

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR THE 2002
WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I could not believe my ears yesterday afternoon when I heard the Senator from Arizona take out after my home State and my home city.

On behalf of the people of Utah and America, I express our outrage over the notion that supporting our country's Olympic Games could be termed either "parochial" or "pork barrel." Nothing could be further from the truth.

I frankly do not agree with every provision the committee recommends either. But, I do not question the motives or sincerity of my colleagues who put it there.

Yesterday, the Senator from Arizona specifically questioned the level of federal support for the 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Salt Lake City. It is, of course, his right to oppose such assistance. But, before he walks further down the plank, I would like to provide a few facts. Perhaps the Senator will reevaluate his position.

First, the report just issued by the General Accounting Office, "Olympic Games: Federal Government Provides Significant Funding and Support," is flawed in several respects. I am sorry that the Senator from Arizona has relied so heavily on this document to form his opinions about the Salt Lake Games.

Foremost among the problems with the GAO report is the fact that it errs in categorizing a number of projects, specifically in the transportation area, as "Olympic" projects. In fact, these are improvements to transportation infrastructure that would have been requested regardless of whether Salt Lake had been awarded the Olympic bid.

I would be happy to show the Senator from Arizona the details of the I-15 improvements and why they were necessary to repair road and bridge deterioration, implement safety designs, and relieve congestion. None of this has anything to do with the Olympic Games. Local planning for this project was actually begun in 1982, 13 years before Salt Lake City was awarded the Games.

GAO itself implies that the inclusion of these projects as Olympic projects is misleading. The report states on page 8: "According to federal officials, the majority of the funds would have been provided to host cities and states for infrastructure projects, such as highways and transit systems, regardless of the Olympic Games."

The major effect of the 2002 Olympic Games on this project is the timetable for completion. Quite obviously, we cannot have jersey walls marking off construction zones and one-lane passages during the Games.

Moreover, while Utah has sought and received some federal assistance for the project, the I-15 reconstruction project has been funded substantially by Utah's Centennial Highway Fund, which was established in 1997 and fund-

ed by an increase in the state's gasoline tax. This fact seems to disappear from the radar screen during these debates.

The GAO report also ascribes the TRAX North-South light rail system to the Olympic expense column. This, too, is not the case. The full funding agreement for the North-South light rail project was granted by the U.S. Department of Transportation in August 1995, less than two months after Salt Lake was awarded the Games. Clearly light rail was not initiated because of the Games.

While the light rail system will certainly benefit Olympic spectators during the Games, that is not why Salt Lake City and communities south of the city built it.

Salt Lake is growing by leaps and bounds. More and more people commute into the city—not unlike the Washington metropolitan area. It is a city that is striving to reduce air pollution by encouraging the use of public transportation. That is why they built light rail.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that the General Accounting Office did another report entitled, "Surface Infrastructure: Costs, Financing and Schedules for Large-Dollar Transportation Projects." In this 1998 report, the GAO evaluated Utah's major transportation projects for the House Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee. This report concluded that both the I-15 and light rail projects were being efficiently run and were well within budget. Many of the contracts were being awarded at costs lower than expected. Yet, this fact was not included in the debate yesterday.

The Department of Transportation Inspector General issued a report in November 1998 concluding that the I-15 reconstruction project was on schedule and that the cost estimates were reasonable. It also praised Utah's use of the "design-build" method of contracting on this project. This fact was similarly omitted from the discussion yesterday.

Contrary to the impression left by the Senator from Arizona, the Salt Lake Olympic Committee, SLOC, has never sought to "sneak" anything into an appropriations bill. Mitt Romney and his staff have been open about every dime being requested.

Those transportation projects which are necessary to put on the Olympic Games in 2002 were delineated in a transportation plan submitted to and approved by the U.S. Department of Transportation. The funds being requested were detailed in that plan.

The Senator from Arizona yesterday implied that these so-called "pork barrel" appropriations for the 2002 Winter Games were an outgrowth of the Olympic bribery scandal which has embarrassed my home state. His comments were most unfortunate for many reasons—not the least of which is his suggestion that these appropriations requests are in any way improper is just wrong.

