

ranking Member, Mr. HINCHEY, as well as the chairman and ranking member of the full Committee on Resources, for their help in bringing the bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1865 will provide permanent protection for about 18,000 acres of the San Isabel National Forest, including the two volcanic peaks known as the Spanish Peaks.

There are many magnificent peaks in Colorado, of course, but these—the easternmost in the Rocky Mountains—are outstanding. The eastern peak rises to 12,683 feet above sea level, while the summit of the western peak reaches 13,626 feet. The peaks can be seen for more than 75 miles. They were well known to Native Americans and were important landmarks for other early settlers as well as for travelers along the trail between Bent's Old Fort on the Arkansas River and Taos, New Mexico.

So, it's not surprising that the Spanish Peaks portion of the San Isabel National Forest was included in 1977 on the National Registry of Natural Landmarks.

The area our bill will protect also has other outstanding resources and values, including a spectacular system of over 250 free-standing dikes and ramps of volcanic materials radiating from the peaks. These volcanic dikes form remarkable free-standing walls, up to 100 feet thick and 100 feet high, some extending for 14 miles. The area also includes winter range for bighorn mountain sheep and deer, and important habitat for elk, pine marten, and other species.

In all, it is a beautiful and unspoiled part of our Centennial State.

In place, the State of Colorado has designated the Spanish Peaks as a Natural Area, and the peaks are a popular destination for hunters, horseback riders, and hikers seeking an opportunity to enjoy an unmatched vista of Colorado's mountains and plains.

In the 1970's, the Spanish Peaks were reviewed by the Forest Service in its "RARE II" review of roadless areas, and the Colorado designation considered including a wilderness designation for the area in the statewide national forest wilderness bill that was enacted in 1980. However, at that time there were concerns about the manageability of the area because of a number of non-federal inholdings. So, the 1980 Colorado Wilderness Act instead provided for continued management of the Spanish Peaks as a wilderness area.

That same pattern was followed again in the most recent Colorado wilderness bill, which included provisions for long-term management of all the other wilderness study areas in our state's national forests. But while the bill that passed the House in 1992 would have designated Spanish Peaks as wilderness, the Senators still had some lingering questions about the land-ownership pattern in the area. So, once again, the final version of that bill included a requirement for continued interim management of the Spanish Peaks as a wilderness study area.

The 1993 bill also required the Forest Service to report about the non-federal inholdings and the likelihood of acquisition of those holdings by the United States with the owners' consent. We got that report in 1995. It indicated the wilderness study area included about 825 acres where the United States owned neither the surface nor the mineral rights, and some 440 acres more where the United States owned the surface but not the minerals.

Since then, United States has acquired most of the inholdings, by purchase from willing sellers—and we have drawn our boundaries so most of the rest are outside the wilderness. So, the way is now clear for Congress to finish the job of protecting this outstanding area as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

That's what this bill do, by adding the Spanish Peaks to the list of areas designated as wilderness by the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993. As a result, all the provisions of that Act—including the provisions related to water—would apply to the Spanish Peaks area just as they do to the other areas on that list. Like all the areas now on that list, the Spanish Peaks area covered by this bill is a headwaters area, which for all practical purposes eliminates the possibility of water conflicts. There are no water diversions within the area.

The lands covered by this bill are not only striking for their beauty and value for primitive recreation, but also for their natural values. They fully merit—and need—the protection that will come from the enactment of H.R. 1865. We should all be proud that it has now passed the House.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4380) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give me a "no" vote on the rule before you. The rule is unworthy of a serious national legislature. The Congress has received a balanced consensus budget with a surplus no less from a local jurisdiction, the District of Columbia, containing only the city's taxpayer-raised funds. Instead of minding its own national business and getting on with the mountain of work left for us to do, this bill has become an excuse for indulging the controversial social and financial whims of some Members of this body. That is unfair to you, it is unfair to me, and it is unfair to District residents. Defeat this rule, unless you are prepared to waste a lot more time in Washington on the smallest appropriation and the one least relevant to your constituents.

I have the Administration's Statement of Policy here. A litany of objections to this bill are listed by the Administration. Among them are three amendments which have been made in order, vouchers, the prohibition on adoption by married couples, and the prohibition on local funds for needle exchange, among others.

This rule reads like a who's who of special interests. It nullifies a modest residency rule that the Control Board supports because the

residency law strengthens the recovering D.C. economy. It puts this body through another vouchers fight not three months after the President has vetoed vouchers. It will make you vote on tricky social issues many Republican and Democratic Members would just as soon avoid.

