

controls that we legislate can actually protect Americans.

As a matter of principle, before enacting export restriction legislation, both Congress and the Administration must ensure that the affected exports in fact can be effectively restricted. I doubt anyone would responsibly suggest that legislating an unworkable control achieves any worthwhile goal or makes any sense.

Other important criteria need to be determined:

Would this bill sensibly update the outdated 1979 law? That is, would it recognize that nation-states and other global actors, technology and the threats to the United States have changed significantly since the end of the Cold War?

Would it enhance America's economic prosperity without sacrificing America's national security?

And would it provide the Executive Branch with all the legal authority and the flexibility it needs to protect the American people? Put another way, would it unduly tie the hands of the Administration in a way that could obstruct its constitutional duty to provide for the national defense?

I have taken a hard look at S. 149, which would update the Export Administration Act. After a careful review, I believe this bill, as reported by the Senate, satisfactorily addresses the criteria I outlined above and enhances America's economic prosperity without sacrificing America's national security.

It would protect Americans by ensuring that the national security agencies in the Executive Branch may be used to identify any actual or looming threats to our national security. In addition to the Commerce Department, the Defense Department, State Department and intelligence community are at the immediate disposal of the President of the United States and can signal at any time to the administration the need to restrict any export.

The Enhanced Control provision of Title II and the Deferral Provision of Title III would provide the President with the authority to control any export he may see an urgent need to control, notwithstanding any other provisions in the bill—including mass market status or foreign availability or set-asides.

There is a glaring need, however, that I believe must be addressed by Congress. The Wassenaar Arrangement for that replaced CoCom is simply inadequate to address multilateral nonproliferation concerns. While the Soviet Union is no longer with us, nuclear proliferation concerns are real and present. Simple periodic reports on dual-use exports are clearly insufficient to address these concerns.

I want to commend Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS and their staffs for holding hearings and briefings on export administration and their very hard work on this issue. But now it is time to move forward with re-authorization, not re-extension.

Officials from the Departments of Defense, State and Commerce have testified at the three hearings before the House International Relations Committee has held on this matter and all have signaled their support for passing the Export Administration Act of 2001, as reported by the Senate Banking Committee. The Administration has provided a clear and unambiguous position that titles two and three pro-

vide adequate authorities to the President with regard to export controls, notwithstanding any other provisions of law. I also look forward to working with the Administration on non-proliferation matters and building a better multilateral mechanism than the Wassenaar Arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House International Relations Committee, I am keenly aware of the national security issues and threats that face our great country. As former Ranking Member in the last Congress of the International Economic Policy and Trade Subcommittee, I came to better appreciate the advent and permanence of rapid technological change and its immediate effects on our national security and economic prosperity.

These considerations have persuaded me of the importance of updating the Export Administration Act. I have concluded that passage of S. 149, as reported, is the prudent way ahead both to protect our national security and to enhance our economic prosperity. I am convinced this bill gets it right. The Administration support for this bill attests that it also believes this is the optimal way ahead. I commend the Administration for that because this truly must be a bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must do its duty and act now to protect Americans and to enhance our economic prosperity. Let us act now to pass the Export Administration Act of 2001.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT
AUTHORIZING CONGRESS TO
PROHIBIT PHYSICAL DESECRA-
TION OF THE FLAG OF THE
UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVE LARGENT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2001

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 36, which would grant Congress the power to add an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the physical desecration of the United States flag. This resolution will preserve the honor and respect due to our national flag.

When I reflect on the men and women who fought and died to protect the flag as a symbol of democracy and freedom, it amazes me that any American would purposely want to destroy that symbol. I believe that most Americans feel a sense of outrage at the sight of the flag being burned or desecrated by protesters trumpeting freedom of speech as their shield for such a heinous act.

In recent history, our flag has lost the protection it deserves. I've noticed a sad pattern developing that we would even permit our flag to be desecrated. When we allow our nation's honor to be disgraced, should we be surprised that we have traitors in our midst? We allow the symbol of all that is good and pure about our country to be defiled and then we are shocked when our leaders are devoid of the values we cherish.

It is time to restore our flag to its rightful place under the law so that our children and

our grandchildren will never be confused about its meaning, its value, or the price paid to preserve it.

A great author once wrote: "You cannot truly love a thing without wanting to fight for it." I love the United States and I want to fight for the hope and freedom it represents to the world. That fight will include protecting our nation's flag.

