10 minutes for Senator DORGAN, 10 minutes for Senator BUMPERS, 10 minutes for Senator GRAHAM of Florida, 10 minutes for Senator SNOWE and 5 minutes equally divided between Senator MCCAIN and Senator WYDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BUMPERS. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to include, if it is agreeable with the manager, 2 minutes for the distinguished Senator from New York to speak on the previous nomination.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator repeat that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator repeat the request? Can we have all extraneous conversations taken to the Cloakroom?

Mr. BUMPERS. I suggest to the distinguished floor manager that I will not object to his request, but I want to include 2 minutes immediately for the distinguished Senator from New York to speak on the previous nomination.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that prior to resuming debate, the Senator from New York be recognized for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I understand the unanimous consent request is now agreed to, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Senator from New York is recognized.

NOMINATION OF SONIA SOTOMAYOR, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the Senate has just passed an enormous milestone in the composition of the American judiciary with the confirmation of Judge Sonia Sotomayor for the appointment to the second circuit court of appeals. It is a fine day for New York, I might say specifically for the Bronx, a fine day for the judiciary.

I thank our distinguished Judiciary Committee chairman, Senator HATCH, Senator LEAHY, and the majority leader, Mr. LOTT, and his colleague, Mr. DASCHLE, and, of course, my colleague, Senator D'AMATO.

It was 7 years ago in March that I had the honor to nominate Sonia Sotomayor to serve on the southern district of New York. President Bush placed her name in nomination, and she was sworn in directly on October 1992. Her subsequent experience on the bench has been admirable. In 5½ years, she has presided over 500 cases and has been overturned only 6 times. She has presided over cases of enormous complexity with skill and confidence that would befit the editor of the Yale Law Journal and a person who rose from the most simple circumstances in south Bronx to the eminence she is now assured.

I thank the Senate, I thank all those involved, and I thank, not least, my friend from Arkansas for yielding me this time.

INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 3677

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, let me remind my colleagues of a very simple fact. Don't vote against this amendment because you want to go home and tell your constituents that it imposes a new tax. It does not. For all of you people, when we talked about unfunded mandates, who talked endlessly about States rights, this is a classic States rights issue. If you vote against my amendment, you are saying to the States: We don't trust you; we are not going to let you collect new taxes on remote sales; we are going to stand by while your tax base is eroded, while you try to raise property taxes in order to pay for schools, but we simply cannot trust you and, therefore, we are not going to give you the authority.

I am telling you—I do not know how I can say it more dramatically, more graphically—as a former Main Street merchant, I can tell you it is patently unfair to make the people of my State and your States make Main Street merchants collect sales tax on every single dime they take in, but if you want to move just across the State line and ship it back into the State, you can do it and not charge any sales tax.

I had a cousin who bought a fur coat in New York. The clerk said, ''You sound like you're southern.'' She said, ''I am. I'm from Little Rock.'' The clerk said, ''Why don't you let us mail this coat to you? That way you won't have to pay this $100 or $300''—whatever it was—''in sales tax.'' She said, ''Fine. Just mail it to me.'' That is the kind of thing that is going on, and it is going to continue to go on.

On your desk, in about 10 minutes, you will find the list of people in this country who strongly favor the BUMPERS amendment. You know who they are? They are the Governors; they are the mayors; they are the city councils; they are a whole host of Main Street merchant organizations. Look at it before you vote, and figure out what you are going to say to them the next time you address their organizations on why you didn't vote for this amendment. Tell the Governors why their tax base is being eroded.

Mr. President, we exempt in this bill—listen carefully—we exempt every mail-order house in the United States that does less than $3 million a year. That exempts about 89% of the mail-order companies in the United States. My amendment would make the States put in a 1–800 number so any mail-order house that is confused can call the State and find out what that State's rule is. We have a blended rate so that the mail-order house only has to collect one rate and the States will distribute it between the cities and the counties. We have done everything in the world to make this as easy as possible for everybody.

Mr. President, here is an article from the New York Times this morning. There is a copy of the article on every member's desk. This article make all the arguments that I have made here this morning.

