

ON SUDAN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I commend the Foreign Relations Committee for its action today in reporting a resolution urging action by the United States and the international community to respond to the ongoing ethnic violence in Sudan. The Senate should act on this resolution as soon as possible.

It has been 10 years since the Rwanda genocide. A decade ago, 8,000 Rwandans were being killed every day, yet the international community was silent. We did not stop the deaths of 800,000 Tutsis and politically moderate Hutu, in spite of our commitment that genocide must never again darken the annals of human history.

Sadly, we may now be repeating the same mistake in Sudan.

In 1998, President Clinton made a special visit to Kigali, Rwanda's capital, "partly," he said, "in recognition of the fact that we in the United States and the world community did not do as much as we could have and should have done to try to limit what occurred" in Rwanda. His visit and strong words remind us that we must not hesitate to act, when the horror is clear and when so many lives may be lost.

Over the past few weeks, reports of severe ethnic violence have come from Darfur, a region of western Sudan. We have heard accounts of thousands or even tens of thousands of people murdered, of widespread rape, and of people's homes burned to the ground.

The Sudanese Government has refused to allow full access to western Sudan. International monitors and humanitarian workers have been prevented from reaching the area. We need immediate access to gather more information on what is happening and to provide urgent humanitarian relief to the one million people the United Nations reports have been displaced internally in Sudan or across the border to Chad.

Many of us hoped that the humanitarian ceasefire and agreement earlier this month between the Sudanese government and rebel forces in western Sudan would end the many months of violence against entire communities. It has not. The bombing of villages by the Sudanese Air Force continues, and so does the mayhem by the paramilitary forces unleashed by the Government of Sudan.

The burning of homes and crops of desperately poor villagers has left in its ashes a humanitarian disaster. Without immediate relief, experts predict deaths in the hundreds of thousands. The cruelty of the Government of Sudan and its paramilitary allies against other ethnic groups raises the very real specter of genocide.

The United States and the international community need to act now, to stop this brutality, to save lives.

President Bush should make a strong public statement alerting the world to the violence in Darfur. He should call the international community to ac-

tion, and increase pressure on the Sudanese Government. Doing so would send a strong signal that the international community will not accept these continuing atrocities. Sudan has been seeking better relations with the United States. It must be told that our nation will have no relations with a genocidal government.

The United States should propose a resolution in the United Nations Security Council to condemn the violations of international law being committed in Darfur, particularly the indiscriminate targeting of civilians and the obstruction of humanitarian aid by the government. The U.N. should demand immediate international access to the region to assess the full scale of the need for assistance. The U.N. should also insist on adequate support for international human rights monitors and for monitors of the ceasefire agreement reached last week.

The international community must demand that Sudan stop the violence now, and give full humanitarian access to Darfur without question or qualification.

To minimize the suffering of those affected by the violence, we should immediately identify funds and food aid to meet at least the traditional U.S. share of the \$110 million appeal from the U.N. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to support urgently needed assistance for internally displaced persons and refugees. These internally displaced persons and refugees must also be allowed by the Sudanese Government and militias to return safely to their homes, to rebuild their lives and communities, as soon as possible.

The European Community, African countries and the rest of the international community should use their considerable influence to pressure Sudan to end the violence in Darfur, and end it now.

If the international community fails to act—and to act now—the consequences will be dire.

United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan was eloquent in his statement at the commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the Rwanda genocide. He said that he would not permit Darfur to become the first genocide of the 21st century.

There will be discussion in Washington and around the world about whether the ethnic violence in Darfur is, in fact, genocide, but we cannot allow the debate over definitions obstruct our ability to act as soon as possible.

It is a matter of the highest moral responsibility for each of us individually, for Congress, for the United States, and for the global community to do all we can to stop the violence against innocents in Darfur. We must act, because thousands of people's lives will be lost if we don't.

STAND WITH OUR NATION'S LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this week mayors and police chiefs from across the country will join with the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence to urge President Bush and Congress to renew the federal Assault Weapons Ban.

