

that NATO enlargement in general, and a Baltic dimension to enlargement in particular, pose absolutely no threat whatsoever to Russia. With several of its high-ranking military officers permanently attached to NATO and SHAPE, Russia must know that the old Soviet propaganda was a deliberate lie. NATO is, and always was, a purely defensive alliance.

I believe that President Bush and Secretary of State Powell are correct in saying that it is premature at this time to “name names” of countries to be invited to NATO membership at the Prague Summit. The Alliance has laid out a detailed procedure for qualifying for membership. Most importantly, in the spring of 2002 NATO must make a third evaluation of each country’s membership action plan or “MAP.”

But it is no secret that some countries are making significant progress militarily, politically, economically, and socially. Slovenia, I believe, is already eminently qualified for NATO membership. Unless it lapses into overconfidence during the next year, it should be a shoo-in in Prague.

Lithuania has apparently done remarkably well in fulfilling its MAP, and its neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, are also coming on strong. The legal status and treatment of the Russian minority in all three countries now is in full compliance with international standards. As long as lingering remnants of bigotry in the Baltic states continue to be erased by democratic education and practice, the political requirements for NATO membership should be met.

Slovakia, after having lost precious time under the populist administration of Vladimir Meciar, now has a democratic government that is also making giant strides toward membership. Its national elections in the fall of 2002 will be decisive in proving to NATO that this progress is permanent.

The southern Balkans, of course, are strategically the most important area for NATO enlargement. Romania and Bulgaria are potentially vital members for the Alliance. Both countries have overcome various kinds of misrule and are also making progress. Other aspirant countries in the southern Balkans are more long-term candidates.

In 1998, I had the privilege of being floor manager for the successful Senate ratification of the legislation admitting Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to NATO. I look forward to playing the same role in 2003 for the admission of one or more of the current candidate countries.

THE GROWING WEB OF SUSPICION OF ASIAN AMERICANS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to indicate my deep concern about what I perceive to be increasing bias in the United States toward Asian Americans and Chinese Americans in particular.

In recent years, we have seen those on the far right and the far left of the

political spectrum raise allegations without proof, distort facts, and make it impossible to refute insinuations. Thus, a web of suspicion is woven about the loyalties of Asian Americans to the United States.

This has created an atmosphere of anti-Asian American and anti-Chinese American sentiment: a House Select Committee report on National Security (although widely debunked as without foundation); the botched Wen Ho Lee investigation; the recent incident with Representative DAVID WU; the attacks against U.S. Secretary of Labor Elaine Chao; hate crimes against Asian Americans; and the attacks against former California State Treasurer Matt Fong.

These examples—and others—have contributed to a troubling and negative stereotyping of Asian-Americans.

Evidence of this comes from a recent Yankelovich survey which asserts: 68 percent of Americans now have a somewhat negative or very negative attitude toward Chinese Americans; one in three now believe that Chinese Americans are more loyal to China than to the United States; nearly half of all Americans—or 46 percent—now believe that Chinese-Americans passing secrets to China is a problem; and 34 percent believe that Chinese Americans now “have too much influence” in the U.S. high technology sector.

Tragically, the unfounded suspicions about the loyalties of Asian Americans has itself created a sense of unease among the Asian American community.

According to Asian American focus groups conducted for the Committee of 100 during January 2001, Asian Americans believe that too many Americans see them as foreigners or as “permanent aliens.”

Increasingly, Chinese-Americans with contacts, family, friendships or business connections in China are labeled disloyal to the United States simply because of their ethnic background and heritage.

The sentiment seems to be that you can’t be both Chinese-American and a loyal American as well.

Now that is not what America is all about.

Sadly, our Nation has a long history of discrimination against Americans of Asian and Pacific Island ancestry. Without a doubt, Asian Americans have suffered from unfounded and demagogic accusations of disloyalty.

Americans of Asian and Pacific Island descent have been subjected to discriminatory laws that have prevented their right to become, and be seen as, Americans:

The Chinese Exclusionary Act of 1882 barred the immigration of Chinese laborers.

In 1907, the “Gentleman’s Agreement” between the United States and Japan limited Japanese immigration to the United States.

A 1913 California law erected barriers to prevent Asian Americans from becoming land-owners.

The Immigration Act of 1917 prohibited immigration from nearly the entire Asia-Pacific region.

The National Origins Act of 1924 banned immigration of persons ineligible for citizenship.

Asian Americans were not able to become citizens of the United States for over 160 years and the Supreme Court consistently upheld laws prohibiting citizenship for Asians and Pacific Islanders with the last of these laws not repealed until 1952.

The Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934 limited the number of Filipino immigrants to 50 per year.

During World War II, we witnessed one of the worst acts of discrimination against any group of Americans, the internment of 120,000 patriotic and loyal Americans of Japanese ancestry.

Despite the fact that their family members were being denied their basic rights as Americans, many young Japanese Americans volunteered to fight for their country and they did so with bravery, honor, and valor.

The record of the U.S. Army’s 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry Combat Group speaks for itself and is without equal: 18,000 individual decorations awarded including 52 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars, and 9,480 Purple Hearts.

The record of the 442nd Combat Group made up of Japanese American soldiers, including our esteemed colleague Senator DANIEL INOUE is unusual: They were the most decorated unit of its size in the Army during World War II, yet only one member until last year received the Medal of Honor when Senator INOUE finally received his long overdue recognition.

Throughout U.S. history Asian Americans have been subjected to discriminatory actions, including the prohibition of individuals from owning property, voting, testifying in court or attending school with other people in the United States.

It is long past time to turn the page on this chapter of our Nation’s history.

And I am appalled that in recent years some have resorted to negative stereotypes to question the integrity of an entire community.

Tragically, this rising tide in discrimination has contributed to a growing number of crimes hate crimes against Asian Americans.

According to the National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium, there were 486 reported incidents of violence against Asian Americans in the latest figures available for 1999, an increase from the 429 incidents in 1998.

This upward trend is even more troubling because it is contrary to the finding reported by the Department of Justice’s 1999 crime victimization report that violent crime rates had fallen by 10 percent during this same period.

Who can forget the harrowing photos in August of 1999 of pre-school children holding hands while fleeing the North Valley Jewish Community center when a white supremacist walked into their school and opened fire?

Later that day, the perpetrator shot and killed Joseph Ileteo, a Filipino-American postal worker. Ileteo was a kind hearted and unselfish man who was simply in the wrong place at the wrong time and slain because of his skin color.

In May 1999, a Japanese American store owner was shot in Chicago, Illinois by a gunmen seeking out ethnic targets.

In July 1999, Benjamin Smith, a 21-year-old college student, went on a three day shooting rampage in Illinois and Indiana, killing one Korean American, one African American, and injuring nine others—Jews, Asian Americans, and African Americans.

These examples are just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to hate crimes against Asian Americans.

And make no mistake about it, these attacks are in part fueled by the anti-Asian sentiment that lingers in our society today.

Even with the strides we have made in combating hate crimes thus far, Asian American groups report that these crimes are still frequently under-reported and therefore the "real" numbers of these incidents is unclear.

According to the Asian Law Caucus's Interim Executive Director Frank Tse:

The invisibility of Asian Pacific Americans has real detrimental effects. If law enforcement does not perceive that we are susceptible to hate crimes, then they are more likely to overlook the red flags at a crime scene. We have seen this firsthand. The result is that perpetrators are not prosecuted, victims do not receive appropriate assistance and the under reporting continues.

The rising tide of anti-Asian American attitudes that can lead to these sorts of tragic incidents are all too often aided and abetted by those in government and the media who ought to know and act better.

Many Chinese-Americans, for example, feel that the Report of the House Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China promoted an atmosphere of suspicion about the loyalty of Chinese Americans to their country.

The House Committee report asserted that:

Threats to national security can come from PRC scientists, students, business people, or bureaucrats, in addition to professional civilian and military intelligence operations.

The PRC also tries to identify ethnic Chinese in the United States who have access to sensitive information, and sometimes is able to enlist their cooperation in illegal technology or information transfers.

It is estimated that at any given time there are over 100,000 PRC nationals who are either attending U.S. universities or have remained in the United States after graduating from a U.S. university. These PRC nationals provide a ready target for PRC intelligence officers and PRC Government controlled organizations, both while they are in the United States and when they return to the PRC.

In light of the number of interactions taking place between PRC and U.S. citizens and organizations over the last decade as trade

and other forms of cooperation have bloomed, the opportunities for the PRC to attempt to acquire information and technology, including sensitive national security secrets, are immense.

Although it is true that the Chinese Intelligence sources utilize these techniques, many Chinese-Americans feel that these sorts of broad-brush allegations create an atmosphere where all Asian Americans fall under a cloud of suspicion.

The report seems to suggest, for example, that because the PRC may try to recruit some ethnically Chinese scientists in the U.S., all ethnic Chinese are under suspicion.

A review of the Report by Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation concluded that the Report was inflammatory, inaccurate, and damaging to U.S.-China Relations.

