

LEGISLATION

Congress has consistently supported the IAEA and has authorized and appropriated funds for the Agency since its inception in 1956. In recent years Congress has continued support for strengthening the safeguards system and through voluntary contributions. However, legislation has also been proposed to withhold portions of the voluntary U.S. contribution to the IAEA to signal displeasure with IAEA programs that benefit particular member states such as Iran and Cuba.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

IAEA documents are available on their web site: <http://www.iaea.org/worldatom>.

International Atomic Energy Agency, "Safeguards and Nonproliferation," IAEA Bulletin, volume 41, number 4, 1999.

Zachary Davis, International Atomic Energy Agency: Strengthen Verification Authority? CRS Report 97-571, May 1997.

PROTESTS AT IMF-WORLD BANK MEETINGS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to comment on some important events that took place here in Washington last week while many of us were back home meeting with our constituents.

For the past 25 years, we've had an annual Spring ritual in Washington. I'm not referring to the cherry blossoms. Every April, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank hold their joint meeting. Bankers and finance ministers from around the world travel to Washington to talk about the global economy, exchange rates, poverty reduction, and the so-called "international financial architecture."

These are tremendously important subjects. But the talks are highly technical, and the results are shrouded in the vague language of diplomatic communiques. The meetings don't produce startling breakthroughs. For most people they are hard to understand. So the annual IMF-World Bank meetings in Washington have rarely generated much news, and the participants liked it that way.

This year was different. A coalition of activists vowed to descend on Washington to disrupt the meetings. More than 1,700 journalists registered to cover the event. Few of those journalists came to report on IMF discussions of extended funds facilities or economic stabilization criteria. They were hoping for the kind of news that protesters made at last year's WTO meetings in Seattle when they closed the city down.

But those who came to Washington hoping for Seattle-style violence were disappointed. Both the police and the demonstrators are to be commended for that. Those who came here hoping to throw the meetings off track were also disappointed. Unlike the WTO ministerial in Seattle, the IMF meetings did not attract a big crowd of protesters. The labor unions stayed home. The big environmental groups were absent. So the meeting took place pretty much as scheduled, albeit with some inconvenience and no dramatic events. Business as usual.

There was one underlying theme among those who did come: a feeling that international economic institutions undermine the interests of ordinary citizens. I heard that on the streets of Seattle last December, when protesters took aim at the world's main trade body. And I heard it again last week when they focused on the IMF and the World Bank. The demonstrators had no confidence that those institutions are moving in the right direction.

This lack of confidence concerns me greatly. It exists not only here at home, but also in many other countries. I believe that America must lead an effort to restore faith in the economic institutions we have worked so hard to build over the past fifty years, economic institutions that have served our country and our people. The World Trade Organization. The IMF. The World Bank. And we in the Congress should lead that effort.

Look at the evidence here at home. In the trade arena, I've seen a rapid decline in the domestic consensus in favor of open markets. One result is that we've been unable to renew the President's fast track trade negotiating authority. Moreover, the lack of a domestic consensus has undermined our ability to lead in the WTO. It has weakened our bargaining power. Other members, especially the EU and Japan, take advantage of our weakened position and resist opening up their markets to the production of American workers and farmers.

In the financial arena, last week's demonstrations showed that Americans are losing faith. They don't think that the IMF and the World Bank serve the needs of the people, especially the most vulnerable here and in other countries. Instead, they believe that the institutions serve the needs of the big and the rich. The IMF and the World Bank stand accused of mismanaging the Asian financial crisis through misguided policies which needlessly lowered the living standards of millions of people, throwing many of them back into poverty. They stand accused of mismanaging the Russian economy.

Are these criticisms justified? It's difficult for Americans to judge. These institutions do not operate in the daylight of public scrutiny. Although they exist on taxpayer funds, they do not hold themselves accountable to taxpayer concerns. America is the biggest shareholder in both the IMF and the World Bank. And the lack of transparency has seriously undermined American public confidence in both the IMF and the World Bank.

Over the past week I've read and heard a number of condescending remarks about the protesters. They've been called naive, poorly informed, misguided. But the concerns they express are real and are shared by many Americans who did not march down Pennsylvania Avenue. We need to take these concerns seriously, because they express a strong undercurrent in American thinking.

