

one Mexican national has been extradited.

What is really sad is the major producers, the major traffickers in methamphetamines were the Amezcua brothers. And recently, to kick sand in our face, to really slap the United States, Mexican judicial officials threw out the charges on two of the Amezcua brothers, and they, in fact, still have not been extradited to the United States. Indicted in the United States, requests for extradition, and again over 40 major drug traffickers, Mexican nationals, not one extradited to the United States.

Also we requested radar in the South to stop the trafficking coming up through Central and South America, and that has not been done by the Mexicans. We have asked that our DEA agents, after we had the murder of one of our agents some years ago, that they be armed to be able to protect themselves. And we have a very limited number of DEA agents because Mexico has limited the number of agents. And we still to this date have not had co-operation in allowing our agents to defend themselves.

So we see a situation that is very critical in the United States; incredible numbers of death, the effect on our young people, the cost to our society, the cost to this Congress, the cost to mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters who have lost loved ones. We have seen a close-down of the war on drugs in 1993 and 1995 and a restarting by this new majority where we put the resources back in. We started the source country programs, the interdiction. We brought the military and the Coast Guard back into the effort, a real effort.

This new majority also passed a 190-million-plus program, unprecedented, to start dealing with demand reduction, educating our young people. And that money is matched by private sector donations, very cost-effective. So we have taken some steps. We do not want to take a step backward.

Tomorrow we will hear about drug legalization, decriminalization, and harm reduction from those leaders of the administration. It is my hope again to continue this effort before the House of Representatives, before the Congress, because it is the most important social question, the most important criminal justice question, the most important societal question facing the American people and our Congress again in great cost in lives and money. And we will be back.

So tonight, as I conclude, I thank those who have listened, Mr. Speaker, and who are willing to take up arms and efforts in combatting illegal narcotics. I thank my colleagues for their attention. And I promise, as General MacArthur said, I shall return and will continue to bring this topic before the Congress and the American people.

#### NAVAL CONFRONTATION BETWEEN SOUTH KOREA AND NORTH KOREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak of a challenge and a threat that has not diminished, but indeed has grown more apparent with each passing day.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, as this legislative day began during morning hour, I came to the well of this House to discuss disturbing reports that appeared on the international news wires and in various publications and in the electronic media earlier today concerning trouble in yet another dangerous location in this world, news that there had, in fact, been a naval confrontation between South Korea and the outlaw nation we know as North Korea.

I was astounded, Mr. Speaker, to hear a spokesman for our government recount the action this morning by saying, well, typically when there has been a confrontation at sea between two vessels involving North and South Korea, the North Koreans in the past have chosen to not engage in any way, and we do not know why the North Koreans chose to engage in this particular instance.

Mr. Speaker, I was surprised at that expression of amazement on the part of one of our government spokesmen, because it has become readily, painfully, dangerously apparent that the outlaw nation of North Korea, short as it is on food for its people, confronting of famine, depleted as it is from any notion of freedom, ruled by a despot, but ironically empowered as it is by the proliferation of nuclear technologies, all these factors come together to show us why North Korea as an outlaw nation is no shrinking violet on the international scene.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, as we catalogue the state of affairs confronting our national security, and as we are mindful of our constitutional duty to provide for the common defense, there are some disturbing realities: A bipartisan commission of this House exposing the unauthorized, unlawful transfers of technology to Communist China; subsequent reports and investigations indicate that the Chinese theft of our nuclear secrets and that the espionage is ongoing; coupled with the proliferation to other nations; the nuclear genie out of the bottle; the sharing of technologies with Pakistan; and the aforementioned rise of North Korea also through the sharing of information.

□ 2215

But more disturbing, Mr. Speaker, than the espionage, if that is possible, is, once again, the tragic dereliction of duties that this administration has engaged in, and perhaps that is a term that works at cross-purposes for what I want to discuss tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall in the days following my election to this institution, prior to being sworn in to the 104th Congress, I had occasion to meet with the now former Secretary of Defense, William Perry. Secretary Perry was an apostle of a notion of strategic partnership, constructive engagement, and ultimately, the transfer of technology to North Korea. I was disturbed as a private citizen, reading even then in the early days of this administration that it was the intent of this administration to share nuclear technologies, albeit ostensibly for power and peaceful purposes, with the outlaw Nation of North Korea, the insistence of this administration to give the North Koreans a pair of nuclear reactors. My question of the Secretary that morning is a question that every American should ask: Why indeed would our Nation be so willing to give nuclear technology to the North Koreans? The upshot of the response from then Secretary of Defense Perry was that I was new to government and I really ought to get a briefing.

