

is to help Minnesota youth grow, develop, and foster leadership skills while serving their communities. The members, made up of traditional and "at risk" youth, lend a hand to the state's elderly, and provide a variety of other volunteer services in several Minnesota communities.

There are many other women and men who belong on this "Honor Role" of outstanding Minnesotans. During this month, we should all take time to remind ourselves of the important contributions made to our society by those of Asian American and Pacific Island descent, who bring with them rich cultures, desire for growth and opportunity, and the chance to achieve the American dream.

EXPORT PROMOTION PROGRAMS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to address the issue of U.S. trade policy, in particular the funds directed toward export promotion in the Bush administration fiscal year 2002 budget.

Until only recently, the United States had been experiencing the largest period of sustained economic growth in our history, with over 20 million jobs created, the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years, the lowest poverty rate in 20 years, and substantial increases in gross domestic product and productivity. According to nearly every analyst, there is a direct correlation between increased international trade and these statistics, with exporting firms and workers contributing as much as 30 percent to our economic growth. Exports in U.S. goods and services have risen by almost 50 percent over the last eight years. This translates into increased international sales for business of all sizes, increased opportunities for high-wage employment, and enhanced economic security for Americans.

Significantly, our trade policy over the last 8 years has included tangible resources directed toward export promotion initiatives, the primary goal being to ensure that exporters, large, medium, and small, could take advantage of market opportunities occurring as a result of international trade negotiations and market liberalization. Included in this trade strategy were a range of policy programs, from trade promotion and financing, to market monitoring and compliance, to database creation and business counseling, all of which were specifically designed to ensure that U.S. firms of all sizes had the information they needed, that they were positioned to take advantage of foreign markets, and, in this manner, that we could unlock the full potential of our national economy.

As I examine the current budget I am concerned that this commitment to export promotion has weakened significantly under the new administration. Given the rapid changes occurring in

the international political economy, I am concerned that the administration is ignoring the challenges U.S. firms now face with their competition. Given the emphasis placed on these programs by foreign governments at this time, I am concerned about the effect this change will have on the level of our exports. Given the state of our economy at this time, I am concerned this will simply be another factor contributing to a decline in economic growth.

Let me give some specific examples of the budget cuts I am referring to. Based on the budget numbers provided by President Bush: Funding for the Trade Development Program, which performs trade investment analyses, works with firms to identify and capitalize on overseas trade opportunities, and conducts export promotion programs, will decrease from \$66 million last year to \$52 million this year. Funding for the Market Access and Compliance Program, which monitors foreign country compliance with multilateral and bilateral trade agreements, will decrease from \$33 million last year to \$28 million this year. Funding for the U.S. Foreign and Commercial Services, which maintains databases on markets overseas and counsels U.S. firms on export opportunities, will decrease from \$199 million last year to \$194 million this year. Funding for the Export-Import Bank, which provides export financing for U.S. companies, will decrease from \$865 million last year to \$633 million this year. Funding for the International Trade Administration, whose primary goal is to expand opportunities for sales by U.S. firms in foreign markets, falls from \$364 million last year to \$361 million this year.

From where I stand, we should not be cutting back on funding for these programs. On the contrary, we should increase funds for programs designed to translate American productivity, vitality, and ingenuity into sales overseas. Unfortunately, what we see here is a policy that runs contrary to the needs of our own country, and, significantly, the policies of most countries in the global trading system. The Bush administration trade policy incorrectly assumes that market imperfections do not exist, and that assistance to firms represents interference in the way the market works. If you look around the world and examine the trade and export policies of other countries, you will see this policy is an anomaly.

If you go down the list of our trading partners anywhere in the world—be it Japan, France, Canada, Mexico, or Brazil—all consider the exports of their goods and services to be a top government priority, and, according to the U.S. Commerce Department, contribute substantial resources, both human and financial, to this goal. The most recent data available shows that the United States ranks dead last

among a group of our trading partners, measured in terms of spending on export promotion as a percentage of GDP. And these data were calculated prior to the fiscal year 2002 budget cuts by the Bush Administration. All of these countries—France, Canada, Germany, Italy, Japan, the UK, Korea, Spain, Sweden, and the Netherlands—understand that trade is not an end in and of itself, but one of the tools by which governments can raise the living standards of its people.

In his nomination testimony before the Finance Committee in January, U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick stated that President Bush assigned a high priority to trade policy as part of his domestic and international agenda. He argued at that time that trade policy is important not only because it incrementally improves the economic welfare of all Americans, but also because it shapes the basic framework of the international system. Through international trade we not only export goods and services, we also export democratic values and stability.

I agree with this statement. But my concern is that the Bush Administration is committed to this kind of trade policy in rhetoric alone. Their budget for export promotion activities suggests that they are unwilling to back up their words with substance—in this case, real funding for the programs that do the work needed to help U.S. firms. From where I sit, it is essential that the United States fund these programs so American business can continue to act as an engine of growth for the country. I am convinced that there is a national economic interest, tangible and beneficial, that needs to be pursued in an effective manner by the United States. While I accept the notion of free markets, I believe there are imperfections and biases in the international trading system that necessitate a commitment of resources to trade and export policy.

President Bush has argued that he has focused on the people's priorities in his budget and put first things first. I would argue that his trade policy—the resources directed toward export promotion policy in particular—are simply another example of the fundamental flaws in his strategic goals for the country. There is still time to make a change in direction. There is still time to fund the programs that have done so much for American businesses and the American people. I urge the Administration to reconsider the funding levels for these programs, and bring them back to the appropriate level.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, May 7, 2001, the Federal debt stood at \$5,643,605,408,260.92. Five trillion, six

hundred forty-three billion, six hundred five million, four hundred eight thousand, two hundred sixty dollars and ninety-two cents.

