



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 2001

No. 82

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord God, who desires us to receive Your word, be with us today, here in Congress and across this great Nation. Fill us with Your Holy Spirit, that with diversity and creative willingness we may find ways to express deep human concerns and yet uncover true wisdom. Thereby, You will guide us in important decisions and impact our future.

May our native differences and historical experiences provide us with insight and an inner freedom so that we discover new avenues to reach consensus and realize Your power at work in each of us.

Grant freedom of speech to peoples everywhere that the cacophony of voices may give You glory and bring all to a deeper understanding that in You we are already one, You the one who was, who is, and who will be the same now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TANCREDO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

A MAJOR VICTORY FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased here this morning to announce that the Republicans in Congress have passed legislation which President Bush has signed into law to provide all taxpayers some money, an immediate tax rebate check.

Because Republicans believe that surplus tax dollars are better spent by the American people than the Washington bureaucrats up here, you will all be receiving a rebate check in the next few weeks: \$600 for married couples, \$500 for head of households, and \$300 for single taxpayers.

Now, this is real money. It is money taken out of Washington put into the hands of families who need it and deserve it. After all, it is their money.

The Treasury Department will start sending letters out to every taxpayer in America explaining when you will receive your tax rebate check and how much you will receive. You can go on the Internet and find out. If you want to, you can call my office and we will give you the Internet site.

Rebate checks will be mailed over a 10-week period at a rate of 10 million

checks per week starting in July. Taxpayers will receive their check according to their Social Security number.

Mr. Speaker, it is their money. The taxpayers should be the ones spending it on car payments, mortgage, saving for college, school supplies and clothing for their children, a new washer, a dryer, on energy bills and gasoline.

CHINA SHIPPING WEAPONS TO CUBA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the State Department now admits that China and Cuba have signed a military agreement, and China is shipping weapons into Cuba. But the State Department said, and I quote, "we are not sure if those weapons are lethal". Unbelievable. Every American knows those are not 4th of July fireworks that China is shipping to Cuba, Mr. Speaker.

Think about it. China is now selling weapons to Cuba. Castro hates America. Cuba is 90 miles away from America. Beam me up. What is next? A Chinese missile 90 miles away from the United States of America. I yield back the next bay of dragons in America's history.

RECOGNIZING POQUOSON HIGH SCHOOL

(Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a group of students from Virginia's First District who recently set international standards in demonstration of their creative problem-solving skills.

Earlier this month, representatives from Poquoson High School joined with

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3077

fellow students from around the globe to compete for international prestige in a contest of ingenuity.

In exercising their talents, these Virginia students not only captured a first place world ranking, but also set a world record through their success at the Odyssey of the Mind's World Competition.

In their rise to confront challenge, Mr. Speaker, these students demonstrated their ability to think critically, to work cooperatively, and to overcome obstacles. Their vigor and success distinguishes our education system in its ability to cultivate the talents of our youth.

In this, it is my desire that these accomplishments of these students be recognized and thus be a testament to the positive role of education in preparing students as emerging leaders.

INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, today, along with 34 cosponsors, I am reintroducing the bill to establish Individual Development Accounts on a national level. They already exist in several States, including Pennsylvania.

IDAs allow working poor families to save and invest and receive matching contributions from their financial institutions. They can be withdrawn and used only to buy a home, start a small business, or get higher education. Finally, after decades of government-funded poverty, we are encouraging poor and working poor Americans to provide for themselves and plan for their futures.

Just like welfare reform, this program will help those who need help, but IDAs will help people help themselves. Imagine the pride of a new investor who has saved enough to go into business for himself or the joy of putting a down payment on a house one thought one would never be able to afford or opportunities made possible by a college diploma.

IDAs are a good idea for this country. They are part of the President's community renewal plan. I encourage my colleagues to join me in making them a reality.

ENCOURAGING LTV STEEL AND THE UNION TO GO BACK TO THE TABLE

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Monday in the City of Youngstown, LTV Steel filed in the bankruptcy court a request to be relieved from its union contract in order to continue its process of reorganization.

Over the past 6 months in conjunction with Federal officials, including

yourself, local officials, counties, State, we have been trying to work with LTV to help them through this bankruptcy. I would encourage LTV corporate officials and the unions to go back to the table.

We know that we are in a difficult time right now, but it is very important that we do not lose 5,000 jobs in the City of Cleveland that would impact 40,000 jobs throughout our area.

LTV, back to the table. The union is ready to work. Let us resolve this issue for the people of the City of Cleveland.

LA LIGA CONTRA EL CANCER PROUDLY SERVES FLORIDA COMMUNITIES

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the League Against Cancer or La Liga Contra el Cancer, as it is more commonly known in my congressional district, recently raised over \$3 million for cancer patients during its 25th annual telethon.

Florida ranks second in the incidence of cancer, as one in every two men and one of every two women are diagnosed over a life-span.

La Liga never turns away cancer patients, and I wish to commend its president, Dr. George Suarez and its VP, Brenda Moreira, and the hundreds of volunteers and sponsors who give hope to thousands of Florida's victims of cancer.

Low-income and uninsured cancer patients come to the League for life-saving treatment. Over 300 Miami-Dade board-certified doctors and hundreds of community members volunteer their time and skills and work tirelessly to help cancer victims.

Last year, with the budget deficit, La Liga provided life-saving services to almost 4,000 patients, all of whom were legal residents of Florida. We thank La Liga Contra el Cancer for its proud record of service to our community.