I subsequently saw former United Nations Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick at another seminar for new Members of Congress, and she concurred with my analysis that no further briefing was necessary, that it did not take a great deal of expertise, nor a list of academic credentials a mile long, or even the length of my arm, to ascertain if someone has turned on the eye of the stove, it is not a good idea to place your hand there because you will be burned. That rather simple observation perhaps does not do justice to the threat that confronts us now in North Korea where this administration continued, Mr. Speaker, in what I believe to be incredibly dangerous, breathtakingly naive, in an almost indescribably irresponsible action, insisting upon giving the North Koreans nuclear technology, and ultimately giving the North Koreans two nuclear reactors.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this House several weeks ago to report a story that has appeared in some quarters in our free press, but strangely, the major publications, Newsweek, cable news networks, broadcast networks have not followed up on the story, which is the subsequent fate of the two nuclear reactors given by the United States to the outlaw Nation of North Korea. U.N. inspectors finally were granted access to North Korea, finally got a chance to check on those two reactors, and Mr. Speaker, one reactor had its core intact, but the core of the second reactor was missing. Even more disturbing, the report in the Washington Times went on to state that a State Department official who accompanied U.N. inspectors on this visit to North Korea was called in front of congressional committees, and that State Department official was instructed by higher-ups at the State Department, Mr. Speaker, not to inform the Congress of the United States and its committees of jurisdiction of the missing reactor core.

Some years ago, Mr. Speaker, John F. Kennedy as a private citizen wrote an historical account of what transpired in England in the days prior to the outbreak of World War II, or at least British involvement in that war. The title of the book was *Why England Slept*. At this hour, in this place, for compelling reasons we might also ask, can this constitutional republic fall into a slumber? Can the health of our economy somehow obscure the clear and present dangers presented by those who oppose us overseas? Can defining deviancy down, to use the phrase first popularized by the senior Senator from New York State, can defining the presidency down, can defining State craft and foreign policy down, to a method of spin control somehow obscure the clear and present dangers we confront? That is the situation we must face as a constitutional republic in the closing years of the 20th century.

There are many pundits, many who willingly engage in what has been popularized as a spin cycle in this town, many who believe that State craft is now a matter of stage craft; that it is how one manages the public relations of embarrassing disclosures, how one feigns inattention in the wake of incredible derelictions of duty, how one somehow laughs off the stunning revelations that either through naivete or conscious, deliberate actions, those charged with defending our Constitution, providing for the common defense, and those at the very highest levels of our government have turned a deaf ear and a blind eye to incredible abuses, or worse, Mr. Speaker, have actively engaged in some of those abuses.

Mr. Speaker, I have observed before that at times, our Capitol city appears to be somehow transported part and parcel into an Allen Drury novel come to life. The accusations are so disturbing, the findings so compelling, the threats so real that it is as if we engage in a collective form of deception to avoid them.

Mr. Speaker, I would call to my colleagues' attention and, by extension, to those who may join us a work pending by Bill Gertz, the defense of national security reporter for the *Washington Times*. Mr. Speaker, the book is accurately, sadly entitled, *Betrayal*. For whether through naivete or a distorted sense of self-interest, our secrets, our defense capabilities, our national security has been betrayed.

Perhaps because the findings are so disturbing, we choose to avert our eyes. It is true that through American history there have been good and great leaders; there have also been, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, our share of scalawags and scoundrels, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we have seen elected constitutional officers willingly and, by some descriptions gladly, share sensitive information or create conditions in which sensitive information can be shared with foreign powers whose goals and aims are diametrically opposed to the national interests of the United States.

□ 2230

That is the sad juncture at which we find ourselves in this late part of the 20th century.

It is unbelievable, in one sense, and sadly, as the reports continue to emanate of nuclear proliferation, as the instability infects Korea once again, as the Russian republic acts provocatively now during peacekeeping operations at Pristina, as Chinese leaders continue to act cavalierly, indeed, with the spectacle in 1995 of a Chinese leader basically threatening the United States, saying, with reference to what was transpiring on Taiwan, oh, we don't believe that you value Taiwan more than you value Los Angeles, with that type of threat we must act.

For if there are those who, for whatever reason, fail to take their oaths of office seriously, fail to understand the almost reflexive, what I believe to be almost instinctive need and desire to provide for the common defense, if there are those who, for whatever reasons, find themselves incapable of that action, we must move ahead and provide that leadership in this Congress, and provide those policies which in fact provide for our common defense.

