

time and their efforts on this legislation.

I want to mention two of the members of our staff who lead our staff and one woman who has served on our committee staff for the past 19 years.

To Rick DeBobes, our committee staff director, he serves us so brilliantly and well and so unselfishly 24/7. He is within earshot, so I will not embarrass him and have him blush other than to say he is so totally indispensable not just to me but to the Senate and all of the staff that work so well with him. Our gratitude.

To Senator MCCAIN's new Republican staff director, Mike Kostiw, his leadership is so effective that it is quite difficult to believe this is Mike's first year.

To Cindy Pearson, our assistant chief clerk and security manager, a special word of thanks and encouragement. Cindy has been serving the committee for the last 19 years. She is the consummate professional in every aspect of her work. She is away from us right now as she undergoes treatment for breast cancer. We want her to know she is ever present in our thoughts and in our prayers. We all look forward to welcoming Cindy Pearson back to the committee family soon.

So Rick's and Mike's and all the other committee staff members' long and hard work and personal sacrifices, day in and day out, to get this bill enacted again this year paid off. They are the backbone of the Senate. They and other people who work for us in this Senate make it possible to turn our ideas into policies and into legislation.

I thank them all. I know I thank them for their expertise and their dedication on behalf of all the members of the committee. They brought us again through to the point of conference with the House. We are hopeful to bring back promptly a conference report. But in the meantime, thanks to them, their professionalism, and their hard work. We are where we are at.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the entire Armed Services Committee staff be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE STAFF

Richard D. DeBobes, Staff Director; Michael V. Kostiw, Republican Staff Director; June M. Borawski, Printing and Documents Clerk; Leah C. Brewer, Nominations and Hearings Clerk; Joseph M. Bryan, Professional Staff Member; William M. Caniano, Professional Staff Member; Pablo E. Carrillo, Minority Investigative Counsel; Jonathan D. Clark, Counsel; Ilona R. Cohen, Counsel; David G. Collins, Research Assistant; Fletcher L. Cork, Staff Assistant; Christine E. Cowart, Chief Clerk; Daniel J. Cox, Jr., Professional Staff Member; Madelyn R. Creedon, Counsel; Kevin A. Cronin, Staff Assistant; Marie F. Dickinson, Administrative Assistant for the Minority; Gabriella Eisen, Counsel; Evelyn N. Farkas, Professional Staff Member; Richard W. Fieldhouse, Professional Staff Member; Creighton Greene, Professional Staff Member.

Gary J. Howard, Systems Administrator; Paul C. Hutton, IV, Research Assistant; Mark R. Jacobson, Professional Staff Member; Gregory T. Kiley, Professional Staff Member; Jessica L. Kingston, Staff Assistant; Michael J. Kuiken, Professional Staff Member; Gerald J. Leeling, Counsel; Peter K. Levine, General Counsel; Derek J. Maurer, Minority Counsel; Thomas K. McConnell, Professional Staff Member; Michael J. McCord, Professional Staff Member; William G.P. Monahan, Counsel; David M. Morrissey, Minority Counsel; Lucian L. Niemeyer, Professional Staff Member; Michael J. Noblet, Research Assistant; Bryan D. Parker, Minority Investigative Counsel; Christopher J. Paul, Professional Staff Member; Cindy Pearson, Assistant Chief Clerk and Security Manager; John H. Quirk V, Security Clerk; Benjamin L. Rubin, Staff Assistant.

Lynn F. Rusten, Professional Staff Member; Brian F. Sebold, Staff Assistant; Arun A. Seraphin, Professional Staff Member; Travis E. Smith, Special Assistant; Robert M. Soofer, Professional Staff Member; Sean G. Stackley, Professional Staff Member; William K. Sutley, Professional Staff Member; Kristine L. Svinicki, Professional Staff Member; Diana G. Tabler, Professional Staff Member; Mary Louise Wagner, Professional Staff Member; Richard F. Walsh, Minority Counsel; Breon N. Wells, Receptionist; Dana W. White, Professional Staff Member.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor. I see my dear friend Senator WARNER is here. Again, I cannot say too often what it means to have as a partner JOHN WARNER of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I very much value the friendship and the working relationship we have had together. It would be interesting if somebody wanted to try to look at records. I suppose since this is our 29th bill we have worked on, that might be a bit of a record. But I think also both of us have been chairman three times. That might be a bit of a record too.

