AMERICAN HORSE SLAUGHTER PREVENTION ACT

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 2002

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CHRIS SMITH, Mr. JONES, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. LANTOS to introduce the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. This bill will prevent the cruel and senseless slaughter of American horses simply to satisfy the culinary desires of consumers in Canada, Europe, Japan, and elsewhere. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 55,776 horses were slaughtered in the United States last year for their meat, which was then sent overseas for human consumption. Thousands more were shipped live across the boarders to Canada and Mexico for slaughter there.

The American public is largely unaware that our horses are slaughtered for human consumption, and the three foreign-owned slaughterhouses operating on U.S. soil would like to keep it that way. As Canadian slaughterhouse operator Claude Bouvry said, ''People in the horse-meat industry don't like talking about slaughtering horses for food because of the horse's almost mythical place in Western culture.''

Horses have played an important role in American history, and continue to do so through their use in agriculture, transportation, law enforcement, military service and as companion animals. American culture is peppered with famous equines, including Paul Revere's Brown Beauty, General Robert E. Lee's Traveler, and General George Armstrong Custer's horse, Comanche—the sole surviving member of Custer's 7th Calvary at Little Big Horn. Other cultural icons of the equine persuasion include the Pony Express, the Lone Ranger's faithful mount Silver, Roy Rogers' Trigger, famed Triple Crown winners Citation and Secretariat, Flicka of My Friend Flicka and Mr. Ed, to name a few.

Pet horses, workhorses, thoroughbreds, Premarine© foals (who are a byproduct of the female hormone replacement drug industry), old and unwanted horses, horses purchased under false pretences and federally protected wild horses go to slaughter. Most arrive at the slaughterhouse via livestock auctions where, often unknown to the seller, they are bought by middlemen working for the slaughter plants.

These so-called middlemen better known as ''killer buyers'' travel from one auction to the next collecting young, old, sick and healthy animals until their trucks are full. Some are shipped for more than 24 hours at a time without food, water or rest. Increasingly, stolen horses are included on the killer-buyers' trucks. As the article Horse Theft: A Victim's Story so aptly puts it ''Rustling horses is quick, profitable and dirty work. Most horse thieves swiftly unload their stolen animals at auction, where most of the creatures end up at slaughter.''

While the transport of horses to slaughter is itself horrific, callous handling at the slaughterhouse often results in additional suffering. Improper use of stunning equipment, designed to render the animal unconscious, means that horses sometimes endure repeated blows to the head, and remain conscious through the last stages of slaughter, including throat slitting.

There are human health reasons to be concerned about horse slaughter, too. Because they are not raised for food or fiber, the flesh of many horses going to slaughter is likely to be contaminated with medications and other substances unfit for human consumption.

Americans do not eat horses. We do not raise them for food. The vast majority of Americans, when told that our horses are being slaughtered for dinner in Europe, are horrified. In fact, a recent survey indicated that the American public would overwhelmingly support a ban on the slaughter of horses for human consumption.

The American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act is a strong bill, which will end the slaughter of our horses for human consumption for good, rather than simply sending the practice over the border. This bill has the support of the American public, the animal protection community, horse owners and prominent members of the horse industry. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the Year of the Horse I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important and long-overdue legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO SANTA CLARA BRONCOS WOMEN'S SOCCER TEAM, 2001 NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 2002

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 2001–2002 Santa Clara University women's soccer team. The SCU Broncos, headed by coach Jerry Smith, took home the first-ever national title in women's sports for Santa Clara University.

Santa Clara University's athletic program, under the leadership of Athletic Director Cheryl Levick, has a rich history of dedicated and talented athletes, who work hard on and off the field, and always maintain a strong commitment to teamwork. Santa Clara University has a strong reputation in the athletic and academic fields, has proven successful in recruiting student athletes, and has provided these athletes with an excellent education and a great athletic experience. Santa Clara's student-athlete graduation rate is the highest in their league.

Though the SCU women's soccer team has been a dominant force in women's collegiate athletics, the 2001 season has proven to be their best. In 2001, with a season record of 23 wins and only 2 losses, they went on to defeat North Carolina for the national title in a 1–0 victory on December 9, 2001, in Dallas, Texas.

Santa Clara University, through its educational and athletic programs, fosters the development of scholar-athletes into outstanding leaders. The leadership skills that these scholar-athletes develop through the mentorship of Head Coach Jerry Smith, Assistant Coach Rich Manning, Assistant Coach Eric Yamamoto, and Assistant Coach Sean Purcell was strongly evident during the championship game and throughout the season. Players Danielle Slanton and Aly Wagner both took the initiative to provide their team with the calm and confidence that only a peer can provide. Aly Wagner has earned the distinction of being named 2001 Female Collegiate Athlete of the Year by the Bay Area Sports Hall of Fame.