Bill Gertz, in his work "*Betrayal*," not only offers accounts of an incredible dereliction of duty, but also offers solutions that he believes and I believe, Mr. Speaker, our constitutional republic must seek in the days and years ahead if we are to protect every American family, if we are indeed to provide for our common defense.

I read now in part from Bill Gertz's work, "*Betrayal*."

The first area is leadership. "The United States must find and place in key position leaders who have two fundamental characteristics: Honesty and courage. The fact that no single senior U.S. official, with one possible exception . . . resigned to protest the national security policies of this president has revealed a crisis in leadership at all levels of government and the military. Military leaders should abandon the 'business mentality' imposed on them by this administration's corporate-government axis. Instead, leaders must be found who do and say what is right, not merely what their superiors want to hear. The military must instill in its leaders a renewed spirit of 'attack and win', not the vague, flabby corporate concepts of dominance and conflict prevention and peacetime activities that are common today."

Secondly, Bill Gertz suggests missile defense. Again quoting from his work, "The greatest strategic threat to the United States is not instability in southern Europe, Saddam Hussein's Iraq, or even international terrorism. It is the danger of long-range strategic missiles. Unless this most serious danger is handled, the military and civilian national security bureaucracy will have no incentive to tackle" those other problems.

"Military power: For America to continue acting as a force for positive

change, U.S. military capabilities—naval, airborne, spaceborne, and ground-based—must be strengthened and missions refined and limited to being used when vital American interests are at stake.

"Business and foreign policy: The United States has to end this Administration's mercantilism by separating the too-close ties between government and the private business sector. The focus on free trade should be continued, but it cannot come before protecting U.S. national security interests.

When it comes to China, "America must treat China as a rival for power and not as a strategic partner. Dismissing current and future threats posed by China is dangerous and could lead to devastating miscalculation and war. The 1995 threat," I mentioned prior to reading this text, "The 1995 threat by" a Communist Chinese general "to use nuclear weapons against Los Angeles if the United States came to the military defense of Taiwan should be taken as a clear warning of things to come."

With reference to Russia, "The United States must promote true democratic reform in Russia with economic incentives for opening up a true free market economy. But with that carrot should be the stick of harsh sanctions for selling weapons of mass destruction to rogue States.

"Defense and foreign policy make for serious business."

Mr. Speaker, I would define that in even starker fashion: Defense and foreign policy make for national survival in the nuclear age.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me no glee to speak of these things, but I am mindful, even when confronted with what at once seemed to be insurmountable problems and difficulties, it has been the strength of the people in our constitutional republic, the reverence for our laws, the reverence for our Constitution, the resolute nature of our people, once informed, to stand together and work to correct the problems; Mr. Speaker, it is in that spirit that I come to the floor tonight to elaborate on these prescriptions to remedy the current sad state of affairs in foreign affairs and national security that confronts us.

At long last, Mr. Speaker, after insistence from day one when I joined this House and the new commonsense majority emerged in the 104th Congress, at long last, in the wake of revelations that the Chinese communists had stolen our secrets, we were finally able to achieve a bipartisan consensus on the need for strategic military defense.

How sad it was to soon discover that the President took a very legalistic interpretation of that stated goal by the Congress of the United States when he sought, through back channels, to reassure the Chinese government that no actions to establish a strategic missile defense system would really be taken

on his watch. Amazing and stupefying though it may be, there were accounts that the President reached out through back channels to do exactly that.

So this Congress again reaffirmed and put in even stronger language the need to establish a national missile defense.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot help but notice the paradox confronting this administration and the American people in terms of national security when our president, during his term in office, has committed more American troops in more venues of peacekeeping than anyone else, and indeed, all his predecessors put together in the post World War II era, and yet, paradoxically, resources for our national defense have continued to dwindle. Real spending for national defense has been cut in essence some 16 percent.

To put a face or a human element on what seems to be dry numbers, understand that we are keeping those who wear the uniforms of our country proudly to defend our interests, we are keeping those folks on the front lines for longer periods of time with less ammunition, with less force replacement, asking them to do more with less, asking them to change the essential role of their missions as constituted by the Constitution of the United States and by the time-honored traditions of what our military has existed for, and we basically have strung our military out and not adequately paid, fed, clothed, or equipped the members of our military.