Let me tell you one other argument they make that I have not made, and that is that people who buy on the Internet are the wealthiest people in the country. They are the ones who are doing most of the buying, because they have Internet access. So if I am a wealthy person, I have a computer in my home, and I am on-line, this sales tax loophole favors me. The guy making $6 to $10 an hour does not have a computer in his house. He does not know what is available on the Internet. It is another way of discriminating against those who have the least.

Mr. President, I am really sorry that we are in such a rush. I know a lot of people want to catch planes, and I am sympathetic to that. I have been in that situation myself. But I want to say, No. 1, please read the New York Times article; please look at the list of people that will be on your desk in about 5 minutes who support this amendment; and, finally, if you are going to vote against this amendment, please figure out what you are going to say to the mayors and the Governors who have the responsibility of keeping the schools open, who have the responsibility of funding the fire departments, who have the responsibility of funding the police departments, keeping the streets clean, keeping the landfills in compliance with EPA rules, and all the other things that cost ''gazillions'' of dollars across the country. Ask them why they are not allowed to collect a little tax to at least help pay the landfill for covering up 4 million tons of catalogs a year, if nothing else.

So, Mr. President, I know everybody is in a hurry. And I guess I have said about all I need to say. I see Senator DORGAN on the floor who wants to speak and who has time allocated. So, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me, in just the 10 minutes that I am allotted, make a comment about the amendment offered by Senator BUMPERS and also to comment about the underlying bill.

Senator BUMPERS offers an amendment that I think is very important and one that I intend to vote for and feel is a good amendment. The bill brought to the floor of the Senate, in its original form when it was passed out of the Commerce Committee, was totally unacceptable to me. I voted against it, worked against it, and felt

its provisions were counterproductive. But since that time, the Senator from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, Senator MCCAIN, I, and others, have worked together; and the bill that will now be presented—I believe changed also by the managers' amendment—is a piece of legislation that has merit. But I think the legislation will be improved by the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas as well.

This legislation is called the Internet Tax Freedom Act. And all of us understand that the information superhighway and new technology mean that commerce in this country is changing. Nowadays, if you want to buy a book, you can walk down to a bookstore someplace and buy a book. You might be able to look in a mail-order catalog and buy a book, or you might be able to go to your computer and buy a book. In either of those cases, you are a consumer purchasing a book.

You can do the same with a saddle, if you happen to ride horses. You can do the same with a car. For that matter, you can do the same with virtually all merchandise these days. And the Internet, used for commerce purposes, is exploding all around us.

The question is: When people are accessing the Internet or, for that matter, a mail-order catalog, or going downtown to make the purchase at a local business, what are the tax consequences? What kind of taxes do they pay? To whom do they pay those taxes? These are important issues.

I am not someone who believes we ought to impede the use of the Internet in any way with punitive taxes. I believe that if there are punitive or discriminatory taxes that would impede the ability of the Internet to serve this country's commerce interests, then let's stop that, let's prevent the States from doing that. I have always said to the Senator from Oregon, who has been a leader on this issue, you and I do not disagree on that score. If there are taxes imposed that are punitive, then I say, stop it. But the other question that is raised by the Senator from Arkansas is a very important question.

Someone decides to start a store on the main street of Fargo, ND, or Little Rock, AR, and they decide to open for business. They rent a place, buy a sign and put it out front. They hire some people to work in the place, get some inventory in, and then they open the door. And they are proud; they have some flowers around for their grand opening. There they are; they are in business. Then someone walks down the street, sees their picture window, goes on in, and buys a product.

When that person buys that product, in Little Rock or in Fargo, ND, that person is going to pay the local retail taxes that are imposed by that State. That is the way it works. That is the way it always works.

Then we see an increase in mail-order sales. What happens with mail-order sales is that someone sends a catalog into the home. The person sitting in a home orders the same products, does not go down to a store to order but just orders it through the mail, and gets those products sold without a sales tax attached. If that State has a 6-percent sales tax, it means that catalog seller has about a 6-percent advantage over the person who has hired the employees, rented the building, and holds himself open for business on Main Street.

