

the island's population, or those carrying out acts of civil disobedience, they will have to face the consequences, because Los Macheteros will not remain with their arms crossed. You can be sure of that."

He added that Puerto Rico should take advantage of "this historic moment and battle against the revolutionary offenses being developed by the United States government, among others."

Why is this important? Because this gentleman was the leader of Los Macheteros, a ruthless terrorist organization that claimed responsibility for bombings and other acts of violence, along with the FALN, throughout the seventies and eighties. He emerged from a decade of hiding this week with this statement that I just read that was broadcast over radio.

One of the prisoners who has been released, who is now free, was a member of this organization. So here we have it, just several days after some of these terrorists were set free, after several days we sent the wrong signal that we are going to tolerate terrorists, negotiate with terrorists, coddle terrorists; just several days after, someone who has been in hiding for a decade rears his ugly head once again.

Yesterday in the other body there was a hearing, and in an effort to try to get to the bottom of what happened here, why the White House would reach this mind-boggling conclusion to release people who were part of a network, who had no remorse, offered no apologies, no contrition for this act that innocent people could be killed, and it could have been anywhere in this country, it could have been any American family just having lunch who could have been killed, the White House office of deputy counsel to the President responded that the reason why they were granted clemency, among other things, they do not pose a danger to society.

These are people who were videotaped making bombs. These are people who were proudly part of an organization that killed innocent people. These were people who were convicted of seditious conspiracy. Some of them at their trial said that they wanted to kill the sentencing judge. Some of them said that if they could, they would kill anybody. These are the people that this White House has chosen to send back into society.

To this very day, we do not know why. I would think the American people and the victims, especially, deserve to know.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 1875, CLASS ACTION JURISDICTION ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon a Dear Colleague letter will be

sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of September 20 to grant a rule for consideration of H.R. 1875, the Class Action Jurisdiction Act of 1999.

Yesterday the Committee on the Judiciary filed its report on this legislation, House Report 106-320. The Committee on Rules may grant a rule which would require that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In this case, amendments must be preprinted prior to consideration of the bill on the floor. Amendments should be drafted to the version of the bill ordered reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. Members should use the office of legislative counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted, and should check with the office of the parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with rules of the House.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1402, CONSOLIDATION OF MILK MARKETING ORDERS

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-324) on the resolution (H. Res. 294) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1402) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to implement the Class I milk price structure known as Option 1A as part of the implementation of the final rule to consolidate Federal milk marketing orders, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONGRESS SHOULD REPEAL ANTIQUATED SHIPPING LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, U.S. shipping laws can add as much as \$1 to the cost of a bushel of export wheat. These antiquated policies should be repealed, and the sooner, the better.

No sector of the U.S. economy is more susceptible to international trade barriers and foreign economic market conditions than agriculture. This fact has become increasingly evident for the past couple of years as Colorado's farmers and ranchers have struggled to market their goods to an ever-expanding global marketplace replete with faltering foreign economies and highly subsidized competitors.

Compounding these profound challenges is a package of special interest laws that have been preserved in America's law books for almost 80 years.

Along with my colleagues on the House Committee on Agriculture, I have worked extensively to pull these regulations out by their roots. U.S. shipping laws impose great costs and burdens on Colorado producers while providing the least benefits to our Na-

tion. In many cases, these regulations have far outlived their original purpose, yet remain on the books, persistently chipping away at the profits and livelihoods of rural Americans.

The most onerous of these policies is one which former U.S. Senator Hank Brown of Colorado worked actively to eliminate during his service in the United States Senate, an outdated maritime law known as the Jones Act.

Passed in 1920 in an effort to strengthen the U.S. commercial shipping fleet, this law mandates any goods transported between two U.S. ports must travel on a vessel built, owned, manned, and flagged in the United States, no exceptions. Unfortunately, over the years the U.S. domestic fleet has languished under the Jones Act, because the Act itself has made it prohibitively expensive to build new ocean-going vessels in U.S. shipyards.

In fact, only two bulkers have been built in U.S. shipyards in the last 35 years, which has left our country with the oldest fleet in the industrialized world. To contract for a new ship would cost an American operator over three times the international non-subsidized rate, almost assuring that no new bulkers are built in the United States.

Still, those few carrier owners who operate U.S.-flagged vessels enjoy an absolute business monopoly. Effectively shielded from any form of international market competition by the U.S.-only policy, known as "cargo preference", operators charged artificially inflated shipping rates, fees and other expenses all underwritten by those who can still afford to ship their products.

Because of this, agricultural producers today do not have access to domestic deep sea transportation options available to their foreign competitors. There are no bulk carriers operating on either coast of the United States, in the Great Lakes, nor out to Guam, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or Hawaii. Colorado producers are thus placed at a competitive disadvantage. Foreign producers are able to ship their products to American markets at competitive international rates, whereas U.S. producers cannot.

Colorado producers also need access to deep sea transportation options because other modes of transportation are often expensive, unpredictable, or unavailable. The rail car shortage we experienced in 1997 could have been averted if just 2 percent of America's domestic agricultural production could have traveled by ocean-going vessel.

With continued record harvests anticipated across the West, and bottlenecks and congestion on rail lines, this could easily happen again. Colorado farmers are therefore vulnerable to artificially high rail rates at a time when commodity prices are already depressed. This in turn raises the cost of production, lowers income, and makes it more difficult for Colorado producers to compete against subsidized foreign products.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, while Congress continues fighting for open foreign markets, reducing unnecessary costs and regulations and promoting sales of American products abroad, the Jones Act continues to impose additionally artificial costs and burdens on Colorado's hard-working agriculture producers.

