanian, German, Polish, Slavic, and on and on.

In recent months, this administration has been working with its Mexican counterparts to craft a new immigration policy that would, among other things, legalize three to four million undocumented Mexican immigrants now working in the United States.

According to the latest numbers from the U.S. Census Bureau, immigrants now comprise about 11 percent of the total U.S. population. That is about 30 million immigrants living in the United States—13 million to 14 million of whom arrived just in the last 10 years.

These numbers are quite extraordinary because they suggest that at least 1.3 million immigrants are settling in the United States each year. That is more than arrived during the last great wave of immigration between 1900 and 1910, when about 850,000 people entered the country each year.

In addition to their arrival in the United States, during the 1990's, immigrant women gave birth to an estimated 6.9 million children. If we add together the number of births to immigrants and the number of new arrivals, immigration during the 1990's led to the addition of 20 million—or two-thirds of the nearly 30 million people who populated the United States over the last 10 years.

If current trends continue, according to the Census Bureau's middle-range projections, the U.S. population will grow from 280 million to 404 million people by 2050, with immigration accounting for about 63 percent of that growth. That means the number of new immigrants entering this country over the next 50 years, about 78 million immigrants, will be roughly equal to 43 times the current population of West Virginia.

As I have said, many of these immigrants will contribute to the economic, cultural, and political development of the United States. But, let us not forget, let us not be unmindful of the fact that there will also be real costs associated with this population increase. Many of these new citizens will come in search of access to quality health care services. Yet too many of our Nation's 5,000 emergency rooms are already operating at critical capacity.

Go over to Fairfax Hospital. I just had my wife of 64 years over to that hospital twice within the last 6 weeks. And I took her both times—once through a call to 911. You will be amazed at what you see. The hospitals are overcrowded.

According to the LA Times, at many of the nation's hospitals, ''ambulances are being turned away and patients are stacked in the hallways.'' If we are to accept these new citizens, it is clear that we will have to spend billions of taxpayer dollars to expand our health care infrastructure.

This Nation also has the responsibility to provide a quality public education to its citizens. Yet, the Department of Education recently reported that the number of children in public schools has grown by nearly 8 million in the last two decades. This growth has strained the resources of many school districts, resulting in overcrowded classrooms and overgrown schools where discipline is difficult if not almost impossible, and individual attention is nearly impossible.

These are questions we ought to think about. We need to think about these things.

In 2000, there were about 8 million school-age children—ages 5 to 17—of immigrants who had arrived since 1970, according to the Center for Immigration Studies. This is roughly equal to the total growth in elementary and

secondary school enrollment over the last 20 years. If we invite more immigrants into our public school system, we must consider the absorption capacity of American public education. This means that we will have to spend billions of taxpayer dollars to expand our public education infrastructure. The current infrastructure is being strained to the hilt.

We also have a responsibility to ensure that these new citizens, at the very least, have access to the resources to become proficient in the English language. The Census Bureau recently reported that nearly one in five Americans does not speak English at home. Among Spanish speakers, only half the adults described themselves as speaking English well, and only two-thirds of the school-age children in Spanish-speaking homes described themselves as speaking English very well. If we accept these potential citizens, we have an obligation to help ensure that they can assimilate themselves into our society.

Population growth will also continue to cause more and more land to be developed. Both past experience and common sense strongly suggest that population growth of this kind has important implications for the preservation of farm land, open space, and the overall quality of life throughout our country. A nation simply cannot add nearly 120 million people to its population without having to develop a great deal of undeveloped land.

There are also environmental concerns that must be considered. A growing nation requires increasing amounts of energy and greater recovery of natural resources, which results in larger output of pollution in our streams and greater accumulations of solid waste in our landfills.

Our resources, as never before, are limited. For all the talk we have heard in recent months from the administration about liberalizing our immigration laws, the President has not made any suggestions—I haven't heard them if he has made any—about how to pay for the additional infrastructure investments that will be required.

Just look around you. The infrastructure is being asked to bear far more than the traffic will bear. Look at our schools. Look at our hospitals. Look at our welfare programs.

Does the Administration want to increase taxes to support these newcomers? We have been cutting taxes. How much of our limited resources is the administration willing to sacrifice? At what price are we willing to accept all of these new immigrants?

These are the questions that our immigration policy needs to address if we are to offer a higher standard of living and a better life to the immigrants that our nation accepts. Instead, the American public is witnessing an immigration debate unfold that threatens to move this nation's immigration laws in exactly the wrong direction.

Today the President of Mexico, Vicente Fox, in addressing a joint session of Congress, spoke about the need to regularize the flow of migrant workers between the United States and Mexico. The Bush Administration contends that we can regularize this migrant flow through a new ''temporary worker'' program.

I assure you, that there is nothing new about ''temporary worker'' programs and the amnesties that usually accompany them. In fact, these kinds of proposals have become a frightenly familiar routine in recent years that have contradicted our immigration laws and sent exactly the wrong message abroad.

In 1986, Congress granted an amnesty to 2.7 million illegal immigrants, based on the promise that it would stem the tide of illegal immigration when combined with a ban on the hiring of illegal immigrants by employers. I supported that proposal, although it later proved to be a false promise. Illegal immigration increased dramatically.

More recently, there have been efforts by Congress to pass the so-called 245(i) status adjustment, which would allow illegals—for a $1,000 fee—to waive the requirement that would force them to leave the country and effectively bars them from reentering the United States for up to 10 years.

This kind of legislation, in particular, flies right in the face—right in the face of the Congress' recent efforts to stop the flow of illegal immigrants. The section 245(i) provision nullifies those measures passed by the Congress that would punish immigrants who enter this country illegally.

Not only is this legislation unfair to every immigrant—both present and past—who waited to legally enter this country, but it sends the message abroad that as long as you can gather together enough money, you can circumvent our laws whenever they prove to be inconvenient.

State and local governments have not done much better at discouraging illegal immigration. Many States are making it easier for undocumented immigrants to apply for a driver's license, government health care benefits, and lower state college tuition. None of these initiatives will act as a deterrent to illegal immigration.

Let us continue to have legal immigration. Let us not offer attractions to illegal immigration.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service estimates that there are about 6 million illegal aliens living in the United States, a number which increases by more than 200,000 per year. And these numbers are based on 1997 population statistics. Once the Census 2000 population statistics are available, immigration experts expect this number to increase to somewhere between 8.5 million illegals and 13 million illegals. That's double the estimated number of illegals in 1986.

The number of amnesties that have been proposed in recent years, and the corresponding rise in illegal immigrants, suggests that something is seriously wrong with this country's immigration laws. It suggests that the basic framework either doesn't work or that we are not serious about enforcing it.

I am amazed at the political support for these amnesty proposals. As I say, I voted for them. I was misled.

Both political parties—Republican and Democrat—support broader immigration rules.

But no one is talking about the additional costs to the American taxpayers. Not one is talking about the strain on our natural and financial resources.

Building a political base is no reason to encourage illegal immigration, nor is building up union membership, nor is importing cheaper labor to replace U.S. workers. We must not glibly rush forward on immigration policy without adequate thought about unintended consequences, tangential ramifications or adequate public education and debate. Whether this rush to loosen our enforcement of immigration laws is due to jockeying for political advantage as cynics might contend, or simply an outgrowth of commendable altruistic urges on the part of our nation's political system, we need to step back, slow down and take a serious look at our immigration policies.

I well understand that there are segments of the American economy which profit greatly by the labors of illegal immigrants. I well understand the human sorrows endured by immigrant families who cannot earn an adequate living in their native land, and so must send a wage earner across the border to work and establish a foot hold for future generations. My experience growing up in the coal fields during the years of the Great Depression was not too far afield from the immigrant experience of today. I know extreme poverty. I know what it is to start out life with the bottom rungs of life's ladder missing. I remember being at the mercy of the coal company employer in the coalfields. I understand the stigma of being undereducated, poor, and without the bottom rungs in the ladder. I understand that. That is why I am so concerned about the direction of our immigration policy of today.

I believe that not enough thought has been given and not enough questions have been asked. I question the sincerity of our rush to appease. Are we really acting in the best interests of the Mexican immigrants or of our own citizens?

I have lived 84 years and one lesson that I have learned in my years of observation and service is that the most precious commodity in public policy is that of honesty—intellectual honesty.

I hope that this rush to further relax our immigration laws is not just a competition for political advantage, but I fear that that is in fact the driving force. If I am right, and ''votes ripe for plucking'' is driving the altruistic claims of both parties, I urge that we draw back and face the ugly possibility of unintended exploitation of foreign workers as the outcome of political jockeying for the Hispanic vote.

In the first place there is no easily identifiable ''Hispanic vote.'' Cuban peoples, Mexican peoples, and other Latin peoples who may have immigrated to the United States have radically different political views and decidedly different priorities. In the second place hispanic peoples who have resided in the United States for some years often deplore the laxer rules which allow new immigrants easier access to U.S. shores, and resent the unfortunate image which newer immigrants may project. The Hispanic votes is not a monolith and it is an insulting, shallow proposition to portray all people's of Latin descent as such.

Then there is the question of honesty again. Are we not skating dangerously close to falsehood when we politicians pretend that we can handle these vast numbers of future immigrants in any sort of decent and humane way? Anyone even vaguely familiar with the health care system in this nation knows that it is inadequate to service our present population and becoming more inadequate each day. Go visit the hospitals in the area. How can we pretend that we can address even the most mundane health care needs of these new immigrants?

We read about those needs in the newspapers—in the Washington Post and the Washington Times. The stories are frequent in those newspapers about the health needs, about the poverty, and about education shortcomings. We are so stretched now that we cannot handle the present load. Our infrastructure just simply can't handle it.

How can we pretend that our overcrowded, underachieving school system can possibly deal with thousands of new immigrant children and come even close to preparing them to cope with the competitive job market in America today.

We are not being intellectually honest. We are not being honest with the legal immigrants who are already in this country. We are not being honest with these people.

We are not being honest with ourselves.

We can't assure these children an adequate education, and that is the truth. Are we consigning these children to a sort of permanent underclass when we fail to give them basic tools with which they can achieve? The truth is, our American infrastructure—both physical and human resource related—is 20 years behind, and falling further behind with each passing year.

From everything to inadequate roads and transportation, to a health care system that assists fewer and fewer people, to an education system that fails to impart either discipline or knowledge, we need to face the fact that our resources are limited. It is a sad yet very true fact that we must all face. And we ought to think about it. I think these are proper questions to ask. We are no longer a land of unlimited possibilities because we no longer provide the basics which allow the people to flourish. We have disinvested in our own Nation. We have disinvested in our own people. The cupboard is not bare, but its contents are decidedly skimpy, and it is a grave disservice to invite the neighbors to a sumptuous feast at our house when we know that there is nothing left in the cupboard, nothing to serve but poke greens and salads that are cut from the hillside.

We risk turning a blind eye to the needs of our own Nation in future years when we try to absorb huge, huge numbers of underskilled, uninsured, undereducated immigrants without a cogent plan for handling their needs and fostering their eventual assimilation into our own society.

We must not rush to appease the demands of our friends to the south of our border without stopping to contemplate the consequences. President Fox of Mexico has the responsibility of delivering on his promise to the Mexican people of more jobs and a stronger economy. He cannot look solely to the United States to solve his economic and political problems.

We must also proceed with caution when we advocate policies that circumvent the intent of our own immigration laws. Those laws are passed by the Congress of the United States and signed by a President of the United States. Those laws are intended to allow for the orderly absorption of immigrant populations, and to prepare that population to become productive, participating English literate, United States citizens.

I can tell you Madam President, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the Senate and as a member of the Senate Budget Committee—as is the distinguished Presiding Officer at this moment—we do not have the infrastructure in place to absorb the number of immigrants to whom this administration is seeking to open our borders.

It would be nice, it would be good, if we were able to solve the economic problems of other countries and provide a higher standard of living for people around the world—but, we cannot. This is no longer the late 19th century or the mid 18th century. Our resources are more limited today than they were a hundred years ago.

The Congress already faces enormous challenges in stretching our ever shrinking financial resources—and they are ever shrinking. The Congress will have to appropriate the 13 annual appropriations bills this year with less than adequate resources to finance our infrastructure needs. I am opposed to the further erosion and draining of the limited resources that are available.

I did not vote for the tax cut. I vigorously opposed it. And my wife and I are returning our check. And as resources shrink, we run the risk of resentment, increasing resentment between those who are coming and those who are here, and those are forces that we do not want to unleash.

We cannot be so generous that we strain our own resources to the breaking point. And if we allow illegal Mexicans to come here, and to stay, what about illegal immigrants from elsewhere? How can we be fair to them if we do not treat them all alike? We cannot be so generous that we strain our own resources to the breaking point.

It is time for us to think of the people of America, and their children and their grandchildren. We need a national debate. We do not need something that can be rushed through on the consent calendar. We need a national debate on our immigration policies. The people out there must seriously ask the politicians, what are the answers to these questions that are being asked? They are legitimate questions. What are the answers?

We must seriously ask ourselves just how many more people our country will be able to accommodate. This is not something, Madam President, that should be rushed through Congress in 4 months or in 4 years, without adequate debate. These are questions that should be thoroughly aired.

Whatever proposal the President sends to Congress, it should be debated at length in the Senate. The American people must know what costs they are being asked to absorb. They must know what sacrifices they are being asked to make. And legal immigrants should be asking the same questions. What are the sacrifices they are supposed to make on behalf of illegal immigrants? Those immigrants who have waited patiently, knocking at the door, how do they feel about it? America is a nation of immigrants. Our golden door should always be open to those who seek refuge from oppression—''those huddled masses yearning to breathe free.'' But we must not turn America's promise into a hollow shell. It is well to remember that illegal immigrants don't just break the law when they come here. They undermine the earning power of America's workforce by reducing wages for the U.S. workforce who do not have high school diplomas.

Madam President, in 1939, John Steinbeck's epic novel, the ''Grapes of Wrath,'' was published. Its protagonists, the Joad family, traveled from the Midwest to California, not to make their fortunes but merely to survive as

migrant workers. Through labor camps, hobo jungles, and ruined farms westward to California, they faced a peculiar kind of torment—the torment and isolation of hardship and poverty amid plenty. Let us proceed with caution—I say this to my political colleagues in this body, in the other body, and in the executive branch, and in the State legislatures, in the counties, in the towns and communities, cities across this Nation—let us proceed with caution, lest we turn America's sweet promise of a cornucopia to bitter grapes of wrath for us all, including our legal immigrants.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I will take a few minutes to make some observations about some of the discussions I have read in recent days in various news articles and have heard from Senators who have commented on these articles relating to missile defense and the President's efforts to discuss with Russia and other friends and allies around the world our intentions with respect to the development of missile defenses to protect the security interests of the United States.

For some reason or other, in recent weeks there have been some misinterpretations made of comments that have appeared in news articles. Some have suggested that the administration, for example, is going to abandon the ABM Treaty or is developing plans and asking for funding in this year's appropriations bills to conduct tests and do development projects for missile defense which would violate the provisions of the ABM Treaty.

It is clear from everything the President himself has said that he would like to replace the ABM Treaty, after full discussions with Russian officials, allies, and friends around the world, with a new strategic framework that more closely reflects the facts as they exist now in the relationship we have with Russia.

The ABM Treaty was written, as we know, in 1972. It was written in an atmosphere where the prevailing doctrine of national security was mutual assured destruction where we would actually have, as a matter of national policy, a plan to annihilate or destroy cities with innocent civilians in retaliation against a nuclear missile strike against the United States from the Soviet Union. And the mutual assured destruction doctrine was very troubling in and of itself, but it was the only thing we had. Deterrence was a way of life—and also a promise of a way of death in case someone decided to authorize a strike against the other. This was an agreement that was entered into at a time when each side seemed to be intent on building new and more sophisticated and more lethal weapons systems targeted to military targets in the other's nation state.

But times have changed. The Soviet Union no longer exists. Even though the Clinton administration attempted to negotiate a succession agreement, it has never been submitted to the Senate for ratification. The succession agreement lists Russia, Belarus, and another nation state as the successor states to the Soviet Union. Think about that. I am sure the Senate would discuss that very carefully and probably at great length, and whether or not the Senate would advise and consent and permit the ratification of that treaty, to permit it to go into effect and have the force and effect of law, is problematical.

But that is just one indication of how times have changed. The Clinton administration continued to respect the ABM Treaty to the extent that it would not undertake testing of even theater missile defense systems if the Russians objected. And in the discussions with our representatives in Geneva and elsewhere, talking on these subjects, it became clear that this country was going to be inhibited in its testing programs of theater missile defense systems because of provisions of the ABM Treaty.

By now, it ought to be very clear that there are threats to our soldiers and sailors who are deployed around the world from these very theater missile offensive systems that we saw Iraq use in the desert war—in the war that we helped organize and wage against them to liberate Kuwait. Twenty-eight or twenty-nine members of a National Guard unit lost their lives in Dhahran as a result of a Scud missile attack.

We cannot tolerate being inhibited and subject to the approval of another country to test and develop and deploy a system that would protect soldiers in that circumstance in the future. We have already, as a matter of fact, developed follow-on systems to the Patriot system, which was the only thing we used to try to counter the Scud missile attacks. And we continue to upgrade and make progress in developing systems that will offer the kind of protection against those missile attacks in the future. The PAC–3 program, for example, has had a succession of successful tests, using the hit-to-kill technology of a defensive system.

There are other examples of theater missile programs. The Army's High Altitude Air Defense Systems—the acronym is THAAD. It sounds like my name is a system that offers protection against missile attack. But to hear some Senators and look at the authorization committee's mark right now, you would think these theater systems were the same as the national missile defense system. We saw reports in the paper that the chairman had presented the Armed Services Committee with a committee print of a military authorization bill for the next fiscal year, and it cuts $1.3 billion out of missile defense. This is being described in the newspapers, and by Senators, too, as a reduction in the amount of money that would be authorized for national missile defense.

When you look at the exact dollar amounts in the bill—and it is not national missile defense—approximately $347 million is cut from the Navy theater-wide program in the chairman's mark, along with $210 million for the THAAD program and $80 million from the airborne laser program. These are not long-range missile programs. These are not missile programs designed to counter intercontinental ballistic missile threats to our country; these are designed to protect men and women in the military service of the United States who are deployed all over the world right now. And they are now under threats from the same kind of missile weapons systems that were used by Iraq. Now they have been modernized, we hear from our intelligence sources, and are more accurate and more reliable and more lethal than they were in the desert war.

These programs should not be cut in the name of trying to restrict the President from using funds that the Congress appropriates for national missile defense. These are intermediate-range defensive systems, the testing and deployment of which were not intended to be covered by the ABM Treaty. And even though the Clinton administration was negotiating with the Russians our rights to test in developing these programs—to some degree at least—it is not the subject of the ABM Treaty. The ABM Treaty wasn't designed to deal with these threats at all.

So what I am suggesting is that the Senate ought to be on early warning that we are seeing an effort being developed here—at least in the Armed Services Committee—to lay groundwork for restrictions on funding, for restrictive language, which I understand is also included in the chairman's mark, which would more closely restrict the President and the Department of Defense in their effort to fully explore the use of technologies that

would help defend our service men and women when they are in harm's way around the world today.

There are some other programs that are cut in this bill that I understand are in the chairman's mark. One is the space-based infrared system, which will provide satellites to track missiles after launch—$97 billion is cut from that program.

So there is a pattern here of undermining the entire effort to develop our defenses to the capability they need to be to fully assure the security interests of the United States. It doesn't have anything to do with the ABM Treaty, in my view, but that is being used as an excuse to hold back these programs. The chairman's mark cuts $350 million from a program previously known as national missile defense, though in reality the number is far higher, as the administration has sought to remove the artificial barriers between the labels ''national'' and ''theater'' missile defense.

The President is talking about missile defenses. We need to have an aggressive, robust testing program so that we can fully understand how these technologies can be harnessed to fully defend our country's interests and protect the security of our Nation.

The chairman's mark even cuts funds that would be used for cooperative missile defense modeling and simulation with Russia. We are hearing a lot about trying to interact more in a positive way with Russia. Here is an example of a program that would give us an opportunity to do that more successfully, and that is proposed for cutbacks in the Armed Services Committee.

There are various legislative restrictions, one of which will provide the Defense Department's missile activities can proceed only in accordance with the ABM Treaty.

That is redundant, isn't it? Or it suggests that the President is planning to undertake something that is inconsistent with the treaty. He has said he is not going to do that. He recognizes the treaty is an agreement that is legally binding. The President has said that.

He is hoping to replace the treaty after negotiations with the Russians with a new strategic framework, but everybody is pronouncing that around here as dead on arrival. Give the President a chance at least to discuss it fully with the Russians rather than rushing over and getting some Russian official to make some derogatory statement about the process and then quoting it as if it is national policy in Russia.

We should give the negotiators a chance. That is what I am suggesting. So writing a bill here that presumes the President is going to violate the ABM Treaty is not getting us off to a good start, particularly if this sends a signal to the Russians: You do not have to worry about negotiating with the President of the United States in good faith because the Senate is going to take over, the Senate is going to make it impossible for the President to negotiate an agreement.

We should not undermine the President's capacity to negotiate a better agreement that will serve our national security interests in a more effective way and replace an outdated, outmoded treaty, a cold war relic, when we could, if we are successful under the President's leadership, negotiate a better agreement that more fully protects our country's national security interests. This kind of provision is needless piling on, making it more and more difficult for our President. I hope the Armed Services Committee will look very carefully at these provisions.

There are a lot of other concerns that I have. I know there may be others who want to discuss issues on other subjects of great national concern, but they are talking about now in one other line of articles that I have seen—and this was discussed in our Defense appropriations hearing yesterday by some Senators—the fact there was a quote in the paper from an administration official saying: We were not bothered by China's buildup, the modernization of their nuclear weapons capability and whether they were going to do that or not would not have any effect on our decisions with respect to missile defense programs.

Secretary Rumsfeld made it very clear at the hearing, responding to one Senator's question, that neither he nor Secretary Powell nor Dr. Condoleezza Rice had made any statement of that kind, and they knew of no one in the Department of Defense or the Department of State or at the White House who had said anything like that.

There is no quote attributed to any particular individual, but yet not only the press have taken that and made stories out of it and repeated them, but now Senators are repeating them as if it was a fact. The fact is, China has been modernizing its military for years. They did not just start a new generation of nuclear weapons or intercontinental ballistic missile technologies and systems after we began improving our missile defense capabilities. China is going to make the decisions they make based on their own considerations of what is in their interests.

I am hopeful, of course, as everyone in this administration and in this Congress, we will be able to have a stable and friendly relationship based on mutual respect with China. Efforts are being made in discussions by the Secretary of State and many others with Chinese leaders in order to develop an understanding, trying to resolve problems as they develop, and we know what they are.

The incident with the surveillance plane in the area presented its own special set of problems, but we worked our way through that with calm and thoughtful leadership and decision-making by the President and his Cabinet officials.

The whole point of this is, we can be a party to inciting the passions of those who worry about the capacity of our country's leadership to function to protect our security interests, and we can do more harm than good by the things we say and the way we discuss these issues and the way we handle bills that come through this Senate.

We should take very seriously the provisions that are in the chairman's print of this authorization bill before the Armed Services Committee, and all Senators ought to notice what is beginning as an official part of our legislative responsibility: an effort that is clear to undermine the President's leadership capacity in developing missile defense systems that will protect our soldiers and sailors and the security interests of our country.