It is with great pleasure that I honor all of the members of the Santa Clara University Women's Soccer team: Erin Sharpe, Taline Tahmassian, Zepeda Zepesa, Alyssa Sobolik, Kerry Cathcart, Jaclyn Campi, Aly Wagner, Anna Kraus, Lana Bowen, Leslie Osborne, Jessica Ballweg, Emma Borst, Devvyn Hawkins, Bree Horvath, Katie Sheppard, Allie Teague, Danielle Slanton, Chardonnay Poole, Kristi Candau, Holly Azevedo, Erin Pearson, and Ynez Carrasco. The teamwork and dedication of these athletes has made the Santa Clara University community, and the entire State of California, proud. I would also like to acknowledge the Santa Clara University Bronco's Athletic Staff, Lisa Eskey, Carrie Rubertino, Jonathan Clough and Cheryl Levick.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to commend and congratulate the Santa Clara University Women's Soccer Team, 2001 National Champions. Go Broncos!

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. MARTIN T. MEEHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 13, 2002

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2356) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform:

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, last night, the House passed H.R. 2356 as amended, the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002.

I would like to speak today to provide guidance to the Federal Election Commission regarding its future interpretation of one of the provisions of H.R. 2356.

H.R. 2356 sets forth a definition of ''electioneering communications'' in Title II. Certain exceptions to this definition are set out in Section 201(3)(B) of the bill, and include (i) news distributed by broadcast stations that are not owned or controlled by a candidate, (ii) independent expenditures, (iii) candidate debates and forums and (iv) ''any other communication exempted under such regulations as the Commission may promulgate . . . to ensure appropriate implementation of this paragraph.''

Specifically, I wish to address some questions that have been raised about the purpose of the fourth exception.

The definition of ''electioneering communication'' is a bright line test covering all broadcast, satellite and cable communications that refer to a clearly identified federal candidate and that are made within the immediate pre-election period of 60 days before a general election or 30 days before a primary. But it is possible that there could be some communications that will fall within this definition even though they are plainly and unquestionably not related to the election.

Section 201(3)(B)(iv) was added to the bill to provide the Commission with some limited discretion in administering the statute so that

it can issue regulations to exempt such communications from the definition of ''electioneering communications'' because they are wholly unrelated to an election.

For instance, if a church that regularly broadcasts its religious services does so in the pre-election period and mentions in passing and as part of its service the name of an elected official who is also a candidate, and the Commission can reasonably conclude that the routine and incidental mention of the official does not promote his candidacy, the Commission could promulgate a rule to exempt that type of communication from the definition of ''electioneering communications.'' There could be other examples where the Commission could conclude that the broadcast communication in the immediate pre-election period does not in any way promote or support any candidate, or oppose his opponent,

Charities exempt from taxation under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code are prohibited by existing tax law from supporting or opposing candidates for elective office. Notwithstanding this prohibition, some such charities have run ads in the guise of so-called ''issue advocacy'' that clearly have had the effect of promoting or opposing federal candidates. Because of these cases, we do not intend that Section 201(3)(B)(iv) be used by the FEC to create any per se exemption from the definition of ''electioneering communications'' for speech by Section 501(c)(3) charities. Nor do we intend that Section 201(3)(B)(iv) apply only to communications by section 501(c)(3) charities.

But we do urge the FEC to take cognizance of the standards that have been developed by the IRS in administering the law governing Section 501(c)(3) charities, and to determine the standards, if any, that can be applied to exempt specific categories of speech where it is clear that such communications are made in a manner that is neutral in nature, wholly unrelated to an election and cannot be used to promote or attack any federal candidate.

We urge the Commission to exercise this rulemaking power consistent with the time frame specified in the bill for the promulgation of new regulations to implement the provisions of H.R. 2356. We also expect the Commission to use its Advisory Opinion process to address these situations both before and after the issuance of regulations.

TRIBUTE TO KANSAS CITIANS' RESPONSE TO OUR RECENT ICE STORM

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 2002

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to pay tribute to the thousands of Kansas City-area residents who over the past two weeks rose to the challenge posed by the worst ice storm to hit the Kansas City metropolitan area in decades.

The storm, which struck our area with unprecedented fury on January 29th and 30th, cut electric power to over 450,000 area residents and caused more than $50 million in damage in Missouri and approximately $47 million plus worth of damage in Kansas. Seven deaths were attributed to the storm.

