

HEINONLINE

Citation: 4 Bernard D. Reams Jr. Law of E-SIGN A Legislative
of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National
Act Public Law No. 106-229 2000 H2527 2002

Content downloaded/printed from
HeinOnline (<http://heinonline.org>)
Sun Apr 21 21:44:23 2013

- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance
of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license
agreement available at <http://heinonline.org/HOL/License>
- The search text of this PDF is generated from
uncorrected OCR text.

So as a consequence of this the Coast Guard has been taking and trying to interdict these vessels in the open ocean and moving them to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands through the collaboration and cooperation of Governor Tenorio and other officials there, and for that at least the people of Guam are grateful, and we certainly endorse this policy, this practice which has been implemented by the Clinton administration.

Illegal immigration into the United States is a Federal responsibility. Because of Guam's proximity to Asia, it is incumbent that Federal agencies assist the Government of Guam in combating this serious problem on our shores. It is important to understand that Guam is only 212 square miles in size and our population is only 150,000. Any significant increase in the immigrant population on the island has significant social and financial repercussions because of our financial, current financial conditions which are affected by the Asian economic crisis, and because we do not have the alternative resources available for noncriminal alien immigrants that are generally available in the U.S. mainland.

The financial strain on Guam's resources are tremendous. I hope that we can find a way to reprogram some \$10 to \$15 million to take care of this problem on Guam and to reimburse the Government of Guam for costs that have already been expended on this crisis.

A PEACEFUL RESOLUTION TO THE SITUATION IN THE BALKANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I hope we are all here well informed of the efforts of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), to bring about a peaceful solution to the situation in the Balkans. In the light of yesterday's votes on the Balkans, I believe this effort should be immediately embraced by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am astounded that the administration choose not to support the attempts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) at finding a peaceful solution to the crisis in Kosovo. The decision by the administration leads me to reluctantly conclude that they are determined to prosecute a war in Kosovo regardless of costs. The attempt by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) in coordination with the Russian Duma should have been wholeheartedly embraced by this administration as a means to ensure the safety of not only the Kosovars, but our men and women in uniform carrying out the NATO mission. I can think of no reason why the administration would reject the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the members of the

Russian Duma. The agreement, if successful, would establish a cease-fire under conditions first proposed by the NATO countries.

Now, if the NATO requirements were dismissed in the proposal and unsatisfactory ones drafted, I could understand that the administration would be unable or unwilling to support it. But a rejection of a potential agreement with the NATO conditions as a prerequisite is unimaginable.

It is essential for this Congress to accept its responsibility to our men and women in uniform and ensure that their safety is the paramount concern of the United States. Unfortunately, with the administration's rejection of the potential peace initiative I cannot be sure that it is theirs.

The United States does not have a vital interest in the Balkans. We have not been presented with clear objectives, any specific mission or even a coherent exit strategy. Now the administration is choosing military action over peace.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to support the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) in the Balkans.

THE HIGH TECH ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the fastest growing segment of our economy has been the high tech segment of our economy driven mostly by computers, software, the Internet, biotech, and also the products that our increasing technology enables us to create. It is what has been most responsible for the strong economy we have enjoyed in the last 7 or 8 years and, more importantly, will be the cornerstone of what the future is going to hold. The more we can do to move the high tech economy forward, the more jobs that we could create and the stronger an economy that we can have.

Now we deal with a lot of complicated issues in Congress. Mostly our goal is to try to improve the lives of the people we represent. There are a lot of very strong difficulties in doing that, but the one thing that most clearly, positively affects the lives of the people all of us represent is a strong economy. That is means opportunity, opportunity for good jobs and a decent wage so that you can take care of your family and build for the future. High tech is critical to that.

That is the first component of what I want to talk about, the high tech economy. The second component is exports and basically creating markets for our goods, specifically for our high tech goods. Ninety-six percent of the people in the world live someplace other than the United States of America.