STOP GOUGING PEOPLE IN CALIFORNIA

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is not bad enough that the energy wholesalers selling energy into California have been able to continue to gouge the California consumer, California families and small businesses, but now we see that the energy companies have joined with the White House, joined with the Republicans in Congress to launch a campaign that, according to CNN, may spend upwards to \$50 million by the energy companies to convince Californians that price caps on wholesale energy costs would be bad for them.

The suggestion is that somehow the price gouging that is going on now in

California and in the western United States is good for consumers. Yet, we see that, in California, more and more households are unable to pay their energy bills. More and more small businesses are at risk or have already gone out of business because of energy costs. We are starting to see individuals make decisions about locating businesses in California.

The White House and its buddies in the energy business ought to stay out of this. What they ought to do is stop gouging the people in California.

THE CHECK IS IN THE MAIL

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, there is a couple of old sayings around. One is that the check is in the mail and, two, I am from the Federal Government and help is on the way.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce to my fellow hard-working Nevadans that their check, their rebate check is truly in the mail. Nevadans can expect to see over \$292 million in tax relief arriving in their mailboxes this summer. Now, that is real help. This equates to an average tax rebate check of over \$420 for every hard-working taxpayer in the silver State.

It is about time. The people of Nevada and our great country have been paying far too much in taxes for far too long. Thanks to this bipartisan tax relief bill passed by this Congress and signed into law by President Bush, single taxpayers can expect tax rebates of up to \$300 and married tax filers can expect up to \$600 in tax relief.

This money can go toward paying the mortgage, a car loan, or a new washing machine or even gasoline for one's car. These tax rebate checks are just the beginning. Americans can expect additional tax relief over the next 10 years. Mr. Speaker, this time Nevadans can be assured that their check their overpayment in taxes is in the mail.

□ 1015

THANKS TO PRESIDENT BUSH FOR TAX REBATES

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am glad he talked about tax relief, because that is what I want to emphasize, too.

Thanks to President George W. Bush, for those who paid taxes for the year 2000, the check is in the mail. Taxpayers are likely to receive a \$300 check in the mail if they are single, a \$500 check if they are a single parent, and a \$600 check if they are married. No one has to even fill out forms, or file anything. They just have to check their mailbox this summer.

Depending on the last two digits of an individual's Social Security number, they could have that money in their pocket as early as July 23. Anyone wishing to find out should check www.samjohnson.house.gov, to learn when they will receive their rebate.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are over-taxed. They are overtaxed, and they deserve a rebate.

CALIFORNIA DREAMING

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, California's Governor has decided to hire high-priced Democrat spin-meisters instead of addressing the emergency crisis in his State. Taxpayers will subsidize Mark Fabiani and Chris Lehane at \$30,000 per month to boost Governor Gray Davis in the media as California's energy crisis further drops his poll numbers.

Instead of repairing California's energy crisis, the Governor is using taxpayer dollars to repair his image. This \$30,000 in consultant fees that will be charged to the taxpayers is more than the Governor earns monthly himself. The Governor has had plenty of time to implement a solution. He knew over a year ago he had a problem; yet Gray Davis has refused to address that problem. He kept putting it off and putting it off and putting it off. It becomes blatantly obvious that the Governor is more concerned about repairing his image than helping the people of his State. Rather than working with the President and the White House to help California, the Governor is trying to find ways that high-priced PR men can exploit the energy crunch to his advantage.

ENERGY AND IMMIGRATION

(Mr. TANCREDO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, many pundits, and many of my colleagues, will undoubtedly continue to discuss the energy crisis that the Nation faces, and specifically in California they will be proposing solutions that will range from increased supply to reduced demand and price caps. Mr. Speaker, when will we get the courage to attack the root of this problem or even discuss the root of this problem? The problem in California and many places around this Nation is a massive population increase caused by massive immigration, both legal and illegal.

It is the numbers, Mr. Speaker. That is what drives everything. That is what drives the demand for all the resources we are now running out of, and it is something we must come to grips with as a Nation. The numbers, Mr. Speaker, more than anything else, that is the reason we are going to be facing these

kinds of dilemmas over and over and over again, starting in California; but believe me, that is just the beginning.

It is the numbers. We have to do something about reducing massive immigration into this country.

THE ENERGY CRISIS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the energy crisis. Let us talk about electricity costs in California. Let us talk about what the White House is going to do.

Take a look at what CNN said the other day in an article by Major Garrett: "Power of advertising fights electricity rate gaps. Worried GOP White House give blessing to utilities California campaign. The major United States utility companies, at the behest of senior congressional Republicans and with White House approval, are going to launch a multimillion dollar advertising campaign to fight the Federal caps on electricity prices in California."

That is how they are going to handle the energy crisis in California, is by getting their friends in the special interests to launch a media campaign against doing something about energy prices in this country, and particularly in the State of California where it has been an overwhelming burden on families with what their electricity costs have been.

This is the way this administration handles the crisis, not by giving any help to Californians. They have walked away and said, "California, drop dead."

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we had a major education bill on the floor for consideration, and we did not permit a single amendment to deal with school construction, renovation, or school modernization. We were afraid to have the issue presented on the floor.

I think we were afraid that we might get a majority vote on it. For some reason, the leadership is afraid of school construction, school modernization, and school repairs. We are pushed into the vehicle of a motion to discharge today; and I urge all of the Members, regardless of their party, to sign the motion to discharge on the Rangel-Johnson bill.

This is a bipartisan bill. It is a bill which impacts on all America, rural as well as urban. It is a bill which almost every school district in America can benefit from. Even charter schools can benefit from a bill which calls for more funding for construction, for modernization, and for repairs.