Senator Brown's fight to repeal the Jones Act was the right fight for Colorado farmers, and it still is.

□ 1700

GLOBAL DAY OF ACTION FOR WTO TURNAROUND RALLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this November, representatives from 135 Nations are meeting in Seattle to decide the all-important global trading agenda for the World Trade Organization.

Unfortunately, these trade bureaucrats and their army of attorneys are not going to discuss the overwhelming need to reform the World Trade Organization before expanding it. They are not going to talk about fighting the spread of AIDS in Africa or stamping out slavery in Thailand. They are not going to talk about Mexican workers who are paid pennies an hour to work in shiny American factories or Indonesian children who work 18-hour days for less than a dollar a day to make a pair of shoes that sell in this country for \$120.

Rather than address the fact that so many of the world's people continue to live in grinding poverty and continue to barely survive, most of them on less than \$1 a day, the trade bureaucrats in Seattle are going to discuss how to sell them compact discs and cellular phones.

My colleagues can count on this, our own United States Trade Representative is not going to mention that millions of American children are growing up in poverty while their parents continue to struggle to find jobs that pay a livable wage. Our own U.S. Trade Rep. is not going to mention that, even though Wall Street is booming, 90 percent of its benefits go to the richest 5 percent of Americans, and our own United States Trade Rep. will not mention that the living wage for most Americans has not increased appreciably in nearly 30 years.

The WTO has weakened the standards we erected to ensure our children are not exposed to imported foods soaked with the same pesticides we banned in the United States. The WTO has undermined the laws and regulations we created in Congress that were intended to protect our privacy, our health, and our environment. The WTO has made improving the lives of workers less important than improving the rights of property holders and intellectual property rights.

Instead of creating a global super-market for America's goods and Services, we have created a system of rules that puts more emphasis on property rights than on human rights. So it is vital that we in Congress, that the American people, realize just what is at stake when the world's largest assembly of millionaires meets in Seattle this year.

We have got to keep fighting to make labor, standards, and environmental rights and human rights as important to our trade bureaucrats as intellectual property rights.

SECURITY ISSUES FACING OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss security issues facing this country and to focus the bulk of my discussion on the issue that is going to be, I think, a major issue for the rest of this year and well into the Presidential elections next year, and that is a national debate on who lost Russia. What caused the current economic and political instability that is occurring in that nation that still possesses a vast supply of nuclear material, weapons, weapons of mass destruction, and pose a significant security threat to America?

Before I talk about Russia and present some perspectives, I would like to first of all commend the Congress, Members on both sides of the aisle, for the passage today of the final conference report on the defense authorization bill. This bill, which passed the House with an overwhelming margin, is a tribute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the two leaders on defense issues in this Congress, and to all the Members who worked hard on giving our military the best possible support in terms of resources to meet the challenges and threats of the 21st Century.

I am concerned that the bill does not have enough in the way of resources to meet the level of deployments that have been entered into by this administration and by the President. In fact, the level of deployments over the past 7 years are now at 33, and that, in fact, compares to 10 deployments in the previous 40 years from World War II until 1990.

We cannot continue to have our troops stationed around the world, involved in harm's way in every possible place, from the Balkans and Kosovo to Macedonia and Somalia and Central America and now perhaps East Timor, and provide less resources to pay for all these deployments. That has been our big problem over the past several years.

So while this bill does not address all of our needs, it certainly is the best

possible legislation that we can come up with given the amount of dollars that the administration made available and the amount that we in the Congress were able to plus up above the President's request. I would hope the President would sign this bill into law as quickly as possible.

There was some last-minute controversy raised because of provisions dealing with changes in the management of our Department of Energy-run laboratories. But I can say this, Mr. Speaker, that those changes are needed. They are important, and they are critical.

We could not have passed DOE reform legislation in my mind that the President would have signed had it been in a freestanding bill, and, therefore, including it as a part of our defense authorization bill was extremely important.

The second issue I would discuss briefly, Mr. Speaker, is an announcement that is going to be made tomorrow by the administration regarding a change in the policy over encryption. Encryption is the technology that we use in the information age to protect and secure transmissions of data.

Up until this point in time, we have had strict limitations on the type and capability of encrypted software that we allow our companies to sell overseas. The reason is that we do not want terrorist groups in rogue States to be able to get the capability to classify their communications so that our national security agency and intelligence community cannot get into the kinds of transmissions involving illegal activities and drug sales and arms transfers that is so important to our security.

For the past several years, it has been a stalemate. Many of the software companies have been pushing very hard to pass legislation to remove all limitations on being able to sell encryption software abroad at any bit strength, any capability.

Many of us in the Congress who are concerned about security issues and Members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on both sides of the aisle have raised our voices and have said we cannot just in one fell swoop wipe away the controls that allow us to maintain the kind of access to secure systems that allow America to protect our troops abroad as well as our homeland here.

In fact, in each of the last two sessions of Congress, I have offered successfully amendments in the Subcommittee on Defense to the encryption bill, overwhelmingly supported by Democrats and Republicans, to slow down this process and to force us to look at the security concerns.

We have said during our opportunities to amend this bill, both last year and most recently in July or August, this past summer, that we were looking for a compromise, that we were looking for a way that we, in fact, could allow our companies to maintain