The Senator from Arkansas is correct—and I think not many people know this—when the person orders from the mail-order catalog and gets the merchandise, that individual has a responsibility—in almost all the States—to pay a use tax. Most people will never do that because they do not know that requirement exists, don't have the forms to comply in any event, and would not want to fill out a set of forms for 86 cents or $1.86. So the fact is, it does not happen.

Now, add to mail-order catalog sales the question of Internet sales. And what are the tax consequences there? What will be the impact on the Main Street businessperson who is competing with that Internet seller, competing with the mail-order seller? What will be the impact on that Main Street merchant? That is the question that is raised by the Senator from Arkansas. It is a very legitimate question.

I come from the Jeffersonian wing of my political party. The Jeffersonian wing believes, as Thomas Jefferson did, that this country is made strong by broad-based economic ownership. A lot of men and women across this country are in the market system, opening up for business, with a network of small businesses doing business all across America. We ought to be mindful of how those folks on Main Street that are risking all their savings to open their businesses are treated with the tax system. If you are a real person that has a business on Main Street you are treated one way for tax purposes, but if you have a catalog firm or Internet selling operation you are treated a different way.

The Internet Tax Freedom Act, at its roots now, as it has been changed, is an attempt to say we don't want anybody to see this Internet system as some huge peach out there that they can take a big bite out of for tax purposes in a way that is punitive and impedes or retards the growth of Internet. I agree with that.

But the Senator from Arkansas raises another question: Do we want the Internet and/or mail-order sellers to have an advantage over the folks who open their businesses on Main Street with respect to the imposition of State and local taxes? The answer to that ought to be no. This ought to be tax neutral. The whole system ought to be tax neutral. No matter how you are selling your product, you ought not be in a circumstance where you are selling it at an advantage over the person that hired the people, found the location and is open for business on Main Street. That is the point the Senator from Arkansas is making.

This is not a new issue, incidentally, for mail-order catalogs, but it certainly is a new issue with respect to the Internet.

I guess it was probably 7 years ago when I was in the other body serving on the Ways and Means Committee, probably 8 years ago, and got a bill through the subcommittee on the Ways and Means Committee to do just exactly what the Senator from Arkansas is proposing. It was very controversial. It never got beyond the subcommittee. I got the subcommittee to vote it out. But then our committee got millions of post cards from across the mail-order spectrum saying that the attempt here was to increase taxes. That is not true at all. The Senator from Arkansas doesn't propose, and I would never propose, we increase taxes on transactions. That is not the case. There is no proposal here that would increase anybody's tax.

The question here is: How do you treat different kinds of commerce in a way that is fair with respect to the imposition of State and local taxes? Some say let's treat it in this way: Have the Federal Government set itself up as the referee and create moratoriums and prohibitions and all kinds of mandates with respect to the State and local governments. I don't happen to favor that. I don't think that is the right approach.

Others say let us find a way to be helpful to the State and local governments to do what is necessary to even this out so we don't have discriminatory taxes imposed on one kind of seller versus another kind of seller. That is what I think is addressed by the Senator from Arkansas.

I do want to mention with respect to the larger bill that is before the Senate, this is very important. If this is done in a way that is inappropriate, in a way that we really don't understand, in a way that changes words sufficient so that we have a blizzard of litigation in all the State courts all across the country or in a way that creates safe harbors for certain kinds of people doing certain kinds of business or punitive tax treatment because competitors are not faced with the same consequences, then we will have done a disservice.

The moratorium that is described in the legislation is a moratorium that I think is appropriate. It says let's take a time out for a few years. We will take a time out and we will evaluate where we are. We will grandfather the States that have certain kinds of taxes, but we won't impose different taxes until we understand what we are doing here. I agree with that.

The New York Times in their editorial this morning says the Senate, which debates this bill today, should resist extending the moratorium to 5 years. I agree with that, as well. We will have Members come to the floor and say, ''Gee, the moratorium is a

great idea. Let's slap a moratorium on the States.''