It is impossible to go forward and really claim we want to reform education unless we are willing to provide the physical facilities that are necessary to educate our children. I urge my colleagues to sign the motion to discharge.

CALIFORNIA'S ENERGY CRISIS

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we all just heard a very interesting discussion, and I am being very generous with that word, on the energy crisis. It seems that there are those who are just content in trying to make political hay out of a problem in California during a period of time when demand for energy went up 25 percent; yet the supply that was allowed through government permit was only allowed to increase 6 percent.

Now, who was at the wheel during that period of time? It was generally liberal Democratic Governors and legislators who did not want nuclear power, even though France has nuclear power and has used it safely and efficiently, and about 25 percent of the power in California is nuclear. They do not want to use coal, because, well, you know, we just cannot use coal, so we do not want that. We do not want to use waterpower, because that would keep salmon from swimming upstream and spawning, even though there are ladders that would allow them to do that.

Sometimes we have to say yes to something. Energy means hospital beds, energy means schools and senior citizens homes. Helping people stay warm and stay protected, that is what energy is all about. I wish that it would be time for the folks from California to start working with the rest of the Nation for a common-sense middle road.

CALIFORNIANS LOOKING TO FERC AND WHITE HOUSE FOR LEADERSHIP IN ENERGY CRISIS

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am representing a district in Los Angeles County, California; and a week and a half ago I had my first experience going through a blackout. One would think that in a community like mine, in the city of El Monte, that our readiness would be there; that we would have substantial support to be able to help our community out. What I found going through 30 minutes of this blackout was that I was unable to use my cell phone because there was no capacity to make calls. All the electricity went out. All our lights went out on our streets. And no one was notified in advance.

This is a serious problem that we are going through, and it was not even 80

degrees in California. So we are talking about a very severe problem that is affecting many residents throughout California.

I happen to represent an area where we have a large number of people who are on fixed incomes, low-income people and senior citizens. They are not going to get a tax break, they are not going to get \$300 or \$600, but they are going to get in return a big utility bill. In addition, they also have to pay more for gasoline, \$2.12. That is what it is.

They are looking for leadership from FERC and from this administration.

SCHOOL MODERNIZATION

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask all Members, both Republican and Democrats, to sign up on the discharge petition to make sure that our kids throughout this country have an opportunity to have a modernized classroom.

Most of our schools throughout this country are 50 to 60 years old. If any of my colleagues live in a home like I live in, a home that is also 50 to 60 years old, where I had to go back and redo the wiring, we need to make sure the wiring for the technology is there in our schools. We need to make sure that those youngsters have access to good quality care and a good education.

One of the realities is that as baby boomers, and we were the largest generation and these facilities were there for us to make sure that we had access to good education, now it is up to us to look and consider now the next largest generation, the baby echo, and make sure that those youngsters have access to good quality care and good quality education.

In terms of the needs, as we look, we want to make sure that this is one of the main priorities throughout the country. I know we recognize that that is important, but we have not put the resources where they should be. So I ask that my colleagues sign up on the discharge petition and force the Congress to come up on this major piece of legislation.

SCHOOL MODERNIZATION LEGISLATION

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), in urging our colleagues to sign the discharge petition for America's children. This is a school modernization bipartisan legislation that is so very, very important.

We were all very disappointed that the House did not have the opportunity to debate this issue in various tax bills that had come before us. Let us just

think about the children for a moment. They are very, very smart. If we tell children that education is important to them, to their own self-fulfillment, to their competitiveness economically, to our international competitiveness, that we have a well-educated workforce, yet we send them to schools that are below par, where they are overcrowded, that are dilapidated, that are leaking, that are not wired for the future, children get a mixed message.

Children see the inconsistency, indeed even the hypocrisy of a message that says education is important, that they should value it; but we do not value it enough to put forth funds in the way that, very wisely, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) have put in their bill. This bipartisan legislation very wisely commits small resources for a big pay-off: for many more classrooms; smaller classrooms for more children.

All the science tells us that children do better in smaller classrooms. School modernization will make that happen. Let us be consistent with the children. Please sign the discharge petition.

EDUCATION IS A FEDERAL PROBLEM

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this is one issue that lends itself to true bipartisanism. I think President Bush, when he was campaigning, emphasized why we should not leave any child behind. That is not merely a campaign slogan. If America is just to keep up, we are going to have to invest in our young people to make certain that we can keep up with foreign technology.

We hope that we will continue to grow and have economic growth in this country, and yet we find that our high-tech people are forced to import labor into this country. We hear pleas every day from the medical industry, from the State Department, how important it is for us to train people for these important jobs, and yet we find that if they are not ready to get a decent public school education, how in God's name are they going to be ready for higher education and high tech?

There are a lot of people that do not believe education is a Federal problem; but the President knows, as do most Americans.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a

quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 374, nays 42, answered "present" 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