Those who say he is going to abandon the ABM Treaty need to look at what the President said. He is trying to replace it with a new framework, a new agreement. I have suggested to some that we ought to consider having a peace treaty as a replacement to the ABM Treaty. We are not at war with Russia any longer. They do not profess to be at war with us. The cold war is over. When wars end, peace treaties are signed. Let's sign a peace treaty with Russia. That would supplant the ABM Treaty.

The ABM Treaty locks into law the doctrine of mutual assured destruction. We do not want to destroy Russia. They should not want to destroy us. So why perpetuate that doctrine with that treaty? Let's work to develop a new framework that more clearly defines the real relationship we have with Russia now.

That is what the President wants to do. Why can't the Senate join with the President, applaud that initiative, support that effort, pass legislation to fund the efforts to strengthen our military forces so we can do the job of protecting the security of this country?

I am not going to suggest these are political games that are being played because I know there are serious differences of opinion on this and other issues that come before the Senate.

I am not questioning anybody's motives. I am just saying I hope Senators will take a careful look at the facts. As we proceed through this process of authorization and appropriation for our defense needs, let's try to work in harmony and unity as much as possible so we will not create any misunderstandings in Russia, in China, or among potential adversaries out there, the so-called rogue states, that continue to acquire technology, that continue to acquire systems, missiles, other means of developing intercontinental ballistic missile capability.

It is a dangerous place out there, and we need to be sure we are doing what we can do and ought to do to protect our security interests in this environment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DISPOSAL OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to share some news with my Senate colleagues. And even though my subject involves radioactive waste, I'm most pleased to report that this is all good news.

As a Nation, we haven't made great progress on disposal of radioactive wastes, Yucca Mountain was supposed to open in 1998—now it might open in 2010 if it progresses at the most optimistic rate.

But in New Mexico, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in the city of Carlsbad opened for disposal operations in March of 1999. WIPP is the nation's first repository for the permanent disposal of defense-generated radioactive waste left from the research and production of nuclear weapons.

WIPP represents the single most dramatic advance this Nation has made in disposal of radioactive waste. In fact, WIPP is a showcase facility for the entire world for demonstrating that mankind can safely remove complex wastes from any impact on our environment.

WIPP accepts a particular kind of waste, transuranic or TRU waste, that is contaminated with certain elements, especially plutonium. This type of waste must be handled with great care to ensure safety of the public and workers. WIPP represents a cornerstone of DOE's national cleanup effort dealing with the nation's nuclear weapons complex. Today, I want to announce that WIPP has filled their first underground room to full capacity.

This is no small achievement. That room now holds over 10,000 drums of TRU waste. The waste arrived in 352 shipments from five DOE sites—Los Alamos, Rocky Flats, Idaho, Hanford, and Savannah River. That required lots of transportation, in fact about one-third of a million miles. And even with so many miles, equivalent to 13 trips around the earth, there were no accidents or even serious incidents. For those who doubt that radioactive cargoes can be shipped safely, WIPP is proof that a well-engineered transportation system can be operated to the highest standards.

The team at WIPP isn't stopping to celebrate this milestone. As I speak, they're busily accepting more waste. Earlierr this week, the shipment number was up to 373 and more then 11,000 drums had moved into the facility.

In closing, I personally commend the Department of Energy, especially the Carlsbad Field Office, for their careful attention to safe operations. The community of Carlsbad deserves tremendous praise for their consistent support of WIPP and its critical national mission. And both the Environmental Protection Agency and the New Mexico Environment Department deserve compliments for their roles in oversight of this facility.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred July 31, 1991 in Coronado, CA. A gay man was choked and beaten by three men. Three Marines, David William Bell and Jeffrey Martin Davis, both 20, and Steven Louis Fair, 26, were charged with attempted murder, assault, robbery and a hate crime.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

GENERAL HENRY H. SHELTON 14TH CHAIRMAN OF JOINT CHIEFS AND A GREAT NORTH CAROLINIAN

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, North Carolina, down through history has been blessed with countless remarkable sons and daughters, and in my judgment, one of the truly great has been General Hugh H. Shelton, the 14th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who was confirmed by the Senate on October 1, 1997, and reconfirmed by the Senate for a second 2-year term in 1999.

In this capacity, this great son of Eastern North Carolina served as the principal military advisor to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the National Security Council.

Prior to becoming Chairman, General Shelton served as Commander in Chief of the U.S. Special Operations Command.

The General was born in Tarboro, NC, in January 1942. He earned a bachelor of science degree from North Carolina State University and a master of science from Auburn University. His military education includes attendance at the Air Command and Staff College in Montgomery, AL, and at the National War College at Fort McNair, Washington, DC.

He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the infantry in 1963 through the Reserve Officer Training Corps, and spent the next 24 years in a variety of command and staff positions in the continental United States, Hawaii, and Vietnam. He served two tours in Vietnam—the first with the 5th Special Forces Group, the second with the 173rd Airborne Brigade. He also commanded the 3rd Battalion, 60th Infantry in the 9th Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, WA; he served as the 9th Infantry Division's assistant chief of staff for operation.

He then returned to North Carolina where he commanded the 1st Brigade of the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg; and then served as the Chief of Staff of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum, NY.

Following his selection as brigadier general in 1987, General Shelton served 2 years in the Operations Directorate of the Joint Staff. In 1989, he began a 2-year assignment as Assistant Division Commander for Operations of the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), a tour that included the Division's 7-month deployment to Saudi Arabia for Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

Upon returning from the Gulf War, General Shelton was promoted to major general and again assigned to Fort Bragg where this time he commanded the 82nd Airborne Division. In 1993, he was again promoted—to lieutenant general—and assumed command of the XVIII Airborne Corps.

In 1994, while serving as corps commander, General Shelton commanded the Joint Task Force that conducted Operation Uphold Democracy in Haiti. In March 1996, he was promoted to general and became Commander in Chief of the U.S. Special Operations Command.

In his 4 years as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shelton worked tirelessly to improve the quality of life for military members and their families. He championed numerous initiatives including the largest across-the-board pay raise for the military in 18 years—helping to narrow the civilian-military ''pay gaps.''

His push for pay table reform targeted greater increases for mid-grade noncommissioned officers, and his retirement reform package reinstated benefits for those entering service after 1986, and, thanks to his dedication and support, an enhanced housing allowance was implemented gradually to eliminate out of pocket expenses for service members living off post.

Chairman Shelton was a strong advocate of the effort to reform medical health care, to make medical care more responsive—to include military retirees over 65. He made great strides to improve the readiness of the U.S. military by articulating a regiment for increased defense spending. As a result, the Department of Defense realized a

$112 billion increase in defense spending over the 5-year defense plan to arrest declining readiness rates. He additionally implemented new processes to carefully manage high demand/low density resources in support of the National Security Strategy.

Chairman Shelton and his staff published Joint Vision 2020 to establish goals and the metrics for the future joint force; he established the U.S. Joint Forces Command as the proponent for Joint Experimentation and Joint Force readiness. He established Joint Task Force-Civil Support to increase the military's ability to respond to crises in the U.S. homeland and established Joint Task Force-Computer Network Operations to enhance protection of U.S. information networks.

The General directed numerous initiative designed to improve the interoperability of the four Services including a Joint Airfighting Logistics Initiative, development of a Global Information Grid, revision of all Joint Professional Military Education programs and an enhancement on the joint warfighting focus of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council.

General Shelton's awards and decorations include the Defense Distinguished Service Medal (with two oak leaf clusters), Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit (with oak leaf cluster), Bronze Star Medal with V device (with three oak leaf clusters), and the Purple Heart.

He has also been awarded the Combat Infantryman Badge, Joint Chiefs of Staff Identification Badge, Master Parachutist Badge, Pathfinder Badge, Air Assault Badge, Military Freefall Badge, and Special Forces and Ranger Tabs and numerous foreign awards and badges.

Mrs. Shelton is the former Carolyn L. Johnson of Speed, NC, who was young Hugh Shelton's high school sweetheart. As Mrs. Hugh H. Shelton, she has been actively involved with service issues and support to military families throughout General Shelton's career. The General and Mrs. Shelton have three sons: Jonathan, a special agent in the U.S. Secret Service; Jeffrey, a U.S. Army Special Operations soldier, and Mark, their youngest son.

Mr. President, Dot Helms and I are proud to have General Shelton and Carolyn as our very special friends—and to be theirs. The General has represented the U.S. military with great distinction for the past four years as its senior military officer.

This splendid North Carolinian has participated in policy-making at the highest levels of Government but he never lost the common tough with our men and women in uniform. He will be remembered as a soldier's soldier and a quiet professional, along with his lovely wife and three sons.

RETIREMENT OF GENERAL MICHAEL E. RYAN

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to honor General Michael E. Ryan, the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force. General Ryan is a great American and, more important, and I'm sure no surprise to my colleagues, he is a fellow Texan. General Ryan has long been a tribute to Texas, the Nation, and especially to the Air Force.

General Ryan graduated from the Air Force Academy in 1965, and during his 36 years of service he commanded at the squadron, wing, numbered air force and major command levels, and accumulated more than 4,100 flying hours in seven different aircraft with 153 combat missions. He flew combat in Southeast Asia, including 100 missions over North Vietnam, and he served in key staff assignments at the major command level, at Headquarters U.S. Air Force and the Joint Staff. As commander of 16th Air Force and Allied Air Forces Southern Europe in Italy, he directed the NATO air combat operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina. We owe him a huge debt of thanks for just this duty alone as his leadership directly contributed to the Dayton Peace Accords.

General Ryan is, fortunately, not an unsung hero as he has received many decorations and medals including: the Defense Distinguished Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Air Medal with 11 oak leaf clusters, the Air Force Commendation Medal with two oak leaf clusters and the Vietnam Service Medal with three service stars.

After serving as the commander of U.S. Air Forces in Europe and commander, Allied Air Forces Central Europe, General Ryan ''took the stick'' of the Air Force as its 16th Chief of Staff. During his tenure, he has exemplified the quiet dignity and honor of that office through his leadership, integrity and foresight. A true leader who understood that his role was to set the course for our 21st Century Air Force and then clear the path to allow his commanders to truly lead their units, General Ryan personifies once said: ''I don't think leadership should be personalized. Good ideas are best when they don't have a single identity. Leadership is a team effort.''

This is a lesson those of us here in Congress would be wise to learn!

Meanwhile, General Ryan's accomplishments are critical and easily quantifiable. He and his leadership team successfully arrested the Air Force's readiness decline of the last decade, and built stability into the expeditionary operations our nation demands by reorganizing the service. At the same time though, General Ryan ensured that despite the Air Force being an all-volunteer force competing in a strong job market, its retention and recruiting efforts never sacrificed quality for quantity. He also led the effort to provide lifetime health care to our men and women who willingly put their lives at risk, as well as a retirement system that properly compensates their service to country.

In a period of leadership challenges and chaos, General Ryan led our Air Force, balancing reductions in forces with dramatically increased operational tasking. Without question, the U.S. Air Force is the world's premier force and our country owes a debt of gratitude to Mike Ryan.

At the same time, we owe a debt of gratitude to the person General Ryan owes much of his success—his wife, Jane Ryan. With dignity and grace she selflessly gave her time and attention to the men and women of the Air Force family. Her sacrifice and devotion have served as an example and inspiration for others. The Air Force will lose not one, but two very exceptional people.

In fact, General Ryan's departure from active duty will signal an historic occurrence for the first time in 63 years, there will no longer be a Ryan in the ranks of the United States Air Force. While General Ryan distinguished himself as an airmen, leader, and trusted advisor to both the President and the U.S. Congress, his father, General John Ryan, also served as the senior uniformed Air Force officer.

The Air Force is a better institution today than it was four years ago. General Ryan's distinguished and faithful service provided a significant and lasting contribution to our Air Force and to our Nation's security. He has served our Nation with honor and distinction. I know the Members of the Senate will join me in paying tribute to this outstanding American patriot upon his retirement from the Air Force. We thank him and wish him and his family much health, happiness and Godspeed.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, September 5, 2001, the Federal debt stood at $5,769,122,055,290.29, five trillion, seven hundred sixty-nine billion, one hundred twenty-two million, fifty-five thousand, two hundred ninety dollars and twenty-nine cents.

One year ago, September 5, 2000, the Federal debt stood at $5,678,475,470,839.16, five trillion, six hundred seventy-eight billion, four hundred seventy-five million, four hundred seventy thousand, eight hundred thirty-nine dollars and sixteen cents.

Five years ago, September 5, 1996, the Federal debt stood at $5,225,564,391,083.90, five trillion, two hundred twenty-five billion, five hundred sixty-four million, three hundred

ninety-one thousand, eight-three dollars and ninety cents.

Ten years ago, September 5, 1991, the Federal debt stood at $3,623,548,000,000, three trillion, six hundred twenty-three billion, five hundred forty-eight million.

Fifteen years ago, September 5, 1986, the Federal debt stood at $2,112,803,000,000, two trillion, one hundred twelve billion, eight hundred three million, which reflects a debt increase of more than $3 trillion, $3,656,319,055,290.29, Three trillion, six hundred fifty-six billion, three hundred nineteen million, fifty-five thousand, two hundred ninety dollars and twenty-nine cents during the past 15 years.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SECTION 245(i) EXTENSION ACT OF 2001

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of calendar No. 73, H.R. 1885, the 245(i) family unification bill; that the bill be amended with a substitute amendment, which is a modified text of S. 778 as reported by the Judiciary Committee, which I send to the desk on behalf of Senator LOTT; that the amendment be agreed to, the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements thereon be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Amendment No. 1532 was agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1532

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Section 245(i) Extension Act of 2001''.

SEC. 2 EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 245(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255(i)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''on or before April 20, 2001; or'' and inserting ''on or before the earlier of April 30, 2002, and the date that is 120 days after the date on which the Attorney General first promulgates final or interim final regulations to carry out the Section 245(i) Extension Act of 2001; or''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''on or before such date; and'' and inserting ''on or before the earlier date described in clause (i);'';

(2) in subparagraph (C), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) who, in the case of a beneficiary of a petition for classification, or an application for labor certification, described in subparagraph (B) that was filed after April 30, 2001, demonstrates that the familial relationship existed before August 15, 2001, or the application for labor certification that is the basis of such petition for classification was filed before August 15, 2001;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Legal Immigration Family Equity Act (114 Stat. 2762A–345), as enacted into law by section 1(a)(2) of Public Law 106–553.

The bill (H.R. 1885), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am so pleased tonight we were able to pass a measure that honors our heritage as a nation of immigrants, and provides American and immigrant families some relief from our outdated immigration laws.

Today, immigrants who don't have the proper documentation to stay in the United States, but do have the legal right to become permanent residents because they are the spouses of US citizens can be stuck in a horrible catch-22 situation. If they return to their home country to get the immigrant visa to which they are entitled, they can be barred from re-entering the United States for up to 10 years.

Take the example of a woman named Norma. Norma entered the U.S. from Mexico, and settled in North Carolina. She then married a U.S. citizen. They have been married over two years, have a child, are expecting another this fall, and recently bought a new home for their growing family. Norma and her husband are torn on what to do about her immigration status. As the wife of a citizen, she qualifies for an immigrant visa. However, if she returns to Mexico to obtain her visa, she would be barred from re-entering the U.S. for 10 years. Norma doesn't want to leave her husband, her children, or her home for 10 years—and she shouldn't have to.

This action allows Norma's family—and hundreds of thousands of other families—to stay together. S. 778, introduced by Senators HAGEL and KENNEDY, extends the period of time for eligible people to file their petitions for relief with the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of Labor for one year.

By doing that, S. 778 would provide real and immediate relief for hundreds of thousands of eligible immigrants.

With 30 Republican and Democratic cosponsors, this bill enjoyed broad bipartisan support:

It passed out of the Senate Judiciary Committee mark up by a unanimous voice vote.

To satisfy critics, Senators HAGEL and KENNEDY compromised by accepting language that immigrants applying under the new 245(i) extension must show that their family or employment relationship existed prior to the enactment of the bill.

I have talked to the President about this issue on more than one occasion, and I raised it again with him this week at the White House. He assured me he shares my concern that we need to take action on this important priority.

Since April 30th of this year, when Section 245(i) last expired, immigrants have been waiting in limbo.

INS statistics show that approximately seventy-five percent of the immigrants who apply for 245(i) relief are the spouses and children of U.S. citizens and permanent residents.

Eight out of 10 legal immigrants come to the United States to join a family member. What message are we sending if our policies pry families apart?

President Vicente Fox's historic visit has helped to focus attention on the need to re-craft our immigration policies in ways that better reflect our core values of family unity, fundamental fairness and economic opportunity.

Passing the Section 245(i) Extension Act of 2001 sends a clear message that we are truly committed to providing real immigration reform.

The Senate has taken the first step. I hope the House will soon follow. Let's put this bill on President Bush's desk, and let's do it this week. Norma's family, and thousands of families just like hers, are looking to us. Let's not let them down.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last year's Legal Immigration Family Equity Act extended the deadline under section 245(i) of the immigration laws to April 30, 2001—a window of just 4 months—to enable persons who are eligible for green cards to adjust their status in the United States, rather than have to return to their country of origin to do so. Clearly this new deadline has proved to be inadequate. The short extension created an overwhelming demand for information and services, and many qualified persons did not have enough time to file their petitions.

To address this urgent problem, Senator HAGEL and I introduced new legislation on April 26, a few days before the April 30 deadline. Congress should have acted long before now to extend the deadline, but all of us who support an extension are pleased that the Senate is finally acting on this bill. I know many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle share my desire to move this bill quickly because it affects so many people. It is a humanitarian measure that has strong bipartisan support. It also has the support of the President.

This bill will provide real and immediate relief to hundreds of thousands of immigrants. INS data show that approximately 75 percent of the immigrants who apply for this relief are the spouses and children of U.S. citizens and permanent residents. These are

families who have made lasting contributions to our communities and contributed to the economic vitality of our nation. This bill does not propose substantial new relief, but only a continuation of the prior relief. Last year's temporary extension to April 30, 2001 was designed to benefit immigrants who were in the country by December 21, 2000. This bill will extend the deadline to provide this group of immigrants with more time to file their petitions.

I know that some of my colleagues support the extension, but had concerns with our bill. We worked with them to develop an acceptable compromise. Our bill, with an amendment offered by Senator KYL reflects our compromise. This compromise requires immigrants benefitting from the extension to show that their family or employment relationship existed on or before August 15, 2001. They will have until April 30, 2002 or 4 months from the issuance of regulations to file their applications with the INS.

Some critics are concerned about fraudulent marriages. But the INS, and not Congress, is in the best position to determine whether a case is fraudulent. The INS closely scrutinizes applications based on recent marriages. Under the current law, the INS conducts extensive interviews before deciding these cases, often separately questioning the couples. Anyone who has been married less than 2 years when their application is approved is required to attend a second INS interview 2 years later, in which INS again reviews the case to determine whether there is a bona fide marriage. Only after the second interview will a recently married immigrant receive a permanent green card.

In INS determines that an individual has committed marriage fraud, that person is permanently barred from receiving a green card and can be criminally prosecuted. Many of us feel that this new restriction is unnecessary, and will lead to needless confusion, delay and hardship. But in the spirit of compromise, we accepted this amendment.

I am pleased that we are moving this bill forward, as this legislation will keep immigrant families together. We cannot continue to delay; otherwise, the purpose of this legislation—to prevent the separation of immigrant families—will be defeated. This measure is of critical importance to Mexican President Vicente Fox, who is in Washington for an historic visit. Our two countries are negotiating important immigration policies which will profoundly affect and benefit our peoples and our economies. Extension of section 245(i) is an immediate and important first step in these negotiations.

Finally, if we are truly to live up to our history and heritage as a nation of immigrants, we must also address the pressing needs of uniting other families separated by our current immigration laws, and meeting the needs of our labor market. I look forward to working with my colleagues to meet these great challenges, and am pleased that the Senate has approved this bill as a downpayment on the reforms that are so long overdue.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this legislation accomplishes a goal supported by President Bush and a bipartisan coalition of Senators—making it easier for people who are eligible to become legal permanent residents to apply for their green cards without leaving the United States. There could not be a more opportune time to pass this bill than during the visit of President Vicente Fox to our nation, and I applaud the Majority Leader for making passage today possible. I hope that the approval of this bill serves as a signal of the Congress' willingness to work with the Mexican Government to achieve our common goals, and to maintain fair immigration policies.

I was pleased to schedule this bill for a markup as soon as I became Chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Although I would have preferred that the Committee report the bill as it was introduced, I am glad that a compromise was reached that allowed the bill to receive the Committee's support and make it to the floor of the Senate.

This bill extends section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which expired on April 30, 2001. Section 245(i) allows foreign-born people who are present in the United States and eligible for legal permanent residency to apply for that status from within the country instead of having to return to their nation of origin to apply. We reauthorized section 245(i) last year, but only for a four-month period. Many eligible immigrants were unable to find attorneys and submit applications during that brief period.

There are at least three good reasons to extend 245(i). First, it allows families to stay together in the United States instead of forcing family members to return to their native countries to apply for their green cards. Second, because immigrants can also qualify to become legal permanent residents based on an employment relationship, extending 245(i) will allow businesses to retain vital employees. Third, because immigrants have to pay a $1000 fee to apply under 245(i), this program raises millions of dollars for the Federal treasury.

Senators KENNEDY and HAGEL deserve great credit for their sponsorship of and support for this bill. I am pleased that the Senate has approved this bipartisan bill to keep families together, and I urge the House to follow the Senate's lead.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, let me briefly say that this is extremely important. With President Fox in the country, this sends a message to him that we really are trying to work toward making things easier in relations between the United States and Mexico. But this has wide application to places other than Mexico. It is important legislation. It is something we worked on very hard. We almost got it done toward the end of last year. It is now completed.

We hope the House will expeditiously move forward on this matter. The chairman of the House Judiciary Committee has been involved in this, Representative SENSENBRENNER. We are grateful for everyone's cooperation.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2500

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, September 10, at 12 noon, the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 96, H.R. 2500, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State appropriations bill; that once the bill is reported, the majority manager or his designee be recognized to offer the text of the Senate committee reported bill as a substitute amendment, and that the amendment be considered agreed to as original text for the purpose of further amendments, provided that no points of order be waived by this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBSERVANCE OF THE OLYMPIC TRUCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 112, S. Res. 126.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. Res. 126) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding observance of the Olympic Truce.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 126) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 126

Whereas the Olympic Games are a unique opportunity for international cooperation

and the promotion of international understanding;

Whereas the Olympic Games bring together embattled rivals in an arena of peaceful competition;

Whereas the Olympic Ideal is to serve peace, friendship, and international understanding;

Whereas participants in the ancient Olympic Games, as early as 776 B.C., observed an ''Olympic Truce'' whereby all warring parties ceased hostilities and laid down their weapons for the duration of the games and during the period of travel for athletes to and from the games;

Whereas war extracts a terrible price from the civilian populations that suffer under it, and truces during war allow for the provision of humanitarian assistance to those suffering populations;

Whereas truces may lead to a longer cessation of hostilities and, ultimately, a negotiated settlement and end to conflict;

Whereas the Olympics can and should be used as a tool for international public diplomacy, rapprochement, and building a better world;

Whereas terrorist organizations have used the Olympics not to promote international understanding but to perpetrate cowardly acts against innocent participants and spectators;

Whereas, since 1992, the International Olympic Committee has urged the international community to observe the Olympic Truce;

Whereas the International Olympic Committee and the Government of Greece established the International Olympic Truce Center in July 2000, and that Center seeks to uphold the observance of the Olympic Truce and calls for all hostilities to cease during the Olympic Games; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly, with the strong support of the United States, has three times called for member states to observe the Olympic Truce, most recently for the XXVII Olympiad in Sydney, Australia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO THE OLYMPIC TRUCE.