I support a thoughtful, sensible moratorium to give time regarding what is happening here, but a 5-year moratorium is far too long. Those who propose that with an amendment—I am sure they will; I am told they will—I hope we can defeat a 5-year moratorium. That is wholly inappropriate.

Those are the comments I want to make in support of the effort made by the Senator from Arkansas. He does the Senate, in my judgment, a real service. As he leaves the Senate, I will miss him walking up and down the aisle telling us about his home State, but I will miss him most importantly for the causes he fights for and the aggressive, energetic manner that he fights for these important things. Sometimes he wins, sometimes he loses, but the prospect of winning and losing doesn't affect the kind of things he knows in his heart are right. He is as aggressive as anybody in this Senate in fighting for the things he finds important.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas. It meets some basic tests. It meets the test of essential fairness.

We have today in this country a situation in which if Main Street were divided north and south, all of the stores along the northern part of Main Street are meeting their obligations to collect the appropriate State and local tax which is levied by their locally elected officials within that State and which are used to support State and local government. But the stores along the south side of Main Street are treated differently because the south side of Main Street is in another State, in another jurisdiction. Therefore, the sales that are made on the south side of Main Street are not subject to the requirement of collection by the seller as are the stores on the north side of Main Street.

Therefore, if you go into a clothing store on the north side of Main Street and buy a suit, shirt, dress or shoes, you will pay and the store will collect and remit to the State those taxes which have been levied. But if you are on the south side of Main Street and you are communicating by telephone or through the post office, that seller does not have that obligation to collect the tax.

This is fundamentally unfair. It is not only unfair to the retail seller on the north side of the street, it is also unfair in that it deprives the community of the resources which are necessary in order to pay for police, fire, health, and particularly educational services, the most expensive service that most communities provide to their citizens.

In his opening statement, the Senator from Oregon and my colleague and good friend, Senator WYDEN, indicated that the fundamental issue here is to treat commerce in a state of neutrality as it relates to technology. I think that very appropriately states the destination that we all want to get to, that we want to treat commerce with neutrality as it relates to the technology with which the commerce is conducted. Clearly, that is not the state of the law today.

Senator BUMPERS gives us an opportunity to achieve that neutrality by saying that all sellers will be responsible for the collection of State and local sales tax whether they are on the north or south side of Main Street.

In addition to being an issue of fairness, it is an issue of our Nation's future. If there is one thing that unites Americans in 1998, it is a recognition that our future as a nation, our future as a cultural leader, as a security leader, and as an economic leader depends, more than any single thing, on the ability of each individual American to be able to perform at their highest level of potential. And it is to our education system that we look to provide for most Americans that means by which they can achieve their full ability.

We have decided here in the Congress—and it is a position which I generally support also as a member of the Jefferson wing of the Democratic Party—that the best government is that government which is closest to the people who are served. We have, in a number of areas, devolved responsibilities to State and local governments. Those responsibilities also carry with them the obligation of State and local governments to provide the resources to finance those services.

We have also, Mr. President, thus far, refused to provide for additional partnerships where the Federal Government could enter into programs to assist State and local responsibilities. One of the most dramatic of those has been in the area of school construction. I must personally say, having stated my essential Jeffersonian position, that I believe it is appropriate for the Federal Government to assist local school districts and States in seeing that old schools are rehabilitated and new schools are constructed to meet an increase in student population. This is a particular issue in my State of Florida, Mr. President, as we are entering a state of maturity in Florida in which we have many schools that are now 40, 50, 60 years old, or more, and need substantial rehabilitation. We are also a State that, every year, is adding some 50,000 to 60,000 new students to our public schools, therefore requiring new schools to be constructed in order to provide the classrooms and laboratories for those additional students, without resorting to overcrowded classrooms.