YEAS—374

Ackerman	Deal	Issa
Akin	Delahunt	Istook
Allen	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Andrews	DeLay	Jackson-Lee
Armey	DeMint	(TX)
Baca	Deutsch	Jenkins
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	John
Baird	Dicks	Johnson (CT)
Baker	Doggett	Johnson (IL)
Baldacci	Dooley	Johnson, Sam
Baldwin	Doolittle	Jones (NC)
Ballenger	Doyle	Jones (OH)
Barcia	Dreier	Kanjorski
Barr	Duncan	Kaptur
Barrett	Dunn	Keller
Bartlett	Edwards	Kelly
Barton	Ehlers	Kennedy (RI)
Bass	Ehrlich	Kerns
Becerra	Emerson	Kildee
Bentsen	Engel	Kilpatrick
Bereuter	Eshoo	Kind (WI)
Berkley	Etheridge	King (NY)
Berman	Evans	Kingston
Berry	Everett	Kirk
Biggert	Farr	Kleccka
Bilirakis	Fattah	Knollenberg
Bishop	Flake	Kolbe
Blagojevich	Fletcher	LaFalce
Blumenauer	Foley	LaHood
Blunt	Ford	Lampson
Boehlert	Frank	Langevin
Boehner	Frelinghuysen	Lantos
Bonilla	Frost	Larson (CT)
Bonior	Galleghy	Latham
Bono	Ganske	LaTourette
Boswell	Gekas	Leach
Boucher	Gephardt	Lee
Boyd	Gibbons	Levin
Brady (TX)	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Brown (FL)	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Brown (OH)	Gilman	Linder
Brown (SC)	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Bryant	Goode	Lofgren
Burr	Goodlatte	Lowe
Burton	Gordon	Lucas (KY)
Buyer	Goss	Lucas (OK)
Callahan	Graham	Luther
Calvert	Granger	Maloney (CT)
Camp	Graves	Maloney (NY)
Cannon	Green (TX)	Manzullo
Cantor	Green (WI)	Markey
Capito	Greenwood	Mascara
Capps	Grucci	Matheson
Cardin	Hall (OH)	Matsui
Carson (IN)	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (MO)
Carson (OK)	Hansen	McCarthy (NY)
Castle	Harman	McCollum
Chabot	Hart	McCrary
Chambliss	Hastings (WA)	McGovern
Clay	Hayes	McHugh
Clayton	Hayworth	McInnis
Clement	Heger	McIntyre
Clyburn	Hill	McKeon
Coble	Hilleary	McKinney
Collins	Hinche	Meehan
Combest	Hinojosa	Meek (FL)
Condit	Hobson	Meeks (NY)
Conyers	Hoefel	Mica
Cooksey	Hoekstra	Millender
Cox	Holden	McDonald
Coyne	Holt	Miller (FL)
Cramer	Honda	Miller, Gary
Crenshaw	Hoolley	Mink
Cubin	Horn	Mollohan
Culberson	Hostettler	Moran (KS)
Cummings	Houghton	Moran (VA)
Cunningham	Hoyer	Morella
Davis (CA)	Hunter	Murtha
Davis (FL)	Hyde	Myrick
Davis (IL)	Inslee	Nadler
Davis, Jo Ann	Isakson	Napolitano
Davis, Tom	Israel	Neal

Nethercutt	Rogers (MI)	Stearns
Ney	Rohrabacher	Stenholm
Northup	Ros-Lehtinen	Strickland
Norwood	Ross	Stump
Nussle	Rothman	Sununu
Obey	Roukema	Tauscher
Olver	Roybal-Allard	Tauzin
Ortiz	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Ose	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Otter	Ryun (KS)	Thomas
Owens	Sanchez	Thornberry
Oxley	Sanders	Thune
Pascrell	Sandlin	Thurman
Pastor	Sawyer	Tiahrt
Paul	Saxton	Tiberti
Payne	Scarborough	Tierney
Pelosi	Schakowsky	Toomey
Pence	Schiff	Towns
Peterson (MN)	Schrock	Trafficant
Peterson (PA)	Scott	Turner
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Phelps	Serrano	Velazquez
Pickering	Sessions	Vitter
Pitts	Shadegg	Walden
Platts	Shaw	Walsh
Pombo	Shays	Wamp
Pomeroy	Sherman	Watkins (OK)
Portman	Sherwood	Watt (NC)
Price (NC)	Shimkus	Watts (OK)
Pryce (OH)	Shows	Waxman
Putnam	Shuster	Weiner
Quinn	Simmons	Weldon (FL)
Radanovich	Simpson	Weldon (PA)
Rahall	Skeen	Wexler
Rangel	Slaughter	Whitfield
Regula	Smith (MI)	Wicker
Rehberg	Smith (NJ)	Wilson
Reyes	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Reynolds	Smith (WA)	Woolsey
Riley	Snyder	Wu
Rivers	Solis	Wynn
Rodriguez	Souder	Young (FL)
Roemer	Spence	
Rogers (KY)	Spratt	

NAYS—42

Aderholt	Hilliard	Ramstad
Borski	Hulshof	Sabo
Brady (PA)	Kennedy (MN)	Schaffer
Capuano	Kucinich	Stark
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Stupak
Crane	Lewis (GA)	Sweeney
Crowley	LoBiondo	Taylor (MS)
DeFazio	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
English	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
Filner	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Gutierrez	Moore	Udall (NM)
Gutknecht	Oberstar	Visclosky
Hastings (FL)	Osborne	Waters
Hefley	Pallone	Weller

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie	Hutchinson	Rush
DeGette	Jefferson	Skelton
Dingell	Johnson, E.B.	Tanner
Ferguson	Largent	Watson (CA)
Fossella	Miller, George	Young (AK)

□ 1054

Mr. WELLER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SHAYS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 877

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 877.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PACIFIC SALMON RECOVERY ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 163 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 163

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1157) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide financial assistance to the States of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho for salmon habitat restoration projects in coastal waters and upland drainages, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 1 pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII. Each section of that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 156 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 163 is an open rule waiving clause 4(a) of rule XIII that requires the 3-day availability of the committee report against

consideration of the bill. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. The rule makes in order as base text for the purpose of amendment the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1 which shall be open for amendment by section. The rule also authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, and lays House Resolution 156 on the table.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1157, the Pacific Salmon Recovery Act, would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide financial assistance to five States in the Pacific Northwest for salmon habitat restoration projects in both coastal waters and upland areas which support a number of important species of salmon. The bill was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) in response to a request from the Governors of Washington, Oregon, Alaska, and California for a coastwide approach to protecting salmon habitat from a variety of natural and man-made threats. The bill authorizes \$200 million for that purpose through fiscal year 2003 to be made available to the States of Washington, Oregon, Alaska, California, and Idaho as well as certain Native American tribes in the region. In order to receive funds, the States must submit a recovery plan to the Secretary of Interior with specific goals and time lines.