That is why, again, this House has moved to make those tough decisions to appropriate such funds as necessary to counteract the dereliction of duty by those who, for whatever reason, naivete or a notion of a socialist utopia, believe that all our secrets should be shared; or more sinister still, Mr. Speaker, that there was political gain, and indeed, there were campaign contributions that awaited them if they would turn a blind eye and avoid any domestic embarrassment while seeking political advantage.

When it comes to business and foreign policy, and our disposition vis-à-vis China or the former Soviet Union, now the Russian republic, Mr. Speaker, I would call to mind the words of that great and good man, our Supreme Allied Commander in Europe during World War II and the 34th president of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower, who warned us in his farewell address of the threats to our constitutional republic from the military-industrial complex.

There is no doubting the dedication of Eisenhower as a warrior and then as our Commander in Chief. There is no doubting his devotion to the military he helped command. But what Ike was warning us about we see the conditions and the symptoms of today, for we see a situation in which business interests and indeed allegiance to the corporation it would seem for many sadly usurps allegiance to one's Nation.

I think of the disturbing reports of the bipartisan Cox committee, how Hughes Electronics deliberately sought to circumvent the law, working with administration.

As we saw, a change in the evaluation of technological transfers as that authority was transferred from the State and Defense Departments to the Department of Commerce, more business-friendly; as we saw the unique political interactions that worked there; as we saw the aggressive attitudes of the Hughes CEO at the time, C. Michael Armstrong; as we saw the provocative actions at Loral missile defense, and Bernard Schwartz, who ironically was the number one contributor to Democrat campaigns in the 1996 cycle, how those two firms in fact supplied the Chinese communists with technology that has improved the guidance systems of the Chinese nuclear missiles, and how this is no longer a remote threat.

Mr. Speaker, everyone within the sound of my voice in the continental United States and, indeed, in Alaska and Hawaii, and in other American possessions in the Pacific, the sad fact tonight, Mr. Speaker, every one of us is vulnerable to a missile attack from Communist China.

Words and statements have consequences. I can recall a night a few years ago when the President of the United States entered this Chamber for a Joint Session of Congress and spoke from the podium behind me here. The President on that evening boasted that on that particular night, no longer were our children targeted by foreign nuclear missiles. Mr. Speaker, I believe we can forgive the American people if they have grown calloused and cynical to those breathtakingly incorrect observations offered by one who constitutionally must provide for our common defense as Commander in Chief. Again, to be diplomatic, I suppose the President was sorely mistaken.

At any rate, whatever the interpretation, events have overtaken us and we stand at a crossroads.

□ 2245

Will we protect the American nation? Will we act in our national interest? Will we rebuild and revitalize our military, taking seriously our constitutional charge to provide for the common defense? Will we adopt a trade policy that is realistic, that is built not on dreams and desires and esoteric wishes but a trade policy predicated on the harsh realities that we confront? Will we distinguish between widgets and weapons? Will we understand the difference between consumer goods and technologies that can threaten our own people?

We must stand ready to protect the American people, even if we wish this burden to be passed to others because of the cynical nature of the spin cycle, because of the personal comfort it might provide, because of the temptation of false reassurance to those who

seek solace in the Dow Jones Industrial Average rather than stark realities of the threats we face.

We cannot turn our backs. Again, it gives me no glee to speak of these things, but we must. It is our duty, as Americans, and this transcends political philosophy or partisan stripe. Indeed, we are our strongest, Mr. Speaker, when we approach problems and meet challenges head on, not as Republicans or as Democrats but as Americans, and that is the task at hand.

However, to understand the best way to address and offer solutions to the threats we confront, we should also stand ready to understand the full extent of the problems presented.

The allegations are that Wen Ho Lee, a Chinese scientist, gave unfettered access to communist China of our most crucial nuclear technology and know-how, the legacy codes that in layman's parlance offer the width and breadth of our knowledge of how to defend our Nation from nuclear attack, the technological advancements that we had that most defense observers believe at least gave us a generation separating us in sophistication from the communist Chinese. Those technological advantages were gone with the stroke of a computer key and the downloading of that sensitive information into unsecured computers.

In the fullness of time, we understand that it has been demonstrated that the Chinese pilfered that knowledge, but more disturbingly, Mr. Speaker, is the knowledge that on an unsecured computer basically open season existed. We do not know the full extent of just who may have pilfered that know-how and knowledge, and so the threat is there.