Two provisions strike at the core of democracy. One gratuitously bars the use of local funds in cooperating with a pro bono voting rights lawsuit that hardly involves the city, anyway. The other defunds the advisory neighborhood commissions that get pittance amounts as elected neighborhood officials who attend to grassroots problems like assuring that parks and river banks do not accumulate trash or harbor crime. At the last minute, a Member got a bright idea, he decided that the District's tobacco prohibitions might be strengthened but did not give me the courtesy of allowing me to ask the City Council to do it themselves.

When you vote on this rule, you will make a statement of where you stand on controversial social issues and where you stand on democracy and devolution. The D.C. appropriation is not the place to take your stand on social legislation. The D.C. appropriation is the place to stand up for democracy. The way to do both is to defeat this rule.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4380) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, school vouchers are the original bad idea for the improvement of public education.

We will hear from the other side that the establishment of school vouchers are the best way to reform and improve education.

This is basically what they are saying. If you provide 2,000 children the option to attend other schools, the remaining 75,000 will have their public education magically improved. The argument is like saying that the best way to improve health programs for everyone is to provide options for 3% of the population and by magic, the health care system will improve.

Public schools need our help and our criticism when it is appropriate; what they do not need is to have their resources taken away for programs which can only benefit a few.

We will hear that the main motivation for the establishment of vouchers is to improve the public schools. This is simply not the case. There are people who like school vouchers because they want to take their kids out of public schools, not because they want to improve the schools, but because they do not like public schools.

I don't mind this. If you want to do this, it's OK, but do not do it at the expense of public schools and do not say you are doing it to improve those schools. You are doing it because you don't care about the public schools which

have made America the great democratic nation that it is and which have made America the great economic power that it is.

Furthermore, if you want to experiment with these school vouchers, why don't you do it at home? Why must we continue to use the District of Columbia as our pet laboratory for everything we like and don't like back home. Leave such matters to the people of the District. They deserve better than to be told what to do and that their children are experimental subjects.

Defeat this bad idea.

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS
VIOLATIONS BASED ON SEXUAL
ORIENTATION

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 7, 1998

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the global persecution of individuals based on their sexual orientation. Yesterday, I chaired a briefing of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus on this alarming situation. Mr. Speaker, I am especially grateful for the support and the participation of our distinguished colleagues, Congressman BENJAMIN GILMAN, Congressman BARNEY FRANK, Congressman WILLIAM DELAHUNT, and Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI.

I initiated yesterday's Caucus briefing because of alarming reports about the ongoing persecution of individuals based solely on their sexual orientation. These unacceptable violations of human rights have included arbitrary arrests, rape, torture, imprisonment, extortion and even execution.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday's briefing was not a discussion of our own nation's laws relating to homosexuality, transsexuality, or bisexuality. I have my own well know views on this issue, which I have clearly stated a number of times in the last couple of weeks when the domestic legal implications of these issues have been considered by the House of Representatives. Other Members clearly have different views, and they have clearly stated those.

Whatever our views on our own domestic laws, Mr. Speaker, the Caucus and all Members of Congress should be standing together in decrying the persecution of individuals and the denial of human rights for any reason, including sexual orientation. The purpose of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus briefing was to uphold the human rights that have been categorically denied all over the world to this persecuted minority.

If a government denies human rights to one group, then it is possible for that government to deny rights to any other group or every group. Gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered people in communities all around the world have been brutally punished both physically and mentally for exercising their fundamental human rights to freedom of speech, freedom of association, and freedom of belief. Mr. Speaker, these violations fall squarely within the scope of international human rights laws.

Nowhere have basic human rights been more comprehensively defined than in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and this

year we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of this historic document. Mr. Speaker, the Declaration guarantees the protection of human rights for everyone. This most assuredly does not mean so long as an individual shares our political views, our religion, the color of our skin, our sexual orientation, or anything else. The 1993 UN Human Rights Conference in Vienna stated it unequivocally by demanding: All Human Rights for All!

We heard exceptional testimony yesterday. The individuals who briefed the Caucus made statements that were head and shoulders above the usual information that we receive at Caucus briefings. These outstanding witnesses were Cynthia Rothschild, Co-Chair of Amnesty International's Members for Lesbian and Gay Concerns; Scott Long, Advocacy Coordinator of the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission; Regan E. Ralph, Executive Director of the Women's Rights Division, Human Rights Watch; and Serkan Altan, a brave young man who was subjected to extreme violence in Turkey because of his sexual orientation and who has now been granted asylum in the United States based on his homosexuality.