The bill also authorizes U.S. representation on the Transboundary Panel of the Pacific Salmon Commission under the Pacific Salmon Treaty Act of 1985.

□ 1100

Finally, the bill authorizes payments to the Northern Fund and the Southern Fund for fiscal years 2001 to 2003, as well as lump sum payments to retirees of certain international commissions.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that enacting H.R. 1157 would cost the Federal Government \$510 million over the next 5 years. Pay-as-you-go procedures would apply because the bill would increase direct spending, although less than \$500,000.

Finally, the bill contains no inter-governmental or private sector unfunded mandates.

The Committee on Resources reported H.R. 1157 by a voice vote on May 16 of this year and has requested an open rule so that Members seeking to amend the bill may have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who represent districts in the Pacific Northwest are deeply committed to the cause of salmon restoration, and while we are determined to fully protect the rights of States and localities to chart their own destiny, we also believe that the Federal Government has an important role to play in this process.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and Members of the Committee on Resources have worked hard to approach the job of salmon restoration in a balanced and responsible fashion.

While H.R. 1157 may not be perfect in every respect, the bill is an important step in the right direction and I do intend to support it.

Accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this open rule. I would note that the underlying bill is noncontroversial and has passed the Chamber twice. The measure authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to provide financial assistance to Alaska, California, Idaho, Oregon and Washington for salmon habitat restoration projects.

Pacific salmon and steelhead trout are fish whose life cycle begins in freshwater, moves into the ocean and then returns to the freshwater when it is time to spawn. Along the way, dams, predators and commercial harvests all contribute to salmon mortality. Many salmon species are currently listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act.

The underlying bill would authorize appropriations of \$200 million to restore and conserve these endangered fish. The measure moved through the committee by unanimous consent and was favorably reported to the House by voice vote.

A bill such as this would be a perfect candidate for the suspension calendar and why it is being considered today under regular order is anybody's guess, but nevertheless I do support this rule and the underlying bill and urge its favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and strongly in support of the underlying legislation. It recognizes the fact that the Federal Government should be a full partner in the issue of salmon recovery. Part of the challenge is that this is a requirement of Federal legislation under the Endangered Species Act, which to be charitable, and this comes from somebody who is a strong supporter of the act and its purposes, it is not always the easiest to administer.

There are also a myriad of built-in challenges coordinating the various responses of the Federal agencies, NMFS, Bonneville Power, Fish and Wildlife, the Corps of Engineers, EPA, the long list of Federal players, and here again it is not always easy to coordinate this effort.

It is hard and expensive to work with the Federal Government, and this legislation acknowledges the fact and would provide help.

Additionally, much of the difficulty we face now is not just an operation of the Endangered Species Act and the complex set of Federal partners. It is a direct result of the application of a wide range of Federal policies and practices we have, many of which that at the time of their enactment made sense to Congress, made sense to the public, but sadly today many of these practices are outmoded. They would have serious side effects, even if we have not moved forward to modify them.

The construction of Federal dams on the Columbia River, for instance, the application of policies for water reclamation, forestry practices on Federal land, mining, transportation. There is an international implication which will be acknowledged later, as my colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), will offer an amendment that seeks to have the Federal Government monitor the impact of harvests in Canada on the impact on salmon, and I think a very good idea.

Unless and until we come forward to deal comprehensively with these range of Federal policies, we need to have the Federal Government help us. There are many encouraging signs of activities taking place today at the local level, with private landowners, with private policies on forest lands. We have State and local activities, as well as the Federal Government itself, but it is going to take us time, money and energy to put these pieces together.

I think this bill is a step in the right direction, and I look forward to the passage of the rule and the act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Pursuant to House Resolution 163 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1157.

□ 1107

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1157) to

authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide financial assistance to the States of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho for salmon habitat restoration projects in coastal waters and upland drainages, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST).

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this morning we are considering H.R. 1157, the Pacific Salmon Recovery Act. This bill was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) with 65 cosponsors. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) introduced a similar bill last Congress, H.R. 2798. That bill passed the House twice, once as a stand-alone bill and once as part of H.R. 5086, a bill including a number of fishery provisions.

Unfortunately, the other body never took up the measure.

Except for some technical changes, H.R. 1157 has the same text as H.R. 2798. This bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide financial assistance to the States of Alaska, California, Idaho, Oregon and Washington for salmon restoration and habitat restoration projects in coastal waters and upland drainages.

Habitat restoration is one of the most important factors in rebuilding endangered species populations, and especially endangered salmon populations. While the Federal Government has been working with local and regional groups to develop a recovery plan for the listed salmon, steelhead and trout species, there is still a great deal to do. The support of State projects is critical to the survival of listed species of salmon, steelhead and cutthroat trout. In some cases, the State and local governments often do a better job than the Federal Government. Local input is very important in order to direct funding to local restoration projects.

This bill will allow the States to focus the money they receive on areas and projects that need the most attention.