There were those, Mr. Speaker, who sadly were engaged in, at the very least, derelictions of duty. Our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) has been a leader in calling for the establishment of a national missile defense. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) on his web site, as well as on my web site, has chronicled the relationships and the time lines of those ostensibly in the service of our government who at the same time either for political considerations or other concerns chose to turn a blind eye, those who through naivete or other motivations chose to open our national labs and invite unfettered access to those who may not have the national interest of the United States at heart, and we as a people need to understand the full implications and the possible consequences of such actions.

Mr. Speaker, in the days ahead I look forward to working with my colleagues in this body in a bipartisan fashion to address these very genuine concerns to rebuild our national defense and to provide for our national security. After all, Mr. Speaker, when we raised our right hands to take the oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies,

foreign and domestic, we were not paying lip service to this document.

It is true that in today's body politic there are those who would take the Constitution of the United States and put it on a shelf to gather dust, to be offered lip service from time to time in a sanctimonious, pseudo-patriotic fashion, but when one raises their right hand to take an oath, it is not an oath of political convenience. It is an oath of personal conviction.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I call on all of our colleagues to join us, people of goodwill who may have legitimate disagreements but who understand, whatever the temporary political embarrassments, our very national survival depends on a sober, rational reassessment of how we provide for the common defense and how we ultimately provide family security for our constitutional republic through our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if anyone else engages in that annual rite known as spring training, or spring cleaning, and pardon me for the Freudian slip but in the great State of Arizona we also have many major league baseball teams who join us for that annual rite known as spring training, but in this instance I was away from the ball park and instead ensconced in my garage at the behest of my life's partner, my dear bride, involved in spring cleaning.

In going through my belongings, I found something that I regard as a treasure. It is a textbook of American history written in 1889, published in 1890 by the American Book Company of Cincinnati. Mr. Speaker, what is compelling about this work is that my home State of Arizona literally does not appear in the text of this history until the next to last page. As one takes that book and reads through it, they cannot help but realize that over a century has passed. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the book was written almost a quarter century prior to the Arizona territory becoming the 48th state. One reads the words of that book and they are acutely aware that they were written before a President Roosevelt of either major party, before what was called the war to end all wars, World War I, before a Great Depression, before World War II, before a space race, before a so-called war on poverty, before men on the moon, before an Information Age, before a nuclear age.

As one reads those words, one cannot help but wonder what will those who follow 100 years from now say of us? Will they say that sadly in a cynical age they succumbed to a cult of celebrity and personality that led them to owe their allegiance not to the Constitution but to the opinion cycle of the media; that they chose to focus on a false prosperity and security that was offered by economic indicators while ignoring the clear and present dangers that confronted them? Or will they instead say that despite the rhetoric of revolution and reinvention, Americans in the late 20th Century and

early 21st Century engaged in restoration, to rally around their constitution, to take into account legitimate political and philosophical differences of people of goodwill but at the same time responded, mindful of their constitutional obligations, whether a citizen or an elected official, to provide for the common defense, to ensure our liberties for ourselves and our posterity?

Mr. Speaker, I pray that it is the latter that our descendants will remember us by. For, I dare say, Mr. Speaker, if we fail to follow that latter course of action there may be no opportunity for any reflection on the former.

So in the best spirit of what makes us Americans, Mr. Speaker, let us unite to deal clearly, calmly but rationally and rapidly to the threats that confront us. Let us do so not out of weakness, not out of embarrassment but out of the most basic goals and highest ideals that those who have gone before have presented to us.

Mr. Speaker, it is in that spirit that I come to the well of this House tonight with entreaties to the Almighty to continue to bless this constitutional republic and those so fortunate to live in it.

#### 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 11 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0049

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 12 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1501, CONSEQUENCES FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACT OF 1999; AND REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2122, MANDATORY GUN SHOW BACKGROUND CHECK ACT OF 1999

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-186) on the resolution (H. Res. 209) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1501) to provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders, and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2122) to require background checks at gun shows, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 659, THE PATRIOT ACT

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-187) on the resolution (H. Res. 210) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 659) to authorize appropriations for the protection of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania, to direct the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields, to authorize the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### THANKS TO STAFF

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to express my appreciation on behalf of the Committee on Rules to all the staff here, and to express my appreciation to the staff of the Committee on Rules for the long hours that they have put in. I would also like to say that in 9 hours we will be beginning a very interesting and rigorous debate on the issues that the reading clerk has just provided for us.

#### 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. GREEN of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOSSELLA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, on June 22.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, on June 22.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COLLINS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On June 14, 1999:

H.R. 435. To make miscellaneous and technical changes to various trade laws, and for other purposes.