SLOC made its budget publicly available to the press. It has briefed officials at federal agencies and at the White House. SLOC has regularly visited with members of Congress including members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. Right from the outset, SLOC outlined their plans and budgets and has provided periodic updates. These updates have showed lower requirements for federal assistance. But, again, this fact was not mentioned in the GAO report or by the Senator from Arizona.

A second criticism of the GAO report is its comparison of federal support for the Los Angeles Summer Games in 1984 to federal assistance for the Salt Lake Games in 2002. Simply put, this is an apples to oranges comparison.

First, the Salt Lake Olympic Committee has fully integrated planning for the Paralympic Games with the Olympic Games. The Paralympics did not even exist in 1984. In 1996, Atlanta chose to have two separate organizing entities.

Second, the Senator from Arizona may not have noticed, but there have been an estimated 7,282 reported terrorist attacks since 1984. Let me refresh my colleagues' memories. These attacks have included: Pam Am Flight 103 in 1988; the World Trade Center in 1993; the Oklahoma City Federal Building in 1995; the Tokyo subway in 1995; Khobar Towers in 1997; and U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998.

Not all of them have been on the front pages of major newspapers, but this startling number demonstrates the need for enhanced security at an international event like the Olympic Games. The same level of security provided for the Los Angeles Games would most likely be inadequate for the Salt Lake Games. It is essential that we provide security based on the situation in the year 2002.

Security and counterterrorism are legitimate federal duties. I am glad the Secret Service is getting \$14.8 million for communications infrastructure. I want our law enforcement personnel to have the best equipment available, not just for the Salt Lake City Olympics, but at all times.

I do not believe that the Secret Service, FBI, and other security agencies are buying disposable products. This equipment will be well used to keep Americans safe in cities all across America.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, by the GAO's own calculation, only \$254 million is requested for planning and staging the Games, not the \$1.3 billion figure cited yesterday. I would like to note that this is roughly 25 percent of the entire budget for the Salt Lake Games.

If that seems like a lot, let us review the point made by the Congressional Research Service in its 1997 report, "Financing the Olympic Games Held in the United States, 1904-1960: A Brief Overview," and noted by the GAO. In

1960, Squaw Valley received an appropriation of \$20 million to assist in staging the Winter Olympic Games—about 25 percent of the total budget for the Games.

Let me be clear that I am not advocating an automatic 25 percent federal subsidy for a host city. But, I wish to make the point that this level of assistance is not unprecedented and could be construed as quite modest when compared with governmental subsidies foreign cities receive from their national governments.

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I would like to make one final point.

The Senator from Arizona suggested yesterday that the USOC should not consider bids of cities that do not have the capacity to host the Games.

Well, Mr. President, that would eliminate every city in America from hosting an Olympic Games, summer or winter. No city—not even New York or Los Angeles—could put on a 21st century, multi-week, international event like this entirely on its own.

Think about this: Lake Placid, New York, has hosted the Winter Games twice, in 1932 and in 1980. But, in 1990, Lake Placid had a population of fewer than 2500 people. There is no way metropolitan Salt Lake City, with a million people, let alone Lake Placid could host these Games under the proposed McCain criteria.

Allow me to suggest, Mr. President, that America itself will host the 2002 Winter Olympic Games, just as it did in Atlanta, Los Angeles, Lake Placid, or Squaw Valley. An American bid city is selected by the United States Olympic Committee for its organizational ability and world class sporting venues. It becomes America's choice. If chosen by the IOC, the city does not host the Games on its own behalf, but for our whole country.

When a U.S. athlete mounts the podium in Salt Lake City two years from now, the music you hear will not be "Come, Come Ye Saints." No, it will be "The Star-Spangled Banner," our country's national anthem.

I agree with the GAO and with Senator MCCAIN on one thing. I agree that we ought to give some consideration to how, if the United States ever hosts another Olympic Games, we should support the host city. There is much to commend a better process for such support.