(a) COMMENDATION OF THE IOC AND THE GOVERNMENT OF GREECE.—The Senate commends the efforts of the International Olympic Committee and the Government of Greece to urge the international community to observe the Olympic Truce.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States Government should join efforts to use the Olympic Truce as an instrument to promote peace and reconciliation in areas of conflict; and

(2) the President should continue efforts to work with Greece—

(A) in its preparations for a successful XXVIII Olympiad in Greece in 2004; and

(B) to uphold and extend the spirit of the Olympic Truce during the XXVIII Olympiad.

SEC. 2. TRANSMITTAL OF RESOLUTION.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President with the request that he further transmit such copy to the International Olympic Committee and the Government of Greece.

TENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASIA PACIFIC PARLIAMENTARY FORUM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 113, S. Con. Res. 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) expressing support for the tenth annual meeting of the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

Whereas the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum was founded by former Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone in 1993;

Whereas the Tokyo Declaration, signed by 59 parliamentarians from 15 countries, entered into force as the founding charter of the forum on January 14 and 15, 1993, establishing the basic structure of the forum as an interparliamentary organization;

Whereas the original 15 members, one of which was the United States, have increased to 27 member countries;

Whereas the forum serves to promote regional identification and cooperation through discussion of matters of common concern to all member states and serves, to a great extent, as the legislative arm of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation;

Whereas the focus of the forum lies in resolving political, economic, environmental, security, law and order, human rights, education, and cultural issues;

Whereas the forum will hold its tenth annual meeting on January 6 through 9, 2002, which will be the first meeting of the forum hosted by the United States;

Whereas approximately 270 parliamentarians from 27 countries in the Asia Pacific region will attend this meeting;

Whereas the Secretariat of the meeting will be the Center for Cultural and Technical Exchange Between East and West in Honolulu, Hawaii;

Whereas the East-West Center is an internationally recognized education and research organization established by the United States Congress in 1960 largely through the efforts of the Eisenhower administration and the Congress;

Whereas it is the mission of the East-West Center to strengthen understanding and relations between the United States and the countries of the Asia Pacific region and to help promote the establishment of a stable, peaceful and prosperous Asia Pacific community in which the United States is a natural, valued, and leading partner; and

Whereas it is the agenda of this meeting to advance democracy, peace, and prosperity in the Asia Pacific region: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress—

(1) expresses support for the tenth annual meeting of the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum and for the ideals and concerns of this body;

(2) commends the East-West Center for hosting the meeting of the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum and the representatives of the 27 member countries; and

(3) calls upon all parties to support the endeavors of the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum and to work toward achieving the goals of the meeting.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF AL-ANON FAMILY GROUPS

• Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, today I congratulate Al-Anon Family Groups on their 50th anniversary and to acknowledge their contributions to many individuals, families and communities who come together to support those in recovery from alcohol addiction. The Al-Anon Family Groups have been a source of help and hope for families and friends of alcoholics for 50 years in communities throughout the United States and worldwide. Although Al-Anon, and its group for younger members, Alateen, have their roots in the United States, there are now over 26,000 Al-Anon and Alateen groups around the world in 115 countries.

The theme for the September 2001 National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month is ''We Recover Together: Family, Friends and Community,'' with its clear message that we need to work together to promote treatment for alcohol and drug addiction throughout our country. The Al-Anon Family Groups is an outstanding example of how a community can support the families, friends and communities of those who are in recovery from addiction.

Scientific research has shown us the devastation that alcohol addiction can have on the brain and the biological systems of the body. But addiction can also damage souls, relationships, families and communities. Effective treatments can help those with addiction illnesses, but it is through the support of groups like Al-Anon that communities and families can join together to make recovery work well for everyone who is affected.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Al-Anon Family Groups for the work they have done to help the countless numbers of those whose lives have been affected by addiction. With treatment and support, people can recover from alcohol addiction, and make positive contributions to their families, workplaces, communities, state and nation. Through the support offered by Al-Anon and Alateen, families and friends of those with addiction illnesses can find the support they need in their lives as well.

With gratitude and respect for the work they do, I offer my congratulations to Al-Anon Family Groups on their 50th anniversary.●

TRIBUTE TO OVARIAN CANCER NATIONAL ALLIANCE

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Ovarian Cancer National Alliance of Washington, D.C. during Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month of September. The Alliance has been instrumental in implementing a three phase public education program targeting key constituencies to deliver crucial information about ovarian cancer.

The information provided to the public about ovarian cancer has allowed the Alliance to successfully develop the tools, strategies and relationships necessary to educate women about the symptoms, risks and treatment of ovarian cancer.

The main thrust of the education program was the development of a pilot awareness program in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Working closely with the Ovarian Cancer Coalition of Greater Washington, the Alliance trained more than 30 volunteers to go into the community to give educational presentations and partnered with area gynecologic and oncology physicians and nurses to do similar presentations in the medical community.

The combined aspects of the program have reached several hundred healthcare professionals and tens of thousand of women. The pilot program has made a marked impact in raising ovarian cancer awareness in the Washington, D.C. area.

The Alliance has begun to identify other communities around the country in which it will conduct similar educational campaigns to heighten awareness of ovarian cancer.

I commend the Ovarian Cancer National Alliance for its selfless dedication to the education of women concerning ovarian cancer and applaud the efforts to reach thousands of women in our country with life saving information. It is truly an honor and a privilege to represent you in the United States Senate.●

COMMENDING THE SERVICE OF GENERAL THOMAS P. KANE

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to bring to the Senate's attention the exemplary career and service of General Thomas Kane, Commander of the 60th Air Mobility Wing at Travis Air Force Base in California.

General Kane is leaving Travis to accept an assignment with NATO on September 12, 2001. When he arrived in Solano County almost 2 years ago, he brought with him a sense of honor, purpose and teamwork that not only resonated on the base itself but throughout the surrounding community. I am not the only one who will miss his spirit, good nature and strength of character.

General Kane is a career Air Force officer. He graduated from the Air Force Academy in 1974 and has earned numerous advanced degrees since. A pilot and highly decorated officer, he has served in many capacities and in many locations over the course of his time in the Armed Forces including Portugal and Korea. Advancing steadily, he was promoted to Brigadier General on September 1, 2000.

I had the pleasure of meeting General Kane in person once at my office in Washington, DC. To me, the most striking thing about him is how much he cares about the men and women in his command. This impressed me very much. In my opinion, this attitude is more than an approach to leadership; it is the very essence of leadership.

General Kane often likes to mention that if he ever leaves the Air Force he would like to be a baseball coach. I am not sure if America needs more baseball coaches, but I do know that we very much need dedicated people leading our military. General Kane is just such an officer. He is a credit to his uniform and his country. I wish him, his wife Renee and their family the very best.●

TRIBUTE TO ALICE WATERS

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to an extraordinary American and Californian, Alice Waters, who has revolutionized our approach to food and the way we eat.

I congratulate her and her flagship restaurant, Chez Panisse, for reaching the milestone of being in business for 30 years. While sustaining a successful restaurant for all of these years is significant, Alice's broader contribution to our culture in the past decades is unparalleled.

While I have known and admired Alice for many years, I am astonished when I consider the effect she has had on our country. Alice has cultivated programs and integrated food and gardening into imaginative projects as ways of fostering love, growth, responsibility and respect of life and work.

Alice's disciples and her philosophy of fresh, local and natural, have spread throughout our land. A remarkable number of protegees have opened their own path-breaking restaurants and have become culinary artists themselves. But her influence goes far beyond the kitchen. Due to the leadership of Alice and her restaurant, Chez Panisse, the National Restaurant Association reports that over 60 percent of the top American restaurants now mention organic ingredients on their menus. Alice worked to pass the Federal organic food law and has helped define new U.S. Department of Agriculture guidelines for school lunches.

Alice has written and co-authored many cookbooks, which provide more than recipes. They have helped to spread her philosophy of food into American home kitchens. She has founded gardening projects at the San Francisco jail and the Edible Schoolyard at Berkeley's Martin Luther King Jr. Middle School, where she established a curriculum that brings organic gardening into classes and where the results of the children's gardening are used in the school's lunch program. The students who participate not only learn valuable skills but also cooperation and responsibility.

Alice believes that as Americans change their thinking about food, America will change for the better. Alice has said about our children that ''Most families in this country don't even eat one meal a day with each other. So how are we going to pass on our values to them if we don't eat with them?''

While Chez Panisse has been graced with many talented people over the years, the one constant has been Alice. She has poured her life into Chez Panisse and into what it represents, and we are all the richer for it.

I am proud to know Alice and I wish her, her good works for our community and nation, and Chez Panisse another 30 years of continued success.●

RECOGNIZING JIM WOSTER FOR HIS SERVICE TO SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a friend and an extraordinary South Dakotan who is about to be inducted into the South Dakota Hall of Fame on Saturday, September 8th. I am very pleased that Mr. Jim Woster, of Sioux Falls, SD has been selected for this very prestigious honor. I am sure this is also a great honor for Jim's wife, Penny, their three children, Jim, Sara, and Michelle, and their new granddaughter, Tessa. Jim's contributions to our State have been many, but he has, in particular, been an absolute champion for the interests of agriculture and South Dakota's rural communities.

After growing up on a ranch near Reliance, SD, Mr. Woster graduated from South Dakota State University with a degree in animal science. As a young man, Jim began to compile an incredibly impressive list of accomplishments in all aspects of South Dakota agriculture. Jim's experiences range from working in the cattle alley at the Sioux Falls Stockyards to conducting important ruminant nutrition research. Jim has been involved in consignment sales of livestock at sale barns throughout the State, and became a highly respected and beloved media personality in our State through his market reports on radio and television. Nobody knows rural America,

and nobody knows South Dakota agriculture better than Jim Woster.

Jim has always exhibited a strong commitment to public service. Throughout his career, he has devoted an enormous amount of time and energy to worthy causes such as the American Cancer Society, the Arthritis Foundation, and the Make-A-Wish Foundation. All this while serving our Nation for eight years as a member of the South Dakota National Guard.

The great honor to be bestowed on Mr. Woster is exceptionally well deserved, as he has contributed so much to our State while at the same time serving as a model for other talented South Dakotans to emulate. I join my fellow South Dakotans on extending congratulations and a ''job well done'' to Jim Woster.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:29 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1866. An act to amend title 35, United States Code, to clarify the basis for granting requests for reexamination of patents.

H.R. 1886. An act to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for appeals by third parties in certain patent reexamination proceedings.

H.R. 2048. An act to require a report on the operations of the State Justice Institute.

H.R. 2277. An act to provide for work authorization for nonimmigrant spouses of treaty traders and treaty investors.

H.R. 2278. An act to provide for work authorization for nonimmigrant spouses of intracompany transferees, and to reduce the period of time during which certain inntracompany transferees have to be continuously employed before applying for admission to the United States.

H.R. 2291. An act to extend the authorization of Drug-Free Communities Support Program for an additional 5 years, to authorize a National Community Antidrug Coalition Institute, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2510. An act to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 234. Resolution stating that the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Floyd Spence, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1866. An act to amend title 35, United States Code, to clarify the basis for granting requests for reexamination of patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1886. An act to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for appeals by third parties in certain patent reexamination proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2048. An act to require a report on the operations of the State Justice Institute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2510. An act to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar.

H.R. 2563. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–3578. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to military personnel accounts; to the Committees on Appropriations; the Budget; and Armed Services.

EC–3579. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the appropriations report; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–3580. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3581. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the funding of the Foreign Comparative Testing Program Projects for Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3582. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition and Technology, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report for Department purchases from foreign entities in Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3583. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, the report of a retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3584. A communication from the Director of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Conversion of Department of Defense Commercial Activity to a Private Contractor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3585. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2001–02 Early Season'' (RIN1018–AH79) received on August 17, 2001; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–3586. A communication from the Executive Director of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report for 1998 and 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3587. A communication from the General Counsel for the National Science Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Non-Governmental Antarctic Expeditions'' (RIN3145–AA36) received on August 15, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3588. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Solid Minerals Reporting Requirements'' received on August 17, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3589. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2001–2002 Refuge-Specific Hunting and Sport Fishing Regulations'' (RIN1018–AG58) received on August 22, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3590. A communication from the Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''DMCA Section 104 Report''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3591. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Gulf War Veterans for Calendar Years 1999 and 2000; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–3592. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Veterans Benefits Administration Nomenclature Changes'' received on August 16, 2001; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–3593. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Duty to Assist'' (RIN2900–AK69) received on August 23, 2001; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–3594. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Brazil; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3595. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3596. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a transaction involving U.S. exports to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3597. A communication from the Deputy Congressional Liaison, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Credit by Brokers and Dealers (Regulation T); List of Foreign Margin Stocks'' received on August 20, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3598. A communication from the Secretary of the Division of Market Regulation, United States Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''240.3a55–1: Method for determining market capitalization and dollar value of average daily trading volume; application of the definition of narrow-based security index. 240.a55–2: Indexes underlying futures contracts trading for fewer than 30 days. 240.3a55–3: Futures contracts on security indexes trading on or subject to the rules of a foreign board of trade.'' (RIN3235–AI13) received on August 20, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3599. A communication from the Counsel for Regulations, Government National Mortgage Association, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Government National Mortgage Association Mortgage-Backed Securities Program-Payments to Security Holders; Book-Entry Procedures'' (RIN2503–AA16) received on August 22, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3600. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a transaction involving U.S. exports to Austria; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3601. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a transaction involving U.S. exports to Malaysia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3602. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Division of Market Regulation, United States Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Registration of Broker-Dealers Pursuant to Section 15(b)(11) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934'' (RIN3235–AI21) received on August 30, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3603. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Railroad Track Maintenance Costs'' (Rev. Proc. 2001–46) received on August 21, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3604. A communication from the Regulations Officer of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance; Revision to Medical-Vocational Guidelines'' (RIN0960–AE42) received on August 22, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3605. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Applicable Federal Rates—September 2001'' (Rev. Rul. 2001–43) received on August 22, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3606. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revise Form W–9'' (Ann. 2001–91) received on August 27, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3607. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2001 National Pool'' (Rev. Proc. 2001–44) received on August 27, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3608. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Weighted Average Interest Rate Update Notice'' (Notice 2001–52) received on August 27, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3609. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Branch, United States Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Change in Flat Rate of Duty on Articles Imported for Personal or Household Use or as Bona Fide Gifts'' (RIN1515–AC90) received on August 30, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3610. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law the report of a rule entitled ''Guidance on Amendment of Section 401(a)(17) of the Code by EGTRRA'' (Notice 2001–56) received on September 4, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3611. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the deep-draft navigation project for Savannah Harbor, Georgia; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3612. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri'' (FRL7032–2) received on August 8, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3613. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clean Air Act Full Approval of Operating Permits Program in Washington'' (FRL7031–6) received on August 8, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3614. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Waste Management Systems; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion'' (FRL7025–3) received on August 8, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3615. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Idaho: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision'' (FRL7013–5) received on August 8, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3616. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulator Commission, transmitting, the Monthly Status Report on the Licensing Activities and Regulatory Duties for June 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3617. A communication from the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to funding for the emergency declared as a result of extreme fire hazards in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3618. A communication from the Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Super Fund Report for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3619. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments for Testing and Monitoring Provision Removal of a Provision for Opacity Monitoring'' (FRL7039–2) received on August 21, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3620. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Conversion of the Conditional Approval of the 15 Percent Plan for the Pennsylvania Portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Trenton Nonattainment Area to a Full Approval'' (FRL7043–5) received on August 21, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3621. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Finding of Attainment for PM–10; Shoshone County (City of Pinehurst and Pinehurst Expansion Area'' (FRL7042–5) received on August 21, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3622. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interim Final Determination that the State of California has Corrected Deficiencies and Stay of Sanctions, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District'' (FRL7028–9) received on August 21, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3623. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, El Dorado County Air Pollutions Control District'' (FRL7028–7) received on August 21, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3624. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Early Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations'' (RIN1018–AH79) received on August 21, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3625. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Migratory Bird Hunting: Early Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands'' (RIN1018–AH79) received on August 23, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3626. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Idaho: Final Authorization of State

Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision'' (FRL7031–5) received on August 23, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3627. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Tennessee'' (FRL7044–4) received on August 23, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3628. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''The Role of Screening-Level Risk Assessments and Refining Contaminants of Concern in Baseline Risk Assessments (2001)'' received on August 24, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3629. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Reuse Assessments: Tool to Implement Superfund Land Use'' received on August 24, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3630. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Operation and Maintenance in the Superfund Program'' received on August 24, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3631. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Local Emergency Planning Committees and Deliberate Releases'' received on August 24, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3632. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Drop Out Box Slag Generated at Electric Arc Furnaces'' received on August 24, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3633. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''FACTSHEET: Tier II Submit'' received on August 24, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3634. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Superfund Post Construction Completion'' received on August 24, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3635. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Recreational Use of Land Above Hazardous Waste Containment Areas'' received on August 24, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3636. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Comprehensive Five-Year Review Guidance'' received on August 24, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3637. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Ocean City, Maryland, and Vicinity Water Resource Study, Final Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3638. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Unregulated Containment Monitoring Regulation for Public Water Systems; Amendment to the List 2 Rule and Partial Delay of Reporting of Monitoring Results'' (FRL7048–8) received on August 30, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3639. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Ozone Attainment Plan and Finding of Failure to Attain; State of California, San Francisco Bay Area'' (FRL7048–1) received on August 30, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3640. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clean Air Act Final Full Approval of Operating Permit Programs; North Carolina, Mecklenburg County, and Western North Carolina'' (FRL7047–2) received on August 30, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3641. A communication from the Deputy Inspector General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Audit Report on Superfund Financial Transactions for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3642. A communication from the Acting Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Designation of Critical Habitat for Sidalcea oregana var. calva (Wenatchee Mountains checker-mallow)'' (RIN1018–AH05) received on September 4, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3643. A communication from the Acting Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Designation of Critical Habitat for the Kootenai River Population of the White Sturgeon'' (RIN1018–AH06) received on September 4, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3644. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of VOC Emissions from Marine Vessels Coating Operations'' (FRL7049–3) received on September 4, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3645. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''FY02 Wetland Program Development Grants Guidelines'' (FRL7047–9) received on September 4, 2001; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 543: A bill to provide for equal coverage of mental health benefits with respect to health insurance coverage unless comparable limitations are imposed on medical and surgical benefits. (Rept. No. 107-61).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 703: A bill to extend the effective period of the consent of Congress to the interstate compact relating to the restoration of Atlantic salmon to the Connecticut River Basin and creating the Connecticut River Atlantic Salmon Commission, and for other purposes..

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1233: A bill to provide penalties for certain unauthorized writing with respect to consumer products.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Michael Parker, of Mississippi, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Sharon Prost, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

Reggie B. Walton, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Deborah J. Daniels, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Richard R. Nedelkoff, of Texas, to be Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1408. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to standardize the income threshold for copayment for outpatient medications with the income threshold for inability to defray necessary expense of care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. CARNAHAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 1409. A bill to impose sanctions against the PLO or the Palestinian Authority if the President determines that those entities

have failed to substantially comply with commitments made to the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 1410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the excise tax exemptions for aerial applicators of fertilizers or other substances; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. ALLARD):

S. 1411. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Denver Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 128

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) was added as a cosponsor of S. 128, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require periodic cost of living adjustments to the maximum amount of deposit insurance available under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for partnerships in character education.

S. 487

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 487, a bill to amend chapter 1 of title 17, United States Code, relating to the exemption of certain performances or displays for educational uses from copyright infringement provisions, to provide that the making of copies or phonorecords of such performances or displays is not an infringement under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 543

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 543, a bill to provide for equal coverage of mental health benefits with respect to health insurance coverage unless comparable limitations are imposed on medical and surgical benefits.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide capital gain treatment under section 631(b) of such Code for outright sales of timber by landowners.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for nondiscriminatory coverage for substance abuse treatment services under private group and individual health coverage.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide grants to States to encourage media campaigns to promote responsible fatherhood skills, and for other purposes.

S. 677

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) were added as cosponsors of S. 677, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the required use of certain principal repayments on mortgage subsidy bond financing to redeem bonds, to modify the purchase price limitation under mortgage subsidy bond rules based on median family income, and for other purposes.

S. 694

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 694, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor.

S. 736

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 736, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the appointment of a Chief of the Veterinary Corps of the Army in the grade of brigadier general, and for other purposes.

S. 805

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 805, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research with respect to various forms of muscular dystrophy, including Duchenne, Becker, limb girdle, congenital, facioscapulohumeral, myotonic, oculopharyngeal, distal, and emery-dreifuss muscular dystrophies.

S. 847

At the request of Mr. DAYTON, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 847, a bill to impose tariff-rate quotas on certain casein and milk protein concentrates.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a national media campaign to reduce and prevent underage drinking in the United States.

S. 917

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 917, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes.

S. 953

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 953, a bill to establish a Blue Ribbon Study Panel and an Election Administration Commission to study voting procedures and election administration, to provide grants to modernize voting procedures and election administration, and for other purposes.

S. 998

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 998, a bill to expand the availability of oral health services by strengthening the dental workforce in designated underserved areas.

S. 1000

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1000, a bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to provide incentive grants to improve the quality of child care.

S. 1014

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1014, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to enhance privacy protections for individuals, to prevent fraudulent misuse of the Social Security account number, and for other purposes.

S. 1036

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1036, a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to establish an international food for education and child nutrition program.

S. 1083

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1083, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude clinical social worker services

from coverage under the medicare skilled nursing facility prospective payment system.

S. 1084

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1084, a bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of diamonds unless the countries exporting the diamonds have in place a system of controls on rough diamonds, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1140, a bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code, to provide for greater fairness in the arbitration process relating to motor vehicle franchise contracts.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1169, a bill to streamline the regulatory processes applicable to home health agencies under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the medicaid program under title XIX of such Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1201

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1201, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes.

S. 1208

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1208, a bill to combat the trafficking, distribution, and abuse of Ecstasy (and other club drugs) in the United States.

S. 1209

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1209, a bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to consolidate and improve the trade adjustment assistance programs, to provide community-based economic development assistance for trade-affected communities, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1349, a bill to provide for a National Stem Cell Donor Bank regarding qualifying human stem cells, and for the conduct and support of research using such cells.

S. RES. 132

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of S.Res. 132, a resolution recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of it.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1408. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to standardize the income threshold for copayment for outpatient medications with the income threshold for inability to defray necessary expense of care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today legislation that would exempt certain veterans from copayments for needed prescription drugs.