The 1994 law banned a list of 19 specific weapons, as well as a number of other weapons incorporating certain design characteristics such as pistol grips, folding stocks, bayonet mounts, and flash suppressors. The assault weapons ban also prohibited the manufacture of semiautomatic weapons that incorporate at least two of these military features and which accept a detachable magazine. This law is scheduled to expire on September 13, 2004.

I support the efforts of the law enforcement community and local leaders who are calling for legislation extending the law. In 1994, I voted for the assault weapons ban and, last month, I joined a bipartisan majority of the Senate in voting to extend the assault weapons ban for 10 years.

Law enforcement support for the assault weapons ban is broad. It includes the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the Police Foundation, the Police Executive Research Forum, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the National Association of School Resource Officers, the National Fraternal Order of Police, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association, and the National Black Police Association.

In addition, mayors and police chiefs from Detroit, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Miami, Seattle, Chicago, and Washington, D.C. have joined over 200 other local leaders in sending a letter urging Congress to immediately pass a 10-year extension of the assault weapons ban.

Despite broad support for this law, the National Rifle Association fought against passage of the assault weapons ban in 1994 and continues to oppose it to this day.

While President Bush has indicated that he supports reauthorizing the assault weapons ban, and a bipartisan majority in the Senate is on the record supporting reauthorization, the President has failed to urge Congress to act on this important legislation before it expires on September 13th. The ban is a major public safety measure that protects citizens and police officers and I urge the President and the Congress to act immediately to reauthorize the law.

OUTSOURCING AND CLOW VALVE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, after 2½ years of a largely jobless recovery, the current administration is on track to be the first in over six decades actually

to lose jobs during its 4-year term. It is particularly alarming that this country has lost more than one in seven of its manufacturing jobs since this administration took office. More than one in seven.

One reason is outsourcing. We have been seeing good, high-wage manufacturing jobs transferred overseas for a number of years. But outsourcing now has accelerated. It has spread to "knowledge-based jobs"—programming, auditing, accounting, engineering, design, telemarketing, animation, editing, transcription, legal assistance, call centers and even core research.

Some economists have argued over the years that free trade helps the United States to concentrate on creating high-wage, high-value-added jobs here in America. But now those jobs are being exported, too. The old rules of comparative advantage have been exploded.

As we all know by now, the President's annual economic report, signed by Mr. Bush, explained why we should be celebrating the outsourcing and off-shoring of American jobs. Gregory Mankiw, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, summed up the report. He said that "outsourcing is a growing phenomenon, but it's something that we should realize is . . . a plus for the economy."

Yes, you heard that right: Outsourcing is "a plus for the economy."

Outsourcing of U.S. jobs, however, is just one side of the coin. The other side of the coin is U.S. jobs that are lost because this administration refuses to enforce our existing trade laws—for example, existing laws that protect against sudden surges of imports from abroad which harm particular businesses or sectors here in our country. This refusal threatens U.S. manufacturers and destroys American jobs.

Let me offer one vivid example:

Clow Valve Company has operated in the town of Oskaloosa, Iowa, since 1878. It manufactures iron pipes, water hydrants and other foundry products. If there's a fire hydrant on your block—and there should be one under most city codes—chances are excellent that it was made by Clow Valve Company.

The company was acquired by McWane, Inc., of Birmingham, Alabama in 1985. McWane owns similar facilities in several other states, including Alabama, New York, Texas, Pennsylvania, Missouri and Tennessee, employing some 7,000 workers.

Last year, McWane, Inc., faced a near tripling of Chinese imports of waterwork pipes compared to the previous year, with Chinese product being sold at prices that severely undercut American producers. Obviously, continued expansion of sales by Chinese companies at this rate could cause serious market disruption. It could threaten all 7,000 jobs in these plants, including the 358 in the Clow facilities in Oskaloosa, IA.