I would be very happy to join Senator MCCAIN in such a mission. But, I wish that, in the meantime, he would join us in support of America's host city for the XIX Winter Olympiad.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will

read the names of some of those who have lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

September 20, 1999:

Donetta L. Adams, 26, Bloomington, IN; Barbara F. Allen, 65, Bloomington, IN; Eugene S. Bassett, Jr., 35, Davenport, IA; Antonio Butler, 19, Miami, FL; William Cook, 38, Detroit, MI; Rosa Gomez, 41, Miami, FL; Travis L. Harris, 27, Chicago, IL; James Hoard, 31, Bloomington, IN; Katherine Kruppa, 39, Houston, TX; Teal Lane, 19, Baltimore, MD; Mark Pitts, 22, Detroit, MI.

One of the victims of gun violence I mentioned was 65-year-old Barbara Allen of Bloomington, Indiana. Barbara's boyfriend shot and killed both her and her pregnant daughter, 26-year-old Donetta Adams, before turning the gun on himself.

Another victim of gun violence, 41-year-old Rosa Gomez of Miami, was shot and killed by her ex-boyfriend after having been harassed and threatened by him on several occasions.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The deaths of these people are a reminder to all of us that we need to enact sensible gun legislation now.

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADING RELATIONS FOR CHINA

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the vote I cast yesterday in support of H.R. 4444, the bill extending permanent normal trading relations to the Peoples' Republic of China.

While the vote we cast yesterday was to grant China PNTR, it cannot be viewed separate from the question of China's accession to the WTO. In our negotiations with the Chinese over their entry into the WTO, we agreed to end the annual exercise of renewing NTR and to extend NTR to China permanently. In fact, if we do not grant China PNTR we will be the ones in violation of the WTO's rules when China is ultimately granted entry into the WTO. And, as a result, we will lose access to their markets and the beneficiaries of this will be our trade competitors in Europe, Asia, and South America. Most importantly, we have gained some very important trade concessions in our negotiations with the Chinese over their entry into the WTO, and we stand to gain even greater trade concessions from them once they join the WTO and become subject to its rules and dispute resolution procedures.

By extending PNTR and allowing China entry into the WTO, the U.S. can expect to increase exports to China by an estimated \$13.9 billion within the first five years. And according to the

U.S. Department of Agriculture, American farmers will account for \$2.2 billion of that increase in exports to China. If our economy is to continue to grow and we are to continue to create more good-paying, skilled jobs so that unemployment remains low and Americans can take home more income, we must expand our economic opportunities. The best way to accomplish that is to find new markets for our products. And the most lucrative new market that exists is China.

As our colleague from Texas, Senator PHIL GRAMM, pointed out in a "Dear Colleague" letter he circulated earlier this week, things in China are changing significantly, if perhaps not as quickly or as comprehensively as we wish. Senator GRAMM quoted a report on China recently issued by the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, in which the observation is made: "Beijing's billboards no longer spout ideology. They advertise consumer products like Internet service, cell phones, and credit cards." There can be little doubt that China is changing. The task left to us to decide is how best to effectuate positive change there.

My primary concern, in evaluating how to vote on PNTR and China's accession to the WTO has always been: "What is in the best interests of Michigan's workers and businesses?"

China was Michigan's 15th largest export market in 1998. That rank has almost certainly risen since then. Michigan's exports to China grew by 25 percent during the 5 years between 1993 and 1998, increasing from \$211 million to \$264 million. Businesses in the Detroit area accounted for \$180 million of those exports in 1998, an 11 percent increase over its 1993 figure. Other areas of Michigan are seeing truly phenomenal growth in trade with China. Exports to China from businesses located in the Flint and Lansing areas grew by more than 84 percent from 1993 to 1998. And exports from Kalamazoo and Battle Creek businesses to China grew by an astounding 353 percent during that same period, according to the U.S. International Trade Administration.

The growth in China trade outside of Detroit is due to the surprisingly high number of small and medium-sized businesses in Michigan that are exporting to China. According to the Commerce Department, more than 60 percent of the Michigan firms exporting to China in 1997 were either small or medium-sized companies. Of the 149 small and medium-sized Michigan businesses exporting to Michigan in 1997, as substantial majority of these were small businesses with fewer than 100 employees. This trend extends beyond Michigan as well. Nationwide, not only did small and medium-sized businesses in 1997 comprise 35 percent of all U.S. merchandise exports to China—up from 28 percent in 1992—but this 35 percent share of the Chinese market was higher than the share small and medium-sized businesses had of overall U.S. merchandise exports that year—31 percent.