Mr. Speaker, these witnesses exposed the tragic fact that basic human rights are not applied everywhere and that they most certainly are not accorded to everyone. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that their statements be placed in the RECORD, and I urge that my colleagues give considerable attention to their striking remarks.

CYNTHIA ROTHSCHILD, CO-CHAIR, AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL MEMBERS FOR LESBIAN AND GAY CONCERNS

I am pleased to be with you today in this precedent-setting meeting. I'd like to thank Congressman Lantos and his staff for making this briefing possible, and I'd like to thank all of you who took time from your busy schedules to be here. I also want to acknowledge Serkan, who will share with us today his personal history as a survivor of human rights violations targeted because of sexuality.

I am particularly glad to be able to contribute to a discussion about an urgent and often overlooked facet of international human rights law and activism—that dealing with human rights violations perpetrated because of sexual identity and conduct.

Documentation from around the world confirms that lesbians, gay men and transgender people are killed, raped, assaulted, subjected to the death penalty, imprisoned, beaten, forced to undergo medical and psychiatric treatment designed to alter our sexuality, brutalized by other forms of torture and arbitrarily deprived of basic liberties because of our real "or perceived" sexual identity and behavior.

These abuses are often sanctioned by the state through legal decree, tacit acceptance (for instance, the refusal to investigate violations or to punish perpetrators) or through promoting violence by official and unofficial state actors (ranging from police to immigration officials to prison guards). Factors such as gender, culture, race, ethnicity, age and geographic location affect the various forms of violations which take place. But no region escapes culpability—sexual behavior and identities are criminalized or vilified, albeit in different ways, all over the globe.

My argument here is quite simple—these abuses occur every day, they pose very real dangers to many, many people, they're in violation of international law, they disrupt lives and sometimes take them—and they must be stopped.

In this presentation, I will offer an overview of human rights violations as they pertain to sexual identity and practice and I will delineate some of the more salient and complicated issues implicit in these experiences. This information, as well as that included in Regan, Scott and Serkan's presentations, is designed to be useful to you as lawmakers, as human rights supporters and as concerned citizens.

Lest I be too vague, let me first set context with a range of specific examples (and please note that because I cite specific countries in these examples it should not be interpreted to mean that these violations don't take place in many other nation-states):

The following information has been compiled and documented by Amnesty International, the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, Human Rights Watch, the International Lesbian and Gay Association, the Magnus Hirschfeld Center for Human Rights and countless other local organizations.

Some of the more flagrant human rights violations, gay, bisexual and transgender people face include abuses in the following three general, and sometimes overlapping, categories: (1) rights to physical and mental integrity, (2) freedom of association and expression, (3) discriminatory laws and discriminatory application of laws.

1. VIOLATIONS OF RIGHTS TO PHYSICAL AND MENTAL INTEGRITY

A. Execution Codified by Law: Under Islamic "Sharia" law, homosexuality is seen as an offense against divine will and is punishable by death. This is true in nine countries, including Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Kuwait, Mauritania, and Iran. In the latter country, death can be administered by stoning or by cleaving bodies in two.

In Afghanistan, you may recall recent reports (carried in the New York Times) of men convicted of sodomy being placed next to standing walls and buried under rubble as the walls were toppled upon them. While intended as a form of execution, it is of interest to note that some people were not actually killed in this process—so having a wall collapse on a person becomes simply a form of torture instead of execution.

B. Extrajudicial Execution (deliberate and unlawful killings by, or with the consent of, the state): In Colombia, death squads—often consisting of off-duty police—have been known to target areas where gay men congregate. As part of social cleansing efforts, victims of these death squads are gunned down in streets, or forcibly 'disappeared.'

C. Other Forms of Torture and Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment: In Saudi Arabia, male same-sex sexual behavior can be punished by flogging.

On a different but related note, Amnesty has noted that lesbians and gay men in the custody of government officials are particularly vulnerable to torture and ill-treated.

Consider the following quotation from an anonymous witness from Peru:

"In 1994, in Lima a very violent raid was carried out in the capital where about seventy-five lesbian women were beaten up and ill-treated by police. Prostitutes get a very rough time in jail. But the treatment of lesbians was even worse. Lesbians were beaten up because however degrading prostitution can be [perceived to] be, it is still regarded as normal behaviour, whereas lesbianism is seen as too threatening to the status quo." [Amnesty International, "Breaking the Silence: Human Rights Violations Based on Sexual Orientation"—1997]

And to cite a particularly relevant and recent example in the United States—most of you will remember the case of Abner Louima, a Haitian man who was attacked by