Small projects like replacing culverts and restoring stream flows may actually open up large areas of spawning habitat for little cost. Those are the projects that can be identified and undertaken by local governments and may provide the most benefit to the listed salmon, steelhead and trout. The States will be making their own decisions and can complement Federal restoration programs already in place.

I would encourage the local people and the Federal people to take off their

Federal hats, take off their local hats, and put their hearts and mind together and get the job done.

I will note that there is currently an authorization in place through Public Law 106-553, the District of Columbia fiscal year 2001 appropriations bill. However, there are differences in the two authorizations. First, the States are only required to match 25 percent in Public Law 106-553 versus a 100 percent match in H.R. 1157 for funds received by the State.

Finally, the current authorization does not include the State of Idaho, while H.R. 1157 does.

This is a good piece of legislation that addresses the conservation needs of salmon, steelhead and trout species residing along the Pacific Coast and Alaska. It is a noncontroversial bill which has a tremendous amount of bipartisan support, with cosponsors, including many Members interested in salmon restoration and those Members range from the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

I urge Members to vote aye on H.R. 1157.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to rise in support of H.R. 1157, a great bill that has been introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON). Basically, it authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to provide financial assistance to the States of Alaska, California, Idaho, Oregon and Washington for salmon habitat restoration projects in coastal waters and upland drainages. As many of our colleagues are aware, there is more than 25 species of salmon on the West Coast right now that have been listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act. Several more are currently under consideration for listing.

In 1999, the States of Alaska, California, Oregon and Washington proposed to tackle this crisis with a coast-wide salmon restoration effort, conservation effort, that would allocate \$50 million of Federal funds to each State for 6 years to support salmon conservation. An habitat restoration project was very important at a regional and local level. In response to this request, Congress established the Pacific Salmon Recovery Fund and appropriated \$58 million for these purposes in the fiscal year 2000 and \$90 million in fiscal year 2001.

In Washington State, our funds are allocated by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board, also known as the SURF Board, one of the great acronyms of all times, which is operated by William Ruckelshaus, a name I think is familiar to many.

The local regional project supported by the Pacific Salmon Recovery Fund will restore habitats and help stem the continued decline of the salmon popu-

lations on the West Coast. H.R. 1157 authorizes the activities that will be carried out using the appropriations in this fund; requires States and tribes to develop a conservation and restoration plan. To receive grants, it specifies the activities that are eligible to receive funding. It requires a one-to-one match of any Federal dollars that are provided and it thereby doubles their conservation efforts, a really good feature of the bill.

Finally, it adds Idaho, a great State, to the list of States that would participate in the program.

Mr. Chairman, in my own State of Washington, this program will enable us to work in conjunction with funding from the Puget Sound Initiative, a bipartisan bill I helped pass last year which authorizes the Army Corps of Engineers to use their expertise in designing community-based habitat restoration projects.

In King County, money appropriated to the funds has already been used to acquire 93 acres of land along Bear Creek, which includes a large wetland, a beautiful little area in my district, salmonid spawning areas and large beds of freshwater mussels, the noninvasive type, I may add.

King County also acquired 172 acres at several high priority habitats along the Snoqualmie River watershed.

□ 1115

The acquisitions focused primarily on the spawning areas in the Snoqualmie Basin, which are very important.

With future funds, we will be looking to provide more protection for salmon habitat along the Cedar River, which is the watershed feeding Seattle. This area has long been known for its critical habitat values, and has everything that salmon need to thrive. In addition to Chinook, sockeye and coho salmon, steelhead will also benefit from this newly protected area in the years to come.

H.R. 57 is a great bill. It will ensure these projects will continue. It is supported by the Governors of all five States, the tribes, fishermen and the environmental community. While the administration has not provided an official position on this bill, it has requested \$100 million for Pacific Salmon Recovery Fund in fiscal year 2002 budget submission. That is good news, and I urge Members to support it today.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important issue to all of us in the Pacific Northwest that care about salmon recovery. Today I rise in support of H.R. 1157, the Pacific Salmon Recovery Act. I compliment my good friend from the State of California for his efforts in directing

funds to the areas where they may actually make an impact to the States and local governments of the Pacific Northwest.

The Federal Government is spending huge amounts of money on salmon restoration in the Pacific Northwest. Unfortunately, the Federal efforts do not always involve the small projects, and the Federal efforts do not always put much emphasis on the projects put forward by local units of government.

Mr. Chairman, I think these smaller local projects, when put together with larger Federal efforts, may actually begin to make a difference in restoring salmon populations and restoring salmon habitat.

At the end of the 106th Congress, the appropriators both authorized and appropriated funds for this type of State effort. Unfortunately, the original authorization left the State of Idaho out, and therefore Idaho received no funds for habitat recovery for these magnificent fish.

While Idaho is not one of the coastal States, it does in fact include much of the habitat for these spawning fish. It is a sad fact that some of these salmon are endangered. It is also a sad fact that Idaho could probably use some financial assistance to augment our salmon habitat restoration efforts.

Mr. Chairman, this bill not only authorizes the funding for the State and local restoration projects, but it also takes a few steps that the current appropriation language does not take. This bill requires the State to match dollar for dollar the funding they get through this authorization. The current authorization only requires a 25 percent match by the States.

This bill also requires that States develop a salmon conservation and restoration plan. This is an important provision that will ensure that funds are spent according to a publicly developed plan, rather than haphazardly funding projects with little or no coordination. This bill also requires the State plans to have measurable criteria by which the activities funded by this bill can be measured.

