William Hodgkiss, Eric Hollinger, Robert Hurrell, Paul Imhof, William Kisner, Roberta James, Thomas Jones, John Laraway, Sarah Lawson, John Litterio, Harry Malatesta, Mary Marchut, Pedro Martinez, Raymond Matthews, Denise McCarthy, Diana Messersmith, Bernard Pierce, Joseph Randazzo, Kenneth Razillard, Norman Rimbey, Jacquie Roach, Gail Rosado, Richard Sanders, Douglas Satterfield, Jay Schopp, Ronald Sexton, Evlyn Stefula, Walter Streeter, John Sweeney, Joanne Tindall, Jose Toress, Robert Tucker, Leonard Valerio, Annemarie Walsh, John Wenner, Mary Wig, and Barbara Worthy.

These names will be entered into the permanent record at the Library of Congress documenting their accomplishments. These individuals symbolize everything that is good about America. They serve as a daily reminder of what public service is all about. These men and women went above and beyond their basic responsibilities in order to make someone else's life a little easier, and—in doing so—make the world a little better place to live. Once again, I would like to thank all the participants of Operation Provide Refuge: your dedication and selfless service is an inspiration to our nation and the world.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES T. CANADY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1999

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for the support of so many religious and public policy organizations in the passage of the Religious Liberty Protection Act. I would like to give special recognition to Prison Fellowship Ministries and Justice Fellowship, Christian Legal Society, Focus on the Family, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, American Center for Law and Justice, American Jewish Congress, Association of Christian Schools International, Family Research Council, Southern Baptist Convention: Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, United States Catholic Conference, Religious Action Center for Reform Judaism, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, and Council on Religious Freedom for their important contribution to this legislation.

I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Douglas Laycock, Alice McKean Young Regents Chair and Associate Dean of the University of Texas School of Law, for his invaluable legal analysis during the drafting and passage of the Religious Liberty Protection Act. I would also like to recognize the important contribution of the scholarship of Presidential Professor Michael McConnell of the University of Utah College of Law in the area of religious liberty.

I note that Congressman CHARLES W. STENHOLM from the 17th District of Texas requested to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1691 but was inadvertently omitted from the list of cosponsors.

UZBEKISTAN'S LITANY OF VIOLATIONS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1999

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I rise today to highlight the persecution of religious believers in Uzbekistan. The problem is worsening by the day, as the crackdown continues under the guise of ''anti-terrorism.'' While there is some justifiable threat of terrorism, the widespread violations of rule of law and human rights perpetrated by authorities are not defensible, especially in light of Uzbekistan's OSCE commitments.

Under President Islam Karimov, Uzbekistan has been the second most repressive former Soviet republic, next to Turkmenistan. Karimov has used new constitutions and referendums extending his tenure to remain in office, where he seems determined to stay indefinitely. In mid-1992, he cracked down on all opposition parties, driving them underground or into exile, and all opposition or independent media were eliminated.

In Uzbekistan today, human rights are systemically violated. Arbitrary arrests, abuse and torture of detainees are pervasive, and flagrantly politicized judicial proceedings are routine. According to Human Rights Watch/Helsinki, there are well over 200 individuals who are prisoners of conscience either for their religious or political activities. Defendants have been convicted of criminal offenses based on forced confessions and planted evidence. The regime has also refused to register independent human rights monitoring organizations (the Human Rights Society and the Independent Human Rights Society), while groups which cooperate closely with the government (Society for the Protection of the Rights of the Individual) have been registered without delay. On June 25, Uzbek police savagely beat Mikhail Ardzinov, one of the country's most prominent human rights activists.

A key component of Uzbekistan's assault on human rights has been a thoroughgoing campaign against religious believers. Since 1997, hundreds of independent Muslim activists and believers associated with them have been arrested. In February of this year, bombs exploded in the capital, Tashkent, which killed sixteen bystanders and damaged government buildings, narrowly missing President Karimov and government officials. Karimov accused Muslim activists of having carried out a terrorist attack intended to assassinate him. The harassment and detention of Muslim activists has greatly intensified since then and an ongoing series of show trials had discredit them as dangerous religious extremists. Last month, six people were sentenced to death and another 16 received prison terms ranging from eight to 20 years in a trial that by no means met Western standards for due process. Since then, two arrested Muslims have died in prison, and there is no sign of a let up. President Karimov has argued that the threat of Islamic fundamentalism in Central Asia's most populous and traditional state necessitates a hard line, especially because Islamic radicals from neighboring Tajikistan, Afghanistan and Pakistan are determined to subvert Uzbekistan's secular, developing democracy. But the state's repressive policies are radicalizing Muslims and turning them against the regime.

