American companies are barred from entering foreign markets, competitors from Asia and Europe are poised to take advantage. Without multilateral support for sanctions, then, the punitive effect of banning American business from a country may be minimal at best.

Second, imposing unilateral sanctions means lost American jobs. It is self-evident that keeping American companies out of foreign markets means lost American wealth.

Third, unilateral sanctions will not necessarily end a foreign government’s use of terrorism. In fact, in cases where terrorist regimes are generally supported by their subjects, imposing sanctions is likely only to increase anti-American sentiment and strengthen the hold of those in power.

I do support unilateral sanctions in certain targeted instances, for example with Iran. But taking away the President’s prerogative to choose and Congress’s ability to assess whether to use this blunt policy tool, as the bill before us would do, will make our antiterrorism foreign policy worse, not better.

Mr. Speaker, we should do everything in our power to end all forms of terrorism. We are right to lead international efforts to isolate and punish terrorists. But imposing the automatic one-size-fits-all response to terrorism contained in H.R. 748 will be ineffective and costly. I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. If the gentleman does not, I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELAHUNT. No, I do not, Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for his reassurances.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCollum] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 748, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair’s prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LAW ENFORCEMENT TECHNOLOGY ADVERTISEMENT CLARIFICATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1840), to provide a law enforcement exception to the prohibition on the advertising of certain electronic devices.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1840

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 “Law Enforcement Technology Advertisement Clarification Act of 1997.”

SEC. 2. EXCLUSION TO PROHIBITION ON ADVERTISEMENT.

Section 521 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) It shall not be unlawful under this section to advertise for sale a device described in subsection (1) if the advertisement is mailed, sent, or carried in interstate or foreign commerce solely to a domestic provider of wire or electronic communication service or to an agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision thereof which is duly authorized to use such device.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCollum] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Delahunt] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCollum].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1840, the Law Enforcement Technology Advertisement Clarification Act, makes a small change to section 521 of title 18, United States Code. The section states that any person who places in any newspaper, magazine, handbill, or other publication, any advertisement of any electronic, mechanical, or other device primarily useful for the purposes of surreptitious interception shall be fined and imprisoned. Thus, current law rightfully prohibits the widespread advertisement of electronic interception devices.

Unfortunately, this blanket prohibition against all advertisements includes advertisements to legitimate law enforcement users. Police departments may not receive mailings from manufacturers or distributors of this technology be able to contact law enforcement agencies and make them aware of improvements. That is the only purpose of this legislation.

It is certainly very important to protect privacy rights of Americans in this country, and this bill does not grant any new authority to law enforcement in the area of electronic interception. Although law enforcement may already legally use devices intended for surreptitious interception, nothing in this bill is altering existing law. This change only relates to advertisement of such equipment through the Federal Bureau of Investigation to ensure that this language will only provide relief to companies that manufacture law enforcement related equipment, and I would like to thank Director Freeh for his assistance with this legislation.

Again the sole purpose of this bill is to allow for the advertisement of such equipment to police departments. It is a very small change but one which could have a very big impact for police departments around the country, and I urge the adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will be very brief. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCollum] for introducing this bill. It is straightforward, it is a sensible exception to that broad prohibition which he alluded to on the advertising of electronic surveillance technology. As he indicated, current law prohibits manufacturers from advertising such devices to legitimate law enforcement agencies. This bill would simply allow such advertising as long as the recipient of the advertising is duly authorized to use the particular devices.

Mr. Speaker, I support the legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCollum] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1840. The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TELEMARKETING FRAUD PREVENTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1847) to improve the criminal law relating to fraud against consumers, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentle
man from Florida?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker. Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Pursuant to section 2326 of title 18 of the United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend the sentencing guidelines to provide a sentencing enhancement for any offense listed in section 2326 of title 18, United States Code—

(1) by at least 4 levels if the circumstances authorizing an additional term of imprisonment under section 2326(2) are present; and

(2) by at least 8 levels if the circumstances authorizing an additional term of imprisonment under section 2326(2) are present.

SEC. 4. INCREASED PUNISHMENT FOR USE OF FOREIGN LOCATION TO EVADE PROSECUTION.

Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend the sentencing guidelines to provide a sentencing enhancement for any offense listed in section 2326 of title 18, United States Code—

(1) by at least 4 levels if the circumstances authorizing an additional term of imprisonment under section 2326(2) are present; and

(2) by at least 8 levels if the circumstances authorizing an additional term of imprisonment under section 2326(2) are present.

SEC. 5. SENTENCING COMMISSION DUTIES.

The Sentencing Commission shall ensure that the sentences, guidelines, and policy statements for offenders convicted of offenses described in sections 3 and 4 are appropriately severe and reasonably consistent with other relevant directives and with other guidelines.

SEC. 6. CLARIFICATION OF ENHANCEMENT OF PENALTIES.