In my talks with representatives from the business, environmental and

labor communities, I find that strong centrist elements seek practical solutions. We in the Congress can supply the political leadership to firm up this middle ground on the issues of trade and finance, trade and labor, trade and the environment, and restore confidence in the international trade and financial system. It is an important undertaking. America's ability to lead the world into an era of global prosperity benefitting rich and poor alike requires us to firm up and expand the middle ground to reforge our domestic consensus.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD LIBYA

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on behalf of Senate Resolution 287, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding U.S. policy toward Libya. It is of grave concern to me that the United States is currently considering a change in its "Travel Ban" policy with Libya, prior to the resolution of the Pan-Am 103 Bombing trial.

Libya is a state sponsor of terrorism and a global agent of instability. Two Libyan intelligence operatives, with prior terrorist activity convictions, are now on trial for the explosion of Pan Am flight 103 in 1988 and the loss of 270 lives, 180 of them Americans. Libya is engaged in one of the most advanced Bio-Chemical efforts in the third world, including the acquisition of delivery vehicles. It has repeatedly engaged U.S. military forces, including an attempted missile attack on U.S. military installations in Italy in 1986.

Taking into account its past behavior, we all agree that Libya has a long way to go to become a member of the family of law-abiding nations. Libya must take concrete actions to provide its sincerity. It must show complete adherence to the Pan Am 103 Judicial Authorities in Hague. If a conviction is reached, Libya must accept responsibility for any court judgement and make full payment to all judgement creditors. It is my sense that Libya must prove its vigilant and sincere cooperation in anti-terrorism efforts.

U.S. policy towards Libya must remain balanced. The "Travel Ban" is an important tool and should not be abandoned without clear justification. A verdict is not yet at hand; I urge you to await the conclusion of the Pan Am 103 trial, and calculate our steps from there.

FLAG DESECRATION AMENDMENT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I stand in opposition to this amendment. As a graduate of the United States Military Academy and a former officer in the Army, I view the American flag with a special reverence borne by experience. I am deeply offended when people burn or otherwise abuse this precious national symbol, and I believe that we should teach young people to respect the flag.

I also feel, however, that the values and beliefs that the American flag represents are more important than the cloth from which the symbol is made. Prominent among these beliefs are the right to voice views that are unpopular and the right to protest. It is these fundamental values, reflected in our Constitution, that have distinguished our Nation for more than 200 years. It is these beliefs that give our flag its great symbolic power.

Flag burning is despicable. However, the issue before us is whether our great charter document, the Constitution, should be amended so that the Federal Government can prosecute the handful of Americans who show contempt for the flag. To quote James Madison, is this a "great and extraordinary occasion" justifying the use of a constitutional amendment?

I would argue no, this is not such an occasion. This is an answer in search of a problem. According to Professor Robert Justin Goldstein, a noted author on this topic, there have been only 200 reported incidents of flag burning during the entire history of our country—that is less than one a year. There is no epidemic of flag burnings plaguing our nation.

Others have said that flag burning is representative of a general decay of American values and patriotism, and something needs to be done about it before it is too late. I would argue the way to encourage patriotism is through encouraging civic involvement, not constitutional amendments. It almost goes without saying that people who are proud of their country will be proud of their flag.

I am still moved by the statement made by James Warner, a decorated Marine flyer who was a prisoner of the North Vietnamese from 1967 to 1973, about flag burning:

I remember one interrogation where I was shown a photograph of some Americans protesting the war by burning a flag. "There," the officer said. "People in your country protest against your cause. That proves that you are wrong."

"No," I said, "that proves that I am right. In my country we are not afraid of freedom, even if it means that people disagree with us."

And I think that is the essence of this debate for me. We live in a democracy, not a dictatorship. The flag symbolizes a political system that allows its people, through their actions and words, to express what they think and feel, even when the government or a vast majority of others disagree with them. I oppose this amendment because I believe that while attempting to preserve the symbol of the freedoms we enjoy in this country, it actually would harm the substance of these freedoms.