But I say to the Senator from Michigan, I give you a most sincere and warm congratulations for your achieving this bill. This is the 19th day the bill was on the floor, and our good friend, the ranking member, was on the floor many of those days. He has called in each day to our distinguished chief of staff, Mike Kostiw, and has talked with me and other members of the staff. So he is very much hands on.

But I think we probably got through with a little less contention this time than in years past. I think that reflects a lot of credit on the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking member and the wonderful staff and very active membership by each and every one of the, as you say, 25 members of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

We work well together as a team. People are very proud to be on this committee. They believe they are serving a most noble cause; that is, the men and women of the Armed Forces, and their families, who tonight are on two battlefronts and, indeed, in many other places of personal danger throughout the world, for the sole purpose of guarding freedom and, most im-

portantly, the freedom we have here at home.

So I thank the chairman. I thank all who made it possible, and say, also, how well our two staffs worked together in a bipartisan way to achieve, as you say, a consensus on almost 200 of those amendments. So I think we have done our job, I say to the Senator. It is at a critical time in the course of our country. Again, I wish the men and women of the Armed Forces and their families only the best.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate insists on its amendment and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, my chairman has overlooked a minor item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with each Senator given 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

#### COSTA RICA AND TRADE POLICY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in this Chamber about a story unfolding right now in Costa Rica.

This country of 4 million people is having a national referendum on October 7—next week—on the Central American Free Trade Agreement, the trade deal this Congress passed by a narrow margin a couple of years ago.

CAFTA stipulates that the last signatory country must approve the deal no later than 2 years after the first signatory country implements the agreement.

So over the past 2 years, the United States, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic enacted the NAFTA expansion.

The Costa Rican people have resisted it.

My colleagues have seen news reports this weekend about a massive rally of fair traders—people who want trade but under different rules—against CAFTA in Costa Rica. Some 150,000 citizens in a country of 4 million people spoke out expressing their opposition to the agreement—150,000 people—and most thought that a conservative estimate.

The pro-CAFTA government gave up efforts to pass CAFTA in the legislature after continued protest against it, including a 2-day general strike last October.

Their is strong opposition to a NAFTA-style agreement. In fact, the issue of whether to approve CAFTA has stirred up such political upheaval that the Government chose to go to a public

referendum instead of going to the legislature. Legislators not unlike our peers in Congress did not want to face voters in their home district if they voted for the pact.

The agreement must be implemented as domestic law—meaning Costa Rica has to enact new laws in order for the trade agreement to take effect. That bothers hundreds of thousands of Costa Ricans because they have in place today strong laws on health, on the environment, on education, on privatization, on generic drugs, on all the kinds of issues that have helped to build the middle class in Costa Rica.

Costa Rica is a progressive country. More than a third of its land is protected in national parks. More than 90 percent of its electricity comes from renewals. Costa Rica's high literacy rates are well known, and it has a strong health care system. Its life expectancy is not too different than our own in this country.

Costa Rica's citizens have also seen what NAFTA—the North American Free Trade Agreement—did to Mexico's middle class, and what especially it has done to Mexican farmers, small peasant family farmers.

These factors have created strong resistance to entering into an agreement that can handcuff policymakers from setting pro-growth, prodevelopment policies in their own country.

As this Chamber knows, NAFTA/CAFTA-style deals are about a whole lot more than just tariffs and quotas. These agreements are top-down pacts that lock in new rules on investment, on food safety, on services, and on procurement.

This month, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development issued a report warning developing countries to be wary of bilateral and regional free-trade deals as they are currently written. They warned them against signing these agreements.

The U.N. report cited NAFTA as an example of a trade agreement that may have short-term benefits but does long-term harm. You hear a lot of talk from the Bush administration that free trade is necessary to address poverty. You hear that the “people,” as they say, of these mostly poor countries want trade deals like NAFTA.

But what we are seeing in Costa Rica right now is what we are seeing around the globe when it comes to trade deals that purely and simply give too much power to multinational corporations. What we are seeing is a loud and clear demand for change.