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK KURTZ

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2001

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to your attention the outstanding career of Chuck Kurtz, who on July 20th concludes a distinguished 33-year career with The Olathe Daily News, which serves my congressional district. Chuck started with The Daily News as a photographer, and later moved to sports writer, sports editor, features editor, seniors editor, and concluded his career as managing editor.

At a retirement party that will be held at The Daily News' office on this Friday, the following letter will be presented to Chuck on my behalf; I am pleased to have this opportunity to share this correspondence with my colleagues:

DEAR CHUCK, I want to add my voice to the chorus of those who are praising you on the occasion of your "retirement."

I'm using the term "retirement" loosely, because I think we all know that though you may enjoy a few weeks of fishing or travel, you will soon return to making a positive impact upon the lives of those around you—just as you have done for so many years at The Daily News.

I have enjoyed working with you over the years, first as Johnson County District Attorney, and now as a Member of Congress. Needless to say, we have often found ourselves on opposite sides of the issues. You wouldn't be the Chuck Kurtz I know if we would have agreed on everything!

But no matter the issue or whether or not we agreed, you always understood that there were at least two sides to every story, and that there may be good reasons for individuals to believe and act as they do. I have seen this not only in your writing, but also in your

You have not only brought a sense of civility to your profession, but you have also brought something of which those in my line of work are often in need—common sense. This is why I will miss you most, and why I think the readers of The Daily News will, also.

Common sense says you shouldn't forget why you do what you do, and you never have. One can tell you are a journalist because you want the public to have the facts they need to make good decisions about their collective future, both locally and nationally. There is honor in this, and I know from first-hand experience that you have had great—and altogether positive—influence on the direction our community has taken. Thank you for your service.

Again, congratulations on your "retirement," and I am looking forward to running into you again soon.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS MOORE,
Member of Congress.

DOGS OF WAR BARE THEIR TEETH
OVER COLOMBIA

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2001

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to offer for the RECORD an op-ed piece written by Ms. Arianna Huffington that appeared in the Los Angeles Times on Tuesday, July 17, 2001. This article regards our country's involvement in Plan Colombia. Before we begin debate on the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, I think it is important that the Congress and the people of the United States reconsider our current policy toward our southern neighbor and third most populous country in South America.

DOGS OF WAR BARE THEIR TEETH OVER
COLOMBIA

For more than a year, critics of our government's drug-war aid package to Colombia (now hovering at \$2 billion) have been warning of the mission creep that threatens to embed us ever deeper in that country's 4-decades-old civil war.

Well, the slippery slope just got greased.

The House of Representatives is about to vote on the \$15.2-billion foreign operations spending bill. Buried amid the appropriations for many worthwhile projects such as the Peace Corps and international HIV/AIDS relief is a legislative land mine. It comes in the form of a couple of innocuous-sounding lines that could lead to a massive escalation of U.S. involvement in Colombia's unwinnable war.

Contained in the section of the bill earmarking \$676 million for "counterdrug activities" in the region are the following eye-glazing provisions: "These funds are in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes and are available without regard to section 3204(b)(1)(B) of Public Law 106-246. Provided further, that section 482(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply to funds appropriated under this heading."

Got that? I didn't think so.

Legislative gobbledygook does not get any gookier, but once the meaningless numbers and letters are decoded, and the statutory dots connected, the ominous significance of those provisions becomes all too clear. If approved, they make possible the unlimited buildup of "mercenaries" and the removal of any constraints on the kinds of weapons they can use.

Under current law, the number of U.S. military personnel that can be deployed in Colombia is limited to 500, and they are prohibited from engaging in combat. But as politicians discovered long ago, there are two parts to every law: the spirit of the law and the letter of the law.

As regard Colombia, our government chose the latter, carrying out a classic end-run around the prohibition by funding a war conducted by mercenaries—hundreds of U.S. citizens working for private military contractors like DynCorp, Airscan and Military Professional Resources Inc.

At the moment, the number of these mercenaries is capped at 300. But the first new provision, if it becomes law, does away with this restriction. The other provision removes language that says "weapons or ammunition" while engaged in narcotics-related activities. It's a deadly cocktail: unlimited private forces armed with unlimited weapons.

Congress has always zealously guarded its rights under the War Powers Act. But unless

its members catch on, they could approve a privatized Gulf of Tonkin resolution without even realizing it's hidden in the bill. And once the dogs of war are unleashed, they're awfully hard to round up again—just ask Bob McNamara.

This ongoing and furtive escalation directly contradicts the government's assurances that, as Assistant Secretary of State Rand Beers put it last week, "Plan Colombia is a plan for peace."

