

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5—EXPRESSING CONGRESSIONAL OPPOSITION TO THE UNILATERAL DECLARATION OF A PALESTINIAN STATE AND URGING THE PRESIDENT TO ASSERT CLEARLY UNITED STATES OPPOSITION TO SUCH A UNILATERAL DECLARATION OF STATEHOOD

Mr. MURKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MACK, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KERREY of Nebraska, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. HELMS, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. GRAMS, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 5

Whereas at the heart of the Oslo peace process lies the basic, irrevocable commitment made by Palestinian Chairman Yasir Arafat that, in his words, "all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations";

Whereas resolving the political status of the territory controlled by the Palestinian Authority while ensuring Israel's security is one of the central issues of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict;

Whereas a declaration of statehood by the Palestinians outside the framework of negotiations would, therefore, constitute a most fundamental violation of the Oslo process;

Whereas Yasir Arafat and other Palestinian leaders have repeatedly threatened to declare unilaterally the establishment of a Palestinian state;

Whereas the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state would introduce a dramatically destabilizing element into the Middle East, risking Israeli countermeasures, a quick descent into violence, and an end to the entire peace process; and

Whereas in light of continuing statements by Palestinian leaders, United States opposition to any unilateral Palestinian declaration of statehood should be made clear and unambiguous: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That—*

(1) the final political status of the territory controlled by the Palestinian Authority can only be determined through negotiations and agreement between Israel and the Palestinian Authority;

(2) any attempt to establish Palestinian statehood outside the negotiating process will invoke the strongest congressional opposition; and

(3) the President should unequivocally assert United States opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian State, making clear that such a declaration would be a grievous violation of the Oslo accords and that a declared state would not be recognized by the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 32—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REAFFIRMING THE CARGO PREFERENCE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. INOUE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 32

*Resolved,*

Whereas the maritime policy of the United States expressly provides that the United States have a merchant marine sufficient to carry a substantial portion of the international waterborne commerce of the United States;

Whereas the maritime policy of the United States expressly provides that the United States have a merchant marine sufficient to serve as a fourth arm of defense in time of war and national emergency;

Whereas the Federal Government has expressly recognized the vital role of the United States merchant marine during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm;

Whereas cargo reservation programs of Federal agencies are intended to support the privately owned and operated United States-flag merchant marine by requiring a certain percentage of government-impelled cargo to be carried on United States-flag vessels;

Whereas when Congress enacted Federal cargo reservation laws Congress contemplated that Federal agencies would incur higher program costs to use the United States-flag vessels required under such laws;

Whereas section 2631 of title 10, United States Code, requires that all United States military cargo be carried on United States-flag vessels;

Whereas Federal law requires that cargo purchased with loan funds and guarantees from the Export-Import Bank of the United States established under section 635 of title 12, United States Code, be carried on United States-flag vessels;

Whereas section 901b of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1241f) requires that 75 percent of the gross tonnage of certain agricultural exports that are the subject of an export activity of the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary of Agriculture be carried on United States-flag vessels;

Whereas section 901(b) of such Act (46 U.S.C. App. 1241(b)) requires that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of other ocean borne cargo generated directly or indirectly by the Federal Government be carried on United States-flag vessels;

Whereas cargo reservation programs are very important for the shipowners of the United States who require compensation for maintaining a United States-flag fleet;

Whereas the United States-flag vessels that carry reserved cargo provide quality jobs for seafarers of the United States;

Whereas, according to the most recent statistics from the Maritime Administration, in 1997, cargo reservation programs generated \$900,000,000 in revenue to the United States fleet and accounted for one-third of all revenue from United States-flag foreign trade cargo;

Whereas the Maritime Administration has indicated that the total volume of cargoes moving under the programs subject to Federal cargo reservation laws is declining and will continue to decline;

Whereas, in 1970 Congress found that the degree of compliance by Federal agencies with the requirements of the cargo reservation laws was chaotic, uneven, and varied from agency to agency;

Whereas, to ensure maximum compliance by all agencies with Federal cargo reservation laws, Congress enacted the Merchant

Marine Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-469) to centralize monitoring and compliance authority for all cargo reservation programs to the Maritime Administration;

Whereas, notwithstanding section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1241(b)), and the purpose and policy of the Federal cargo reservation programs, compliance by Federal agencies with Federal cargo reservation laws continues to be inadequate;

Whereas the Maritime Administrator cited the limited enforcement powers of the Maritime Administration with respect to Federal agencies that fail to comply with section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1241(b)) and other Federal cargo reservation laws; and

Whereas the Maritime Administrator recommended that Congress grant the Maritime Administration the authority to settle any cargo reservation disputes that may arise between a ship operator and a Federal agency: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) each Federal agency shall administer programs of the Federal agency that are subject to Federal cargo reservation laws (including regulations of the Maritime Administration) to ensure that such programs are in compliance with the intent and purpose of such cargo reservation laws; and

(2) the Maritime Administration shall closely and strictly monitor any cargo that is subject to such cargo reservation laws and shall provide directions and decisions to such Federal agencies as will ensure maximum compliance with the cargo preference laws.

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the law of the land, specifically section (1) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, declares that the United States shall have a merchant marine sufficient to, among other things, carry a substantial portion of our international waterborne commerce and to serve as a fourth arm of defense in time of war and national emergency.

The importance of these requirements has been dramatically illustrated by the vital role of our merchant marine in World War II, Korea, Vietnam, during operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, and most recently in Haiti, Somalia, and Bosnia.

While the privately owned and operated U.S.-flag merchant marine has performed so magnificently and effectively in times of crisis, it has also made extraordinary efforts to ensure that a substantial portion of commercial cargo bound to and from the United States moves on U.S. vessels. Given the chronic overtonnaging in international shipping, cut-throat competition, and the competitive edge our trading partners give their national flags, this has not been easy. In addition to competition with subsidized foreign carriers, U.S.-flag carriers are forced to compete with flag of convenience carriers. Over two-thirds of the