I believe that the Federal Government has a role to play in this area, and it will be a role that could be played without undue interference with the responsibilities of State and local officials for the management of public education. I point out, however, that none of those efforts to provide for expanded Federal assistance has been accepted—other than some items through the Tax Code—and there has been a limited benefit to a certain number of school districts. But if we are not going to be providing an aggressive partnership to help States meet what today is over a $200 billion unmet need for school rehabilitation and new school construction, at least we ought to be assisting the States by allowing them to have their own taxes collected by remote sellers.

According to the New York Times editorial, which was previously referenced, the loophole that exists in today's law that holds that remote sellers are not responsible for collecting State and local sales taxes results in a revenue loss of $3.5 billion today. And that number will rise as more commerce is conducted from remote sales. That $3.5 billion, if the States collect it, could finance a significant beginning of States meeting their school construction needs.

So as I believe the first principle of the former profession of the occupant of the Chair is to ''do no harm,'' at least we ought to do no harm to the States by not precluding them from securing the revenue which they would have gotten had those sales been on the north side of Main Street because the decision was made to buy on the south side of Main Street from a remote seller.

So, Mr. President, this is not only an issue of fundamental fairness, it is an issue of States in this era of devolution of responsibility and Federal reticence to provide assistance to States carrying out their most important responsibilities, such as the education of their children. This will be a step toward our recognizing our responsibilities to our brethren at the State level to be able to fulfill these responsibilities.

Now, Mr. President, as I conclude, I do so with strong support for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. Having offered the same amendment in the Finance Committee and having seen it defeated, and knowing this is not the first time that it has been debated on the Senate floor with the result being defeat, I am not optimistic that the Senate today, regrettably, will adopt the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

We are going to have another debate on a collateral subject, Mr. President. I alert my colleagues to this. It is the debate on whether the commission, which will be established in Senator WYDEN's bill, should have the opportunity to consider the issue of the responsibility of remote sellers to collect State and local sales tax. At a minimum, if we are not going to adopt Senator BUMPERS' very wise proposal today, we certainly should allow the commission to consider this on another

day with even more analysis than we already have, and we will be in a position to do so.

Mr. President, as I conclude, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of October 2, 1998, entitled ''Fair Taxation in Cyberspace.''

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

[From the New York Times Oct. 2, 1998]

FAIR TAXATION IN CYBERSPACE

The rapid growth in sales of goods over the Internet raises hard questions about how states might fairly tax those transactions. The same problem has existed for years in mail-order sales. Consumers are technically liable for sales taxes on all purchases, including out-of-state catalogue purchases, but mail-order companies are required to collect sales taxes only in states where they maintain a physical presence. This loophole costs state and local governments about $3.5 billion a year.

The National Governors' Association and local government groups are rightly worried they will lose billions more a year from Internet sales that would otherwise be taxable in a traditional store. That loss—estimated to reach $10 billion a year in the next decade—will have a disproportionate impact on states that depend heavily on sales taxes, providing a tax break mostly for the affluent who have access to the Internet.

On-line service providers and electronic commerce lobbying groups, of course, want to make cyberspace tax-free, arguing that taxation would choke off Internet growth. Tax policy should not discriminate against electronic sales. But neither should the Internet be protected from taxes that apply in other realms of commerce.

Congress should keep the principle of parity in mind as it works through the proposed Internet Tax Freedom Act. The bill is intended to give state and Federal officials some breathing room to tackle these issues in a coordinated fashion. The House version, approved in June, would establish a three-year moratorium on any new Internet sales taxes and taxes on access to on-line services. It would also create a national advisory commission to examine ways to improve tax collection on all remote sales, including possible changes in Federal law to close the out-of-state-sales loophole.

The Senate, which debates the bill today, should resist extending the moratorium to five years, as some senators want. A long moratorium is unnecessary and would be hard to undo as consumers and businesses become accustomed to a tax-free cyberspace. In the meantime, the dozen states that have enacted Internet access taxes should be allowed to keep those taxes in place. Congress has no good reason to truncate state taxing authority, particularly since Internet commerce is thriving.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute from the time remaining of the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. BUMPERS.