Currently, veterans with incomes of less than $24,000 a year are exempt from copayments for most VA health care services. However, when it comes to prescription drugs, the income threshold for exemption is just $9,000 a year. Veterans earning over $9,000, well below the poverty threshold established by the Census Bureau, are required to make copayments. These copayments place an undue burden on our poorest veterans. To compound the problem, the Department of Veterans Affairs recently proposed increasing the copayment for prescription drugs from $2 to $7 per 30-day prescription.

I have serious concerns about what this copayment increase will mean for veterans. Indeed, I have already heard from a number of veterans whose incomes hover just above the $9,000 threshold, who must make the required copayments for their pharmaceuticals. Many of them are on several different medications for multiple medical conditions, each requiring their own copay. There are many veterans like Steven Smith, formerly of Greenwood, WV, who has no health insurance except Medicare and depends upon the VA for his medications. With the lack of a Medicare drug benefit, he, and many veterans like him, are faced with a 350 percent increase in what they must pay for life-sustaining medications.

I am not alone in my concerns about the impact the copayment increase will have on veterans. In commenting on the proposed regulations, the VFW recently cited an example of a veteran who has an annual income of $10,500, just above the current exemption limit set by VA. The increase in the prescription copayment rate would force that veteran to allocate over 8 percent of his annual income just to prescription drugs. There is a grave danger that, faced with this situation, many veterans will stop seeking necessary medical care because they are priced out of the system.

At a glance, the increase to $7 per prescription may seem reasonable enough and in keeping with industry standards. However, consider a veteran with an income of about $9,000 a year who currently pays $2 per prescription for 10 medications a month. He presently incurs out-of-pocket costs of $240 a year. Under the new regulations, his costs would go up to $840 per year, an increase of $600. For someone living barely over the $9,000 annual income threshold, this is a substantial sum.

I am also concerned about disparities in how VA defines who is ''poor'' for the purpose of exemption from health care copayments. For prescription drugs, veterans with more than $9,000 annual income must make copayments, but for outpatient care, hospitalization, and extended care, the income threshold for copayments is $24,000 per year. My proposed legislation would raise the exemption level for prescription copays to make them the same as all other VA health care copays. It will be less confusing to veterans, easier to administer, and quite simply, it's the right thing to do.

My legislation, the Veterans' Copayment Adjustment Act, would also require VA to delay implementing the increase in prescription copayments until we see an adjustment to copayments for other health care services. On July 24, I held a hearing on prescription drug issues in VA. At that hearing, we heard testimony from VA Secretary Anthony Principi who also believes that new drug copayments shouldn't be put into effect until we see a reduction in other health care copayments.

As part of the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act, Congress gave VA authority to adjust the different health care copayments. This was intended to make VA's copayments more rational. Currently, veterans must make a copayment of over $50 for outpatient care services. There is no doubt that $50 for a routine outpatient visit is unreasonable at best, and at worst, discourages veterans from getting the primary care they need. By delaying the increase in the medication copayment until VA implements its adjusted outpatient copayment, we will reduce the negative financial impact on our Nation's veterans. I am confident that VA will study this issue closely and will expeditiously set the outpatient copayment to be more in line with managed care plans.

I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in seeking to provide affordable health care for our sick and disabled veterans. They have sacrificed for all of us, and deserve every effort we can

make to keep them from having to choose between buying needed prescription drugs and putting food on the table.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1408

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Veterans' Copayment Adjustment Act''.

SEC. 2. STANDARDIZATION OF INCOME THRESHOLDS FOR COPAYMENT FOR OUTPATIENT MEDICATIONS AND FOR INABILITY TO DEFRAY NECESSARY EXPENSES OF CARE.

(a) STANDARDIZATION.—Section 1722A(a)(3)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(B) to a veteran whose attributable income is not greater than the amount provided for in subsection (b) of section 1722 of this title, as adjusted from time to time under subsection (c) of that section.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 2002, and shall apply with respect to calendar years beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF INCREASE IN COPAYMENTS FOR OUTPATIENT MEDICATIONS PENDING COLLECTION OF COPAYMENTS FOR OUTPATIENT CARE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may not implement under section 1722A(b)(1) of title 38, United States Code, an increase in the copayment amount for medications furnished on an outpatient basis under section 1722A(a) of that title until the Secretary commences collection of amounts for outpatient visits for medical services under section 1710(g) of that title.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. CARNAHAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 1409. A bill to impose sanctions against the PLO or the Palestinian Authority if the President determines that those entities have failed to substantially comply with commitments made to the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE COMPLIANCE ACT OF 2001

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am today joining with my good friend, Senator FEINSTEIN from California, who is in the Chamber as well, in offering the Middle East Peace Compliance Act of 2001. We do that with the support also of our colleagues, Senators DASCHLE, SCHUMER, MIKULSKI, CRAPO, CLINTON, CARNAHAN, BOXER, TORRICELLI, EDWARDS, CLELAND, ENSIGN, and SHELBY.

We also do so with full appreciation of the dire and untenable situation in the Middle East.

Given the ongoing and relentless bloodshed in the Middle East, the time has come for finger pointing. Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) Chairman Yasser Arafat—and the terrorists he allows free reign in the West Bank and Gaza—are guilty of waging a guerrilla war against America's most important and reliable ally in that region. Scores of innocent Israeli men, women and children have been killed by bombs, bullets, knives, and stones. In acts of cowardice, Palestinian suicide bombers have caused death and destruction in discos, pizza parlors, cafes, and on the streets of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv.

There appears no end to this madness. On Monday of this week, four bombs exploded in the Jerusalem neighborhood of French Hill. On Tuesday, a Palestinian suicide bomber disguised as an orthodox Jew killed himself and injured others on a Jerusalem street close to two international schools. One wonders how much more of this terror the people of Israel can—or should—endure.

Mr. Arafat and his minions are enlisting Palestinians of all ages to their misguided cause of mutually assured destruction. One Palestinian children's television show reportedly broadcast a song: ''When I wander into Jerusalem, I will become a suicide bomber.'' Mr. President, Israel is well aware of the people in Mr. Arafat's Neighborhood, and they are not ones they, or any peaceful loving people, would choose to associate with.

The legislation we are introducing will make clear the intentions of Mr. Arafat and the PLO. In a report to Congress, the Administration is required to determine whether or not the PLO has lived up to its 1993 commitments under the Oslo Accords to renounce violence against Israel, and what steps have been taken by the PLO and the Palestinian Authority to investigate and prosecute those responsible for killing American and Israeli citizens. Should the Administration determine that the PLO's actions run contrary to their word, the President is required to immediately suspend all assistance to the West Bank and Gaza, except humanitarian aid. He is also required to initiate additional sanctions against the PLO, which may include denying visas to senior officials and downgrading their representative office in the United States.

I intend to offer this legislation, along with Senator FEINSTEIN, as an amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, which may be considered by the full Senate in the near future.

While I will have much more to say on the situation in the Middle East at a later date, let me close by asking a question of my colleagues: If the daily terrorists attacks taking place against Israelis were occurring on American soil against U.S. citizens, what would our response be? A democracy in a region of dictatorships and kingdoms, Israel has the right and responsibility to protect and defend its citizens against terrorism. The United States should be clear in its support of Israel exercising this right, in whatever manner the people of Israel, through their elected leaders, deem appropriate. To date, Israel has shown remarkable restraint.

Mr. MCCONNELL. With great thanks to my colleague from California in collaborating with me on this effort, and looking forward to further efforts on behalf of this proposal, I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his leadership. We have consulted together on this bill, and I am very proud to join him as the lead Democratic cosponsor.

I ask unanimous consent to put the following Members from this side of the aisle on the bill: Senators DASCHLE, SCHUMER, MIKULSKI, CLINTON, CARNAHAN, BOXER, TORRICELLI, EDWARDS, and CLELAND.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky and I joined together in this legislation because we believe that if the violence between the Palestinians and Israel is to end and the peace process is to gain any momentum, the Palestinian leadership must show it can muster the political will that is necessary to meet the commitments they made at Oslo.

Most people, I think, don't know what the Oslo accords were. In fact, the Oslo accords were letters that were sent between the Palestinian and Israeli leadership in 1993. Those letters became the Oslo accords.

I want to indicate what the Palestinians, over the signature of their chairman, Mr. Arafat, said they would do on September 9, 1993:

> The PLO recognizes the right of the State of Israel to exist in peace and security.
>
> The PLO accepts United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.
>
> The PLO commits itself to the Middle East peace process, and to a peaceful resolution of the conflict between the two sides and declares that all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations.

These are not my words, these are the words of Chairman Arafat.

It goes on:

> The PLO considers that the signing of the Declaration of Principles constitutes a historic event, inaugurating a new epoch of peaceful coexistence, free from violence and all other acts which endanger peace and stability. Accordingly, the PLO renounces the use of terrorism and other acts of violence and will assume responsibility over all PLO elements and personnel in order to assure their compliance, prevent violence, and discipline violators.

In view of the promise of a new era and the signing of the Declaration of Principles, and based on Palestinian acceptance of Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, the PLO affirms that those articles of the Palestinian Covenant which deny Israel's right to exist, and the provisions of the Covenant which are inconsistent [with the commitments of this letter] are invalid.

For its part, Israel, under Prime Minister Rabin, in a letter to Chairman Arafat, stated:

I wish to confirm to you that in light of the PLO commitments included in your letter, the Government of Israel has decided to recognize the PLO as the representative of the Palestinian people and commence negotiations with the PLO within the Middle East peace process.

Mr. President, that was what formed the beginning of Oslo—not the end, but the beginning of the Oslo peace process. They were the necessary minimum threshold to begin that process—a recognition that Israel has the right to exist in peace and security and that the Palestinian people have a right to be represented in peace negotiations by representatives of their own choosing.

Unfortunately, since Camp David last year, the Palestinians have carried out more than 6,700 armed attacks against Israelis in a fundamental violation of their peace process commitments. This Palestinian campaign of terror has killed 155 Israelis, 114 of them civilians, and it has wounded another 1,500 Israelis.

As the Senator from Kentucky pointed out, whether it is a bomb that goes off in a pizza parlor, a discotheque, a school bus, or a shopping mall, this is the way that kind of violence has happened.

Now, Israel has responded. Some have criticized Israel for that response. Yet if Israel is not going to practice that kind of response, the violence—such as the incident that just happened in Jerusalem, I think, yesterday, when somebody dressed as an Orthodox Jew walking down the street with a bomb in his backpack, detonated the bomb when an Israeli officer came up to him—must stop. A group of schoolchildren were nearby, but luckily they were not injured. Many others were.

The subject here is terror, and no Israeli and no Palestinian should have to live with terror every day, when a child gets on that school bus, when a son goes to work, when a wife goes shopping, when friends meet at a cafe or pizzeria or go to a night club.

The bombings, the terror, and the violence must stop. The Palestinian use of this kind of terror over the past 10 months runs contrary to what is expected of a peace partner. Mr. Arafat must understand that allowing an atmosphere of violence and terror to continue will not and cannot lead to peace.

The bill we are proposing today, the Middle East Peace Compliance Act, sends that signal clearly and simply and says either the PLO live up to these commitments or we return to a pre-Oslo posture.

So it is a very simple and very straightforward bill based on these commitments. It calls for the President to issue a report addressing whether the PLO and the Palestinian Authority are in compliance with the fundamental commitments they have repeatedly made to renounce terrorism.

If the President is unable to find that the PLO or the Palestinian Authority is adhering to its commitments, it requires him to restrict nonhumanitarian assistance to the West Bank and Gaza and to impose one of two additional sanctions: Denial of visas to Palestinian Authority officials, or closing the Palestinian office in the United States.

I think this legislation is necessary to send a message that we cannot continue this kind of violence. We cannot see that letter abrogated in chapter and verse—the letter that became the foundation of PLO recognition, and the letter that became the foundation of the Oslo peace process.

Let me be clear. It is also my expectation that the Government of Israel, for its part, must continue to meet the commitments it has made to peace and continue to exercise restraint in reaction to these Palestinian terrorist acts.

Mr. President, we submit this legislation. Again, I am very delighted to work with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. We have a bill and, as the Senator said, we will also offer this as an amendment to the foreign operations appropriations bill. I thank the Chair and the Senator. It has been a great pleasure to work with him.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1409

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Middle East Peace Compliance Act of 2001''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On September 9, 1993, Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) Chairman Yasser Arafat made the following commitments in an exchange of letters with Prime Minister of Israel Yitzhak Rabin:

(A) ''The PLO recognizes the right of the State of Israel to exist in peace and security.''.

(B) ''The PLO accepts United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338'' pertaining to the cessation of hostilities and the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

(C) ''The PLO commits itself to the Middle East peace process, and to a peaceful resolution of the conflict between the two sides and declares that all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations.''.

(D) ''The PLO considers that the signing of the Declaration of Principles constitutes a historic event, inaugurating a new epoch of peaceful coexistence, free from violence and all other acts which endanger peace and stability. Accordingly, the PLO renounces the use of terrorism and other acts of violence and will assume responsibility over all PLO elements and personnel in order to assure their compliance, prevent violence and discipline violators.''.

(E) ''In view of the promise of a new era and the signing of the Declaration of Principles and based on Palestinian acceptance of Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, the PLO affirms that those articles of the Palestinian Covenant which deny Israel's right to exist, and the provisions of the Covenant which are inconsistent with the commitments of this letter are now inoperative and no longer valid.''.

(2) The Palestinian Authority, the governing body of autonomous Palestinian territories, was created as a result of the agreements between the PLO and the State of Israel that are a direct outgrowth of the September 9, 1993, commitments.

(3) The United States Congress has provided authorities to the President to suspend certain statutory restrictions relating to the PLO, subject to Presidential certification that the PLO has continued to abide by commitments made.

SEC. 3. REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, at the times specified in subsection (b), transmit to Congress a report—

(1) detailing and assessing the steps that the PLO or the Palestinian Authority, as appropriate, has taken to substantially comply with its 1993 commitments, as specified in section 2(1) of this Act;

(2) a description of the steps taken by the PLO or the Palestinian Authority, as appropriate, to investigate and prosecute those responsible for violence against American and Israeli citizens;

(3) making a determination as to whether the PLO or the Palestinian Authority, as appropriate, has substantially complied with such commitments during the period since the submission of the preceding report, or, in the case of the initial report, during the preceding 6-month period; and

(4) detailing progress made in determining the designation of the PLO, or one or more of its constituent groups (including Fatah and Tanzim) or groups operating as arms of the Palestinian Authority (including Force 17) as a foreign terrorist organization, in accordance with section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(b) TRANSMISSION.—The initial report required under subsection (a) shall be transmitted not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Each subsequent report shall be submitted on the date on which the President is next required to submit a report under the PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 (title VIII of Public Law 101–246) and may be combined with such report.

SEC. 4. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If, in any report transmitted pursuant to section 3, the President determines that the PLO or Palestinian Authority, as appropriate, has not substantially complied with the commitments specified in section 2(1), the following sanctions shall apply:

(1) SUSPENSION OF ASSISTANCE.—The President shall suspend all United States assistance to the West Bank and Gaza except for humanitarian assistance.

(2) ADDITIONAL SANCTION OR SANCTIONS.—The President shall impose one or more of the following sanctions:

(A) DENIAL OF VISAS TO PLO AND PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY FIGURES.—The President shall prohibit the Secretary of State from issuance of any visa for any member of the PLO or any official of the Palestinian Authority.

(B) DOWNGRADE IN STATUS OF PLO OFFICE IN THE UNITED STATES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall withdraw or terminate any waiver by the President of the requirements of section 1003 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1988 and 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5202) (prohibiting the establishment or maintenance of a Palestinian information office in the United States), and such section shall apply so as to prohibit the operation of a PLO or Palestinian Authority office in the United States from carrying out any function other than those functions carried out by the Palestinian information office in existence prior to the Oslo Accord.

(b) DURATION OF SANCTIONS.—The period of time referred to in subsection (a) is the period of time commencing on the date that the report pursuant to section 3 was transmitted and ending on the later of—

(1) the date that is 6 months after such date;

(2) the date that the next report under section 3 is required to be transmitted; or

(3) the date, if any, on which the President determines and informs Congress that the conditions that were the basis for imposing the sanctions are no longer valid.

(c) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The President may waive any or all of the sanctions imposed under this Act if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States, and reports such a determination to the appropriate committees of Congress.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE; TERMINATION DATE.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) TERMINATION DATE.—This Act shall cease to be effective 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. ALLARD):

S. 1411. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Denver Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to facilitate the move of the Denver Veterans Affairs Medical Center, DVAMC, from its present site in Denver to the former Fitzsimons Army Medical Center in Aurora, CO. I am happy to be joined in this effort by my friend and colleague Senator ALLARD as an original co-sponsor. The bill would authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to accomplish the transfer in a timely manner. It would also require the Secretary to submit a report to the Veterans Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee of both the Senate and House of Representatives. This report would detail the costs of the transfer and would be submitted 60 days prior to awarding a contract for the move.

The relocation of the DVAMC to the former Fitzsimons site offers a unique opportunity to provide the highest quality medical care for our veterans. The University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, UCHSC, is moving its facilities from its overcrowded location near downtown Denver to the Fitzsimons site, a decomissioned Army base. The UCHSC and the DVAMC have long operated on adjacent campuses and have shared faculty, medical residents, and access to equipment. A DVAMC move to the new location would allow such cost-effective cooperation to continue, for the benefits of our veterans and all taxpayers.

The need to move is pressing. A recent VA study concludes that the Colorado State veterans' population will experience one of the highest percent increases nationally in veterans 65 and over between 1990 and 2020. The present VA hospital was built in the 1950's. While still able to provide service, the core facilities are approaching the end of their useful lives and many of the patient care units have fallen horribly out of date. Studies indicate that co-location with the University on a state-of-the-art medical campus would be a cost effective way to give veterans in the region the highest quality of care. The move would also provide a tremendous opportunity to showcase a nationwide model of cooperation between the University and the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA. These cooperative initiatives have proven time and again their effectiveness.

Timing is also very important. The VA needs to move quickly to realize the financial advantages of this unique opportunity. In order to make the move fiscally effective, the VA needs to make a decision not later than 2004. Additionally, our veterans are aging and their needs are increasing. Assisting our veterans with their medical needs is a promise we, as a country, made long ago.

The savings we can realize by approving the timely transfer of our veterans' medical treatment facilities in the Denver region compels me to urge my colleagues to act quickly on this bill. We must not miss out on this opportunity to serve America's veterans and their families by ensuring that they receive the excellent medical care they deserve.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Denver Veterans Affairs Medical Center Transfer to Fitzsimons Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECT TO FACILITATE TRANSFER OF DENVER DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER, COLORADO.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out a major medical facility project, in the amount appropriated for the project pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (b), for purposes of the transfer of the Denver Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Colorado, from its current location in Denver, Colorado, to the site of the former Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Aurora, Colorado.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the Construction, Major Projects, account such sums as may be necessary for the project authorized by subsection (a).

(c) TRANSFER OF MEDICAL CENTER.—(1) Upon completion of the major medical facility project authorized by subsection (a), the Secretary shall transfer the Denver Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center to the facility constructed pursuant to that authorization.

(2) Amounts for the cost of the transfer authorized by paragraph (1) shall be derived from amounts in the Construction, Major Projects, account for a category of activity not specific to a project that are available for obligation.

(d) REPORT ON TRANSFER COSTS.—Not later than 60 days before awarding the contract for the major medical facility project authorized by subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the estimated cost of the transfer of the Denver Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center under subsection (c).

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the following:

(1) The Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Appropriations of the Senate.

(2) The Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED & PROPOSED

SA 1527. Mr. THOMPSON proposed an amendment to the bill S. 149, to provide authority to control exports, and for other purposes.

SA 1528. Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 149, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1529. Mr. KYL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 149, supra.

SA 1530. Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. JOHNSON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 149, supra.

SA 1531. Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2500, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1532. Mr. REID (for Mr. LOTT) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1885, to expand the class of beneficiaries who may apply for adjustment of status under section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality

Act by extending the deadline for classification petition and labor certification filings, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1527. Mr. THOMPSON proposed an amendment to the bill S. 149, to provide authority to control exports, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 197, line 15, strike ''substantially inferior'' and insert ''not of comparable quality''.

SA 1528. Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 149, to provide authority to control exports, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert at the appropriate place the following:

SEC. XXX. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA'S IMPROPER BAILOUT OF HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Government of the Republic of Korea over many years has supplied aid to the Korean semiconductor industry enabling that industry to be the Republic of Korea's leading exporter;

(2) this assistance has occurred through a coordinated series of government programs and policies, consisting of preferential access to credit, low-interest loans, government grants, preferential tax programs, government inducement of private sector loans, tariff reductions, and other measures;

(3) in December 1997, the United States, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), other foreign government entities, and a group of international financial institutions assembled an unprecedented $58,000,000,000 financial package to prevent the Korean economy from declaring bankruptcy;

(4) as part of that rescue package, the Republic of Korea agreed to put an end to corporate cronyism, and to overhaul the banking and financial sectors;

(5) Korea also pledged to permit and require banks to run on market principles, to allow and enable bankruptcies and workouts to occur rather than bailouts, and to end subsidies;

(6) the Republic of Korea agreed to all of these provisions in the Stand-by Arrangement with the IMF dated December 3, 1997;

(7) section 602 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999, as enacted by section 101(d) of Division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 105–277; 112 Stat. 2681–220) specified that the United States would not authorize further IMF payments to Korea unless the Secretary of the Treasury certified that the provisions of the IMF Standby Arrangement were adhered to;

(8) the Secretary of the Treasury certified to Congress on December 11, 1998, and July 2, 1999 that the Stand-by Arrangement was being adhered to, and assured Congress that consultations had been held with the Government of the Republic of Korea in connection with the certifications;

(9) the Republic of Korea has acceded to the World Trade Organization, and to the Agreement of Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (as defined in section 101(d)(12) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act);

(10) the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures specifically prohibits export subsidies, and makes actionable other subsidies bestowed upon a specific enterprise that causes adverse effects.

(11) Hynix Semiconductor is a major exporter of semiconductor products from the Republic of Korea to the United States; and

(12) the Republic of Korea has now engaged in a massive $5,000,000,000 bailout of Hynix Semiconductor which contravenes the commitments the Government of the Republic of Korea made to the IMF, the World Trade Organization and in other agreements, and the understandings and certifications made to Congress under the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999:

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the United States Trade Representative should forthwith request consultations with the Republic of Korea under Article 4 and Article 7 of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures of the World Trade Organization, and take immediately such other actions as are necessary to assure that the improper bailout by the Republic of Korea is stopped, and its effects fully offset or reversed;

(2) the relationship between the United States and Republic of Korea has been and will continue to be harmed significantly by the bailout of a major exporter of products from Korea to the United States;

(3) the Republic of Korea should end immediately the bailout of Hynix Semiconductor;

(4) the Republic of Korea should comply immediately with its commitments to the IMF, with its trade agreements, and with the assurances it made to the Secretary of the Treasury; and

(5) the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of Commerce should monitor and report to Congress on steps that have been taken to end this bailout and reverse its effects.

SA 1529. Mr. KYL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 149, to provide authority to control exports, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 296, strike line 1 through line 7 and insert the following:

''(3) REFUSAL BY COUNTRY.—If the country in which the end-user is located refuses to allow post-shipment verification of a controlled item, the Secretary may deny a license for the export of that item, any substantially identical or directly competitive item or class of items, any item that the Secretary determines to be of equal or greater sensitivity than the controlled item, or any controlled item for which a determination has not been made pursuant to section 211 to all end-users in that country until such post-shipment verification is allowed.''

