

domestic market for FCOJ. While the Florida industry will continue to seek out new export markets, both for fresh and processed products, it is myopic to think that we are likely to be as large a factor in foreign markets as Brazil. We simply do not have the domestic subsidies we would need to compete with the Brazilians and Europeans in Europe. Furthermore, we cannot be there to develop those new foreign markets slowly over the many years it will take them to achieve higher disposable incomes, if the Florida industry is forced out of existence by the elimination of the tariff. We want to serve the U.S. market and we can do so without the huge government payments that other agricultural sectors receive. However, the U.S. orange juice tariff is necessary to offset the unfair or artificial advantages that lower the price of Brazilian juice.

Florida Citrus Mutual understands that free trade in many industries, including many agricultural industries, leads to increased competition, eventual price benefits to consumers, and overall global economic growth. Unfortunately, free trade cannot deliver these rewards to such a concentrated and polarized global industry, especially one in which the developing country's industry is, in fact, already the most highly developed in the world. Florida Citrus Mutual appreciated the opportunity to explain to the Committee the unique global structure of the orange juice industry and the negative economic effects that would occur as a result of U.S. tariff reduction or elimination.

DOMESTIC POLICIES AFFECTING THE SPECIALTY CROP INDUSTRY

CONCLUSION

The U.S. Government's approach to domestic policy that impacts the fruit and vegetable industry, including the citrus industry, is to a large extent driven by the U.S. trade policy as it affects the industry. Our ability to properly address issues of pest and disease interdiction and eradication, labor law reform, agricultural research and export market growth depend almost entirely upon the balancing impact of the tariff, which assures that the industry can continue to exist in an unsubsidized domestic environment alongside otherwise artificially manipulated global competition.

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 19, 2003]

TARIFFS WOULD CONTROL OVERSUPPLY

(By Mark Ritchie)

Last September in Cancún, the Bush administration's promises of free trade's benefits ran headlong into the reality of the last ten years under the World Trade Organization and the U.S.-Canada-Mexico arrangement known as NAFTA—the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Governments from Latin America, Africa and Asia decried the loss of millions of farm jobs, and denounced a system that promotes the continued export of agricultural commodities below their cost of production price (dumping) by U.S. and European agribusiness corporations. That's why the WTO talks in Cancún collapsed.

Fortunately, a close look at the underlying conflicts at the WTO reveals the potential for a new approach that negotiators trying to create a Free Trade Area of the Americans should use as a blueprint. It would create a win-win solution to the chronic low prices that plague farmers in the United States, Brazil and elsewhere.

International trade negotiations used to be about finding solutions that were aimed at benefiting societies as a whole. In 1947, just a few miles from Miami, governments met in Havana to discuss the creation of the Inter-

national Trade Organization (ITO). The stated goal for the organization was full employment and the need to global monopolies and predatory trade practices. At that time, the nations gathered knew well the ravages of war and the role that brutal trade conflicts played in creating the economic Depression of the 1930s, the breeding ground for fascism.

BALANCING NEEDS

At the talks in Havana, the U.S. Department of Agriculture brought forward a special set of agricultural trade rules that would help balance the needs of producers and consumers with an emphasis on protecting food security over the long term. In essence, U.S. negotiators, with the Great Depression still very much on their minds, developed rules that helped nations balance supply and demand.

The ITO never got off the ground, but these agricultural rules were included in the original general Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, precursor to the WTO. The rules allowed nations to use quantitative import controls as long as they were imposing supply controls. This spurred countries to address domestic oversupply, helping to bring global supply and demand into balance. This plan was key to the "golden era" for U.S. and global agriculture in the 1950s and 60s.

The WTO Agreement on Agriculture undid this important work, but now the ministers gathering in Miami have an opportunity to make improvements by returning to the work done by the pioneers back in Havana in 1947. They have to tackle global over-supply in ways that can help producers in Florida and Brazil earn a profit by restoring the balance between supply and demand that has been damaged by the "race to the bottom" results of free trade.

Negotiators must address monopoly-style business practices that dominate global trade in highly competitive products when global prices fall too far.

TARIFFS BENEFICIAL

The solution to low commodity prices in general, be it orange juice or coffee, is not that complicated. Every business knows that when supply and demand are out of balance, there is going to be trouble. In agriculture, when there is not enough supply, some people go hungry. When there is too much supply, prices drop, farmers suffer and many go out of business.