Mr. President, we have talked about catalog sales and the loss of funds. Yesterday, on the DOD authorization bill, we usurped States in their ability to tax, and now we are turning that around. Yesterday, we told the States that we are going to usurp a tax if we don't think it is fair locally or statewide. The residents of Tennessee who work in Kentucky at a Federal installation, who have been paying taxes—and the States have worked it out—were excluded yesterday. And then my residents in Kentucky are paying the Tennessee sales tax, and they were not exempt because Tennessee goes on a high sales tax and no income tax. So, yesterday we said to State and local governments that you can't tax.

There are 240 installations around the country. I think you will rue the day that you usurped the Buck Act and you said to the States that we are Big Brother and we will tell you how to tax. Now we have a catalog question before us that says we ought to get the tax. So we have to be very careful what we are doing. Yesterday was a bad day, not necessarily for Kentucky, but for others. Oregon had the same problem with Washington. They passed a law and worked it out and everything is fine. That is what we ought to do between States. This was not a Federal tax.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, like my friend from Arkansas, I am concerned about the effect that mail order sales companies have on local retailers. I have no axe to grind with these businesses, and in fact applaud their ability to provide a very important service to many Americans. The convenience of this type of purchasing is good for the consumer.

What does concern me is the possibility that mail order and other direct sales companies' popularity is on the rise simply because they are not required to collect state sales taxes. I do not know if that is the true reason for their growth, but I would be concerned if they are taking advantage of what may be, in effect, an uneven playing field. Remember, local merchants, who compete with direct sales companies for business, have no opportunity to avoid collecting sales tax on their transactions.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas raises a very important issue, and I am glad that the Senate has had the opportunity to debate it this morning. But this is a complicated issue, and cannot be fully considered over a few hours of debate on the floor of the Senate.

I have several questions about the proposal offered by the Senator from Arkansas. For example, is it reasonable to set the exemption level at $3 million of annual sales? Is the per state exemption level of $100,000 in annual sales an appropriate level? On whom should this obligation be imposed?

Mr. President, these are just some of the questions that the Advisory Commission should be given the opportunity to explore. It may be that when this issue is fully reviewed, the Congress will decide that the approach proposed by the Senator from Arkansas is the correct one. But I don't think we can make that judgment today, and that is why I am voting to table this amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of Senator SNOWE's time to the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM ACT

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I have sought recognition to speak briefly in support of the International Religious Freedom Act, which was introduced today.

Mr. President, this follows some 2 years of effort. This legislation, first introduced by Congressman FRANK WOLF in the House and then introduced by myself in the U.S. Senate, seeks to put the imprimatur of the United States of America squarely in opposition to the religious persecution that is going on around the world. Again, the efforts have continued for 2 years.

Recently, because of certain objections to the tough sanctions imposed in the bill introduced by Congressman WOLF and myself, compromise legislation has been crafted with the leadership of Senator NICKLES, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator COATS, with my participation, which strikes out at religious persecution around the world. Freedom of religion is a basic American value; perhaps along with freedom of speech, the basic American value; perhaps even more important than any other value expressed in our Bill of Rights, because freedom of religion is the first item mentioned in the Bill of Rights.

We have seen around the world egregious religious persecution with clerics being mistreated in China; with individuals being sold into slavery in Sudan. My own observations and investigation in Saudi Arabia, illustratively where Christians cannot have a Christmas tree in their window if it can be viewed by the outside; where Jewish men and women in the fighting forces in Tent City—where we have some 5,000 American personnel protecting the Saudis in the midst of a desolate desert—those Jewish military personnel are afraid to wear their dog tags, their identification being just too risky. In the Egyptian press Congressman WOLF and I have been vilified and chastised for our efforts to fight against religious persecution around the world.

You can judge people by their enemies as well as by their friends. It is a tribute of a sort—also a tribute of a source—to be so chastised for speaking out against religious persecution.

The bill, which was introduced today, Senate bill 1868, candidly, does not go as far as this Senator would have liked. My own view is that religious persecution ought to be met by very forceful sanctions. But the message was clear and unequivocal that the President's