Its principal editor, Dr. Michael May, argued that the Report alleged that "essentially all Chinese visitors to the United States are potential spies. This has cast a cloud of suspicion over both foreign and Asian-born U.S. staff members of U.S. companies."

Many Chinese and Asian American groups have written to me to express their concerns about the impact the insinuations and unfounded allegations of the Report have had on Chinese and Asian Americans. In a May 21st letter to the Editor and Chief of the Los Angeles Times, John Fugh, a retired Chinese-American Major General with 33 years of service in the U.S. Army and its former Judge Advocate General, wrote:

The impact of this inflammatory report has created an environment in which many Chinese and Asian Americans have had their loyalty questioned based on their ethnicity, especially in the defense sector.

The Asian Law Alliance of San Jose noted that the allegations of the Report "led to a broad-based hysteria that detrimentally impacted Asian American scientists working to support U.S. research and development."

The Organization of Chinese Americans argued that the "report and the false impression it gave the American public had serious repercussions on the careers of Chinese Americans at some government agencies and in some instances, private industry."

Now I would like to speak about some people who may well have been targeted because they are Asian Americans.

Dr. Wen Ho Lee, an American citizen and nuclear scientist, formerly employed at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, was arrested in 1999 on 59 charges ranging from violating the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to mishandling classified data and held in solitary confinement for nine months before all charges were dropped except for one—downloading classified data onto his personal computer. I have been told that others at the lab also downloaded information but were not charged.

Media reports and government information portrayed him as a Chinese spy.

After reviewing the facts of the case, I am convinced that whatever else may have been involved the case also had serious undertones of racial stereotyping that need to be examined closely.

This is a man who had been held under the most extraordinary security conditions. Dr. Lee, a sixty-year old scientist at the time, was prohibited from outside contact, except for his immediate family, and shackled at the wrists, waist and ankles on the occasions in which he was allowed to leave his cell.

In an impassioned letter about the Wen Ho Lee case, one of my constituents expressed:

As a Chinese American . . . I ask no more than what is due to every citizen of this country, namely, to be treated with respect and dignity. I resent those who would question the loyalty of Chinese Americans any time a particular Chinese American is suspected of an egregious act. In their haste to decry the alleged espionage by an individual, not only are these public officials and said media guilty of a rush to judgment but of tarring with a broad brush other American citizens who are guilty of nothing else other than having the same ethnicity of the suspect.

Instances like the Wen Ho Lee case engender a sense of disunity and division within the community, which undermines the basic tenets on which this nation was founded.

In another instance of how poisoned this atmosphere has become, Oregon U.S. Representative DAVID WU was recently nearly denied entry into the Department of Energy building in Washington, DC because guards questioned whether he was an American citizen.

After Representative WU and an aide arrived, a guard refused to recognize his Congressional identification and asked three times whether the two were U.S. citizens.

Eventually, the two were allowed entry by a supervisor but this incident indicates the web of suspicion surrounding all Asian Americans, and even those that are elected to Congress.

Following the incident, Representative WU wrote U.S. Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham:

I am disturbed that yesterday's incident is the tip of an iceberg, an indicator of a much larger problem at DOE which maybe damaging our national security.

Representative WU has asked Secretary Abraham to review employment practices and operating procedures to prevent future discrimination against employees of Asian descent. I join with Representative WU in this important request.

Lastly, in recent months, a distinguished public servant currently the Secretary of Labor, has been harshly

and unfairly attacked and her loyalty questioned because, as a Chinese-American, she has knowledge of China, has met with Chinese business people, citizens, and leaders.

This is yet another case in which ethnic background appears to be sufficient grounds to question someone's patriotism, someone's business activities, and in this case, even the conduct of Elaine Chao's husband as a U.S. Senator.

Another troubling incident involves the case of Matt Fong, a former Treasurer of the State of California and a former Lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Air Force, who has been nominated as Under Secretary of the Army and has had his loyalty to our nation questioned.

As it transpires, Mr. Fong unknowingly accepted some funds which he should not have in order to retire debt from his 1994 campaign for California treasurer from Ted Sioeng, an Indonesian businessman.

But when Mr. Fong discovered that some of these funds came from Sioeng's personal account, he immediately returned the money. There were legitimate questions raised about the Sioeng donation but Matt Fong did the right thing when he found out: He returned the money.

I am sad to say that questionable campaign contributions of this sort occur more often than they should, from people of all ethnicities and backgrounds. That is one of the reasons why campaign finance reform is so essential.