SA 1530. Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. JOHNSON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 149, to provide authority to control exports, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 193, line 10, strike ''party'' and insert ''person''.

On page 193, line 16, strike ''party'' and insert ''person''.

On page 205, line 7, after ''competition'' insert '', including imports of manufactures goods''.

On page 222, line 6, strike ''Crime'' and insert ''In order to promote respect for fundamental human rights, crime''.

On page 223, line 3, strike ''The'' and insert ''Except as herein provided, the''.

On page 223, line 9, after the period, insert the following: ''The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to exports of any of the items identified in subsection (c).''.

On page 223, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(c) REPORT.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 602 or any other confidentiality requirements, the Secretary shall include in the annual report submitted to Congress pursuant to section 701 a report describing the aggregate number of licenses approved during the preceding calendar year for the export of any items listed in the following paragraphs identified by country and control list number:

(1) Serrated thumbcuffs, leg irons, thumbscrews, and electro-shock stun belts.

(2) Leg cuffs, thumbcuffs, shackle boards, restraint chairs, straitjackets, and plastic handcuffs.

(3) Stun guns, shock batons, electric cattle prods, immobilization guns and projectiles, other than equipment used exclusively to treat or tranquilize animals and arms designed solely for signal, flare, or saluting use.

(4) Technology exclusively for the development or production of electro-shock devices.

(5) Pepper gas weapons and saps.

(6) Any other item or technology the Secretary determines is a specially designed instrument of torture or is especially susceptible to abuse as an instrument of torture.

On page 226, line 8, insert ''and'' after ''title;''.

On page 226, strike lines 9 through 22 and insert the following:

(ii) upon receipt of completed application—

(I) ensure that the classification stated on the application for the export items is correct;

(II) refer the application, through the use of a common data-base or other means, and all information submitted by the applicant, and all necessary recommendations and analyses by the Secretary to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the heads of any other departments and agencies the Secretary considers appropriate; or

(III) return the application if a license is not required.

On page 296, line 13, strike ''parties'' and insert ''persons''.

On page 296, line 11, after ''necessary'' insert '', to be available until expended,''.

On page 296, line 20, after ''necessary'' insert '', to be available until expended,''.

On page 297, line 20, after ''$5,000,000'' insert '', to be available until expended,''.

On page 298, line 12, after ''necessary'' insert '', to be available until expended,''.

On page 300, line 12, after ''$2,000,000'' insert '', to be available until expended,''.

On page 300, line 14, after ''$2,000,000'' insert '', to be available until expended,''.

On page 311, strike lines 2 though 4 and insert the following: ''other export authorization (or recordkeeping or reporting requirements), enforcement activity, or other operations under the Export Administration Act of 1979, under this Act, or under the Export''.

On page 311, line 14, insert ''by an employee or officer of the Department of Commerce'' after ''investigation''.

On page 315, strike lines 6 through 10 and insert the following: (1), except that no civil penalty may be imposed on an officer or employee of the United States, or any department or agency thereof, without the concurrence of the department or agency employing such officer or employee. Sections 503 (e),

(g), (h), and (i) and 507 (a), (b), and (c) shall apply to actions to impose civil penalties under this paragraph. At the request of the Secretary, a department or agency employing an officer or employee found to have violated paragraph (1) shall deny that officer or employee access to information exempt from disclosure under this section. Any officer or employee who commits a violation of paragraph (1) may also be removed from office or employment by the employing agency.

On page 315, line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 603. AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, MEDICINE, MEDICAL DEVICES.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE SANCTIONS REFORM AND EXPORT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000.—Nothing in this Act authorizes the exercise of authority contrary to the provisions of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–387; 114 Stat. 1549, 549A–45) applicable to exports of agricultural commodities, medicine, or medical devices.

(b) TITLE II LIMITATION.—Title II does not authorize export controls on food.

(c) TITLE III LIMITATION.—Except as set forth in section 906 of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, title III does not authorize export controls on agricultural commodities, medicine, or medical devices unless the procedures set forth in section 903 of such Act are complied with.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''food'' has the same meaning as that term has under section 201(f) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(f)).

* * * * *

On page 324, strike lines 1 through 4 and redesignate paragraphs (14) and (15) accordingly.

Beginning on page 324, line 21, strike all through page 325, line 5, and insert the following:

(j) CIVIL AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any product that is standard equipment, certified by the Federal Aviation Administration, in civil aircraft, and is an integral part of such aircraft, shall be subject to export control only under this Act. Any such product shall not be subject to controls under section 38(b)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(b)).

On page 325, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

(k) CIVIL AIRCRAFT SAFETY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may authorize, on a case-by-case basis, exports and reexports of civil aircraft equipment and technology that are necessary for compliance with flight safety requirements for commercial passenger aircraft. Flight safety requirements are defined as airworthiness directives issued by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) or equipment manufacturers' maintenance instructions or bulletins approved or accepted by the FAA for the continued airworthiness of the manufacturers' products.

On page 325, line 6, strike ''(k)'' and insert ''(l)''.

SA 1531. Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2500, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 35, line 8, after the semicolon insert the following: ''of which $500,000 shall be available for the Learning for Life Program conducted by the Boy Scouts of the National Capital Area;''.

SA 1532. Mr. REID (for Mr. LOTT) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1885, to expand the class of beneficiaries who may apply for adjustment of status under section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by extending the deadline for classification petition and labor certification filings, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Section 245(i) Extension Act of 2001''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 245(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255(i)(1)) is amended—

(1) is subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''on or before April 30, 2001; or'' and inserting ''on or before the earlier of April 30, 2002, and the date that is 120 days after the date on which the Attorney General first promulgates final or interim final regulations to carry out the Section 245(i) Extension Act of 2001; or''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''on or before such date; and'' and inserting ''on or before the earlier date described in clause (i);'';

(2) in subparagraph (C), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) who, in the case of a beneficiary of a petition for classification, or an application for labor certification, described in subparagraph (B) that was filed after April 30, 2001, demonstrates that the familial relationship existed before August 15, 2001, or the application for labor certification that is the basis of such petition for classification was filed before August 15, 2001;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Legal Immigration Family Equity Act (114 Stat. 2762A–345), as enacted into law by section 1(a)(2) of Public Law 106–553.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 6 at 9:30 a.m. in closed session to mark up the Department of Defense authorization Act for fiscal year 2002.

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet for a hearing on Brian Jones, of California, to be General Counsel, Department of Education during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 6, 2001. At 10:00 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a markup on Thursday, September 6, 2001 at 10:00 a.m., in SD226.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 6, 2001 at 9:30 a.m. to hold a mark-up.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND SPACE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Technology and Space of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Thursday, September 6, 2001, at 2:30 p.m. on shuttle safety.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 6, 2001 at 1:30 p.m. in closed session to mark up the strategic programs and provisions contained in the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2002.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2001

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 11 a.m., Monday, September 10. I further ask unanimous consent that on Monday, immediately following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate conduct a period of morning business until 12 noon with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each with the following exceptions: Senator THOMAS or a designee from 11 to 11:30; Senator DURBIN from 11:30 to 12 noon.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I express my appreciation and that of the Senate for the patience of the Presiding Officer. We thought we would be finished several hours ago. I know the Senator from Florida had many other things to do. As usual, he is such a team player.

On behalf of the whole Senate, I express my appreciation.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, therefore, on Monday, September 10, as a result of the consent agreements that have been entered, the Senate will convene at 11 a.m. with a period of morning business until 12 noon. At 12 noon, the Senate will take up the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill. Rollcall votes will occur on Monday after 5 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2001

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:29 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 10, 2001, at 11 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PROVIDING WORK AUTHORIZATION FOR NONIMMIGRANT SPOUSES OF TREATY TRADERS AND TREATY INVESTORS

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 2001

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I support passage of this legislation, which was sponsored by Chairman GEKAS, Ranking Member JACKSON-LEE, and Congresswoman LOFGREN. Even though current law permits spouses of E visa holders to come to the United States, those same spouses are not allowed to work here. The effect is to limit a household to one income for no apparent reason.

H.R. 2277 reverses that by simply allowing the spouses to work in the United States. Not only is this good for immigrant families, which now would be able to rely on two incomes, but it also will increase the labor pool and increase tax revenues. For these reasons, the bill passed both the Immigration Subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee by voice votes.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO MR. ROBERT L. BRANDT ON HIS RETIREMENT AS SUPERINTENDENT FROM THE VANTAGE CAREER CENTER

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to rise today to recognize a great man who has touched many young lives, Mr. Robert L. Brandt. Mr. Brandt has spent the last 25 years as superintendent of the Vantage Career Center in Van Wert, Ohio. This month, he is stepping down to take a less active role for the remainder of the year when he will officially retire.

In his 25 years, Mr. Brandt has turned the Vantage Career Center into one of the shining stars in the State of Ohio. In 1974, he was asked to join the effort to create a vocational school for Van Wert. He was responsible for choosing the site and developing a building financial plan to have the school open in two years. Right on schedule, the doors of the Vantage Vocational School, as it was originally known, opened in 1976 serving only four school districts. Today, more than eleven school districts send their students to the Vantage Vocational School. In addition, each year more than 5,000 dollars adults gain valuable work and career skills through Vantage's Adult Education Program.

Mr. Brandt has never taken his eye off what was truly important, the students. In a recent newspaper article he was quoted as saying, "My biggest joy in all of this is seeing the number of students who have attended Vantage who have made real successes of themselves—especially those who hadn't done very well in school before coming here."

Though Mr. Brandt officially stepped down as superintendent on July 1, 2001, he has remains at Vantage as Special Projects Coordinator ensuring a smooth transition for the new superintendent.

Mr. Speaker, year after year professionals such as Mr. Brandt dedicate their lives to the future of America. There is no more important or challenging job than that of our nation's educators. At this time, I ask my colleagues of the 107th Congress to join me in saluting Mr. Brandt and all that he has done for the youth of Ohio.

IN HONOR OF NEW YORK'S SCHOOL OF STRINGS

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor New York's School for Strings on its 30th Anniversary. The School for Strings, which annually trains approximately 300 students and thirty teachers of violin, cello, and piano, is one of the oldest and most distinguished Suzuki programs in the United States. The school's founder and director, Miss Louise Behrend, was one of the first musicians and teachers to bring the Suzuki approach to the United States, and the success of the program today is evidence of her persistence and the school's excellence.

In its first thirty years, the School for Strings has enriched the lives of over one thousand families, teaching many the skills needed to earn placement in some of the finest graduate programs and orchestras in the country. Former School for Strings students can be heard in the orchestras of the Metropolitan Opera, the Boston Symphony, the Chicago Symphony, and numerous other world-class groups, and at the music conservations of such distinguished schools as Julliard, Eastman, Curtis, Peabody, and Oberlin. Equally prominent is the school's Teacher Training Program, which has graduated more than 400 qualified Suzuki teachers who bring their knowledge of music to many eager mind around the country.

The School for Strings has also added music into the lives of many underprivileged children through its Start-Up Program. The Start-Up Program pairs children with SFS teacher trainees at reduced rates. After three years, many of the students continue the Suzuki Program with scholarship assistance for the school. For the past five years, the School for Strings has offered an after-school Suzuki program at PS 116 with lessons three times a week in violin and cello for elementary school-age students.

The School for Strings, in its first 30 years, has brought to many the lifelong gift of being able to make music, and the accompanying discipline, concentration, and intellectual stimulation. These fortunate students will be tomorrow's orchestra musicians, talented amateurs and music lovers. On June 16th, 2001, twelve hundred of these former students gathered to fill Carnegie Hall with music, a celebration of the tremendous contribution the school has made to New York City and communities around the country. Congratulations to the School for Strings on 30 years of musical excellence, and I look forward to 30 more years of beautiful music!

PROVIDING FOR WORK AUTHORIZATION FOR NONIMMIGRANT SPOUSES OF INTRACOMPANY TRANSFEREES

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 2001

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I support passage of this legislation, which makes two positive changes to immigration law. First, because of how current immigration law operates, multi-national companies are having a difficult time encouraging overseas employees to work in the United States. This is because U.S. law would not permit the spouses of those employees to work here; in essence, if the employee wants to relocate to the United States with a spouse, that spouse would have to give up his or her career. The effect is to deny such families the ability to seek two incomes and to limit our revenues from taxing that second income. To rectify this, H.R. 2278 changes the law so that spouses of intra-company transferees can work in the United States.

Second, current law requires that intra-company transferees be continuously employed in the United States for one year before being eligible for permanent residency here. This long waiting period makes it difficult for employers to bring qualified employees to the United States. H.R. 2278 corrects this situation by reducing the waiting period to six months. This bill is good for immigrant families, and it is good for employers.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO MR. ALBERT ''ALLIE'' J. ALLMAN

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize a close personal friend of mine, Mr. Albert ''Allie'' J. Allman, Jr. I have been fortunate to call Allie my friend for more than 30 years. Over his lifetime, he has dedicated himself to working for the benefit of his country, the State of Ohio and the Tiffin community.

His volunteerism began in 1943 as a Navy serviceman, and has continued in various political, social and service organizations including the City Council, the Park Board, the Betty Jane Rehabilitation Center, the Cerebral Palsy Committee, the Elks, the Sierra Club, and as a Eucharistic minister at St. Joseph's Catholic Church.

While serving as secretary of the Chamber of Commerce in 1955, he aided in forming Tiffin's first industrial and economic development corporation, and in acquiring land for the Seneca County Airport and Riverview Inn Complex. From 1952 through 1961, Allie was the Director of the Community Chest, which was a forerunner of the United Way.

Although he is semi-retired after 22 years as a claims manager of United Insurance Company, Allie is still active in politics. Allie is well respected by many public officials throughout Ohio because of his ability to work with all people and see all sides of a situation.

Allie is currently secretary of the Seniors And Lawman Together (S.A.L.T.) Council, which he helped form. This organization unites seniors and law enforcement officers in working together for a safer community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues of the 107th Congress to join me in saluting Allie for his years of service to the Tiffin community and the State of Ohio. I want to also wish my dear friend, his wife Jane, their five children and their seven grandchildren all the best in their future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO DEBORAH RITTER PLOTZ-PIERCE

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Deborah Ritter Plotz-Pierce for a lifetime of educating and inspiring New York City students. A group of her most dedicated fans, students in her sixth grade class of 1963–64, will be gathering on Sunday, October 7th to thank her for the significant role she played in shaping their lives. In the words of one of her students, she sparked the imagination of her students to ''achieve, accomplish, reach and claim their place in the American Dream.''

After graduating from Brooklyn College, Deborah Plotz-Pierce began a career that would impact the lives of countless students. From 1958 to 1965, she worked at PS 213 in the East New York section of Brooklyn, where she was assigned to work with gifted and talented students and their parents. After marrying Milton Plotz-Pierce and having her first child, she would begin a battle that would impact the lives of many women. After falling victim to the rules that governed pregnant New York City female teachers at that time, she filed a sexual discrimination complaint against the Board of Education. Over the course of the next four years, Mrs. Plotz-Pierce's case ascended to the Court of Appeals, whose decision led to the amendment of the New York City Maternity By-Laws to reflect greater gender equity. Her long-fought battle for equality in the system surely made a tangible and vital difference in the lives of a generation of New York City teachers.

After having her second child, she returned to the classroom, where she remained until her retirement in 1991. In 1992, Mrs. Plotz-Pierce was invited to join the teaching faculties of Touro College and the Education Department of City College. During the next seven years, she trained and mentored new teachers for the New York City Board of Education, passing her years of knowledge and experience on to the next generation.

Throughout a lifetime of learning, teaching, and mentoring, Deborah Ritter Plotz-Pierce has provided such inspiration to her students that they gather after 35 years to celebrate and thank her. She is truly a model educator, and I join her students in thanking her for a lifetime of dedication to the students of New York City.

SCHEDULE

HON. RICHARD K. ARMEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for the week.

The House will next meet for legislative business on Monday, September 10 at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 o'clock p.m. for legislative business. The House will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to member's offices tomorrow. On Monday, no recorded votes are expected before 6 o'clock p.m.

On Tuesday and the balance of the week, the House will consider H.R. 2586, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, the International Relations Committee has had under consideration today H.R. 2646, the Farm Security Act of 2001. The Agriculture Committee completed its consideration of the bill prior to the Summer District Work Period. As we move into next week, we will also be taking a look at this important piece of legislation as a possibility for consideration on the floor.

One final note, Mr. Speaker: Next week will be our only full week of legislative business in the House during the month of September due to the Jewish holidays that fall in the later half of the month. After consultation with Minority Leader GEPHARDT, I released an updated September schedule to all members last month detailing the House's schedule during the Jewish holidays. If members have any questions regarding the September schedule, they should feel free to contact my floor office for more information at any time.

TRIBUTE TO DOCTOR HARVEY ''JERRY'' CLAREMONT

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the community of Shrewsbury, Massachusetts in celebrating the nomination of Doctor Harvey ''Jerry'' Claremont as the 2001 ''Spirit of Shrewsbury'' Grand Marshall. For many years, Dr. Claremont has been a distinguished member of the Shrewsbury community, thanks to his countless efforts to help the less fortunate.

Dr. Claremont and his wife, Anne Marie Pelletier, have long given of their time. Over the past twenty years, his family has adopted seven Korean children into their home. In addition, over thirty children have stayed with the family while they have been in this country receiving medical treatment. Dr. Claremont worked for twenty-seven years as a general and vascular surgeon while recruiting volunteers and founding Children's HealthCare and Nutritional Goals Through Education. That group has sent volunteers to developing countries in order to see patients, perform operations, and deliver medical supplies. Dr. Claremont was instrumental in creating a free medical clinic in the town of Shrewsbury that is responsible for helping uninsured patients.

Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous pride that I acknowledge the outstanding work of Dr. Harvey Claremont. I congratulate him, and wish the town of Shrewsbury the best of luck on the 2001 Spirit of Shrewsbury Celebration.

REQUIRING A REPORT ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 2001

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I support passage of this bill and would like to commend Chairman COBLE and Ranking Member BERMAN for bringing it to the full House. The State Justice Institute was established as a nonprofit corporation in 1984 to award grants to improve the quality of justice in State courts and develop new and efficient solutions to problems faced by all courts.

Unfortunately, Congress has not conducted oversight over the Institute in approximately 15 years, so we have no information about how it is functioning. This bill solves that problem by requiring the Attorney General to submit a

report to Congress on how the Institute is functioning and how successful its grants have been in improving the quality of judicial education. Once that report is received, Congress can better oversee the Institute and determine what resources it needs.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF THE FIVE MILLION HOUR SAFETY MILESTONE ACHIEVED AT THE DAVIS-BESSE NUCLEAR POWER STATION OAK HARBOR, OHIO

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to express congratulations to employees of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station for having achieved a significant safety milestone. On August 9, 2001 the employees of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station will have worked five million hours without a lost-time accident.

As the first nuclear power plant in Ohio, the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, since beginning operation in 1977, has generated more than 110 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity, enough power to supply about 20 million homes with electricity for an entire year. The plant produces enough electricity to meet the demand of about half the people in northwest Ohio.

Not only have Davis-Besse employees operated the plant reliably, they have observed the highest standards of safety, as well. So, again, it is my pleasure to recognize this important safety milestone. Five million hours without a lost-time accident means that, for more than three years, no employee has missed work due to a work-related illness or accident.

Employees and managers at Davis-Besse have been able to achieve this and other milestones by paying close attention to detail and striving for excellence in even minor daily activities. Because of this operating philosophy, Davis-Besse has been recognized within the nuclear industry as a top performing plant.

In addition to being an important power producer, the plant also is an important asset to the local community. It is one of the largest local employers, conducts business with more than 800 other businesses in Ohio and is a strong supporter of such causes as United Way, Ohio Reads, Boy Scouts of America, numerous wildlife and environmental organizations, and other charities.

The economy of Ohio, and the country, is driven in part by safe, reliable energy, particularly electricity. The Davis-Besse plant has proved itself a valuable asset in meeting our energy needs. And I ask all of my colleagues of the 107th Congress to join me in recognizing the excellent work of the employees at the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Plant.

HONORING WILLIAM GREEN

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who has dedicated himself to improving housing opportunities for people throughout Bergen County. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor William Green of River Vale, New Jersey, this year's chairperson of the Community Housing in Partnership's (CHIP) Golf Invitational.

As the Chairperson of this year's tournament, Bill has worked long hours to make the CHIP Golf Invitational an enjoyable experience for participants, as well as raise funds to develop affordable housing in Bergen County. It is a testament to his dedication that Bill has balanced this responsibility with his busy full-time job as a Senior Vice President at MetLife.

Bill's work at CHIP will help change the lives of so many in our community by developing affordable housing. Thanks to CHIP, independent living options now exist for working low-income families, senior citizens, recovering alcoholics, and formerly homeless individuals. And CHIP has teamed up with the Bergen County Community Action Program to provide supportive services, as well.

People who give so much of themselves, as Bill Green, do not do so for the recognition. However, he certainly deserves to receive it.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate Bill Green as well as his wife Susan and their daughters Katie and Emily, for all their hard work, dedication and generosity on behalf of CHIP, and wish them health and much happiness in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 2001

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 233. On a day when President Fox makes his first official visit to Washington, I cannot think of a better day to honor and recognize the importance of our relationship with our neighbor to the south, Mexico.

The ties that bind our nations together span the course of hundreds of years. From a confrontational beginning to a cooperative future the United States and Mexico will always have a special connection.

The election of President Fox represented a remarkable day in the history of Mexico. On this day, Mexico cast aside 71 years of single party rule and officially joined the community of democratic nations. It is my sincere hope that this smooth and peaceful transition of governments becomes the model for the future of Mexico.

In the realm of trade, over 80% of all Mexican exports are sent to the United States, and nearly three-quarters of its imports come from the United States. Though our financial interaction is an important component, this relationship is not solely based on economics. With millions of people of Mexican descent living in cities throughout the United States, Mexican culture, cuisine, and music have become pervasive in American society.

In my own district in Queens, New York, the Mexican population has been the fastest growing immigrant group. It always amazes me to watch the development of these men, women and children as they work tirelessly to succeed in the United States. Despite their presence in the United States, the homeland is never forgotten. The connection to their roots and family in Mexico remains strong each and every day. The Mexican community is truly a credit to the American economy, American culture and American values.

This is why I support President Vicente Fox's effort to create a new immigration policy between the U.S. and Mexico which unites families separated by U.S. immigration law and provides the American economy with critical employees through the guest visa program.

Through NAFTA and geography, our countries are connected and our economies are linked. By helping our neighbors to the south, we are helping our own country grow and prosper in the 21st century.

It is these unique circumstances, which makes our relationship with Mexico so important. I look forward to working closely with President Fox and Mexican Parliamentarians on issues of mutual interest in the years to come.

DETERMINATION OF SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTIONS OF PATENTABILITY IN REEXAMINATION PROCEEDINGS

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 2001

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I support passage of this bill and would like to commend Chairman COBLE and Ranking Member BERMAN for acting on this issue because our patent system is in need of repair. Specifically, the reexamination process—which lets parties bring challenges to patents that have been issued—may not be functioning as planned because of the substantive and procedural limits involved. As a result, applications that should not receive patents not only receive them, but keep them after a review process.

