

potential terrorists, to be profiled and bugged and tapped and taped and held indefinitely without the full protections of the law. All the law enforcement techniques and technologies in the world will not eliminate all risk. If we are to honor the greatness of our Nation and the sacrifice of all those who have laid down their lives in her defense, we must be careful not to frighten ourselves into some kind of quasi police state.

This Memorial Day, we honor the fallen from our wars by marking their graves with flowers and flags. In life, they were just like us. They came from all walks of life, from every State and territory, from farms and city streets. They were young, and funny, and brave. They were our children, our brothers and sisters, our fathers and mothers. They were members of many families and members of the American family. In death, they are a silent reminder of the high price some must pay so that the rest of us might enjoy the benefits of living in this great Nation. Put a flag or a flower down this weekend, but for the rest of the year, guard dearly the principles of the Nation they fought and died for. The greatest and most lasting memorial to our Nation's dead is to cherish and pass what is best about our Nation.

I close with the words of Van Dyer in his poem "America For Me."

As schoolchildren, we all memorized this poem and others like it:

'Tis fine to see the Old World, and travel up
and down

Among the famous palaces and cities of re-
nown,

To admire the crumbly castles and the stat-
ues of the kings,—

But now I think I've had enough of anti-
quated things.

So it's home again, and home again, America
for me!

My heart is turning home again, and there I
long to be

In the land of youth and freedom beyond the
ocean bars,

Where the air is full of sunlight and the flag
is full of stars.

Oh, London is a man's town, there's power in
the air;

And Paris is a woman's town, with flowers in
her hair;

And it's sweet to dream in Venice, and it's
great to study Rome,

But when it comes to living, there is no
place like home.

I like the German fir-woods, in green battal-
ions drilled;

I like the gardens of Versailles with flashing
fountains filled;

But, oh, to take your hand, my dear, and
ramble for a day

In the friendly western woodland where Na-
ture has her way!

I know that Europe's wonderful, yet some-
thing seems to lack!

The Past is too much with her, and the peo-
ple looking back.

But the glory of the Present is to make the
Future free,—

We love our land for what she is and what
she is to be.

Oh, it's home again, home again, America for
me!

I want a ship that's westward bound to
plough the rolling sea,

To the blessed Land of Room Enough beyond
the ocean bars,

Where the air is full of sunlight and the flag
is full of stars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The Senator from Missouri.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
S. RES. 154

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 154 regarding the European Union action against agricultural biotechnology, a resolution submitted earlier today by me and Senators TALENT, LINCOLN, LUGAR, and BAUCUS. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I object to the request made by my good friend from Missouri, that land from which Old Crumb, that great hunting dog, came. I believe it is Warrensburg, MO, where that statue stands today, the statute of Old Crumb, that great hunting dog.

But I must on this occasion object. I do it at the behest of another Senator. I assure the distinguished Senator that I bear no ill will toward him, certainly. But, on this occasion, I have promised that I would object, and I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objec-
tion is heard.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I understand how this place works. We knew there was to be an objection. But we have submitted a resolution which will be referred to committee because it is a matter of great importance. While apparently 99 Senators did not have an objection, we will have an opportunity when this matter is reported out of the appropriate committee to deal with what I think is a very serious issue.

This resolution before us today expresses strong support for President Bush's decision to stand up for our trade rights before the World Trade Organization. The action taken by our President is right on principle, right on law, right on science, and it is morally right.

Two years ago, the European Environment Commissioner, Margot Wallstrom, told a news conference the following:

We have already waited too long to act. The moratorium is illegal and not justified. The value of biotechnology is poorly appreciated in Europe and there's a risk the biotechnology industry will not develop.

In short, we could not have said it better. We appreciate the Commissioner's courage to be so candid.

Since reason has not prevailed in Europe, it is time for our overtaxed patience to give way to the need to exercise our rights before the World Trade Organization. If the Europeans had

been satisfied to exist as a "plant technology free zone" without aggressively attempting to influence other nations, this action would not have become as imperative as it is.

Mr. President, this European ban on plant biotechnology is a lesson about the serious harm that can come in the form of unintended consequences. Too-clever politicians in Europe, coupled with the hysterical anticommmercial activists, decided they could whip their public into a frenzy and shield the European Union producers from U.S. competition by suggesting that the new technology is not safe.

Even perhaps more venal—if that is possible—certain leftwing organizations decided they could raise fears and cause unfounded scares in the public and raise money through solicitations to fund their own salaries by spreading lies about the food that we in the United States eat every day.

But now that the European Union politicians are listening to their scientists and realize that the technology is safe, they say they cannot accept it because their public is against it. In other words, they now claim to be hostage to the misinformation they created and, indeed, fostered.