Non-Muslims faiths, particularly Christians, have also been subjected to harassment, imprisonment and violations of their religious liberty, especially those who share their faith and are actively meeting. According to Compass Direct, Ibrahim Yusupov, the leader of a Pentecostal church in Tashkent, was tried and sentenced last month to one year in prison on charges of conducting missionary activity. Another court in June sentenced Christian pastor Na'il Asanov to five years in prison on charges of possession of drugs and spreading extremist ideas. As with other cases mentioned below, witnesses attest that police planted a packet of drugs on Pastor Asanov and also severely beat him while he was in detention.

Also in June, three members of the Full Gospel Church in Nukus were sentenced to long prison sentences. Pastor Rashid Turibayev received a 15-year sentence, while Parhad Yangibayev and Issed Tanishiev received 10-year sentences for ''deceiving ordinary people'' as well as possessing and using drugs. Their appeal was denied on July 13. Reports indicate that they have suffered severe beatings in prison, have been denied food and medical attention, and their personal possessions have been confiscated by the police, leaving their families destitute. Recently, the most senior Pentecostal leader in Uzbekistan, Bishop Leonty Lulkin, and two other church members were tried and sentenced on charges of illegally meeting. The sentence they received was a massive fine of 100 times the minimum monthly wage. The leaders of Baptist churches, Korean churches, the Jehovah's Witnesses, as well as many others, have also been subjected to harsh legal penalties. Although they have filed for registration, local authorities refused to sign their documents.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department's report on Human Rights Practices for 1998 reported that the Uzbekistan law on religion ''limits freedom of religion'' with strict registration requirements which make it virtually impossible for smaller church organizations to gain legal status. The law passed in June 1998, ''prohibits proselytizing, bans religious subjects in school curriculums, prohibits teaching of religious principles, forbids the wearing of religious clothing in public by anyone except clerics, and requires all religious groups and congregations to register or re-register.'' Also approved last May was a second law establishing the penalties if one were convicted of violating any of the statutes on religious activities. The penalties can range anywhere from lengthy prison sentences, massive fines, and confiscation of property, to denial of official registration rights. On May 12 of this year, Uzbekistan tightened its Criminal Code, making participation in an unregistered religious group a criminal offense, punishable by a fine equivalent to fifty times the minimum monthly wage or imprisonment of up to three years.

Mr. Speaker, these actions indicate that the policies of the Government of Uzbekistan toward religious groups are not moving in the right direction.

In fact, these initiatives are in direct violation to Uzbekistan's OSCE commitments, including Article 16.3 of the Vienna Concluding Document which states that ''the State will grant upon their request to communities of believers, practicing or prepared to practice their

faith within the constitutional framework of their States, recognition of the status provided for them in the respective countries.'' In the Copenhagen Concluding Document of 1990 Article 9.1, Uzbekistan has committed to ''reaffirm that everyone will have the right to freedom of expression including the right to communication. This right will include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers.'' Uzbekistan's current course of strangling all forms of religious discourse is a flagrant, deliberate, and unrelenting violation of these principles.

Last year Congress overwhelmingly passed the Religious Freedom Act of 1998 which reaffirmed the United States' commitment to supporting religious freedom abroad through U.S. foreign policy. Considering the litany of violations affecting religious liberty and the ongoing persecution of believers, it is time for Congress to consider our aid programs to Uzbekistan, including our military cooperation programs which cost about 33 million dollars in this year alone. Congress should also reconsider our trade relationship with Uzbekistan and scrutinize other programs such as Cooperative Threat Reduction where we can leverage our influence to help protect religious liberty and human rights.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR EDWARD QUAGLIA

HON. DAVID D. PHELPS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1999

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mayor Edward Quaglia of Herrin, Illinois. Mayor Quaglia served the people and city of Herrin faithfully for more than twenty years; seven of those years as an alderman on the City Council, and for 15 years as mayor. This year, on May 31, Mayor Quaglia retired as Mayor due to health concerns. In honor of his retirement, the City of Herrin, the City Council of Herrin, and Mayor Victor Ritter have proclaimed July 18, 1999 as ''Mayor Edward Quaglia Day.''

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Quaglia will be long remembered by the good people of the City of Herrin, southern Illinois, and the entire State for his determined dedication to making Herrin a better place to live and to raise a family. Mayor Quaglia will not only be remembered for his numerous achievements including improving the city's infrastructure, and his hard work on development and construction of the Civic Center, the Annual Mayor's Community Wide Thanksgiving Dinner for the poor and homeless, the High School Sport's Complex, and planning the city's premier annual event Herrinfesta Italiana, but most importantly for his compassionate and straight-forward leadership style. He always gave all he had for a good cause and put the welfare of the citizens and City of Herrin first. When speaking of Mayor Quaglia, it is impossible not to mention his family, which is so important to him. His wife JoAnne has always stood by his side and been the light of his life. He has five loving children and four beautiful grandchildren.