Now in the U.S. we still manage to consume 20 percent of the world's goods, services and products, so what

that means is if we are going to have growth in any aspect of our economy really, not just the high tech aspect, we are going to have to look overseas. We are going to have to look to that other 96 percent of the world out there and increase their consumption of our goods.

Bottom line: Increase exports, and in particular, increase exports of high tech products. Those are the two things that need to come together, the importance of getting at that 96 percent of the rest of the world and the importance of continuing to allow our high tech economy to thrive. If that high tech economy is going to thrive, we are going to have to get access to those other markets. Our companies in this country are going to have to get access to those other markets for one central reason, that we are the leaders in most aspects of the high tech economy.

We are far from alone. Countries throughout the world are developing their own Internet technology, their own telecommunications technology, their own software and hardware technology. We have competitors out there, and if they have access to markets that we do not have access to, that is inevitably going to catch up with us. It is going to give them the ability to grow and prosper and then feed more money back into research and development to develop the next best product, and in the high tech community, as my colleagues know, today's best product could be just totally out the window tomorrow as technology leaps ahead. You have to be the one in the position to leap ahead, and to get there we have to give our high tech products access to those foreign markets, and we are failing in three areas right at the moment.

Number one, we have too many broad based economic sanctions that are unilaterally imposed by our country. We unilaterally decide that our country's companies will not be allowed to do business with dozens of other countries for dozens of other reasons. This does not work because while we make that unilateral decision, our competitors do not. Our competitors sell products to those same countries, so we do not have any impact on the country that we are trying to impact except to force them to buy good goods from our competitors.

But two other areas are specifically problematic for the high tech community. One is encryption software, and skipping a complicated analysis, encryption software is basically the software that enables you to protect whatever is on your computer, to make sure that only you can see it and no one else can. This is very important for a variety of reasons, privacy reasons but also competitive reasons.

Any computer technology, computer product, software product that is sold requires top-of-the-line encryption technology, but our country does not allow our companies to export top-of-

the-line encryption technology. We place caps on how much of it can be sent out, depending on the product and depending on the service. That puts us at a disadvantage with our competitors and gives them a chance to get ahead of us in the high tech economy and jeopardizes future economic growth.

We do this because we are concerned about the national security implications of encryption technology, and they are there, there is no question. The better encryption technology you have, the better you are able to either protect your national security or breach somebody else's. The mistake we made is in assuming that by placing controls on the export of our companies' encryption technology, that somehow stops the rest of the world from getting it.

Encryption technology can be downloaded off the Internet. Dozens of other countries sell and export top-of-the-line encryption technology. All we do is place ourselves at a disadvantage and in the long run hurt our national security interests. We hurt them because we hurt our own companies' ability to be the leaders in leap-ahead technology. There was a great relationship in this country between the National Security Council, the FBI and our high-tech companies. They can work together to develop the best products to help with our national security concerns, but not if the company developing the best technology is from China or Germany or even Canada. They do not have the same cooperative relationship with the FBI that our own companies can have. We need to change encryption technology export, for the good of our economy and for the good of our export sector.

INTERPRETING THE VOTES ON KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the subject that is on all of our minds is the fight in Kosovo, and I would like to focus on properly interpreting the votes of yesterday and looking to what our opportunities for solving this crisis might be tomorrow.

Yesterday was a momentous day in the history of this House. First, we voted with an over 80 percent vote that the President should not send major ground forces into Kosovo without the approval of this House.

Now it is fair to point out that there were those on the other side. They argued that Congress should not have a role in determining whether ground forces are deployed. They argued that our enemies would tremble in fear if they knew that one man, the President of the United States, without the approval of Congress, could deploy 100,000 American soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I would tremble in fear, and the founders of this republic would

tremble in fear if it was thought that one man, without the approval of the representatives of the people, could send 100,000 of our men and women into battle.