One reason for this is that the Federal Circuit ruled in a 1997 case called In re Portola Packaging that the PTO could not, in reexamination, revisit patents and publications it had before it during the initial examination process. This ruling basically nullified the reexamination process and has prevented examiners from reviewing patents carefully. It is understandable why, at a recent hearing on this topic, the opinion of our witnesses on the need to reverse this ruling was unanimous.

Fortunately, the Chairman and Ranking Member were able to work with numerous patent experts on how to resolve this issue. At

the same time, I hope we can still resolve other outstanding issues in the reexamination process, such as what kinds of materials—or prior art—PTO examiners can consult.

SUPPORT OF TAIWAN'S BID TO RE-ENTER THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Taiwan's bid to re-enter the United Nations and the right of its 23 million citizens to have their voices heard in that world body.

Taiwan is an economic powerhouse—consistently ranking among the world's top economies over many years. Its GNP and population are larger than three quarters of the existing member countries of the UN. Taiwan holds approximately $100 billion in foreign exchange reserves. Significantly, it is the seventh largest trading partner to the United States.

Taiwan has used its economic resources to assist developing countries and contribute to international organizations. Taiwan sent over 10,000 experts to train technicians in developing countries and has provided aid to countries in need including a generous aid package to Kosovo. It understands the meaning of responsibility among the community of nations and is prepared and able to actively support the endeavors of the United Nations.

Taiwan is an openly democratic society. Free and fair elections are held at all levels of government. Two years ago, Chen Shui-bian was the first President from the opposition party to be elected as Taiwan's president. In addition, Taiwan's constitution guarantees its citizens freedom of assembly, expression and association, freedom of religion and freedom of the press.

President Chen has been a bulwark of support for human rights. He has committed Taiwan to upholding the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, and the Declaration and Action Program of the 1993 Vienna Conference on Human Rights.

Since his election, President Chen has continued to seek renewed political and commercial dialogue with the Chinese mainland. Taiwan believes that its membership in the United Nations would have a positive effect on peace and stability in the region. This belief is supported by such examples as East and West Germany which were both members of the UN and by the membership of both North and South Korea which have been seeking an improved relationship.

A number of countries have asked the United Nations to reconsider Taiwan for UN membership. Both Houses of the U.S. Congress, by large margins, have endorsed Taiwan's desire for participation in the United Nations. The time has come for Taiwan to officially enter the community of nations.

TRIBUTE TO KENNETH JERNSTEDT

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to recognize one of Oregon's most distinguished sons, Kenneth Jernstedt, on the occasion of the dedication of Ken Jernstedt Airfield on September 8, 2001, in the City of Hood River, Oregon.

A devoted husband and father, a fearless warrior, a public servant, and a friend to the people of the Columbia Gorge, Ken Jernstedt is as fine an American as I have ever known. Naming the airfield in Ken's honor is a fitting tribute to a man who not only has served this community so ably, but who personifies aviation in Oregon. From his days as a combat pilot in the skies over China to his service as a test pilot after his return, Ken is an airman through and through.

Recruited from the U.S. Marine Air Corps in 1941, Ken Jernstedt was among a restless and eager group of young pilots who answered the call to protect the Burma Road, a vital support line into China. These young men made up the American Volunteer Group, commonly known as the Flying Tigers, a clandestine organization of American civilian volunteers that became operational even before the United States entered the war against Japan.

The Flying Tigers served in China and Southeast Asia from December, 1941 to July, 1942 under the command of their charismatic leader, Claire Chennault. In just six months of combat operations, Jernstedt and his comrades-in-arms were credited with destroying 296 enemy planes and more than 1,000 airmen. For this toll on the enemy 22 Tigers made the ultimate sacrifice, never to return to the country they had served so honorably.

During his tour with the Flying Tigers, Ken Jernstedt served as a flight leader of the 3rd Squadron. In combat against the enemy, he scored 10½ victories in his P–40 fighter, earning him the Distinguished Flying Cross, one of the highest decorations awarded by the United States for valor in aerial combat. Following the disbandment of the Flying Tigers in 1942, Ken became an experimental plane test pilot, a job no less dangerous than combat against the Japanese. Among the planes he piloted was the P–47 Thunderbolt.

Later in his life, Ken directed his tremendous energies toward less dangerous endeavors. After serving as mayor of the City of Hood River from 1959 to 1960, he was elected to the State Legislature, where he served with distinction in both the House and Senate for a combined 20 years. Following his departure from the Senate, Ken again served as mayor of Hood River from 1989 to 1990. In addition to his invaluable public service at both the local and state levels, Ken has served as honorary chair of the Air Safety and Education Foundation of the Oregon Pilots Association.

In the future, as generations not yet born pass through the gates of Ken Jernstedt Airfield, they will be reminded of this giant of a man. If they admire courage in the face of danger, if they value personal sacrifice in a culture of self gratification, and if they cherish freedom in a world filled with oppression, they will salute him as I salute him today. Ken Jernstedt is, in a word, a patriot. For one who so values the liberty that was purchased with the courage of men like him, I can think of no higher compliment.

PROVIDING FOR APPEALS BY THIRD PARTIES IN CERTAIN PATENT REEXAMINATION PROCEEDINGS

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 2001

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I support passage of this bill and would like to commend Chairman COBLE and Ranking Member BERMAN for addressing this issue. The patent reexamination process, which lets parties challenge patents that the PTO already has issued, is subject to numerous procedural and arbitrary limits that inhibit its effectiveness.

For example, section 315 of the patent law says third parties who file for a reexamination and then lose can file an administrative appeal but then cannot appeal that decision to the Federal Circuit. The law gives only a patent owner the right to appeal to the Federal courts. That provision contradicts the very purpose of reexamination—if someone feels the PTO incorrectly rules on an issue of patentability, that party should have the right to an appeal.

Fortunately, the legislation before us resolves this problem. It amends the law so that any party in reexamination—the patent owner or the third party—can appeal a decision of the PTO to the Federal Circuit. This legislation will go a long way to shoring up our patent system and has the support of numerous patent experts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK FOLEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 333 and 334, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both measures.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained by a delayed flight and was unable to be present last night for floor votes.

If had been present, I would have voted in the affirmative on H.R. 2291 and H. Con. Res. 233.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a personal explanation. Yesterday, I was absent from the Chamber as I attended the funeral of Liston Ramsey, the late Speaker of the North Carolina House of Representatives. During that time, I was not present to vote on Roll Call Votes 333 and 334. Had I been present, I would have voted Yes on both. I ask that my statement be submitted in the appropriate place in the RECORD.

VERMONT HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT CONGRESSIONAL TOWN MEETING

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the outstanding work done by participants in my Student Congressional Town Meeting held this summer. These participants were part of a group of high school students from around Vermont who testified about the concerns they have as teenagers, and about what they would like to see government do regarding these concerns.

I am asking that these statements be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I believe that the views of these young persons will benefit my colleagues.

REGARDING THE MEDIA IN PUBLIC LIFE, MAY 7, 2001

APRIL LEICHTNAM: ''There are two ways to slide through life; to believe everything or doubt everything. Both ways save us from thinking.'' Alfred Korzybski. The media plays an important role in the lives of all human beings. There are numerous different forms of media. Some of these forms are printouts such as newspapers, books, fliers, billboards, clothing, signs and magazines. Along with print media, there is nonprint media, such as television, radio, movies, cassette tapes, CDs, videotapes, Internet and other electronic modes of communication. When the media constructs the message they would like to convey, they have two things in mind. They have a purpose, and they design them to evoke a certain response from their audience.

LAURA DICK: The main purpose of the media is to inform people of the things around them, to persuade them into doing and buying things, to entertain them by showing them false images, and to sell products by not always telling what is true. Also, when constructing ads, the advertisers look to make the ad appealing to those who are seeing it. They use many different types of techniques. Some of these techniques include humor, comparisons, economics, social prestige, emotional appeal, appeal to fears and insecurities, statistics and studies, exotic appeals, a sense of belonging, a sense of mastery, a desire to be noticed, consumer compliments, the use of parental figures, and also ''weasel'' words. many of these techniques are designed to target a certain audience. Also, a lot of these claims on TV make ads meaningless. for example, an ad will say, ''virtually spotless,'' instead of just ''spotless,'' which does not mean the dishes will be totally spotless, but it makes one think they will be. Some other common advertising techniques include bandwagon, attraction, happy families, something-for-nothing, testimonials, ''all natural,'' nostalgia, and patriotism. We ask have a statistic that shows the influence on media on the lives of many people today. For example:

APRIL LEICHTNAM: During one year, a child will see approximately 3,000 drinking episodes on television. The average American child will view approximately 75,000 beer ads by the age of 18. Alcohol advertising accounts for 3 to 5 percent of total revenue on TV, and 12 percent on radio. Prime time and soap operas expose teenagers to sexual scenes every nine minutes. Fewer than 6 percent of males and 2 percent of females on TV are obese, yet 25 to 45 percent of the American population is overweight, and two major health problems among teens are anorexia and bulimia. The average American watches 1,000 hours of television every year. In 1991, three out of four households owned a VCR. The average American sees about 32,000 commercials every year. In 1998, a 60-second commercial cost $2,600,000 during the Super Bowl. The average American household owns two to three televisions. The average child views 10,000 murders, raps and aggravated assaults in one year. 20 to 28 hours per week are spent viewing television. This is the only activity we spend more time doing besides sleeping. Four out of five Americans believe violence on TV causes real violence. Beer commercials air while drinking portrayal occurs five times per hour. Average high school students spend two to three hours a day watching TV on school days, and eight hours a day on weekends. 90 million households own at least one TV set. 63 percent have two or more sets. By the first grade, the average child has seen 5,000 hours of TV. There are more people in the world who have televisions than indoor plumbing. In promoting things that are not reality, the media promotes such complex problems as drug addiction, crime, teen pregnancy, promiscuous sex, materialism, violence, racism, eating disorders, tobacco and alcohol consumption by teens and younger children, sexual and physical abuse, profanity, voter apathy, and pornography. Therefore, we conclude that media literacy classes should be offered in every high school in the state of Vermont.

REGARDING PUBLIC SCHOOLS, MAY 7, 2001

PATTY RALSTON: We have a video.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: You have a video?

PATTY RALSTON: Yes.

(Videotape played.)

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: Thank you very much for that excellent video. Who wants to begin verbal presentation now? You don't think you are going to get away with just the video, do you? Just because you are TV stars does not exempt you from discussing it. Your name again?

SELENIA COGHLAN: Selenia Coghlan. Like I said on the video, I just feel that like—I'm not in public school right now, but I go to the Learning Edge. I'm getting my adult diploma. But when I was in the middle school or public schools, I feel that, if you are on a different level than the other kids, like if you can't read as well or you can't do math as well, they treat you a lot differently. And, basically, I feel it is the teachers' fault, because they're there to educate you and they should be the ones to teach you, and when you get your diploma, it shouldn't be just because you got passed along. You should know something.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: Let me back you up here. I don't know that everybody knows. Why don't you guys say a few words about the Lund Home? How is the Lund Home different from other schools?

SELENIA COGHLAN: The Lund Home is for young parenting and pregnant teens. And is it a small class, where all females that are pregnant or parenting can get their diploma or GED. And they take math, history, everything that public schools take, and they also take parenting skills classes and like things that you need to know about parenting, or whatever. If you don't want to parent, what you could do, or if you want to parent, what you could to.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: Thank you. Next?

PATTY SALVAS: I never went to public schools in Vermont, but I do know that a lot of the public schools aren't very friendly to teen moms, and for like the people on welfare, they don't give them enough initiative. So they need to be more sympathetic towards them.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: Okay.

PATTY RALSTON: People shouldn't really, like just cause we had kids young and everything too, doesn't mean like—you know what I mean? Because I will make it, and whether anybody says I won't, I will.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: How many students are there at Lund?

PATTY RALSTON: We go to the Learning Edge. It is a different program, but there is like seven, eight—ten right now. Ten right now.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: And do you think the Learning Edge does things for young parenting moms that a public school often does not do?

PATTY RALSTON: Yes. They're helpful. And they're always there if you need like support or anything. They are there. You know they're there.

SELENIA COGHLAN: The other students that were talking before us, they said something, the other side—what is it called?

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: Alternative.

SELENIA COGHLAN: Alternative schools. I think those are really great for kids. Some people do have problems maybe, with family, and that is why the are there, but some kids learn slower than other kids. Like me, I have to have somebody explain what I need, you know, like how to do it. Or if I just have a teacher in front of me saying, this, and there you go, I won't know anything, and then I won't do it.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: So you think different types of kids respond to different—

SELENIA COGHLAN: Everybody is different. I feel like everybody is different and everybody learns differently. There are kids that can learn things a lot quicker, and lots of people that can't. And I feel it is good to have alternatives for pregnant and parenting teens, and just for other kids that need the extra help, even if they are not pregnant or parenting.

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE REGARDING DEATH OF THE HONORABLE FLOYD SPENCE FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

SPEECH OF

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 2001

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, Like most of my colleagues, I was in my district—the southside of Chicago—when the news of the death of our friend, FLOYD SPENCE, came. I was shocked and saddened by the knowledge that this institution had lost, yet, another Member.

Born in 1928 in South Carolina, FLOYD SPENCE was a product of the South Carolina schools and a member of the U.S. Naval Reserve. He was first elected to public office in 1956, the South Carolina Legislature, and he served there until his election to the South Carolina State Senate in 1966.

FLOYD SPENCE began his 30 years of service in this body in 1971 and he served three terms as Chairman of the Armed Services/National Security Committee in the House before yielding the gavel to his successor at the beginning of the current Congress. Throughout his Congressional career, FLOYD SPENCE served the citizens of South Carolina's Second Congressional District, and the citizens of this nation, well.

Mr. Speaker, FLOYD SPENCE was my neighbor in the Rayburn Building. I will remember his cheerful greetings as we passed in the hallways and in the elevators. He was always optimistic, always upbeat, always energetic, always courtly, always the gentleman. I will also always appreciate the unfailing kindness and courtesy of his staff.

Mr. Speaker, my prayers go with his family, his friends, his constituents and his staff, at this time of sorrow. I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this Resolution expressing the condolences of this House on the passing of the Honorable FLOYD SPENCE.

RECOGNIZING THE 275TH ANNIVERSARY OF PRINCE GEORGE'S PARISH

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 275th anniversary of the founding of Prince George's parish. The Parish, and its home, Christ Episcopal Church, make up the oldest congregation in Rockville, Maryland.

In 1726, the Prince George's Parish was excised from the original southern Maryland parishes, and began to serve the small population on the banks of Rock Creek. The original log chapel was replaced in 1808 by a brick church, and then in 1822, moved one mile to downtown Rockville.

During the Civil War, Christ Church played a role in the underground railroad, despite the presence of slave owners within the parish. Following the war, in 1884, the parish began construction of its current building, strongly influenced by the popular gothic revival architecture. A short time later, in 1896, Christ Episcopal Church joined the newly founded Diocese of Washington, forming a community of churches in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan region.

The past century has seen a series of additions to the original church building. In the mid-1960's, the worship space was expanded and new classroom space was added. This allowed the growing congregation to remain in downtown Rockville, and cemented the partnership between the parish and the Christ Episcopal School.

Education plays an important role in Christ Episcopal Church. In addition to the presence of Christ Episcopal School, the Christ Church hosts a seminarian from the Virginia Theological Seminary for a two-year field education placement. Parishioners attend weekly bible study and adult covenant classes, where students learn about the history of the Episcopal church, and the development of the Christian faith. All of this is in addition to the normal Sunday School classes.

Service also plays a leading role at the church. Congregants volunteer at the Rockville Nursing home and with Habitat for Humanity of Montgomery and Frederick counties. The church recently hosted visiting preacher Reverend Joshua Louw, rector of a parish serving a population of individuals relocated by apartheid, from the companion Diocese of Capetown, South Africa.

Of course, worship is the primary function in the Parish. The Reverends John S. McDuffie and Susan Astarita lead the parishioners in worship every Wednesday and Sunday.

I am extremely proud to have the Prince George's Parish in my Congressional district. Its fascinating history and rich tradition of education, service, and faith, is a source of inspiration for all Americans. I join with the Prince Georges's parishioners in celebrating this impressive 275th anniversary.

TAIWAN BELONGS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1996 Taiwan held the first ever direct election for president and four years later, in the presidential election of 2000, opposition party candidate Chen Shui-bian won the presidential election. Miraculously, Taiwan had a peaceful transfer of power, and for the first time in fifty years, an opposition party replaced the ruling party. Today, Taiwan's democracy is in full bloom. Every political office is contested through free and fair elections, thus dispelling the myth that democracy and Asians don't mix.

Taiwan's rapid evolution into a full fledged democracy with a capitalist free-market economy clearly signals that Taiwan is ready to play a larger role on the international stage. Already, Taiwan is a member of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation and participates actively in the Asian Development Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the Inter-American Development Bank.

Congress has repeatedly recognized Taiwan's desire to broaden its participation in the international arena by adopting legislation supporting Taiwan's participation in the World Health Organization. The aftermath of the 1999 earthquake is a perfect example of why Taiwan should be allowed to participate. Unlike other disasters around the world, the United Nations delayed providing assistance to Taiwan until they got permission from China. If Taiwan had been a participant in the WHO, or better still, a member of the United Nations, no such delays would have occurred. Instead, thousands of Taiwanese suffered needlessly until the international community finally responded.

After one year in office, President Chen Shui-bian has a solid record of achievement for his nation. Taiwan continues to seek resumption of dialogue with the Chinese mainland regarding eventual reunification. In addition, Taiwan has maintained a strong relationship with the United States and other friendly nations. Taiwan stands tall among nations and over the years has played a significant role in helping other nations develop. Taiwan has sent over 10,000 experts to train technicians in developing countries and has provided aid to many countries in need. It has given much to the world and the world community is enriched as a result.

Unfortunately, despite Taiwan's desire to be a helpful global partner, Taiwan is not a member of the United Nations. It is time for the United Nations, on the principles of universality enshrined in the United Nations Charter, to acknowledge Taiwan's accomplishments and allow Taiwan to be a Member State.

Mr. Speaker, Taiwan belongs in the United Nations. I personally support Taiwan's bid to return to the United Nations and I urge other members to do so as well.

RECOGNITION OF RICHARD H. WALKER'S PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Richard H. Walker of New York State. Today, we bid him farewell as Director of Enforcement of the Securities & Exchange Commission and commend him for his ten year SEC tenure. More importantly, today, we offer our deep gratitude for his service to the American people.

An attorney by profession, Mr. Walker shared many years of his life as a public servant. He began his service to the SEC as the Director of Northeast Regional Office in 1991. He later moved to Washington, DC to become General Counsel and then, in 1998, he took the reigns as Director of Enforcement, the Commission's largest division. Mr. Walker has worked tirelessly for reform in securities litigation and earned his reputation as a brilliant,

dedicated, and creative leader. As he returns to work in the private sector, Mr. Walker humbly calls his service to the SEC the ''highlight of his legal career''. We call his commitment an extraordinary contribution.

America's investors benefited greatly while Mr. Walker headed the SEC's nationwide enforcement effort. He led the division's fight against earnings management and other financial reporting abuses. He was the key force behind some of the most significant financial fraud cases ever brought forward in the history of the Commission, including those cases against: W.R. Grace, Cendant, McKesson HBOC, Microstrategy, Sunbeam, Arthur Andersen, and the 1999 landmark auditor independence case against PricewaterhouseCoopers.

A well-respected leader, Mr. Walker also stood out as a team player. He forged working relationships with state and local prosecutors and the FBI, resulting in a record numbers of criminal prosecutions for violations of federal securities law. He passion for justice was evident as he attacked organized crime in securities activities by coordinating civil and criminal prosecutions. He led several major, successful undercover sting operations, revealing the largest number of people ever charged with securities fraud.

The Commission also established the Internet Enforcement Program to combat internet securities fraud under Mr. Walker's direction. Because of Mr. Walker's efforts, an estimated 250 violators were held accountable. He rose to the challenge of advancing technology with characteristic determination.

Mr. Walker received many awards for his outstanding contributions during his ten years at the SEC, including: two-time receipt of the Chairman's Award for Excellence, the Commission's Distinguished Service Award, the Commission's Law and Policy Award for his key role in the government's successful appeal in U.S. vs. O'Hagan, a landmark case which upheld the misappropriation theory of insider trading. Today we award him with our deep gratitude and recognize him as an exemplary model of all that is good and right with our government.

I applaud him for his achievements while serving in three demanding positions at the SEC and thank him on behalf of all those whose lives he affected for the better. As he returns home, he leaves an important part of our government in better condition than when he arrived. He laid the valuable groundwork for our continued efforts to carry out the SEC's mission of investor protection. But most importantly, Mr. Walker reaffirms our confidence in caring, effective public service.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I wish Mr. Walker the best of luck in his future endeavors and well-deserved success!

IMPACT OF FUEL COSTS ON SALES REPRESENTATIVES

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer the attached comments of the National Alliance of Sales Representatives Associations on the impact of rising energy costs on small businesses. As Chairman of the Small Business Committee, I will continue to review the issues raised in the attached letter.

THE NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF SALES REPRESENTATIVES ASSOCIATIONS,
Atlanta, GA, August 2, 2001.

Subject: Impact of Increasing and Volatile Energy Costs on Sales Representatives

Chairman DONALD MANZULLO,
House Small Business Committee,
Washington, DC.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As Chairman of the Bureau of Wholesale Sales Representatives and President of the National Alliance of Sales Representatives Associations I have the opportunity to discuss the impact that increasing and volatile energy costs with many other sales representatives. What follows are a summary of my experiences but they are typical of what is happening to sales representatives across the country. The National Alliance of Sales Representatives Associations (NASRA) is based in Atlanta and represents more than 10,000 sales representatives who work in industries like apparel, shoe, gift, furniture, and other related sectors.

THE IMPACT OF RISING FUEL COSTS

When energy costs wildly fluctuate as they have in the last four months, sales representatives who are independent business owners, find that they have to absorb the rising energy costs with no ability to pass any of the cost increases on to their customers. As a result a season that has already been hurt due to a slowing economy goes into the proverbial tank as we are all forced to absorb cost increases that cannot be reflected in our commissions.

Here are some personal illustrations of how these costs increases have affected my business. My territory consists of Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, Delaware and The District of Columbia.

I travel in excess of 50,000 road miles per year and I make a minimum of five trips annually to key areas of my territory. In addition, I attend twenty to twenty five trade shows.

My travel is done in a mini van racked for the purpose of housing my samples. Naturally the added weight decreases fuel efficiency but nevertheless the vehicle is critical to my business. Within 30 minutes of my home you can presently find gasoline prices ranging from $1.65 to $1.16 for regular unleaded and I am aware that prices across the country have been even higher.

Some sales reps have chosen to purchase diesel fuel motor homes for the purpose of efficiency. During the past few months, diesel prices in my area have ranged from $1.70 to $1.31. At recent prices it makes the investment in travel a real issue. Most diesel vehicles are commercial, busses and trucks and the trucking industry has requested they be allowed to pass on these increased costs. Commissioned sales representatives who drive diesel or gasoline powered vehicles do not have the ability to pass on rising costs nor petition congress for such rebates.