Five years ago, May 7, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,093,910,000,000, Five trillion, ninety-three billion, nine hundred ten million.

Ten years ago, May 7, 1991, the Federal debt stood at \$3,437,531,000,000, Three trillion, four hundred thirty-seven billion, five hundred thirty-one million.

Fifteen years ago, May 7, 1986, the Federal debt stood at \$2,018,050,000,000, Two trillion, eighteen billion, fifty million.

Twenty-five years ago, May 7, 1976, the Federal debt stood at \$598,331,000,000, Five hundred ninety-eight billion, three hundred thirty-one million, which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion, \$5,045,274,408,260.92, Five trillion, forty-five billion, two hundred seventy-four million, four hundred eight thousand, two hundred sixty dollars and ninety-two cents during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

LIEUTENANT GENERAL DANIEL W. CHRISTMAN

• Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the career of an outstanding soldier and a good friend, Lieutenant General Daniel W. Christman, who is retiring after more than thirty-six years of active military service. General Christman's exemplary military career, culminating in five years as the Commanding General and Superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point, exemplifies the professionalism and seriousness of purpose that have helped make the U.S. military the best in the world.

Prior to his service at the United States Military Academy, General Christman had a remarkable military career for over 30 years. General Christman graduated first in his class from West Point and later taught in the Department of Social Sciences as an Assistant Professor of Economics. He has held several senior executive positions in the Army, all of which have taken advantage of his unique talents for creative leadership and strategic vision. Using his training in civil engineering, he has commanded a major U.S. Army Corps of Engineer District in Savannah Georgia and headed the Army's Engineer School in the early 1990s.

Throughout his distinguished career, General Christman has played a vital role in development and implementation of some of the most important security policy issues of the last several decades. He served in the Ford Administration as a member of the National

Security Council Staff. During the Gulf War, he directed a strategic planning group which advised the Army's Chief of Staff on war prosecution policies. He represented the U.S. in Brussels, Belgium as a member of NATO's Military Committee where he had active involvement in the historic expansion of NATO, pursuing peace in the Balkans and military dialogue with Russia. Immediately before arriving at West Point, General Christman served for two years as Assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Pentagon. In that position he advised the Secretary of State on a broad range of issues, including arms control with Russia and Middle East peace negotiations between Israel and Syria.

General Christman's tenure as the 55th Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy has been marked by a forward thinking strategic vision and the development of a more cooperative and positive environment at the Academy. I met with General Christman soon after I was sworn in as Senator and have been greatly impressed by his leadership at West Point. His success at obtaining critical funding support has enabled West Point to continue to attract high quality young cadets willing to embark on Army careers. He helped to raise funds for the Center for the Professional Military Ethic, as well as endowments for several academic department chairs and improved athletic facilities. He helped to inspire the creation of a dynamic and forward-looking Strategic Vision for the U.S. Military Academy 2010.

General Christman's exemplary service and devotion to duty, honor and country have left a lasting impact on the U.S. Military Academy, and indeed the U.S. Army. His numerous awards reflect the respect and admiration of those who have had the privilege to serve with him. I join my fellow Senators in wishing General Christman the best of luck in his future endeavors and my sincerest gratitude for his distinguished service to his country. •

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL DANIEL W. CHRISTMAN

• Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the outstanding service to our nation of Lieutenant General Daniel William Christman, the 55th Superintendent of the United States Military Academy. On June 30, 2001, General Christman will retire from the United States Army after an outstanding career of more than 36 years of service in peace and in war to the Army and the Nation.

General Christman is a modern model of the soldier-scholar. After graduating first in his class from West Point in 1965, then young second Lieutenant Christman traveled to Fort Benning to undertake the Ranger Course. He then served as a Platoon

Leader and later as a Commander in the 2d Infantry Division, Korea. In 1969, he commanded a company in the 101st Airborne Division in Vietnam.

Returning from combat, General Christman went on to distinguish himself in numerous command and staff positions with U.S. Forces, both overseas and in the Continental United States. In Europe, his assignments included serving as the 19th U.S. Representative to the NATO Military Committee in Brussels, Belgium, and Commander of the 54th Engineer Battalion in Wildflecken, Germany.

General Christman's key command positions included service as the Commanding General of the U.S. Army Engineer Center and Commandant of the U.S. Army Engineer School at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, and Commander of the Savannah District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in Savannah, Georgia.

General Christman occupied senior executive positions in Washington, D.C. which required creative leadership and strategic vision. He served as a Staff Assistant with the National Security Council during the Ford Administration, and as Assistant to the U.S. Attorney General for National Security Affairs in the Reagan Administration. General Christman was the Director of Strategy, Plans and Policy at the Department of Army Headquarters. In this capacity, he supported negotiations relating to the Conventional Forces in Europe arms control talks between NATO and the Warsaw Pact on behalf of the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He also served as Assistant to General Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff advising the Secretary of State on a broad range of military and national security issues such as arms control with the Russian Federation and the Middle East peace negotiations between Israel and Syria.

Over the years, General Christman also found time to continue his own education. He earned a Masters Degree in Civil Engineering and a Masters Degree in Public Administration from Princeton University, and holds a Law Degree from George Washington University.

For his service, General Christman has received, among others, the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Army Distinguished Service Medal, the Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal, Merit Service Medal and the Air Medal.

General Christman has made many valuable contributions to our nation and the Army, but I believe that he has left his most indelible mark on the United States Military Academy, the institution where he began, and will soon end his Army career. After his graduation, General Christman first returned to his alma mater in 1970 as an Instructor, and later Assistant Professor in the Department of Social