Section 2327(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "under this chapter" and inserting "for which an enhanced penalty is provided under section 2326 of this title".

SEC. 7. ADDITION OF CONSPIRACY OFFENSES TO SECTION 2326 ENHANCEMENT.

Section 2326 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ", or a conspiracy to commit such an offense," after "or 1344".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] and the gentle
man from Massachusetts [Mr. DELAHUNT] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM].

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.
the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the author of this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, Mr. Speaker, and I especially thank him as chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime for his leadership in helping to move this important legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by reading from an article in last week's New York Times dated June 29. The article describes a recent investigation by Federal prosecutors targeting fraudulent telemarketers based out of Chattanooga, TN.

According to Federal officials, at least 100,000 people, most of them elderly, sent $35 million to fraudulent telemarketers based there from 1992 to 1995. According to the Times, and I quote:

These scams were connected loosely, if at all. They ranged from single operators to 30-person operations. Typically, the lonely grandmothers and grandfathers were told that they had won one of four prizes: a new car, a Hawaiian vacation, $25,000 in cash, or $10,000. They were then asked to send a check, usually for hundreds or thousands of dollars, by overnight mail to cover taxes, postage, and handling for the winnings. If the taxes were high, the telemarketer would say, "Then the prize must be wonderful." According to the woman from New York who had fallen prey to the slick criminals, "I have been a widow for 19 years. It is very lonely. They were nice on the phone. They became my friends."

Fortunately, Federal prosecutors succeeded in winning convictions of 50 people as a result of their investigation. However, the average sentence in those 50 cases was less than 3 years for each person. Many of these people will be eligible for parole even sooner. The legislation I am offering today will send a loud and clear message to fraudulent telemarketers: the punishment for destroying the lives of our Nation's most vulnerable citizens will fit the crime, and it will be severe.

Telemarketing fraud has become a critical problem across the country, but especially in my home State of Virginia, where it has made victims of countless unsuspecting folks and their families.

Who are these victims? They are most often the elderly and disabled, those who have contributed so much to our society over the years. They are veterans of World War II and Korea, they are our retired schoolteachers, they are our parents and grandparents. Many of these victims, longtime residents of southwestern and central Virginia, come from a time when one's word was his or her bond, and they are often misled by their芷 artistic, poetic side, to say whatever it takes to separate victims from their money. It has been estimated by the FBI that nearly 80 percent of all targeted telemarketing fraud victims are elderly.

Who are these people who victimize our Nation's elderly? They are white-collar thugs who contribute nothing to our society but grief. They choose to strip victims not only of their hard-earned money but also of their dignity. They are swindlers who con our senior citizens out of their life savings by playing on their trust, sympathy and, if that does not work, their fear.

These criminals have said that they do not fear prosecution because they count on their victims' physical or mental infirmity or the embarrassment that victims feel from being scammed to prevent them from testifying at trial. Even if they are brought to trial, they are currently not deterred from engaging in telemarketing fraud because the penalties are so weak.

My bill raises the risk for criminals by directing the U.S. Sentencing Commission to increase by four levels the sentencing guidelines for fraudulent telemarketers and by eight for those who defraud those most vulnerable in our society, those over the age of 55.

My bill also includes conspiracy language to help put a stop to the targeting of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State. Virginia is now the target of Virginia as a victim State. Virginia is currently called a victim State.

My bill also offers a number of unintended consequences, unintended problems.

I am aware of the fact that the authors of the bill, the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from New York, have tried to meet some of the objections that the administration has put forward. I am also aware that the administration was probably late into the game as this bill was moving along. I appreciate that they are trying to deal with those problems by including a number of exceptions in the bill. My concern is that they cannot see every problem or circumstance, and I think what is really needed in this bill to make it okay is a waiver authority for the President.

Let me try to spell out very quickly some of the consequences that I see in this bill, and I know they are not intended by the authors. I think the bill would not help and could harm the peace process. All of us realize that process is at a very fragile state today, a very high priority for the United States, for the United States is trying to restart the peace talks.

The prohibition on financial transactions, for example, with Syria in this bill will not make it any easier and could make it a lot more difficult for the United States to act as a catalyst in the peace talks between Israel and Syria. I think it is quite possible that the bill could hurt counterterrorism cooperation.

The authors of the bill are exactly correct when they say that Syria continues to provide safe haven and logistical support to some of the groups engaged in terrorism. It is also true, however, that Syria has been helpful to the United States on certain terrorism cases. This bill would make cooperation by Syria more difficult.

I think the bill's exceptions are too narrow and could harm U.S. interests. For example, the emergency medical services exception does not include...
As I stated before he got here, a number of the provisions in the bill, in my personal belief and that of my staff and the experts we have had look at it, do cover and do address those areas of concern. Again, as I stated earlier, it seems to me that for that particular Sanctioning countries with the named terrorist countries, Iran, Iraq, Sudan, North Korea, Libya, Syria, that it is very important that we do send this message, that we are not going to allow financial transactions from citizens of these countries and those governments as long as they are on the terrorist list.

