

market products. Where Title V is an appropriate response to such cases, it is inappropriate to apply it to most lawyers whose clients already expect that all their disclosures are confidential, covered by state codes of ethics and attorney-client privilege.

For example, the Legal Aid Society of New York City had to translate its privacy notice into many different languages to serve its ethnically diverse clientele. It also had to devote an inordinate amount of time to dealing with confused clients who could not understand why they were getting privacy notices from their lawyers when information they share with their lawyers is presumed to be confidential. I fear this could have a chilling effect on the willingness of individuals to share critical information with their attorneys. The confusion these privacy notices are causing in New York is unnecessary given that there is express language forbidding the sharing of client information in the New York state ethics code for lawyers.

The recently filed amicus brief at the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia by 19 state and local bar associations further lays out some of the ways that the Act conflicts with the practice of law, the rights of clients and the duties of attorneys. The brief was drafted by the former President of the American Law Institute, Professor Geoffrey Hazard.

To quote from the amicus brief: "Not only does the GLBA provide less broad and less beneficial privacy protection than do existing state ethics rules governing lawyers, there are contradictions and discrepancies in the concepts of confidentiality and in the responsibilities of the 'service providers' under GLBA as applied to practicing lawyers. These disconnections make clear that the application of both privacy regimes to lawyers is unworkable. . . ." The stringent enforceable codes of professional conduct that attorneys are under contain opt-in requirements tailored to the profession. Their clients must affirmatively agree to the attorney revealing any personal information about that client.

I join Representative BIGGERT in introducing this legislation today, because it is my intention to target this limited area where the interpretation of GLBA can be improved by a legislative fix. The FTC's standing interpretation of Title V of the Act is causing confusion that is detrimental to the attorney-client relationship. It is appropriate for Congress to intervene. I have met with numerous constituents from New York City on this issue and am convinced that attorneys should not fall under the existing language.

I look forward to continuing to work to safeguard the privacy of my constituents during this Congress. This legislation is limited and strictly targeted. As for the larger privacy issues—the American public deserves more privacy protections, not fewer. When this body passed the GLBA provisions, we never considered its impact upon the practice of law because we had not intended it to apply to lawyers. Now that we see the confusion, expense and conflict that this act has wrought upon the legal community, we must act to clarify our original intent.

IN HONOR OF NELLIE POU, RECIPIENT OF THE HISPANIC AMERICAN GOOD SCOUT AWARD

HON. ROBERT MENEDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Mr. MENEDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Assemblywoman Nellie Pou of New Jersey who was honored on February 7th at the Hispanic American Good Scout Award Dinner at the Robert Treat Hotel in Newark, New Jersey.

Currently deputy speaker of the New Jersey Legislature, Ms. Pou has led an impressive career and has quickly emerged as a leader in the New Jersey Assembly. She is the first woman and first Hispanic to represent the 35th Assembly District of New Jersey, and was named assistant minority leader after only three years in office. An active member of the legislature, Ms. Pou has authored a number of successful bills that reflect her commitment to health advocacy, child safety, and disabled and senior citizens. She has focused her efforts to improve education by reducing class-size and has secured funding to ensure the continuation of critical school programs across the state.

Assemblywoman Pou played a leading role in ensuring the 2000 Census was accurately reported and that New Jersey would not be underrepresented in the amount of federal aid it received. She was also a strong advocate for redrawing the legislative districts to fairly represent census results.

Ms. Pou holds an impressive record of service in government and working for the state of New Jersey. Before serving in the Assembly, Ms. Pou worked for more than 22 years in county and municipal government, and served as director of the Paterson Department of Human Services for 12 years.

Since being elected to the Assembly in 1997, she has served on two critical committees, the Assembly Budget Committee and the Assembly Appropriations Committee, which together oversee the development of the annual state budget. Ms. Pou has also served on the Assembly Housing Committee and the Task Force on School Facilities Construction Oversight. She is a member of the Women's Democratic Caucus, the Assembly Advisory Council on Women, and the New Jersey Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect.

Currently serving her third term in office, Assemblywoman Pou is vice chair of the Assembly Appropriations Committee and a member of the Assembly Health and Human Services Committee, in addition to her appointment as deputy speaker.

Assemblywoman Pou is the mother of two children, Edwin and Taina.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Nellie Pou for her outstanding leadership and service to her district and the state of New Jersey.

INTRODUCING UNITED STATES-KOREA NORMALIZATION RESOLUTION OF 2003

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the United States-Korea Normalization Resolution of 2003.

Sixty years ago American troops fought in a United Nations "police action" on the Korean Peninsula. More than 50,000 Americans lost their lives. Sixty years later, some 37,000 U.S. troops remain in South Korea, facing a North Korean army of nearly a million persons. After 60 years, we can no longer afford this commitment.

The U.S. defense guarantee of South Korea costs more than \$3 billion per year in direct costs and approximately \$12 billion per year in total costs. Total U.S. aid to South Korea has exceeded \$14 billion since the war.

But South Korea of today is not the Korea of 1950. Today's South Korea is a modern, industrialized, economic powerhouse; it has a gross domestic product more than 40 times that of communist North Korea. It has a military more than 700,000 persons strong. Nor is it at all clear that the continued U.S. military presence is necessary—or desired.

Not long ago, incoming South Korean President Roh Moo-huyn, recognizing that the current tension is primarily between the United States and North Korea, actually offered to serve as a mediator between the two countries. It is an astonishing move considering that it is the United States that provides South Korea a security guarantee against the North. Additionally, it is becoming more obvious every day that with the man on the South Korean street, the United States military presence in their country is not desired and in fact viewed as a threat.

We cannot afford to continue guaranteeing South Korea's borders when we cannot defend our own borders and when our military is stretched to the breaking point. We cannot continue subsidizing South Korea's military when it is clear that South Korea has the wherewithal to pay its own way. We cannot afford to keep our troops in South Korea when it is increasingly clear that they are actually having a destabilizing effect and may be hindering a North-South rapprochement.

That is why I am introducing the United States-Korea Normalization Resolution, which expresses the sense of Congress that, 60 years after the Korean War, the U.S. security guarantee to South Korea should end, as should the stationing of American troops in South Korea.

I hope my colleagues will join me by supporting and co-sponsoring this legislation.

A BILL TO CLARIFY THE TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL ESCROW ACCOUNTS

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from California,