We need modern trade agreements that enable countries to restore the balancing mechanisms for supply and demand. To take that step, the Bush administration needs to unlock the "free trade" straitjacket of eliminating tariffs at all costs, and start focusing on agricultural market fundamentals.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

DANIEL AND JO ANN PLATT

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, today I rise to honor two outstanding Missourians, Daniel and Jo Ann Platt. The occasion is a special one, as they celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary.

Only a year after Jo Ann, a native of Indiana, and Dan, a New Yorker, were married on December 5, 1953, they came to the Midwest from Manhattan, where Dan—an anesthesiologist—had been asked to become chief of the Anesthesia Department at Knickerbocker Hospital and the New York Eye and Ear Infirmary.

Instead, Dan practiced at Alton Memorial Hospital, a place where the

Platts believed that he could engage in a personal, patient-centered style of medicine that was impossible in a larger, more urban hospital setting. And there, he opened the first recovery room in the St. Louis metropolitan area, and established one of the first coronary care units and intensive care units in the St. Louis area, along with Barnes Hospital. Upon Dan's retirement in 2002, Alton Memorial Hospital dedicated its surgical and emergency building in his name, to commemorate his 48 years of service to the community, complete with a bust and a plaque paying tribute to Dan as "the consummate physician."

As Dan worked long hours at the hospital, Jo Ann was busy, as well. Over the years, she has served the community in many capacities, including as a member of the board of trustees of St. Louis Country Day School, on the vestry of The Church of Saint Michael and Saint George, on the board of governors of the Saint Louis Woman's Club, on the board of the St. Louis Charitable Foundation, and as a board member for both the Jennie D. Hayner Library Association and the Alton Museum of History.

Yet the bulk of Jo Ann's time was spent in supporting Dan's practice of medicine—which she considered a ministry—and being a devoted and fun-loving mother to their three children: Drew, now a commercial realtor and developer in Evansville, IN; Brett, who runs his own currency hedge fund in London, England, and recently became engaged to Mariela Ferro; and Carol, an attorney, political analyst and commentator, who lives in San Marino, CA, with her husband Jack Liebau, a portfolio manager who recently opened his own investment management firm. Carol, after surviving Harvard Law School as an overt Republican, worked faithfully on my staff in Washington for 2 years before realizing that her colleagues simply could not listen fast enough. All three children remember lives filled with the love, support and encouragement of their parents—and many, many good times.

Truly, Dan and Jo Ann's life together has been full of accomplishments and blessings—most notably, the heartfelt love and respect of their children and children-in-law. We wish them every happiness in the years to come, together with our warmest congratulations and best wishes.●

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. NICKLES (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. SMITH):

S. 1934. A bill to establish an Office of Intercountry Adoptions within the Department of State, and to reform United States laws governing intercountry adoptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORZINE:

S. 1935. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require employers to offer health care coverage for all employees, to amend the Social Security Act to guarantee comprehensive health care coverage for all children born after 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. NICKLES (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. SMITH):

S. 1934. A bill to establish an Office of Intercountry Adoptions within the Department of State, and to reform United States laws governing intercountry adoptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, today on National Adoption Day, I rise to introduce the Intercountry Adoption Reform Act along with my colleagues Senators LANDRIEU, CRAIG, BINGAMAN, INHOFE and SMITH. The primary focus of this bill is to streamline, simplify and improve the foreign adoption process for families, adoption agencies and more importantly for the foreign adopted children of American citizens.

In the last decade, there has been a significant growth in intercountry adoption. In 1990, Americans adopted more than 7,000 children from abroad. In 2002, Americans adopted almost 20,000 children from abroad. Families are increasingly seeking to create or enlarge their families through intercountry adoptions. There are many children worldwide who are without permanent homes. It is the intent of this bill to make much-needed reforms to the intercountry adoption process used by U.S. citizens and therefore help more homeless children worldwide find a permanent home here in the United States.

There are two main goals of this legislation. First, and more importantly, this bill acknowledges and affirms that foreign adopted children of American citizens are to be treated in all respects the same as children born abroad to an American citizen. Under existing law, foreign adopted children are treated as immigrants to the United States. They have to apply for, and be granted immigrant visas to enter the United States. Once they enter the United States, citizenship is acquired automatically. Had these children been born abroad to American citizens, they would have traveled back to the United States with a U.S. passport and entered as citizens. This bill provides for equal treatment for foreign adopted children.