□ 1400

But the fact that Congress insists upon approving in advance any deployment of ground troops does not mean that Congress has prejudged the issue.

Whether this country supports ground troops will depend, in my opinion, on what we discover is happening to the men of Kosovo. Because the refugees come out, the women, the children, the old men, but the younger men and the middle-aged men are left behind. They may join the KLA, and that is their right; they may be detained, and that is not something that would cause incredible outrage. But if we discover, as so many fear, that the men of Kosovo are being systematically slaughtered, then there will be an outcry throughout Europe and the United States, and it is possible that this House would authorize the use of ground troops.

Second, and I think most telling, we voted 2-to-1, and that is very rare in this House, by a 2-to-1 majority against ending all hostilities. In doing so, we made it clear that America is not simply going to shrug our shoulders and walk away. This is the most important vote, and the vote that should be focused on by Belgrade.

The third vote, and, unfortunately, the vote that is getting the press, was a vote of 213 to 213 as to whether this House would go on record authorizing the air strikes.

Now, our own press is misinterpreting this vote, for it came just a few hours after, by a 2-to-1 majority, my colleagues and I voted not to stop what is going on now. We are not fools. What is going on now is an air campaign, and our decision not to stop it should have been read as a decision to go forward, at least for the present time.

But our own press, let alone the people in Belgrade, misinterpret the last vote yesterday, because they fail to account for two groups that voted against the resolution. One was a group, unfortunately, of some of my Republican colleagues, who, while they support continuing the air campaign, oppose saying anything good about anything President Clinton has ever done. It is not a secret even in Belgrade that President Clinton is not popular in the Republican Caucus, but that does mean that this people or this Congress wants to stop action and let Milosevic have his way.

Second, there were a group that I respect immensely who looked at some of the hidden possible legal implications of that resolution. They noticed that under the War Powers Act there may be a challenge to any attempt by the President to put in ground troops without the approval of this House, and that there is some judicial writing to the effect that if Congress authorizes

any kind of force, that we are in no position to limit any other kind of force.

Properly interpreted, the votes of yesterday are clear: We should proceed to work to put Kosovars back in their homes in security and peace, and I addressed the House earlier on some of the more creative ways to try to accomplish that.

EXEMPTING U.S. FOOD AND MEDICINE FROM UNILATERAL TRADE SANCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for 5 minutes. Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I want to use these 5 minutes for purposes of commencing the administration's announcement of yesterday in which they are exempting food and medicine from unilateral trade sanctions. This has a possible immediate and positive impact on agriculture exports of wheat, rice and corn.

The United States agricultural producers, and we will hear a little bit more about that in the next hour, have faced a lot of problems with trade barriers imposed by other countries; but United States sanctions, when we and some who believe that our own policies can be put forward by denying shipment of food and medicine to countries, that too becomes a sanction or a trade barrier.

We have clearly proven, I think, over the last several years that sanctions do not work; they hurt producers, and they hurt those that we do not intend to hurt. I think that we can find much more effective ways to implement foreign policy.

Therefore, the new policy, which is part of the administration's long-term review of sanctions, which is intended to ensure effectiveness of economic sanctions, is designed to minimize the cost to United States' producers of anything and maintain the reputation of the United States as a reliable supplier, something that often gets overlooked by some who believe that these actions, as they result in what is perceived to be in the best interests of the United States, often do not accomplish that which was intended.

A recent report from the President's Export Council showed that more than 75 countries may be subject to sanctions. In 1995, sanctions cost America \$15 billion to \$19 billion and affected 200,000 to 250,000 export-related jobs.

Speaking specifically of agriculture, United States agriculture exports account for 30 percent of all U.S. farm cash receipts and 40 percent of all agricultural production. Sanctions and embargoes make it more and more difficult for farmers and ranchers to expand agricultural markets, particularly when the 95-96 farm bill was designed to make us more reliant on foreign markets. It absolutely makes no sense then to deny the market opportunity for our producers.

Document No. 82