Finally, this amendment to the Constitution is technically problematic. The language of the amendment is vague and fails to offer a clear statement of just what conduct the supporters of the amendment propose to prohibit, or to advise the American

people of the actions for which they may be imprisoned. There is no definition of what a "flag" is for purposes of this amendment, or any consensus regarding the meaning of "desecration." This leaves the Supreme Court to clarify these meanings, the same court that supporters believe erred in protecting flag burning as freedom of speech in the first place.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, April 24, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,711,905,996,688.11 (Five trillion, seven hundred eleven billion, nine hundred five million, nine hundred ninety-six thousand, six hundred eighty-eight dollars and eleven cents).

Five years ago, April 24, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,839,548,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred thirty-nine billion, five hundred forty-eight million).

Ten years ago, April 24, 1990, the Federal debt stood at \$3,066,631,000,000 (Three trillion, sixty-six billion, six hundred thirty-one million).

Fifteen years ago, April 24, 1985, the Federal debt stood at \$1,731,710,000,000 (One trillion, seven hundred thirty-one billion, seven hundred ten million).

Twenty-five years ago, April 24, 1975, the Federal debt stood at \$514,446,000,000 (Five hundred fourteen billion, four hundred forty-six million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,197,459,996,688.11 (Five trillion, one hundred ninety-seven billion, four hundred fifty-nine million, nine hundred ninety-six thousand, six hundred eighty-eight dollars and eleven cents) during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TUFTS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC SERVICE

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today I applaud Tufts University for furthering the values of leadership, citizenship, and public service, by founding a University College of Citizenship and Public Service. By creating this new college, Tufts' President, Dr. John DiBiaggio, is fostering an attitude of "giving back" to supplement the University's vision that 'active citizen participation' is essential to freedom and democracy.

Tufts has a history of commitment to civic education, having founded the Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs over 50 years ago. The largest student organization on the Medford campus is the Leonard Carmichael Society, a community service group, which boasts about 1,000 members. Recently, Tufts has hatched the "United Leaders for a Better Tomorrow," a new student organization that aims to encourage young people to

pursue careers in public service. With chapters starting across the country, this group of young leaders seeks to re-enlist those Americans interested in public service in using public office as a vehicle for change.

Tufts University is now renewing its commitment to public service with an entrepreneurial spirit. Tufts is not adding a stand-alone college, composed of its own buildings and faculty. Instead, the university is creating a 'virtual college,' one "without walls;" challenging itself to infuse all classroom instruction with the ideas of citizenship and public service.

According to Tufts' President Dr. John DiBiaggio, the tangible impact will mean that a major in child development who is mentoring kindergarten kids in a poor community could also participate in legislative advocacy to improve conditions in that community or, a Tufts student who wants to be a chemist will have an opportunity to measure pollution in nearby waterways, determine the sources of this pollution and then create a local team to clean them up.

The need for a college of public service has never been greater. While Tufts students, Massachusetts residents, and citizens nationwide are volunteering at record rates, voter participation rates continue to fall. Just two stops away on the T's red line, the "Vanishing Voter Project" at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government measures the depth of the public's cynicism and apathy towards public service. Last week, according to the Vanishing Voter Project's Voter Involvement Index, only 19% of the American public paid any attention to the Presidential race. In fact, at no time during the Presidential Primaries—one of the most hotly contested races in years—did the number of Americans paying attention to the race rise above 46%. In the world's leading democracy, in an age where limitless information is available at our fingertips, we can do better.

More than ever, it is critical that we restore and maintain civil society. We need voters that are educated and engaged. Tapping the cutting edge of the New Economy's budding e-commerce, Tufts is partnering with eBay founder, Pierre Omidyar. eBay, is now the world's leading person-to-person online trading community. Omidyar's ten million dollar investment in the College of Public Service includes financial aid packages for 24 undergraduates every year, enhanced public and private sector internship opportunities, citizenship-based career workshops, and a senior honors program in civic activism. Mr. President, Tufts University's College of Citizenship and Public Service and its partnership with eBay's Pierre Omidyar illustrates the possibilities provided by technological innovation. The promise of a technology based digital democracy is that billions of people will engage in business, receive their news, and even vote, directly and