We see it in the WTO negotiations, which continue to falter as developing countries resist WTO expansion. We see it in Ohio—in Lorain and Mansfield, in Youngstown and Lima, in Dayton and Chillicothe—where hard-working men and women who have made America the strongest Nation in the world are betrayed by Washington's trade policy.

Presidents from both parties have entered into trade agreements, agreements such as NAFTA, promising they

would create millions of new jobs and enrich communities. Instead, too many of these agreements, too often, have cost millions of jobs and devastated communities.

Two years ago, when I served in the House, we created a bipartisan coalition against the Central American Free Trade Agreement. Religious organizations, labor unions, environmentalists, small businesses, human rights advocates, and small manufacturing companies were part of this bipartisan opposition.

The opposition that was evident in Washington and, more importantly, in congressional districts around the country caused the Bush administration to make deals and promises and—in the words of one sympathetic lawmaker to the Bush administration—helped us so that we “twist[ed] arms until they break into a thousand pieces.”

The Bush administration got what it wanted when it pushed NAFTA through. But we won the debate. Today in Costa Rica, we are seeing similar scare tactics taken by the pro-CAFTA administration.

A memo was leaked to the Costa Rican press, and it has caused an uproar for good reason. In this memo, the Costa Rican Vice President and a Member of Congress outlined a plan to President Arias that uses fear, threats to local officials, and attacks on CAFTA opposition as tactics to win the referendum.

The Second Vice President, one of the memo's authors, had to resign from his government office while officials investigate whether any laws had been broken.

The memo states clearly:

The mayor that does not win his canton—  
Which is their political jurisdiction—  
The mayor that does not win his canton (precinct) will not get a penny from the government in the next three years.

It is pretty simple. The memo says the government then needs to “stimulate fear” among Costa Ricans. It even lists the kinds of fear that are effective: Stimulate fear. Create fear of the loss of jobs if CAFTA is not approved. Stimulate a fear of violence and civil strife. Stimulate a fear of Chavez and Castro if Costa Rica does not approve CAFTA.

Specifically, there has been an informational campaign in Costa Rica that if this agreement fails, then the United States will punish Costa Rica by revoking the existing trade benefits that Costa Rica has under the Caribbean Basin Initiative. That is simply patently false.

Costa Rica will continue to benefit from CBI because it is the law. It is a permanent program. Its existence depends on the U.S. Congress, not an edict from the Bush administration.

These tactics should sound familiar to my colleagues who recall the CAFTA debate. These tactics make it very clear that what is at stake—in Costa Rica this week and when this

Chamber takes up issues of trade and globalization—is that there are very different competing ideologies. There is the NAFTA ideology and there is the fair trade ideology.

In truth, I believe the defeat of this referendum may actually do more to improve Costa Rican-U.S. relations because it is clear that there is a fair trade movement on the rise in this Chamber, in the House of Representatives, and surely across the land. Look at elections last year in the Presiding Officer's State of Rhode Island, in Ohio, in Pennsylvania, in Missouri, and in Minnesota and Virginia and Montana, because it is clear there is a fair trade movement on the rise in this country and in Costa Rica.

We have reason to hope. If the referendum is defeated, we can create a new trade agreement that benefits workers and communities, small businesses, religious folks, people who care about an economy that works for more of us, that helps us to create a solid, strong middle class, not just supporting the multinational corporations.

We have a choice. The people of Costa Rica have a choice there this week. We can continue with the fair trade model or we can reject the NAFTA and CAFTA models and work together on a new trade deal, a fair trade deal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BURMA

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for the past week the world watched the people of Burma rise up against the oppressive regime that rules that country.

Then, the tyrannical junta that has held power for some 40 years, the State Peace and Development Council, brought out its soldiers and it brought out its guns. They arrested, brutalized, and killed many who bravely stood up to the misrule of this junta.

So while last week the streets were filled with brave monks adorned in saffron robes demonstrating for freedom, today those same streets are occupied by uniformed thugs and lined with barbed-wire barricades. For now the people of Burma have largely fallen silent. But the silence in Burma is a deafening one that we can still hear. Even if the freedom-loving people of Burma had been temporarily quieted, the rest of us can still lend our voices to their cause.

Earlier today, Senator KERRY and I introduced a sense-of-the-Senate resolution condemning the SPDC for its brutality in snuffing out these cries for