RISING FUEL COSTS AFFECT IN OTHER AREAS

If it were only the rising cost of fuel perhaps the impact would not be so great. These same rising costs effect every phase of my business and my life.

1. The hotels I use have added energy surcharges without notice.

2. Food and restaurant prices have gone up due to transportation costs.

3. Airlines, busses and trains have also added energy surcharges.

4. The convention centers and hotels that host our trade shows have new energy clauses in their leases.

5. Retail prices on my products have increased because of rising production and shipping charges. When retail prices rise retail slows which directly impacts my wholesale business.

CALIFORNIA IMPACTS SALES REPRESENTATIVES NATIONALLY

As a final insult many sales representatives including myself have been affected by the energy crisis in California. My business begins with samples. Recently, I have had delays in getting samples, especially from California. This is due largely to rolling black outs which has slowed production. If I do not have my samples shipped on time so that I can display them at the trade shows my time and money invested in trade shows is lost.

At this time I cannot plan my business because the costs keep changing. They never go down and yet my income does not increase proportionately. A business that is run without the ability to plan is doomed to failure.

All costs rise with rising energy prices. Where does it end? It seems to end with me.

On a more personal note our family had to make a very difficult decision. After more than 30 years in a business he loved my husband has left the industry. There can be no doubt he was literally forced out by these rising costs. Unfortunately, more and more of my colleagues are making similar decisions. It is well known small business is the engine for our country. What will happen when we are unable to run the engine?

SOLUTIONS

Congress needs to look for long-term solutions to maintain some level of stability in energy costs. The quick fixes have been meaningless to me. We need a long view energy policy. We MUST put stability ahead of volatility so that small business owners can plan.

Mr. Chairman I wish to thank you for looking into this issue and for your assistance to the National Alliance of Sales Representatives.

Sincerely,

SANDRA HANLON BLOOM.

A TRIBUTE TO SIR ARTHUR GILBERT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend, an extraordinary man, and a giant in the art world, Sir Arthur Gilbert, who passed away on September 2, of this year.

Born in 1913, Arthur's family emigrated from Poland to London where they operated a furrier business. After deciding not to enter the family business, Arthur chose to work with his wife, Rosalinde Gilbert, a struggling dress designer. He adopted her surname for business reasons, and the two of them quickly made a small fortune producing and marketing her evening gowns. In 1949, they decided to leave the damp and cold of London for the warm

California sun, and they moved to Los Angeles, intending to retire.

Instead of retiring, Arthur made a second fortune in real estate. Arthur ''never made money just for the sake of making money,'' as he liked to say, but he will be remembered not for how he made money, but rather how he spent it. His passion for collecting art came about almost accidently, while looking for decorations for his new home in Los Angeles. A friend suggested to him that he needed some silver to dress up the living room, so he purchased, in his words, a ″schmaltzy cabinet by the 18th century silversmith Paul de Lamerie.'' It was also this time that he bought his first micromosaics, which are images created by tiny threads of glass. Arthur became quite enamored with micromosaics, and eventually purchased over 200 pieces.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times (September 4, 2001) noted in its obituary of Mr. Gilbert that ''in time his collection grew to comprise several collections. The silver and silver-gilt items include scores of ornate tankards, dishes, candelabra and cups that once decorated the royal and aristocratic dinner tables of Europe. His gold collection was made up of some 20 gold snuff boxes, which like the 260 micromosaics, and his 80 portrait miniatures, are best appreciated through a magnifying glass.''

Arthur Gilbert was justifiably proud of his collection, and frequently he personally led tours through the museums which housed his collection. As his collection continued to expand, it eventually became too large for the space constraints at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, where it had been housed for some time. In 1996, Arthur accepted an offer to house his collection in the newly renovated Somerset House, an 18th century palace in London, where it is now displayed. He called it ''Britain's heritage regained,'' since many of the pieces originally belonged to British aristocrats. The collection—valued at over $200 million—has been open to the public since May of last year. In appreciation of this lavish bequest, Arthur Gilbert, who never renounced his British citizenship, was knighted in 1999.

In addition to his donated art collection, both Arthur and Rosalinde Gilbert were benefactors of numerous charities and organizations. These include the Arthur and Rosalinde Gilbert Center for the Advancement of Scientific Research. They have contributed generously to the February 1941 Foundation—an extraordinary foundation created to thank the Dutch people for assisting Jews fleeing Nazi persecution and downed Allied pilots during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Los Angeles Times (September 4, 2001) captured the essence of this outstanding philanthropist, when it quoted him: ''Whether you collect snuff boxes or matchboxes, don't buy because it's going up in value but because you like it or it will enhance your life —then give it away.'' I invite my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Sir Arthur Gilbert, an outstanding Californian and a generous philanthropist.

A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING WILLIAM DAVID PEOPLES

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, Whereas, Officer William David Peoples, of the Cambridge, Ohio Police Department has been recognized as its Officer of the Month for May 2001; and

Whereas, Officer Peoples has continually demonstrated a superlative degree of professionalism, care and commitment in his role as a police officer, and

Whereas, he was awarded the Exceptional Service Medal in 1995 for his heroic actions and effective problem solving as he helped deliver water to the 12,000 residents of Cambridge when a main line broke; and,

Whereas, he was again recognized with the Life Saving Medal with Silver Torch, in 1997 for his patience and bravery in the prevention of a suicide attempt;

Therefore, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the dedication and the exemplary service of Officer William D. Peoples, a man whom I am proud to call a constituent and one who serves as an example to us all.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMUNITY BAPTIST CHURCH OF SANTA ROSA, CA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleague from California, Ms. LYNN WOOLSEY, I wish today to recognize Community Baptist Church of Santa Rosa as this congregation celebrates the 50th anniversary of its founding.

A few African American families formed the hub of the church 50 years ago, which has since grown into a fully integrated congregation of 650 people, with three choirs, two youth groups, an on-site day care center, and a charter high school.

The congregation's first pastor was The Reverend Washington E. Boyce, who was serving as the assistant pastor at the First Missionary Baptist Church in the neighboring County of Marin when he traveled north to Sonoma County to enlist the support of local residents in building a spiritual community.

Community Baptist became an official congregation in 1951, and the first deacon, Curtis Wyatt, Jr., was ordained in 1952.

The first church services were held in members' homes and in community buildings in Santa Rosa. The first church building officially opened in 1956.

The Reverend James E. Coffee became the minister at Community Baptist Church in 1965 and has served the congregation for the past 36 years.

Over the course of the past 50 years, the church has played a vital spiritual and cultural role in Sonoma County and has enriched the lives of thousands of people.

The church is an active participant in the Hate-Free cities movement; has provided a home for self-help programs such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous; has initiated and maintains a four day annual Martin Luther King, Jr. celebration; has established and supports a community garden; has established and maintains a ministry of outreach to Lytton Ministries, a transition program for people trying to free themselves from addictions; and has established and supports the Second Sunday Morning Breakfasts, a forum for discussing, strategizing, and taking action on issues of civic, social and political importance.

The church also has an active youth program. It founded and runs the Village Project, which helps forge positive adult child relationships and the Rites of Passage program to help adolescents transition into adulthood. The church has also established a Martin Luther King, Jr. Scholarship program and actively supports the 100 Black Men Mentoring program.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of its vibrant history and traditions and its many contributions to Sonoma County, it is appropriate that we acknowledge today this pioneering congregation.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE THAT WORLD CONFERENCE AGAINST RACISM PRESENTS UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS GLOBAL DISCRIMINATION

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my severe disappointment regarding the lack of engagement by the United States in the United Nations World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, August 31–September 7, 2001, in Durban South Africa.

The United States has an extraordinary perspective on racism. It has made great strides towards addressing some of its problems. When the original Constitution was enacted, it declared African-Americans to be three-fifths of a human being. During Reconstruction, this very body initially refused to seat the first African-American Members of Congress. Today, there are thirty-nine African-American Members of Congress and numerous Cabinet officials. Though we have a long way to go with regards to race relations, we have come a long way.

This Nation presided over a slave trade that will go down in world history as one of the most grotesque examples of man's inhumanity to man. Once slavery was abolished, due in large part to pressure from other nations, parts of the United States then enacted codes designed to deny African-Americans their full citizenship rights. As abhorrent as this pattern

was, Americans of good conscience rose to the challenge and implemented laws to ensure equal treatment under the law. We have a long way to go, but we have come a long way.

This Administration owed it to all Americans to deliver the message of possibility to the world. Yet, unfortunately, this administration approached this conference with little interest and a miniscule commitment to engagement. Representatives of this Administration stymied the preparation that began during the previous Administration. Therefore, its withdrawal from the conference was not a surprise.

And while the actions in Durban were not surprising, hope that the refusal to discuss differences does not become the trademark of this Administration and mar its ability to engage in constructive dialogue about civil and human rights in this country. The withdrawal from Durban, combined with the lack of a domestic civil rights policy, an unwillingness to proceed with much-needed election reform and the glaring refusal to end racial profiling, leads me to doubt this Administration's ability to candidly and fairly address issues of race and diversity within this country.

Mr. Speaker, racism in real. Discrimination is real. The argument for reparations should be openly discussed and seriously debated in this country. America must face its current racial reality and reconcile with its inglorious racial past. I suggest that Members of this House begin our national healing by passing a resolution which offers an acknowledgement of the sufferings caused by slavery and an official apology for governmental actions which perpetrated their condition. If we, as Representatives of the United States Government, cannot apologize for this sorry and unfortunate history, our future will be forever marred and our enemies will be able to say that the United States left Durban because it did not want to address its own history.

I call upon the Congress and the President to show the leadership necessary to begin healing within our country.

A COMMANDING ROLE FOR JAMES N. GOLDSMITH

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate an ally of veterans everywhere and my close friend, James N. Goldsmith, upon his election as Commander-in-Chief for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. It is with particular pride that I note that Commander Goldsmith is a resident of Lapeer, Michigan.

Jim Goldsmith's election to head the VFW is a tribute to his many years of dutiful attention to the needs of veterans and the faith that his fellow veterans have placed in him for continued service and fidelity to their health and welfare. A decorated U.S. Army veteran who served in Vietnam, Jim has a deep and personal understanding of the obligation all citizens owe to the men and women who served this country during times of conflict on foreign soil and to those on active duty today.

Upon returning from Vietnam in 1967, Jim joined VFW Post 5666 in Flushing, Michigan, and he's been fighting on behalf of veterans ever since. A Life Member of VFW Post 4139 in Lapeer, Jim has held many posts in the local, state and national organization and he has received numerous awards. In 1978, Jim was selected as Michigan's ''Young Veteran of the Year,'' and, in 1980, he became the first Vietnam veteran to win election as Department Junior Vice Commander.

Jim has traveled the world to learn the concerns of active duty service members and reservists. Adhering to a soldier's code never to leave a buddy behind, Jim has remained committed to accounting for missing American service members. He has made two trips to Southeast Asia in efforts to recover the remains of those still missing. He also has been a strong advocate for addressing veterans' medical needs and has made diabetes research a top priority.

Never willing to accept full credit for his good deeds, Jim points to each of the 2.7 million members of the VFW and its Ladies Auxiliary as key to his efforts. He also singles out his sons, Jim and Jeff, for enabling him to serve their needs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing gratitude to Commander-in-Chief Goldsmith for his valiant, enthusiastic and ongoing work for veterans. I am confident that Jim will continue to find new and better avenues to assist the men and women who have put their lives on the line in defense of our great Nation.

RECOGNITION OF 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF SYRACUSE'S ST. BRIGID AND ST. JOSEPH'S PARISH

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 75th anniversary of St. Brigid and St. Joseph Church in Syracuse, New York. Its congregation is gathering to recognize this important milestone during a memorial mass and celebration on Sunday, September 16, 2001.

Established on May 26, 1926, and incorporated on August 9, 1926, St. Brigid's was formed from a portion of the rapidly growing St. Patrick's Parish on Tipperary Hill. While masses were first celebrated within St. Patrick's School by St. Brigid's founding pastor—Rev. William H. McCormick, the parish's first sanctuary was constructed the following year at the corner of Willis Avenue and Herkimer Street at a cost of $165,000. The church's cornerstone was laid on June 15, 1927 with its first mass on August 21st. St. Brigid's School opened on September 6th of that year under the direction of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondolet.

Since that time, the parish has grown considerably. Under the leadership of its second pastor—Rev. William J. Brennan, the parish's debt was retired. Construction of a larger sanctuary began in 1955 with a Dedication Day Mass celebrated in the new church on November 6, 1956. Rev. J. James Bannon was pastor at that time. In 1964, St. Brigid's merged with St. Joseph's French Church to become St. Brigid and St. Joseph's Parish. Rev. David J. Norcott became the combined church's first pastor followed by Rev. James A. McCloskey.

The parish is served today by Rev. Laurence W. Kennedy, Pastor, Mr. Leonard S. Monnat, Deacon, and Sister Theresa Brown, CSJ, Director of Human Development and Parish Minister. Approximately 510 families are served by St. Brigid and St. Joseph's Church. The parish continues to be a strong steward of Christian values and community outreach, ministering to the people of Syracuse's Westside.

On the occasion of its 75th anniversary, it is my honor to recognize the people of St. Brigid and St. Joseph's Church and to extend best wishes for many more successful years of faith-based ministry to follow.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROTECT THE PRIVACY RIGHTS OF OUR NATION'S UNIFORMED SERVICEMEMBERS

HON. RICK BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues Mr. SHAYS and Mr. WAXMAN, in introducing legislation to protect the privacy rights of our nation's uniformed servicemembers.

If enacted into law, the legislation we have put forward will clarify that the same right of privacy guaranteed to all other individuals under the Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act shall apply to members of the uniformed services.

The Privacy Act was established in 1974 to ensure that the information the Federal Government collected as part of the operations and practices of agencies is protected, and the agencies observe and safeguard the right to personal privacy.

The need for this legislation arises from a September 2000 federal district court ruling which stated that military servicemembers cannot sue for damages when records containing information about them, which under the terms of the Privacy Act may not be released, are released by the government in violation of the Privacy Act. The Court based its ruling on the Feres doctrine, a 51 year old judge-made doctrine which states that servicemembers cannot bring civil actions against the government for acts incident to service because they have benefits available through their military health and other programs. As a result of this ruling, there is no effective way to prevent the unauthorized release of sensitive military personnel records and no way to compensate servicemembers for damages arising from acts by government agencies that are in violation of the Privacy Act.

Congress enacted the Privacy Act with an unambiguous intent to make government responsible for the damages it causes when the

law is violated. Our bill clarifies the intent of Congress to ensure that the right of privacy granted under the Act shall apply to members of the uniformed services and that military personnel may use the remedies of the Privacy Act, the Feres doctrine notwithstanding. A right without a remedy is no right at all.

The merit of this legislation is clear. The government collects vast amounts of sensitive information from and about military servicemembers. Fairness requires that the information, once collected, be made secure. Moreover, such an assurance will be in aid of the recruitment efforts of all our volunteer armed forces.

I urge the speedy adoption of this legislation.

A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING ASSISTANT CHIEF ROBERT B. MCKENNA

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, Whereas, Robert B. McKenna successfully completed the Federal Emergency Management Agencies Executive Fire Officer Program; and,

Whereas, the Emergency Fire Officer Program is designed to provide senior officers with a broad perspective on various facets of fire administration; and,

Whereas, Robert McKenna throughout his career has dedicated himself to demonstrating the highest degree of professionalism;

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join with me in recognizing the impressive accomplishments of Robert B. McKenna, a leader in his community whom I am proud to call a constituent.

RECOGNIZING BRIGADIER GENERAL THOMAS KANE FOR HIS SERVICE AT TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Brigadier General Thomas P. Kane, Commander of the 60th Air Mobility Wing, Travis Air Force Base, California, upon his reassignment to NATO's Allied Command Europe as Deputy Director of the Reaction Force Air Staff in Kalcar, Germany.

As Commander of the 60 AMW, General Kane was responsible for the combined efforts of all operations and support activities associated with the worldwide air mobility mission and responsible for ensuring the readiness and well being of the installation's active duty, reserve and civilian personnel and their families. Aircraft and personnel under General Kane's command have responded to combat efforts and humanitarian relief efforts worldwide.

Travis Air Force Base and its personnel have flourished under General Kane's command. He has been a tireless advocate for decent, affordable housing, successfully obtaining an increase in the Basic Allowance for Housing allotment for Travis personnel.

He has also been one of the driving forces in the countywide Affordable Housing Task Force to pursue alternative sources of funding for off-base housing.

Through his leadership, the base, working in partnership with Pride Industries, has launched a website to assist the base population in their efforts to locate affordable housing.

General Kane organized a group of key individuals to help implement his vision of privatizing the museum at Travis Air Force Base as the Jimmy Doolittle Air and Space Museum. The fundraising phase of this project was inaugurated this summer.

In 2000, the 60th Air Mobility Wing won the coveted Solano Trophy, which is awarded annually to the best active duty wing in the 15th Air Force.

General Kane is a graduate of the United States Air Force Academy and holds advanced degrees from the Naval War College and the University of Southern California.

His military decorations include the Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal with four oak leaf clusters, Aerial Achievement Medal, Air Force Commendation Medal, Air Force Achievement Medal, Combat Readiness Medal with device, National Defense Service Medal with device and the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal.

Mr. Speaker, Brig. General Thomas P. Kane is a true patriot and distinguished American who has devoted himself to the service of our country. It is appropriate that we honor him today by expressing our gratitude for his dedication and wishing him well on his new NATO posting.

THE PASSING OF HARRY WEISBROD

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Mr. Harry Weisbrod, a champion of labor and an active participant in the public policy process. While an investigator for the Department of Labor, Mr. Weisbrod changed the collective bargaining process in this country forever by organizing the first union of federal employees. Later, as a founder of a wage and labor consulting firm, he fought to develop ways for companies to be prosperous without forsaking their responsibility to support a standard of living which every American worker deserves. During his extraordinary life, he worked both within government and with government to promote a quality of life for its workers.

Mr. Weisbrod was a veteran and party activist. He cheated on his eye exam in order to enter the United States Army during war-time. Later, as a resident of Dallas, he contributed to the improvement of the educational system by helping to organize the League for Educational Advancement in Dallas (LEAD), a grassroots organization devoted to school board reform. A true public servant, he was appointed to numerous Dallas boards and commissions, including the Dallas Civil Service Commission. Mr. Weisbrod believed in our system of government. He was an active participant in the Democratic Party and helped to develop many of its more progressive activities and programs.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Weisbrod transcended Earthly boundaries on September 1, 2001. Through this statement, it is my hope that the record of his service will be forever enshrined in American history.

C. KEVIN DYKEMA: CHARTING A COURSE FOR BAY CITY

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate my close friend, Bay City Times Publisher C. Kevin Dykema, for the instrumental role he played in bringing the extraordinarily successful Tall Ships Celebration 2001 to my hometown of Bay City, Michigan, and for his leadership in organizing the Maritime Festival that welcomed the vessels to our community.

As chairman of the Board of Directors of Bay City's Tall Ships Celebration, Kevin spent incalculable hours at the helm to steer a course for an event that has left residents of Bay City swelling with pride. Kevin deserves our highest praise and gratitude for his vision, hard work and dedication. The impact of his efforts will be felt for many years as permanent residents and visitors from all points on the map sing the praises of Bay City, Michigan, and list the celebration as yet another example of the city's welcoming attitude.

A long-time sailing enthusiast, Kevin turned his love for the water and his interest in maritime history into an economic windfall for the area when he initiated and fulfilled a plan to bring the Appledore schooner to Bay City as a permanent attraction and educational tool for students and adults to learn more about the unique environment of the Saginaw Bay. A cofounder of BaySail, Inc., the non-profit organization that oversees the Appledore, Kevin has been an enthusiastic and energetic booster of historical sailing ships. While the opportunity to lure the Tall Ships challenge to Bay City was certainly a labor of love for Kevin, he could not have anticipated the massive team effort or the extraordinary time commitment required. Yet, he pulled it all off with flying colors.

Such endeavors are nothing new for Kevin. He has been a vital and visible force in the community since first coming to town in 1991. His involvement in a wide-ranging number of service organizations and his willingness to step up to the plate to lead various volunteer efforts have served our community well. Of course, such involvement cannot occur without the support of family and Kevin has been fortunate to have the encouragement of his wife, Betsy, and children, Pete and Jane.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Kevin Dykema for his quiet yet firm hand in navigating Bay County, Michigan, on an unalterable course that will lead to further economic prosperity and perpetuation of the city's reputation as a welcome port-of-call for friends and visitors alike.

TRIBUTE TO DONNA SPEZIALE RICHARDS

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to a longtime Syracuse journalist who passed away as a result of a sudden brain aneurysm while visiting family in Florida.

For over 20 years, Donna Speziale Richards covered breaking news in Syracuse and Onondaga County as both a radio and television news reporter. Born in Syracuse, she was a graduate of Solvay High School and Onondaga Community College. She worked as a radio reporter for both WFBL–AM and WHEN–AM, where she also served as news director. She then went on to cover local stories for WTVH–TV5 as a television news reporter for eleven years.

1988 she won an Emmy award as a member of a team of reporters covering the bombing of Pam Am Flight 103. During her tenure as a journalist, Donna's work was recognized by the Associated Press Broadcasters Association, the state Broadcasters Association, and the Syracuse Press Club.

Most recently, Donna had left broadcasting to serve our community as a public relations specialist for the U.S. Small Business Administration office in Syracuse. Through her work in that position, she was known as an informative and helpful source for local media and business people and a committed federal employee.

Donna leaves her husband, Donald; two stepsons, David and Paul Richards; her mother, Mary Speziale; and a brother, Skip Speziale. She was 43 years old.

Throughout her career, Donna was not one to seek special recognition or the spotlight. With this honor, it is my hope that her local involvement and balanced work receives the attention that it deserves. Donna leaves a reputation for fair and accurate reporting that should serve as a lasting example for all young, local journalists who follow in her footsteps. She will be missed.

A TRIBUTE TO ROSE ANN VUICH

HON. CALVIN M. DOOLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to former California state senator Rose Ann Vuich, a mentor and friend of mine who passed away in Dinuba, California on August 30, 2001.

Rose Ann's parents immigrated from Yugoslavia to California's Central Valley, where the family ranched near the community of Cutler. After Rose Ann's father Obren passed away in 1940, her mother Stana and the family worked hard to keep the ranch prosperous. Their prosperity led them to eventually acquire three other ranches and allowed Rose Ann to open her own accounting firm in Dinuba.

Rose Ann was close to her family and deeply committed to her community. She served on the boards of the Tulare County Fair and Alta District Hospital and was active in political organizations.

Rose Ann was truly a barrier breaker. She paved the way for other women in public service by being elected as California's first female state senator in 1976. Before that, she was the first female president of the Dinuba Chamber of Commerce. She forced changes in the Senate, most notably when she rang a bell on her desk whenever male colleagues referred to the "gentlemen of the Senate."

During her sixteen years in the state senate, Rose Ann was a model public servant. She listened carefully to her constituents, represented them tirelessly, and set an example of integrity and character. She encouraged people to expect more of their elected officials, and her shadow over the Central Valley will be long.

She set a strong standard of ethical behavior that led her to raise tough questions about legislation before the Senate. She rose to become chairman of the Senate Banking and Commerce Committee, a position that allowed her to advocate on behalf of Valley agriculture. She also tirelessly shepherded construction of Highway 41 in Fresno, which she considered her proudest accomplishment.