Finally, this bill requires that the States maintain their current level of funding for salmon recovery activities and not just substitute this Federal money for currently funded State salmon programs and use their funds for other priorities.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good piece of legislation, one that I believe will help the State and local governments partner in the recovery of salmon and salmon habitat in the Pacific Northwest, including the State of Idaho.

As has been mentioned, this legislation in a somewhat different form passed the House twice during the 106th Congress, both times by voice vote. I urge Members to support this legislation.

Once again, I compliment my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), for his effort in making sure that we do whatever we can to

recover the salmon and other fish of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who has done a tremendous job fashioning this bipartisan success story.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I would like to also thank the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) for his help on this bill; the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN); the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL); and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) from the subcommittee that helped make this bill possible to be heard on the floor today. I would also like to thank all the staff that worked diligently to make sure this good bill was here.

Mr. Chairman, in California virtually every salmon spawning habitat has been altered by human activities, such as water diversions, dam building, overfishing and urban development. In many streams and rivers, the alterations have been so severe that fish can no longer return to their historical spawning areas. As a result, almost 80 percent of the salmon caught commercially in the Pacific Northwest and in northern California today come from hatcheries.

My bill will authorize \$40 million per year for 5 years for California, Washington, Oregon, Alaska, and Idaho. The money will be distributed to the State agencies after an MOU has been approved by the Secretary of Commerce. It is designed to prioritize salmon recovery, provide a criteria for measuring success, and promote projects that are scientifically based and cost effective.

The States and the local governments will receive funds on a 50-50 cost-share basis for these restoration projects. This will double the amount of money spent and the amount of work that can be done to enhance this important purpose.

Salmon species are very much a part of the culture of the Pacific Northwest. Many of the port towns in my district on the north coast, such as Point Arena, Fort Bragg, Eureka, and Crescent City, were founded around the commercial fishing industry. Many of these towns have been devastated by the collapse of salmon populations.

Over the last 30 years, the salmon fishery closures in these areas have contributed to the loss of nearly 75,000 jobs. Private landowners, conservation groups, and industry have already committed a significant amount of resources to aid in the reversal of this decline. But the efforts are not sufficient. In fact, species are still declining. Recovery efforts must be stepped up, and they must be stepped up now.

By restoring our salmon populations, we can lessen the burden on industry and private landowners. By bringing

back the salmon, the fishing industry economy will rise; and eventually the ESA regulations can be lifted. More importantly, if we restore salmon populations, future generations, like their ancestors, can enjoy and prosper from a great national treasure.

The Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Act of 2001 not only enjoys bipartisan support in Congress, but also the support of a diverse organizational structure, such as the American Homebuilders, the California Farm Bureau, American Rivers, Trout Unlimited, and the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure and pass the Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Act today.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, let me first applaud the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), and the gentleman from Maryland (Chairman GILCREST) for their efforts on this important bill and for protecting this valuable resource.

I am a strong supporter of H.R. 1157, the Pacific Salmon Recovery Act. This measure would provide significant assistance to the Northwestern States and tribal and local governments involved in salmon management recovery and conservation activities.

The salmon populations are economic and wildlife resources whose preservation is our national responsibility. As such, the recovery of salmon populations in the Pacific Northwest is of great importance to the ecological, recreational, and economic future of the region.

The recovery of our salmon populations are important to the once-thriving commercial salmon fishery business, which is dwindling as a result of a decline in salmon population. This has left the industry crippled. Thus, by protecting healthy salmon runs and those of other species, we can possibly revive what was once a sustainable fishing industry in the region. Once there were 12,000 jobs in this industry. Would it not be great if we could move towards restoring many of those jobs?

These activities, coupled with a revival of the recreation industry, provide for a potential increase in commercial and recreational fishing, which can provide the region with new opportunities for economic growth.

Our efforts are also an important part of our commitment to honoring our treaty obligations with Native American tribes and with Canada. It is important to emphasize that, in passing this bill, we will take a significant step in honoring our treaty obligations. The history of the United States is replete with unfulfilled promises. As a Nation, we must remedy this by setting new precedents and taking steps to honor our commitments.

The potential cost of litigation, should Canada or the tribes contest the

treaties in court, could be enormous. Some observers estimate that attorney fees, potential damage awards and/or a settlement based upon a failure to maintain a viable salmon population could exceed \$10 billion.

Mr. Chairman, we must act now to preserve this magnificent national resource. By passing this measure, we take a necessary step in moving the salmon further from extinction. It is an action that makes sense for the ecosystem, the economy, the nations and tribes with whom we have treaty obligations; and most importantly, it allows us to pursue a balanced approach to preserving this national resource.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a great Congresswoman from California; but she grew up on the shores of Puget Sound.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1157, not only because I was born and raised in the Pacific Northwest, but because I have lived all of my adult life in California along the coast and know how important the Pacific Salmon Recovery Act will be and how much support we must give it.

I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for his hard work to bring this bill to the floor and to my colleagues, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST), for their work and support.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill, because, like the three gentleman that I just mentioned, I and our Pacific Coast colleagues in a very bipartisan manner know that salmon are in trouble.

Over the past decade, we have witnessed a huge decline in salmon population, and the listing of salmon on the endangered species list is a clear warning that we must take this seriously. That is why communities and local officials in my district of Marin and Sonoma Counties, just north of San Francisco across the Golden Gate Bridge in California, are actively supporting Federal efforts to help with salmon restoration.

We are fortunate that Marin and Sonoma Counties combined have received almost \$850,000 from the current salmon recovery initiative, which was formed under President Clinton; and even better, these Federal dollars are available and are being leveraged at State, local, and nonprofit levels for resources that will bolster the recovery efforts even further than that \$850,000.