So why in this case are there some who still raise questions about Mr. Fong's loyalty, suggesting that because of this contribution, which some believe may have originated with the Chinese government, Mr. Fong may represent a security risk?

There is no evidence that the funds to Mr. Fong originated with the Chinese government, or that the contribution represents an effort by the Chinese government to "buy" Mr. Fong. But because of Mr. Fong's ethnicity, just leveling the allegation creates an environment of suspicion which by its nature is difficult to refute.

All is insinuation, and I am loath to say that it appears that it can only be for one reason why these questions have been raised: Mr. Fong's ethnicity.

As Karen Narasaki, President and Executive Director of the National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium put it:

Fong's mother served as California Secretary of State for many years and Fong himself has served his country, both in the Air Force and as California State Treasurer. To question his loyalty to the U.S. is the worst sort of racial profiling.

I am disappointed that there are many who appear to believe that it is still acceptable to attack Asian Americans. This is completely unacceptable in America.

All Americans should be highly offended by the negative stereotypes and media coverage of Asian-Americans

who have made profound contributions to our nation.

How can we question the loyalty of any American because of his or her race or ethnic background? To put it simply, this is un-American and must be stopped.

We all need to work together to raise awareness about the positive contributions all Asian Americans have made to every aspect of life here in the United States, and of the sacrifices they have made in defense of this country.

We must redouble our efforts to eliminate racial stereotypes that strike at the heart of American values and shame us all.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred September 28, 1994 in Las Vegas, NV. A gay man, Scott Grundy, 30, was shot to death. Aaron Vandaele, 19, was charged with murder, robbery, burglary, and grand larceny after he allegedly said he planned to visit a gay bar to rob a homosexual.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, June 20, 2001, the Federal debt stood at \$5,641,023,159,870.17, five trillion, six hundred forty-one billion, twenty-three million, one hundred fifty-nine thousand, eight hundred seventy dollars and seventeen cents.

One year ago, June 20, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,653,560,000,000, five trillion, six hundred fifty-three billion, five hundred sixty million.

Five years ago, June 20, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,108,536,000,000, five trillion, one hundred eight billion, five hundred thirty-six million.

Ten years ago, June 20, 1991, the Federal debt stood at \$3,493,082,000,000, three trillion, four hundred ninety-three billion, eighty-two million.

Fifteen years ago, June 20, 1986, the Federal debt stood at \$2,039,809,000,000, Two trillion, thirty-nine billion, eight hundred nine million, which reflects a debt increase of more than \$3.5 trillion, \$3,601,214,159,870.17, three trillion, six hundred one billion, two hundred four-

teen million, one hundred fifty-nine thousand, eight hundred seventy dollars and seventeen cents during the past 15 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REVEREND LEON SULLIVAN

• Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to pay tribute to Reverend Leon Sullivan who was not only a great American but a great citizen of the world. He was called the "Lion of Zion," a reference to the Zion Baptist Church where he was a fixture at the pulpit for 38 years. His accomplishments carried him beyond the city of Philadelphia to nationwide acclaim and then to worldwide leadership. From founding the Opportunities Industrialization Center, OIC, to America's most prestigious corporate boards where he brought recognition for minority employment to initiatives on education and health care in Africa, Dr. Sullivan was a global leader in successfully striving to improve the quality of life for those in need of assistance.

I first met Dr. Sullivan in the late 1950s when I was an Assistant District Attorney prosecuting cases in a magistrate's court at 19th and Oxford Streets in the heart of the city's African American community. Dr. Sullivan reclaimed that shambled police court and made it into OIC's first job training school. From that modest start, Dr. Sullivan went on to establish 56 centers nationally and another 46 centers internationally.

Standing 6 feet 5 inches, Dr. Sullivan was a powerful orator in the Zion Baptist Church on Sundays and an even more powerful social innovator the other 6 days of the week. His towering strength gained national recognition when he was asked to serve on the board of directors of General Motors, Mellon Bank, Boy Scouts of America, and the Southern African Development Fund.

With unparalleled accomplishments in the United States, Dr. Sullivan then turned his attention to Africa, where he initiated the Sullivan Principles. The Sullivan Principles are a code of conduct for businesses operating in South Africa which is acknowledged to be one of the most effective efforts in combating discrimination in the workplace. On April 12, 2000, I introduced a resolution along with Senator FEINGOLD that called on companies large and small in every part of the world to support and adhere to the Global Sullivan Principles of Corporate Social Responsibility wherever they have operations.

Dr. Sullivan also founded the International Foundation for Education and Self-Help, IFESH. IFESH was established to train people around the world in various disciplines including farming, teaching, healthcare, banking and economics.