Consequently, we now have a major trade infraction. Our farmers have lost \$300 million a year in corn exports. The European public doubts the credibility of their science community. European investment in new plant science is in sharp decline. Their farmers do not have access to new technology. Most importantly, world-renowned scientists are leaving the European Union.

They are coming to Missouri, where our leading scientists, such as Dr. Roger Beachy and Dr. Peter Raven, are hiring them and providing them a refuge where they can practice their science free from the Luddite hysteria or "Eurosclerosis" from which they came.

But most tragically—most tragically—the countries in the developing world have been frightened into refusing to feed their starving people the food we have sent them—which is food we eat—because they fear the hysterical European rejection is more serious than death by starvation. We have sent food, humanitarian efforts, to aid and keep these people alive. Unfortunately, their leaders have been frightened by Europeans who say they will never import from them again.

Regrettably, I would say that Europe's fastest-growing exports are hysteria and underappreciated plant scientists. We would like Europe to join us in our efforts to help feed the hungry in the world, not scare the world into needless, wanton starvation.

I do not believe this is where the Europeans wanted to be when they started this nonsense but this is where it has predictably taken them.

This technology was developed, studied, tested, reviewed, approved, planted on several hundred million acres over 7 years, rereviewed and reapproved,

using a strict and science-based system. We are basing our review on science and on experience—lots of experience.

All of us in America today are eating the food that has been improved by genetic modification. We recognize that no technology will ever be 100-percent safe. We must regulate this and other technologies aggressively and thoroughly and scientifically. But this has been the most scrutinized new food technology of our age—or any age—and it has been planted on several hundred million acres around the world for many years. The naysayers still have not identified a single stomachache coming from biotechnology, despite their desperate search.

Our findings are not unique in the world. The case we have taken against the EU is joined by the Governments of Argentina, Canada, Egypt, Australia, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, and Uruguay.

The U.S. National Academy of Sciences completed a report that “emphasized it was not aware of any evidence suggesting foods on the market today are unsafe to eat as a result of genetic modification.”

I can list those which agree with us: the World Health Organization, France’s Academy of Sciences, the American Medical Association, the French Academy of Medicine, the Royal Society of London, the Brazilian Academy of Sciences, the Chinese Academy of Sciences, the Indian National Science Academy, the Mexican Academy of Sciences, and many others.

Twenty Nobel laureates, including Dr. Norman Borlaug, known as “the father of the Green revolution,” with whom I spoke earlier this week on this subject, has come out in strong support. All of the major U.S. scientific societies are behind this technology. Dr. Patrick Moore, founding member of Greenpeace and a trained biologist, said directly:

I believe we are entering an era now where pagan beliefs and junk science are influencing public policy. GM foods and forestry are both good examples where policy is being influenced by arguments that have no basis in factor logic.

The scientific consensus on this matter is overwhelming. In this country, farmers, scientists, regulators, courts, shareholders, elected officials, editorial boards, and consumers have all ratified the product and process and future of biotechnology in their own ways. For all practical purposes, it is a settled issue, and remains so.

In my office last week I had a South African cotton farmer who said that new technology in a seed has changed his life. He now has a harvest. He produces profitably. He has a savings account. And now all his neighbors are using that technology.

U.S. agriculture continues to be on the forefront of the application of modern science. In 1940, it took one farmer to feed 19 people. Now one farmer feeds

129 people. But tragically, 800 million children in the world remain hungry. New applications of biotechnology in the U.S. have increased crop yields by 4 billion pounds, saved growers \$1.2 billion, and reduced pesticide use by 46 million pounds in the year 2001 alone.

If wealthy citizens in Europe want to shop at trendy expensive food boutiques, that is their right, but their government should not be preventing the public from choosing their diet, and it most certainly should not be discouraging the developing world from trying to eat well to grow and live a better life.

I am very proud of the work President Bush and Ambassador Zoellick, Administrator Natsios, Under Secretary Larson, Ambassador Hall, and many others have done to preserve the viability of this new technology. The EU has made agreements with us to abide by rules they are now flagrantly ignoring. These promises should be kept.

I appreciate the cosponsors of this resolution, the support of farm groups, including the National Corn Growers, Missouri Farm Bureau, and Missouri Soybean Association.

The best arguments on behalf of this are contained in Wednesday’s article in the Wall Street Journal by U.S. trade ambassador, Robert Zoellick. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 21, 2003]

UNITED STATES V. EUROPEAN UNION

(By Robert B. Zoellick)

The U.S.—joined by Argentina, Canada and Egypt, and supported by nine other countries—last week asked the European Union to lift its moratorium on approving agricultural biotech products, in accordance with the rules of the World Trade Organization.