I will continue to work with the administration and with the gentleman from Indiana as well as others to improve this bill as we go forward, but it does occur to me that at the present moment there is no peace process with respect to Syria. I wish there were. I hope there will be.

I certainly would like to see this bill, if anything, encourage that process. Syria certainly could do so by dropping those things which it is doing that puts it on the terrorist list, albeit maybe lesser than those things which some of the other countries on the list are doing.

Mr. Speaker, returning to the subject at hand, the bill that is before us of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Goodlatte], H.R. 1847, regarding telemarketing fraud, affects just about everybody who owns a telephone.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Stearns] on H.R. 1847.

[Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of this legislation sponsored by my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Goodlatte], and reported out of the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary, chaired by another good friend, the gentleman from Orlando, F.L., Mr. Bill McCollum.

There is a quote by Sir Walter Scott that goes something like this: "Oh, what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive." I think that quote by Sir Walter Scott sort of summarizes what we are here for. It is perhaps a perfect description of the fraud committed by the unscrupulous telemarketers who prey on the susceptibility of our citizens. Particularly in Florida we have senior citizens, elderly people, and I think telemarketing should be something that people would use to prey on our citizens.

I was the original cosponsor of this legislation when it was first introduced on January 21, 1997, when I believe the bill dilution was H.R. 474. Now it is H.R. 1847. It has been strengthened, I think, through the committee process, so I think the current version is even better.

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

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
Telemarketing fraud is really one of the most dastardly types of crimes in this country. The bill will do a lot to enforce that law and to make much tougher punishments.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H. Res. 154.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT NATION'S CHILDREN ARE ITS MOST VALUABLE ASSET AND THEIR PROTECTION SHOULD BE HIGHEST PRIORITY**

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 154) expressing the sense of the House that the Nation's children are its most valuable assets and that their protection should be the Nation's highest priority.

The Clerk read as follows:

**H. RES. 154**

Whereas the Nation's most valuable and vulnerable asset is its children;

Whereas their protection should be one of our highest priorities;

Whereas nearly two-thirds of State prisoners serving time for rape and sexual assault victimized children; and

Whereas in danger. Losing a child is a nightmarish experience about the need for increased child protection.

The resolution, prepared in consultation with National Missing Children's Day, is a declaration by this Congress that child abduction is a very serious matter and that we intend to work with State and local law enforcement to ensure that effective and appropriate measures are in place to prevent crimes against children.

Justice Department statistics indicate that over 1 million children are reported missing each year. Over 100,000 abductions of children are attempted by nonfamily members annually. This resolution includes these and other statistics in its findings, in addition to providing that States should have in place laws which severely punish individuals convicted of offenses against children. The resolution declares that law enforcement agencies should take steps necessary to safeguard children against the dangers of abduction and exploitation and should work in close cooperation with Federal law enforcement to form an efficient response to reports of child abductions, especially in cases where a life may be in danger. Losing a child is a nightmare which becomes a reality for too many Americans. I would like to commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS] for his efforts and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution declares that protection of children should be our highest national priority. I certainly share the concern expressed in the bill that is before us. If someone's child is missing, they are more concerned about that than any other issue.

However, I do recognize that it is important and necessary for the Congress to reaffirm even such self-evident truths. I commend the author of the bill, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS] for doing so.

How the States choose to protect our children is, of course, another matter. This resolution does not actually require the States to do anything. For that reason, it was reported favorably by our committee without dissent. But it does urge States to take various actions which the States favor, including the adoption of laws that require the registration of convicted sex offenders, and severely punish those who commit offenses against children. Most of the States already do those things. But again, I recognize that it is sometimes useful for the Congress to encourage the States to do what they are already doing.

Given so much harmonious agreement, it seems out of place to strike a discordant note, but there is something that does trouble me about this resolution. What troubles me is the implicit assumption that the people responsible for local law enforcement have more to learn from the Congress than we have to learn from them. I know from my own experience in law enforcement that this is simply not the case. If communities around the country choose to adopt these kinds of measures, it will not be because Congress thinks they should. It will be because they have determined that these measures are the best way to protect their children for whom they are responsible. If they do not do so, it will not be because they care less about their children than we do; it will be because they have chosen other ways which they think would be more effective within their communities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, once we have affirmed our concern for the well-being of America's children, I hope we will remember the many other things that threaten them. Things like malnutrition, lack of education, inadequate health care.

Unlike local law enforcement, these are things that we can do something about.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of this bill, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Florida for both their willingness and how important it is at times for us to remind ourselves and to remind our State and local officials and also our law enforcement officials of the importance of our children and to remind them, too, that we are all concerned and very interested in their protection.

As the father of four and the grandfather of six and, by the way, Mr. Speaker, I put my request in to my four children hopefully to get a baker's...