I know that Mayor Quaglia will be sorely missed by all of Herrin in his retirement. But it is a retirement well earned, and one that I am sure that Edward Quaglia, and his family and friends, will enjoy with him to the fullest. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my fellow Members to share in my wish to extend Mayor Quaglia a long, healthy, and happy retirement along with Godspeed.

TRIBUTE TO BOB TOBIAS

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1999

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise in tribute to Bob Tobias, who is retiring after 31 years with the National Treasury Employees Union—including sixteen years as its president. He has been a tireless and effective advocate for the workers he represents, and he is a well-regarded spokesperson for the interests of all federal employees.

I got to know Bob in 1996 when we were both appointed to the National Commission on Restructuring the IRS, which I co-chaired with Senator BOB KERREY. He was an active and productive member of the Restructuring Commission, and helped to develop a number of the Commission's recommendations that were later signed into law as part of the IRS Restructuring and Reform Act.

I admire Bob for speaking up on IRS reform at a time when I suspect many of his members were uneasy about the long-term ramifications of the restructuring effort. He deserves a great deal of credit for helping to shape a bill that will not only benefit American taxpayers, but will also create a greatly improved work environment for IRS employees.

I understand that Bob plans to teach and write on public policy issues after leaving the NTEU. But he will also be continuing to work on IRS reform—I understand that he will be nominated by the President to serve on the IRS Oversight Board.

Bob played an important role in creating the framework for a new IRS for the 21st Century. I look forward to continuing to work with him in his role on the IRS Oversight Board, and I wish him the best of luck in all his future endeavors.

INTRODUCING THE LAND RECYCLING ACT OF 1999

HON. JAMES C. GREENWOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1999

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Land Recycling Act of 1999 along with a strong bipartisan group of co-sponsors. The Act will remove Federal barriers to the cleanup of brownfields across the country. Removing these barriers will spur investors, benefit cleanup contractors and provide tools for state and local governments to tackle this longstanding problem. These efforts will provide for more livable, secure and vibrant neighborhoods. The blight that has dominated both urban and rural areas should not continue.

My bill will bring about aggressive state reclamation and cleanup of brownfields—abandoned or underutilized former industrial properties where actual or potential environmental contamination hinders redevelopment or prevents it altogether. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] estimates that there may be as many as 500,000 such sites nationwide. In my own congressional district, the southern portion of Bucks County is estimated to have 3 square miles of abandoned or underutilized industrial property.

These well-positioned, once-productive industrial real estate sites pose continuing risks to human health and the environment, erode state and local tax bases, hinder job growth, and allow existing infrastructure to go to waste. Moreover, the reluctance to utilize brownfields has led developers to bulldoze greenfields, which do not pose the risk of liability. Development in these areas contributes to suburban sprawl, and eliminates future recreational and agricultural uses. The Land Recycling Act will help stop urban erosion, and provide incentives to the redevelopment of our cities and towns across the country.

The brownfields problem has many causes. Foremost among them is the existing Federal law itself. Under the Superfund law, parties who currently own or operate a facility can be held 100 percent liable for any cleanup costs regardless of whether they contributed to the environmental contamination and regardless of whether they were in any way at fault. Because of the potential for this kind of liability, it is simply not worth dealing with the environmental exposure as long as developers have the alternative of building in rural areas where they are not exposed to liability. Owners can't sell and instead simply mothball them indefinitely. Clean-up contractors face uncertain liability.

Unrealistic standards and one-size-fits-all remedy selection also prevent voluntary actions and leave sites in years of red tape. The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act [RCRA] poses nearly identical concerns. Under section 7003 of that law, for instance, EPA has broad authority to order a current owner-operator to address environmental contamination, again, regardless of fault.

Thirty-two states have launched so-called voluntary cleanup programs. We must help these programs thrive. Under these initiatives property owners comply with state cleanup plans and are then released from further environmental liability at the site. The subcommittee has received testimony in the past from a variety of states and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], demonstrating that these state voluntary cleanup programs have been responsible for the redevelopment of hundreds of brownfields. In the first year the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania enacted its brownfields program, it succeeded in cleaning 35 sites.

Although many of these state laws have proven successful, states, businesses, and other experts have testified that the possibility of continuing Federal liability despite an agreement to limit State liability—the so-called dual master problem—seriously diminishes the effectiveness of State voluntary cleanup programs. Because redevelopers face the potential for cleanup obligations above and beyond what a State has decided is appropriate to protect health and the environment, they may hesitate to enter into agreements with sellers to purchase idle properties. The testimony establishes, in my mind, that if brownfields redevelopers could be confident that the cleanup