On a personal level, I had the pleasure of serving as Rose Ann's Administrative Assistant immediately prior to my coming to Congress in 1990. I learned from Rose Ann the virtue and dedication of public service, and the importance of standing up for what is right.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to Rose Ann Vuich and celebrating her long and distinguished legacy of service to California's Central Valley.

A PROCLAMATION CELEBRATING THE 50TH BIRTHDAY OF ELLEN RATNER

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to my colleagues:

Whereas, Ellen Ratner was born August 28, 1951 and will be celebrating her 50th year surrounded by admiring friends and family; and,

Whereas, Ellen has much to be proud of as she reflects on her past accomplishments and anticipates her future endeavors; and,

Whereas, Ellen has achieved respect and notoriety among Presidents, Members of Congress, and foreign leaders as she has successfully navigated and illuminated the ever changing tide of American politics; and,

Whereas, Ellen is also an accomplished writer, authoring "The Other Side of the Family: A Book for Recovery from Abuse, Incest, and Neglect" as well as "101 Ways to Get Your Progressive Ideas on Talk Radio"; and,

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join with me in honoring Ellen Ratner as she celebrates 50 years of achievement. I am honored to be a close friend with a woman whom I hold in the highest esteem.

IN RECOGNITION OF DONALD ROWE'S DISTINGUISHED CAREER IN GOVERNMENT

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. DOUG OSE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues from Calfironia, Mr. George Miller and Mr. Ose, I wish today to recognize Donald R. Rowe, who is retiring this month following a long and distinguished career in county government.

Mr. Rowe retires as the Director of the Solano County Health Services Department, a position he has held for the past twelve years. As Director, he had the overall administrative, budget and leadership responsibilities for 1,200 employees and an annual operating budget of $187 million.

He was previously employed with the county from 1987 to 1989 as the Chief Executive Officer of Business and Personal Insurance Services.

Mr. Rowe came to Solano County from Fresno County where he worked as the Solid Waste Coordinator, as both a Senior and Principal Administrative Analyst in the County Administrator's Office, as the Associate Director of Health and as the Director of Health.

Mr. Rowe currently serves as Chair of the Solano Partnership Health Plan Board of Directors, which is one of five California health insurance organizations providing full service health maintenance coverage for the Medicaid population.

He is a member of the Executive and Legislative Committees of the County Health Executives Association of California, the State of California Health Information for Policy Project Committee and a founding member of the Solano Coalition for Better Health, a community wide collaborative health planning and community action committee.

Mr. Rowe holds a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Social Welfare from California State University, Fresno and a Master of Public Administration Degree from the University of San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, because of Donald Rowe's many contributions to county government, and specifically to Solano County, it is proper for us to honor him today.

THE PASSING OF DR. FOSTER KIDD

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life of Dr. Foster Kidd. Dr. Kidd was a true Texas community leader. He was tirelessly dedicated to improving the health of all Americans. He was the first African-American dentist appointed to the Texas State Board of Dental Examiners and made great strides toward helping the community understand the importance of oral health care. During his life, he chronicled the achievements of African-American dentists through numerous publications, including ''Profile of the Negro in American Dentistry.'' He was a dentistry expert, activist, historian, mentor, father, husband and friend to many.

Dr. Kidd was a leading authority on African-American orthodontic history, collecting scores of documents that tell the story of black dentists. He was also an extraordinarily effective mentor, using his love of golf to mentor local youths. Dr. Foster Kidd was a true Dallas hero.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Foster Kidd moved on to do his work in a better place on August 21, 2001. Those who knew him, however know that his work will continue to live on through his research, his books and the lasting impact he had on all who met him.

SHIRLEY ROBERTS: BRINGING FAIR WINDS TO BAY CITY

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my good friend, Bay Area Convention and Visitors Bureau Executive Director Shirley Roberts, and to express the gratitude of an entire community for her outstanding work in promoting my hometown of Bay City, Michigan. 1, along with the citizens of Bay City, am especially appreciative of Shirley's herculean efforts in bringing the Tall Ships Celebration 2001 and Maritime Festival to town this summer.

As one of the founders of BaySail, Inc., Shirley deftly navigated any and all obstacles to provide safe harbor for more than a dozen historical schooners to drop anchor in Bay City for an unprecedented nautical exhibit that truly put the community on the map as a destination point for tourists from near and far. Her efforts helped hundreds of thousands of visitors discover or rediscover Bay City, significantly enhancing the prosperity of the summer season for many small businesses, restaurants and tourist attractions. In addition, the event provided a wonderful opportunity for residents and others to get a glimpse into Bay City's legendary maritime history and its many contributions to the shipping industry.

Bay City has come to expect a lot from Shirley because she always delivers. Employing all the vim and vigor that she consistently has applied to other community endeavors, Shirley dove right into the Tall Ships project to ensure smooth sailing for seafarers and landlubbers alike. Moreover, Shirley's keen understanding that the success of any voyage depends equally upon the leadership of the skipper at the helm and the quality of the crew went a long way to making the event a smash hit.

Shirley has always been the first to acknowledge the role others have played in her accomplishments and her modesty is perhaps one reason for her remarkable ability to recruit and retain enthusiastic and hard-working paid staff and a legion of volunteers. In fact, it is a testament to her team-effort approach that so many volunteers answer the call whenever she asks. Shirley also enjoys the wholehearted and energetic support of her husband, David, and daughters, Michelle and Erika, and typically credits them for their role in her success.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in praising Shirley Roberts for her gung-ho spirit and unwavering devotion to Bay City and surrounding communities. I am confident she will continue to bring fair winds and Godspeed to any and all undertakings on behalf of the citizens of Bay County, Michigan.

TRIBUTE TO NEW YORK STATE SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, on October 12, 13, and 14, 2001, the New York State School Food Service Association will mark its 50th anniversary at its annual statewide conference in Syracuse, New York. The New York State School Food Service Association is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1951 whose goal it has been to provide wholesome meals to children in New York State schools.

Today, the association has 3,700 members and serves 1.6 million lunches and 450,000 breakfasts per day. In addition to providing nutritious meals, the association has fought for increases in the number of free and reduced-price meals served to children deemed to be in severe need as well as breaking down impediments to participation in the School Breakfast Program.

On behalf of the people of the 25th Congressional District in the State of New York, I extend my appreciation to the New York State School Food Service Association for their decades of tireless work on behalf of New York State's children. Additionally, it is my honor to congratulate the association on their semi-centennial anniversary conference and wish it continued success in ''Feeding America's Future.''

CHRISTO'S ''RUNNING FENCE''

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor those who worked on Christo's ''Running Fence'' on the occasion of its 25th anniversary. A project of the internationally renowned artist Christo and his wife Jeanne-Claude, the ''Running Fence'' was completed in Sonoma and Marin Counties on September 10, 1976, after 42 months of collaborative efforts.

These efforts included participation of the affected ranchers, 18 public hearings, three sessions at the Superior Courts of California, the drafting of a 450 page Environmental Impact Report, and the temporary use of the hills, sky, and ocean. The ''Running Fence'' was 18 feet high and its 24.5 miles in length crossed 14 roads, 59 ranches, and the town of Valley Ford. It extended from near Freeway 101 in Sonoma County to the Pacific Ocean at Bodega Bay. As promised, the project was removed 14 days after its completion and all the materials given to the ranchers.

The beauty of the ''Running Fence'', constructed of 240,000 square yards of white nylon, and the beauty of the California countryside complemented each other perfectly to create a breathtaking artistic vision.

Mr. Speaker, although the ''Running Fence'' was designed to be temporary, Christo's project will live forever in the imaginations of those who saw it and in its identification with the landscape of Sonoma and Marin Counties.

A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING BILL MAZEROSKI

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, Whereas, Bill Mazeroski will be inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame on Sunday, August 5, 2001 at 1:30 in the afternoon at the legendary Cooperstown, New York; and,

Whereas, Bill Mazeroski grew up in Turkeyfoot and Rush Run, Ohio where his dedication to the game lead him to perform arduous tasks for his Uncle so that he could earn enough money to purchase his first baseball glove; and,

Whereas, his professional career began as a second baseman for the Pittsburgh Pirates in 1956 and ended 17 great years later in 1972; and,

Whereas, Bill Mazeroski is an eight time Gold Glove winner and holds the major league record for the most double plays for a second baseman; and

Whereas, Bill Mazeroski became the first player ever to end the World Series with a home run; and,

Whereas, Bill Mazeroski is a National League all-time All-Star; and,

Whereas, his career total included 2,016 hits and a .983 field percentage at second base; and,

Whereas, he went on to cultivate new baseball talent as a coach for the Pittsburg Pirates and later for the Seattle Mariners;

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join with me in congratulating Bill Mazeroski, an exceptional athlete, one of Baseball's all time greats, and an Ohio Valley legend.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT HAUTMAN

HON. MARK R. KENNEDY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce a resolution honoring artists participating in the Federal Duck Stamp Program, especially Minnesota's very own, Robert Hautman.

Robert has successfully won his second Federal Duck Stamp competition with a winning pintail design after winning his first award in 1997-1998.

Robert and two of his brothers, James and Joseph, have seen their art featured on thirty-five state and federal stamps.

From the Oval Office to the Smithsonian Institute, their creations have been displayed in prominent places throughout Washington, D.C.

Congratulations Robert on this well-deserved award.

INDIAN RACISM EXPOSED AT RACISM CONFERENCE—PRESENTATION MOVES CONFERENCE TO TEARS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, at the World Conference on Racism in Durban, Dalit and Kashmiri activists showed up to exert pressure against India's racist caste system. The caste system, which discriminates against people merely because of the group into which they are born, is one of the most racist systems in the world.

The demonstrators handed out literature, buttons, and headbands demanding equal rights for all peoples. They have been chanting and drumming to force the caste system onto the agenda for the conference.

India argued for keeping casteism off the agenda in Durban, saying that there are laws against caste discrimination on the books. This is true, but unlike our civil rights laws, the anti-caste laws are never enforced and are routinely violated. Dalits are forced to use separate facilities, such as tea shops. Dalits are forced to endure separate living areas, separate burial grounds and restrictions on their movements. They cannot enter the temple. A few years ago, a Dalit constable entered a Hindu temple on a rainy day to seek refuge from the rain and he was stoned to death by the Brahmins in the temple. In another incident, a Dalit girl was blinded by her teacher after she drank water from the community water pitcher. This kind of racism is unforgivable, especially in a country that calls itself a democracy.

According to a report in Canada's National Post, a Dalit woman named Murugesan Manimegalai spoke at the Durban conference. She told the story of how her husband, with a tenth-grade education, was elected Sarpanch of their village—the president of the village council, similar to the mayor. Almost immediately, they received death threats from the upper-castes. "We will see how the president functions without a head," said one note. After he had been in office six months he was followed home on the bus. A group of men surrounded the road and told everyone "except Dalits" to leave. Then they grabbed Mr. Manimegalai and stabbed him in the stomach. Despite his pleas not to kill the other Dalits, they chopped up the six other Dalits in front of him. Then they murdered Mr. Manimegalal, chopped off his head, and threw it in a well. Unfortunately, incidents like this are all too common in India.

I would like to take this opportunity to salute the protestors for their success in bringing India's racism to the world's attention. That is the first step towards ending it.

Mr. Speaker, India must learn that a democracy respects the basic human rights of all people, not just those in a position of power and privilege. It must transcend its Brahminocracy and bring real democracy to all the people. How can people continue to live in the facade of Indian democracy when they cannot enjoy even the most basic rights?

America can help this process along. We should maintain the existing sanctions on India. We should stop all aid to India until the full range of human rights can be enjoyed by all the people there, not just the Brahmins. We should declare our overt support for the 17 freedom movements currently operating within India's borders. We can do so by supporting a free and fair plebiscite, under international supervision, on the question of independence for Khalistan, Kashmir, Nagaland, and the other minority nations living under the boot of Indian oppression. Former President Carter might be a good person to head an international monitoring team.

The Council of Khalistan has issued a press release praising the demonstrators who are bringing the issue of Indian racism to the forefront. The Information Times has also run an excellent article on the demonstrations. I would like to place them both into the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues. In addition, I would like to insert the National Post article into the RECORD.

[From the National Post, Sept. 6, 2001]

UN RACISM CONFERENCE MOVED TO TEARS, NOT ACTION—RACE VICTIMS TELL STORIES

(By Corinna Schuler)

DURBAN, SOUTH AFRICA.—In an oft-ignored chamber of the cavernous convention centre, the real victims of racism struggle to have their stories of suffering heard.

This is not one of the dozens of rooms where international negotiators spend days behind closed doors, locked in debate about where to place a comma or whether to spell "Holocaust" with a capital "H."

Here, persecuted people from every corner of the globe take their turn on stage between 1:30 p.m. and 3 p.m. every day to tell simple stories abut real suffering—the only forum at this massive United Nations gathering where the personal pain of discrimination is laid bare.

One day, the speaker was an escaped slave from Niger. The next, an aboriginal woman from Australia. Then, a migrant worker from Brazil.

Yesterday it was Murugesan Manimegalai's turn. The 29-year-old mother of four is a member of India's lowest caste, so impoverished she had never left the confines of her squalid settlement before boarding a plane this week for Durban. "I was very worried that it might fall," she confides with a shy smile. But she pushed her fear aside yesterday, took a deep breath and told the story of her husband's horrifying murder to a crowd of 200 human rights activists and a few journalists. By the time she was done, even the moderator was blinking back tears. "We are Dalits"—untouchables—began Ms. Manimegalai.

As one of India's 1.4 million lowest-caste people, she grew up in a segregated village—forbidden to draw water from the communal well or to attend the same temple as upper-caste people.

Her husband had only a Grade 10 education, but became an eloquent activist and was elected president of a village council. Members of the upper caste warned he would not last six months. "We will see how the president functions without a head," said one written death threat.

After six months in office, when Mr. Manimegalai took a trip into town, upper-caste people followed him home in a bus. A crowd of men blocked off the road, screaming wildly for everyone to run away—"except Dalits."

"They grabbed my husband by the shirt and stabbed him in the stomach. Even then, my husband pleaded with the dominant caste people not to kill the rest of the Dalits. They ignored him, and chopped the [six] others in front of his eyes." Ms. Manimegalai did not stop for a breath as the next words tumbled out. "Even after my husband's death, the anger, the bitterness, the caste-fanatic feeling did not subside."

"They cut off his head and threw it in a well nearby." Witnesses were too terrified to come forward and it was only after three years of protest that some of the attackers were finally jailed. "We strongly demand," Ms. Manimegalai concluded, "that the caste system in our country be abolished. We demand education for our children, job opportunities—and dignity." The roar of applause continued for a solid minute. When the diminutive Ms. Manimegalai stepped off the stage, a burly African woman grabbed her in a bear hug, sobbing. Ms. Manimegalai was overwhelmed as others waited in line to give a hug or shake her hand. Tears streamed down her face as she stood in the glare of the TV lights.

It was not the first time the Voices Forum has borne witness to such raw emotion. But many of the 1,100 journalists in Durban to cover the UN's World Conference Against Racism have been too preoccupied by arguments over Israel and demands for reparations for the colonial-era slave trade to take much note.

The armies of suited government officials working to write up a "historic" blueprint for fighting racism and intolerance were not present to hear Ms. Manimegalai's demands.

Many were in a room down the hall, arguing about whether words such as "descent" and "ethnic origin" should be included in the list of grounds for discrimination.

At the end of her speech, a moderator thanked Ms. Manimegalai and other presenters for having the courage to speak out.

''You should never doubt raising your voice in this chamber,'' she said assuringly. ''Never doubt the importance of doing that.''

The sorry truth is that the powerful testimonies heard in the Voices Forum have little chance of being incorporated into the UN's final declaration on racism, or its program of action.

''Cast out Caste'' posters have been plastered all across Durban and activists have handed out thousands of information brochures in an effort to highlight the injustice of the caste system in Hindu society. But India has fought all attempts to include any mention of caste, and neither the UN nor any government is pushing the point. The strongest language in the draft declaration comes in a single paragraph that refers to discrimination based on work or descent—and even those watered-down words seem set to be withdrawn. Likewise, Eastern European countries refuse to acknowledge the discrimination endured by the Roma, or gypsies, no matter how many emotional stories they have told in Durban this week.

The African slave girl who told her story moved an audience to tears, too.

Inside conference rooms, however, African government delegates are so engrossed in debate about the slave trade of centuries past there has been almost no talk of how people like 17-year-old Mariama Oumarou and 20,000 others in Niger could be spared the horror of slavery today.

Will this conference change Ms. Manimegalai's life? The document under such hot debate is not an international treaty or a UN resolution. In fact, it's not a legal document of any kind and—if agreement is reached here by tomorrow—countries are free to ignore it.

But, Ms. Manimegalai lives with the hope her presence here will help the suffering Dalits of India break free from their oppression. ''I am destitute,'' she said. ''My house is just a matchbox and I do not have enough money to care for my children. They are living with relatives.

''But when I saw the big crowd in the room today, I was not afraid. I was happy. At least I can tell the world our story. There are many people back home who are relying on me here.''

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE FOR VALLEY HOSPITAL IN RIDGWOOD, NEW JERSEY

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Ms. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Valley Hospital in Ridgewood, New Jersey, on the momentous occasion of their 50th anniversary of service to northern New Jersey. From a small and difficult beginning, the Valley Hospital has become a premier example of quality and commitment to medical excellence. This weekend, in celebration of their golden anniversary, the Valley Hospital ''Old Fashioned Fair'' will be held in the town of Ridgewood.

This remarkable hospital was once only a dream for the northwest New Jersey community. However, due to the perseverance of a small group of concerned community members, this vision of a hospital was transformed into a reality. Plans began nearly forty years before ground was even broken. In 1910, community groups gathered to raise money for a hospital, however the stock market crash and the Great Depression stalled their attempts. With the leadership of the Women's Auxiliary in 1944, local residents rallied again to donate almost $1,000,000 to break ground in 1949. Today we are able to congratulate the Valley Hospital on fifty years of outstanding service to northwest New Jersey. A passage from The Sunday News, dated June 19, 1951, illuminates the struggle and success of the hospital:

There has been discouragement and heartache, delay and disappointment. There have been set-backs of every conceivable variety during these years of construction but now at long last, comes the fulfillment of the dream—a community hospital completely equipped with every facility that modern medicine and modern science have developed, ready to take its place along with the best in the country in caring for those who are ill.

In August of 1951, the first patient walked through the doors of the Valley Hospital. That first year, over 4,000 patients entered those doors. In the following fifty years, the Valley Hospital expanded to meet the constantly changing needs of the growing community and implemented cutting-edge technology. Last year, the hospital administered to 42,540 patients and welcomed 3,221 babies. Thirty-five physicians of the Valley Hospital were named in the ''Best Doctors in New York'' list of the New York Magazine this year; a list compiled by their peers throughout regions of New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut. This month the Valley Health System, the hospital's umbrella organization, will be the nation's first health provider to feature Mayo Clinic health information on their website. As one can tell, this is a phenomenal group of people involved with the hospital.

The Valley Hospital has risen to preeminence on the national level in health care and medical technology for its patients. Under Mike Azzara's guidance as Chairman of Valley Health Systems, and Audrey Meyer's leadership as President and CEO of the Valley Hospital, the hospital has entered the 21st century as a premier provider of health care in not only New Jersey but the entire Northeast United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in commending the Valley Hospital for its service to the community in the past fifty years, and recognizing those committed to continuing its tradition of excellence in the future.

A TRIBUTE TO THE BLIND AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED CENTER OF MONTEREY COUNTY, INC.

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Blind and Visually Impaired Center of Monterey County, whose thirtieth anniversary was celebrated on August 12, 2001. The center has been assisting visually impaired individuals to transcend the loss of sight as independent, contributing community members of Monterey County, in my district. I am pleased to be able to honor their work here in the U.S. Congress.

The Blind and Visually Impaired Center of Monterey County offers a wide variety of services to its clients, and works to cater these services to each individual's needs. With such programs as Daily Living Skills and Braille Instruction, information and referral services, accessible technology, support groups, and an Orientation and Mobility Instruction course, this center offers much to the communities of Monterey County. Last year, the Blind'', and Visually Impaired Center provided direct services to three hundred forty-eight clients from twenty-two towns, cities, and villages. The clients live throughout Monterey County, from the coastline at Pebble Beach to the farm communities of Greenfield and King City.

I am proud to honor the work of the dedicated staff and volunteers at the Blind and Visually Impaired Center of Monterey County. The thirtieth anniversary of the center offers an opportunity to pay tribute to the hope of its founders and the diligence of those who work there. I look forward to their continued success.

NATIONAL PAYROLL WEEK

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the tireless efforts of payroll employees of this nation. September 3–7 is National Payroll Week. In honor of this week, we should all thank the more than 130 million payroll professionals who work tirelessly to ensure that workers receive their wages and federal employment taxes and worker earnings are reported.

Company payroll departments prepare over 4 billion paychecks each year. In addition to paying workers accurately and on time, payroll professionals play a key role in crucial government programs including the enforcement of fair labor standards, child support deductions and payments, unemployment insurance, Social Security taxes and benefits, and Medicare.

Payroll professionals deserve our thanks for helping maintain this nation's system of preserving funds for the American community. Regular efforts are made to educate ordinary workers about the payroll tax withholding system. Nationwide, 20,000 members of the American Payroll Association organize outreach programs for their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby ask you and our colleagues to join with me in thanking the payroll employees who are indeed, ''Working for America'' and proclaim September 3–7, 2001, National Payroll Week.

VIOLENCE PREVENTION WEEK

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 2001

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the community of Brownsville, Texas, for reminding our children about the values we cherish by commencing ''Violence Prevention Week'' as the new school year begins.

Each year, parents, students and educational professionals begin the school with more trepidation than we ever did, for today the worst-case scenario is not that our children will get in a fight, but that they will be a victim of gun violence.

Here in Texas, we know that if the central component of these tragedies were merely the existence of guns, the level of school violence we see today would have always been so. It is much more: the responsibility that family teaches (including gun safety and proper storage); the faith and tolerance taught by family, churches, synagogues and mosques; the entertainment our children see; and the everyday examples of behavior to which young people are exposed.

In short, it is many things. Our society at large is far less to blame for the incidents of violence we have seen in communities across the country than are the individual families and communities whose job it is to be a good example every day. We should teach responsibility, emphasize faith, and offer age-appropriate entertainment and examples of behavior to children.

Brownsville is taking an important step in speaking to the issue of school violence by planning Violence Prevention Week, sponsored by the Brownsville Independent School District, the local law enforcement agencies, the Brownsville Chamber of Commerce and the local church community.

Events throughout the week include: a formal proclamation and efforts to bring up the subject around the dinner table, essay contests to make the subject pertinent to students, a ''Violence Prevention Fair'' at a local mall, school addresses by Dana Scott, sister of Rachel Scott, was killed at Columbine, and the incorporation of topics relating to violence prevention into the school curriculum.

Events will culminate in a LIFE (Laborers in Fields of Education) breakfast for educators and community leaders on Saturday, Sept. 8. The guest speaker will be Darrell Scott, father of Rachel Scott, whose story of refusing to deny her faith at her killer's request inspired millions around the world.