"From the beginning," he wrote in an op-ed, "we have stated that there is no military solution to Colombia's problems." Then why, pray, the need for offensive weaponry and unrestricted number of mercenaries?

To make matters worse, a new investigation by the Center for Public Integrity found that U.S. anti-drug money spent on Latin America is being "funneled through corrupt military paramilitary and intelligence organizations and ends up violating basic human rights."

Those who scoff at the idea that our drug-fighting efforts in Colombia could lead to the U.S. becoming embroiled in a massive counter-insurgency war should take a look at a new study by the Rand Corp. commissioned by the U.S. Air Force. The study calls on the United States to drop the phony "counter-narcotics only" pretense and directly assist the Colombian government in its battle against leftist rebels: "The United States is the only realistic source of military assistance on the scale needed to redress the currently unfavorable balance of power."

There is still the chance that Congress will refuse to go along with this statutory trickery. Reps. John Conyers (D-Mich.) and Janice D. Schakowsky (D-Ill.) are considering an amendment to eliminate the new provisions.

Turning an army of heavily armed mercenaries loose in the middle of a bloody civil war is more than a misguided policy—it's utter insanity. It's imperative that our lawmakers defuse these provisions in the bill before they blow up in our faces, and the cliché of "another Vietnam" becomes a sorry Colombian reality.

REGARDING UC DAVIS AND THE
NATIONAL TEXTILE CENTERS

HON. DOUG OSE

OF

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2001

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in supporting the effort on behalf of the University of California at Davis to be included as a member of the National Textile Center (NTC).

Mr. Speaker, it is silly not to include UC Davis in the NTC. Currently, NTC has no member schools west of the Mississippi River. California is America's second leading producer of cotton as well as being a leading national manufacturer of apparel, grossing over \$13 billion annually. The NTC supports a consortium of research at six universities: Auburn, Clemson, Georgia Tech, North Carolina State, University of Philadelphia, and Dartmouth. To include UC Davis in this prestigious company will go a long way to advancing the safety, quality, and durability of clothing and textile products.

UC Davis is the single largest employer in my district, and the faculty is recognized nationally and internationally for their research activities. The Division of Textiles and Clothing offers the most comprehensive textiles and

clothing undergraduate major in the western United States, and no other western university can challenge the laboratory facilities and equipment. UC Davis utilizes the best in human resources, generates the best in physical product, and trains the best of the next generation. As an example, UC Davis is unique to the textile world in its study of fiber and polymer science. The production and use of fibers and polymers go beyond the forms of fabrics and plastics to high performance membranes, composites, and electronic and communication applications. These common-place, daily use substances are constantly being upgraded and improved by the staff and students at the Division of Textiles and Clothing.

Social Science research at UC Davis addresses sociocultural meanings of textiles and apparel, fashion theory, and production-consumption issues related to gender and ethnicity. Collaborations between the physical and social sciences have resulted in a better understanding of the principles underlying the efficacy and acceptance of protective clothing. These discoveries have protected farm workers, health care providers, firefighters, and others. This valuable research can only enhance the NTC and accelerate the next generation of high quality textile product.

I appreciate the committee's interest in UC Davis and the Division of Textiles and Clothing. The Chairman has been generous in engaging us in this colloquy, and I want to thank him personally for his efforts. I am anxious to work with the committee and my colleagues from California on this issue.

FEDERALLY FINANCED, INTEREST
FREE MOTOR VEHICLE ACT, H.R.
2544

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2001

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been taking a wild ride on the energy roller coaster for far too long. The citizens of our great nation must not be forced to suffer the ups and downs of an energy crisis that never seems to get better. While the Bush administration has taken a pro-active stance on energy through the release of its National Energy Policy in May, 2001, there is much more to be done—as a Congress, a Nation, and as citizens. For the past eight years, our Nation was subjected to the last Administration's "wait and see" energy policy that was reactive rather than pro-active.

Mr. Speaker, on June, 2001, I sponsored the Federal Motor-Vehicle Fleet Act, H.R. 2263, which enjoys bi-partisan support. The Act mandates that ten-percent of the vehicle fleet purchased by the Federal Government must be comprised of Hybrid-electric Vehicles (HEV) and other high-efficiency vehicles that are powered by alternative sources of energy, sources other than gasoline and diesel.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing my companion bill, the Federally Financed, Interest Free Vehicle Act, which as the title indicates, offers federally financed, interest free loans to public schools, municipalities, and local government to purchase Hybrid-Electric and other environmentally friendly high-efficiency vehicles. This program, to be administered by the Department of Transportation,