The world stands on the threshold of an agricultural revolution. The science of biotechnology can make crops more resistant to disease, pests and drought. By boosting yields, biotechnology can increase farmers productivity and lower the cost of food for consumers. It can help the environment by reducing pesticide use and preventing soil erosion. And new crops offer the promise of something greater still: foods fortified with nutrients that could help stem disease—including saving the eyesight of over 500,000 children who go blind each year because they lack Vitamin A. Where food is scarce, or climates harsh, increased agricultural productivity could spell the difference between life and death, between health and disease for millions. Biotech rice, for example, is twice as resistant to drought and saltwater, while withstanding temperatures about 10 degrees lower than other varieties.

For almost five years, the EU has violated its own rules and procedures—and disregarded the advice of its scientific committees and commissioners—by arresting action on applications for biotech food products. This moratorium violates the EU’s basic WTO obligations to maintain a food approval process that is based on “sufficient scientific evidence” and that acts without “undue delay.”

Some Europeans have asked why the U.S. and its 12 partners would not wait longer.

Yet the European commissioners working to lift the moratorium are the hostages of their member states. As Environment Commissioner Margot Wallstrom concluded last October: “I have stopped guessing when the moratorium would be lifted—[S]ome member states are opposed—and will have to move the goal posts.” We stopped guessing, too.

As we have waited patiently for European leaders to step forward and to deploy reason and science, the EU moratorium has sent a devastating signal to developing countries that stand to benefit most from innovative agricultural technologies. This dangerous effect of the EU’s moratorium became evident last fall, when some famine-stricken African countries refused U.S. food aid because of fabricated fears—stoked by irresponsible rhetoric—about food safety.

As a major importer of food, Europe’s decisions ripple far beyond its borders. Uganda refused to plant a disease-resistant type of banana because of fears it would jeopardize exports to Europe. Namibia will not buy South Africa’s biotech corn for cattle feed to avoid hurting its beef exports to Europe. India, China and other countries in South America and Africa have expressed the same trepidation. “Thirty-four percent of the children [in Africa] are malnourished,” says Dr. Diran Makinde of the University of Venda in South Africa. Yet Africans are told of biotech crops: “Don’t touch them.”

For five years, the world has waited patiently, assured by European officials that a change in policy is “just around the corner.” But around every corner we have found a new roadblock. First, we were asked to wait until new biotech approval regulations were drafted. Then it was to wait for a labeling scheme, then for rules on legal liability, and then for new regulations on where biotech crops can and cannot be planted.

While Europe has added barrier after barrier to fight fictions, biotechnology has demonstrated benefit after benefit based on facts. “No till” biotech farming has reduced soil erosion by one billion tons a year. Over the past eight years, biotech cotton and corn have reduced pesticide use by 46 million pounds of active ingredients. The Chinese Academy of Science estimates biotech could reduce China’s pesticide use by 80%.

Overwhelming scientific research shows that biotech foods are safe and healthy—a conclusion that the EU’s own Directorate-General for Research reached two years ago. The National Academies of Science and Medicine in France concur. So do the scientific Academies of Brazil, China, India, Mexico, the U.K. and the U.S. Dr. C.S. Prakash of Tuskegee University presented me with a statement signed by more than 3,200 scientists world-wide, including 20 Nobel laureates, supporting agricultural biotechnology.

Some claim that we are “forcing” biotech foods on European consumers. Yet all we ask is for consumers to have the right to make their own decisions, a right they are now denied because the EU is blocking access to foods that EU regulators and scientific associations acknowledge are safe. The legal case for biotechnology is clear, the science overwhelming, and the humanitarian call to action compelling. We hope this debate will lead the EU to finally lift its moratorium without imposing new barriers.

Mr. BOND. I join with many of my colleagues in commending the President and his team as they go to Europe aggressively to press their case before the G-8 meeting in France next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator

BUNNING be added as a cosponsor of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I spoke on this last night, and my friend and colleague from Missouri has covered the ground well, but I wish to say a couple things that I think are important to emphasize.

The first is, it is becoming increasingly obvious to everyone around the world that there is no reason, other than market protection, not to permit a biotech product into Europe. It is not bad for the environment. It is good for the environment.

In 2001 alone, biotechnology reduced the application of pesticides by 46 million pounds in addition to reducing soil erosion and creating an environment more hospitable to wildlife.

It would be good for the environment of Europe and the world to allow a biotech product there. It would be good for them, frankly, to start using it in raising their own product.

It is also increasingly obvious that there is no safety hazard. Practically everybody in America has eaten biotech corn or product made from biotech soybeans. There has not been a single case or suspicion of anybody being hurt by it. And, of course, there would not be because producers have been adjusting plant genetics for decades and decades and decades. This is just a new way of doing a very old and a time-honored thing that is very important to the production of the agriculture and to the advancement of human welfare.

I congratulate the administration on filing this WTO action. It is, if anything, overdue. I congratulate my friend and colleague for his comments. I hope the Senate can get behind the resolution just as quickly as possible and support the administration in this effort.