Furthermore, these children are not immigrating to the United States in the traditional sense of the word. They are not choosing to come to our country, but rather American citizens are choosing to bring them here as part of their families. Once a full and final adoption has occurred, then the adopted child is a full-fledged member of the family and under adoption law is con-

sidered as if "natural born." As a child of an American citizen, the foreign adopted child should be treated as such, not as an immigrant.

The second goal is to consolidate the existing functions of the Federal Government relating to foreign adoption into one centralized office located within the Department of State. Currently, these functions are performed by offices within the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State. Consolidation of these functions into one office will result in focused attention on the needs of families seeking to adopt overseas and on the children they are hoping to make part of their families.

Today, when a family seeks to adopt overseas, it has to first be approved to adopt by the Department of Homeland Security. Then, after a child has been chosen, the Department of Homeland Security has to determine if the child is adoptable under Federal adoption law. After this determination is made, the Department of State has to determine whether the child qualifies for a visa as an immediate relative of an American citizen. This bill seeks to minimize the paperwork involved and streamline the process by having these functions all performed in one, centralized office, the Office of Intercountry Adoptions, staffed by expert personnel trained in adoption practices.

The focus of this office will be on foreign adoptions and only on foreign adoptions. Officials in the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State that currently perform the functions being transferred to this new office have many other duties, such as screening for terrorists or dealing with illegal immigrants. Adoption is frequently a low priority on the desk of such officers. By consolidating these functions into one office, with its sole focus being foreign adoption, these issues can be handled more promptly and given the priority they deserve.

Another aspect of the Office of Intercountry Adoptions that I consider extremely important is the proactive role that we intend for it to take in assisting other countries in establishing fraud-free, transparent adoption practices and interceding on behalf of American citizens when foreign adoption issues occur. By establishing an Ambassador at Large for Intercountry Adoption, this legislation will provide a point of contact for foreign governments when issues involving foreign adoptions arise.

In the last few years there have been many examples of instances where our government has had to intercede on behalf of Americans seeking to adopt a foreign child. For example, Romania has been closed to foreign adoption for more than 2 years now. When Romania issued its moratorium on foreign adoption, hundreds of American families who were in the process of adopting Romanian orphans were unable to complete their adoptions. Fortunately, the Department of State was able to work

successfully with the Romanian government to have these adoptions processed and persuaded Romania to grant exceptions to the moratorium for these American families and their adopted. Unfortunately, the moratorium is still in place leaving many orphans stuck in orphanages across Romania.

There also have been major adoption issues involving Cambodia, Vietnam, and Guatemala in the last 2 years. These issues are still being addressed by various officials within the Department of State and the Department of Homeland Security. It will be greatly beneficial to have a point person within the Federal Government to work on these issues, facilitate resolutions, and intercede on behalf of American families.

There also are some very significant procedural changes in the foreign adoption process included in this bill. Under the Child Citizenship Act of 2000, a foreign child adopted by a U.S. citizen acquires automatic citizenship upon entry into the United States to reside permanently. This bill proposes to change the point of acquisition of citizenship from entry into the United States to the time when a full and final adoption decree is entered by a foreign government or a court in the United States. Prior to citizenship attaching, the child must be determined to be an "adoption child" under U.S. law as defined in this bill. This provision is made retroactive to January 1, 1950, the year Americans began to adopt from abroad. This date also addresses the issue of children adopted during this time period whose parents failed to naturalize them under previous law.

Additionally, the Secretary of State shall issue a U.S. passport and a Consular Report of Birth for a child who satisfies the requirements of the Child Citizenship Act as amended by this Act. No visa will be required for such a child; instead it will be admitted to the United States upon presentation of a valid U.S. passport. No affidavit of support under 213A of the Immigration and Nationality Act will be required nor will the child be required to undergo a medical exam. These changes are again made to more closely equate the process of bringing a foreign adopted child home to the process of documenting and bringing home a biological child born abroad to a U.S. citizen.

When a U.S. citizen gives birth abroad, the parents simply go to the U.S. Embassy, present the child's birth certificate, their marriage license and proof of U.S. citizenship. Upon receiving this documentation, the embassy provides the parents with a U.S. passport for the child and a Consular Report of Birth that serves as proof of their child's citizenship as well as the child's birth certificate. This process takes little to no time to complete.

The process for foreign adopted children, however, is anything but quick and easy. Currently, an adoptive family may have to travel from the country where it adopts a child to another