As the Kansas City Star described it, the storm ''blasted through [and] left most of the metropolitan area a dangerous tangle of downed trees, felled power lines and snarled traffic . . . During an intense 12 hours, from 7 p.m. Wednesday to 7 a.m. Thursday, [for example,] Johnson County emergency dispatchers took 420 calls, mostly from people reporting tree limbs pulling down overhead lines. The Kansas City Fire Department dispatchers took 1,100 emergency calls in a 12-hour period; ordinarily they receive 1,400 in a month.''

Mr. Speaker, our constituents dealt heroically with this unexpected calamity and we want to take special note of the outstanding contributions made by those whose job it was to respond to this crisis: police, firefighters, 911 operators, KCI airport employees, and members of the Missouri and Kansas National Guard, to note just some of them.

Medical teams dealt with cases of carbon monoxide poisoning, exposure, and injuries due to falling tree limbs and falls on ice. Homeless shelters opened their doors to neighbors left without heat and electricity and church groups, the Salvation Army, the Red Cross and municipal emergency services worked overtime and went the extra mile to help those in need during this time of crisis. Countless community volunteers including AmeriCorps, the Boy Scouts, and United Way gave their time to assist in the recovery process. Whether you were in Rosedale or Brookside, Independence or Overland Park, the ''Kansas City Spirit'' was prevalent with neighbors helping neighbors to cope with the devastation.

Most notably, hundreds of repair crews from area utilities—including Kansas City Power and Light, Missouri Public Service, the Kansas City, Kansas, Board of Public Utilities, Independence Power and Light, Westar Energy, and SBC—worked around the clock, along with 400 out-of-state repair crews and 350 out-of-state tree trimming crews, to replace lines, repair blown fuses and clear ice-laden trees that had cut off power lines and created fire and injury hazards. In fact, it is estimated that of the 450,000 trees that line Kansas City's streets, 10 percent of them will be gone when the cleanup is complete and over 10 percent of the city's privately owned trees also will have perished. To these utility workers, the people of the Kansas City area owe a special debt of gratitude.

We also applaud the leadership of our Governors Bill Graves of Kansas and Bob Holden of Missouri along with the countless local elected officials who worked in tandem with state and federal emergency management officials in compiling the damage assessments so that our Governors could request the Federal Emergency Disaster Declaration. The President and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) acted quickly to start the process of bringing federal relief to our community so that now the full recovery can occur.

Mr. Speaker, we have proven once again Kansas City truly is the heartland of America—when our friends and neighbors are in trouble, our community comes together to address the crisis and to get the necessary job done—quickly, efficiently and effectively. We have never been prouder to represent the Kansas City metropolitan area.

THE OTHER HALF OF THE JOB: FINANCING OUR FOREIGN POLICY

TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 2002

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent hearing with Secretary of State Colin Powell, I raised concerns about how we are financing the War on Terrorism. While there is no doubt that there is a need for increased defense spending, I worry that necessary resources are not being made available to finance our diplomatic and development programs overseas. As this war proceeds, it will be our responsibility to establish stable democracies to fill the vacuum left by fallen regimes. It is therefore necessary to properly fund related assistance programs.

Dr. Michael McFaul wrote an article entitled ''The Other Half of the Job'' in the February fifth edition of the Washington Post that deals with this very issue. He contends that if we intend to urge governments to promote liberty and freedom, it is our responsibility to provide assistance to those nations to establish stable democracies, and thereby create friendly allied states. He cites the examples of Germany and Japan. Just sixty years ago they were the greatest security threat to this nation, and today, after sustained support, they are among our strongest allies.

Dr. McFaul is an expert in the area of international relations and deserves recognition for his work in promoting world peace. He is a professor of political science at Stanford University and a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. His outstanding scholarship has raised awareness and given light to this, among other important issues. His insights are valuable and worthy of consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read Dr. McFaul's thought provoking article and I request that it be included in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Tuesday, Feb. 5, 2002]

THE OTHER HALF OF THE JOB

(By Michael McFaul)

The United States is at war. President Bush therefore has correctly asked for Congress to approve additional resources to fight this war. The new sums requested—$48 billion for next year alone—are appropriately large. Bush and his administration have astutely defined this new campaign as a battle for civilization itself, and have wisely cautioned that the battle lines will be multifaceted and untraditional.

So why are the new supplemental funds earmarked to fight this new war largely conventional and single-faceted—i.e., money for the armed forces? Without question, the Department of Defense needs and deserves new resources to conduct the next phase of the war on terrorism. The Department of Defense may even need $48 billion for next year.

What is disturbing about President Bush's new budget, though, is how little creative attention or new resources have been devoted to the other means for winning the war on terrorism. The Bush budget is building greater American capacity to destroy bad states, but it adds hardly any new capacity to construct new good states.

We should have learned the importance of following state destruction with state construction, since the 20th century offers up