I know the support for biotech is bipartisan in this Chamber. I believe very strongly that it is overwhelming. I know we have tried to do this quickly this week, and maybe too quickly. Maybe we will not get it done today but I hope we can get it done soon and the Senate can go on record.

I close by saying, it is not just a question anymore of fairness and fair trade and the truth prevailing—as important as all those issues are. It is a question of hunger in the world. To me, the turning point was when the European Union countries not only refused to take the biotech product themselves, which I don't even think is defensible, but then they began trying to convince African countries that are in danger of famine to turn down shipments of safe, nutritious U.S. humanitarian biotech food aid.

This is now a question of trying to get food to people who are starving. That is too much, even for the European Union. I think it is time we said it. That is the point of this WTO ac-

tion. That is the point of our resolution. That is the reason my colleague from Missouri has spoken on this important issue late at the end of this week. That is the reason I wanted to come down to the floor and join him in his comments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, before I begin, I should note my good friend, the senior Senator from Missouri, is on the floor. He had to put a unanimous consent request earlier, knowing that under the procedures we follow, it would be objected to by the senior Senator from West Virginia.

I will tell my friend from Missouri that in my 29 years here, I have never heard an objection so eloquently stated as was stated by the senior Senator from West Virginia. I think of the number of times we all make these requests, and most of the time unanimous consent requests are granted, as the Senator knows. For example, he recently made one allowing the junior Senator to speak and for me to follow. I can't help but think it would be nice if sometimes it wouldn't get so raucous around here, if we could hear more of the words of Senator BYRD in this regard. He included a history, geography and literature lesson, all in a simple "I object." It makes life better.

I wish my friend from Missouri a good break, as I do my friend, the distinguished Presiding Officer. He will soon, I am sure, be heading to New Hampshire, as I will to Vermont.

GLOBAL HEALTH AND THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on a far more serious matter. I listened to the speech the President gave at the Coast Guard Academy a few days ago. I must say that this Democrat agrees with so many of the things the President said. I was especially pleased to hear him speak about the importance of foreign aid to America's security. But I became concerned after I looked behind the rhetoric of the President's speech. I wanted to see if the President's own budget request reflected his words. It does not.

At the Coast Guard Academy, the President spent a good deal of time talking about the global AIDS crisis, the worst public health threat in human history. I commend President Bush for that. He has shown great leadership on AIDS, although a bipartisan group in Congress has been pushing for action on AIDS for years.

The bill we passed last week, an authorization bill, authorized \$15 billion over 5 years to combat AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. It is an important step forward. It showed that we are beginning to take the AIDS pandemic seriously. But before we all applaud ourselves and pat ourselves on the back, let's have a dose of reality. This was an authorization bill. It does not appropriate any money.

For all intents and purposes, it is like writing a check without enough money in the bank. I can recall a meeting on a different subject where someone was offering a pledge of close to \$1 billion to fund an initiative. Kidding around, I said: I will double that. I will give you my check for \$2 billion. In fact, I had \$138 in a checking account.

That is what we have done here. By passing the AIDS authorization bill, we have promised to write a check without enough money in the bank.

Let me explain. The President's budget request contains only about half of the \$3 billion authorized for AIDS for fiscal year 2004. It remains to be seen whether the promise of that bill—a promise with which I agree—will be fulfilled. To do that, the President is going to have to submit a budget amendment for the balance of these funds.

It also remains to be seen whether the Foreign Operations Subcommittee will get the allocation that supports that amount.

The bill we passed also authorized \$1 billion for the global fund to fight AIDS and TB and malaria. Again, another promise. For fiscal year 2004, the President has only budgeted \$200 million for the Global Fund, that is one-fifth of the amount we authorized. In addition, it is a cut of \$150 million from what was appropriated last year.

There is another problem. While the President's fiscal year 2004 budget for foreign operations does include approximately \$1.2 billion to combat HIV/AIDS, it robs Peter to pay Paul to pay for increases in HIV/AIDS programs, as the President's budget cuts other essential international health programs anywhere from 5 to 63 percent.

Let's take a look at the chart. The information on this chart, incidentally, is from the United States Agency for International Development.

Child survival and maternal health programs are cut by 12 percent. These are the programs that provide life-saving child immunizations. They also help to reduce needless pregnancy-related deaths each year. People will be astounded when they hear how many of these types of deaths occur each year. Six hundred thousand deaths. Many of these deaths could be easily prevented if we just put more resources into these programs. Instead, the President's budget cuts these programs by 12 percent.

It would cut programs for vulnerable children by 63 percent.

It would cut programs to combat other infectious diseases such as measles.

Measles kill 1 million children—not 100,000 or 200,000—but 1 million children a year. Again, this is something which is easily preventable. Every one of us can just go to the doctor's office and get our children and grandchildren immunized against measles. In many poor nations, parents and grandparents do not have that luxury. They need our help.