Nonetheless, President Bush has steadfastly refused to use his authority

under Section 421 of the Trade Act of 1974 to restrain this surge of imports, even though such a step was unanimously recommended by the International Trade Commission (ITC) last December. I wrote to the administration on two occasions, once to the ITC and once to the President himself, urging that our trade officials utilize existing laws that were enacted for the very purpose of temporarily protecting American jobs from sudden surges of imported products.

The President's refusal to enforce our trade laws has profound consequences. In Oskaloosa, it could mean the loss of some or all of the 358 good-quality, high-paying jobs at the Clow Valve Company. In turn, that would have a devastating impact all across Mahaska County. Bear in mind that Clow Valve is now the single largest employer located in the county. It is an employer with deep roots in the community. I imagine there might be some bewilderment among people there about the refusal of the Bush Administration to stand up and defend those jobs.

Let me summarize the basic facts:

We have a clear case of harmful trade practices on the part of the Chinese—flooding the U.S. market with cut-rate waterwork pipes.

In December, the United States International Trade Commission ruled that a surge in imports of Chinese waterwork pipes had caused market disruption and material injury to domestic manufacturers such as Clow Valve Company.

The Commission was unanimous in its conclusion that imports from China should be restrained pursuant to section 421 of the Trade Act of 1974.

The Commission was unanimous in its prediction that, without implementation of an effective relief program, the U.S. waterwork pipes industry may have to close plants and lay off workers.

And yet, the White House refused to act. Which leads me to ask: Whose side are they on?

Mr. President, it is clear to me that the jobless recovery here in the U.S. is not an accident. It is the result of a productivity surge that has benefited corporate profits, not workers' paychecks. It is the result of corporate America's enthusiastic embrace of outsourcing and off-shoring jobs, with the blessing and encouragement of the Bush administration. And it is the result of the refusal of this administration to enforce our trade laws—its refusal to stand up for American workers, including in the face of seriously harmful trading practices from abroad.

We cannot build a sustainable recovery by exporting jobs, driving down U.S. wages to match foreign wages, and allowing nations like China to flood our market with cheap imports.

No, a true recovery must include all Americans. It can only be built on a foundation of good jobs and good wages—here in America, not overseas. And it can only be sustained if the ad-

ministration, at long last, is willing to enforce our trade laws and stand up for American workers.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, next week the Senate will consider a trade adjustment assistance amendment introduced by my colleagues Senators WYDEN and COLEMAN. I am a co-sponsor of this amendment, which is offered on the JOBS bill, to which we will be returning next week.

I also want to acknowledge Senators ROCKEFELLER and BINGAMAN, who have worked hard to produce a strong amendment.

This amendment is the right thing to do. And now is the right time to do it.

The JOBS bill is about creating jobs and about keeping existing jobs in America. But we all know that—no matter how strong we make this JOBS bill—some workers may still see their jobs move overseas.

Since 1962, trade adjustment assistance—what we call "TAA"—has provided retraining, income support, and other benefits so that workers who lose their jobs due to trade can make a new start.

The rationale for TAA is simple. When our government pursues trade liberalization, we create benefits for the economy as a whole. But there is always some dislocation from trade.

As President Kennedy said, "those injured by . . . trade competition should not be required to bear the full brunt of the impact." "There is an obligation," he said, for the federal government "to render assistance to those who suffer as a result of national trade policy." We meet that obligation through TAA.

The TAA program has not been static over time. Several times, Congress has revised the program to meet new economic realities.

Most recently, in the Trade Act of 2002, Congress completed an important overhaul and expansion of the TAA program. I am very proud to have played a leading role in passing this landmark legislation.

But I am also the first to admit that our work is not done. Economic realities continue to change, and TAA must continue to change with them.

I am co-sponsoring the Wyden/Coleman amendment, because it makes common sense changes that help TAA keep up with the times.

Most importantly, the amendment extends TAA to service workers. Right now, we only give TAA benefits to workers who make things. That means American workers in the service sector cannot access this program.

But today, more than 80 percent of non-farm U.S. jobs are in the service sector. And the market for many services is becoming just as global as the market for manufactured goods.