Next month, these Federal funds will begin to bear fruit. I do not think I should say that. They will begin to bear fish, not fruit. Projects that are under way will eventually return our salmon runs to their former abundance.

For example, the Kelly Road Stabilization Project in my district will help stop erosion from going into the nearby waterways that harm salmon habitat. Also in Sonoma County,

through the county ecology center, a program will focus on bringing private landowners, government agencies, and environmental groups together to work on restoration efforts.

Other exciting habitat restoration efforts in my district that are getting under way include the Lagunitas Sediment Management Project, the Willow Creek Restoration Project, and work on Pine Gulch Creek.

Mr. Chairman, expanding habitat restoration efforts is a key component of any recovery effort, but we all know that money is another key ingredient to making these programs happen. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1130

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the Pacific Salmon Recovery Act. I am very proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation.

I want to thank the people who worked so hard to bring this to the floor, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), and also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), for their hard work on this issue.

This is a very important issue for the fishermen in my district, particularly those in Morro Bay and San Luis Obispo. They depend on salmon for their livelihood, and when these species are endangered, it is a serious threat to provide for their families.

Steelhead salmon has been listed in my district as a threatened species north of the Santa Maria River, and as an endangered species to the south. It is vitally important that we restore their numbers.

As Members know, this legislation would authorize \$200 million in Federal assistance to State programs so that they can restore salmon and steelhead populations. This funding would not only add to the resources that the California Fish and Game already has, but also leverage more funds from the State and from other local sources. This kind of assistance would support ongoing projects in California.

In my district, projects designed by groups like the South-Central Steelhead Coalition, the Arroyo Grande Watershed Forum, led by Central Coast Salmon Enhancement, these groups would benefit from this funding. These collaborative projects would be able to put such funds to good use in a way which will restore our natural resources.

This is a good bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1157.

I want to first off thank my colleagues, the gentleman from California

(Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), on this side of the aisle, for the work they have done on the issue, and my colleagues, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), for the hard work they have done as well on this issue. I am pleased to join them in cosponsoring this important piece of legislation.

Having served in local government before being in Congress and having worked with those who are in the trenches on this issue of salmon recovery, I can tell the Members that solutions need to come from the bottom up and not the top down. The funds provided by this bill will empower local communities to deal with salmon recovery efforts at the local level. That is the proper approach, and that is why I support this bill.

As an example, the Haskell Slough project along the Skykomish River in my district is considered many a model of what successful salmon recovery can look like throughout the Pacific Northwest. A coalition of private landowners, local governments, businesses, and tribes use Federal dollars to restore a critical piece of freshwater habitat, and the fish have come back by the thousands.

Passing this legislation will help fund hundreds of individual projects like the Haskell Slough project, and continue to move us in the right direction on salmon recovery.

So again, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this work, for their work on this issue, and urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 1157.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to tell a personal story that relates a bit to this bill.

Last week I was sitting in my living room. I live on Puget Sound in the State of Washington. I was talking to one of my staffers about an environmental issue. We were sort of bemoaning some of the problems we have, both environmentally and legislatively, as it pertains to the environment here.

We were particularly concerned about the salmon, who really are on the ropes up and down the West Coast. These salmon are very much on the edge of extinction in a lot of these runs.

We were sort of down-mouthed at the moment, and just at that moment a bald eagle came soaring by, literally with the wings straight out, not flapping, just soaring on the wind as it came up over the shoreline, sort of eye level right past our house.

It was sort of a message, I think, maybe from some other power that we ought to keep our heads up when it comes to these endangered species; that if the bald eagle can have a spectacular recovery, perhaps the salmon can, too.

I think this is a good step forward towards that end. I want to compliment

our friends on the other side for their work in getting this bipartisan product out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the comment about the bald eagle was well received, I say to the gentleman from Washington. If we can restore that magnificent creature to a healthy population, I am sure that we can do that to many other forms of nature's bounty.

The great Northwest is a magnificent and splendid place. If this one small effort can do what we want it to do, the fish will prosper, the land will prosper, and then people will prosper.

I urge my colleagues to give an aye vote on this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague from California for his leadership in introducing H.R. 1157, the Pacific Salmon Recovery Act. This bill will be an important tool for the Pacific Northwest's efforts to preserve and protect our unique salmon runs. Our region understands the importance of providing salmon with the habitat they need to flourish, and our state and local governments have developed valuable programs to recover salmon runs. This legislation will allow those established programs to qualify for federal matching grants, and provide the incentives needed to enable new organizations to participate in salmon recovery.

For Washington state, that means that our Salmon Recovery Funding Board will have an additional revenue source. This board does a good job of getting the funds to programs that are instrumental in recovery efforts, but they need more funding and that is exactly what this bill will do. This bill could mean additional funds for restoration projects like those on the Hylebos Watershed, and the Green and Duwamish Rivers. The states and Indian tribes know what needs to be done to help salmon recover, but they need help from the federal government. This bill will allow existing programs to expand on their successes with the opportunity to qualify for further funding. This bill authorizes \$200 million a year for three years for states and Indian tribes for salmon conservation and restoration projects in the coastal and upriver of Alaska, California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

Last year the House considered a similar bill, but it was never taken up in the Senate. I am hopeful that the House's early action on this bill will give the Senate ample time to consider this legislation so that the President can sign it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1157, which authorizes financial assistance to West Coast states to support restoration and conservation of Pacific salmon. This bill would also support the restoration of a historic industry, comprised of proud fishing men and women and their communities, that provides both food and recreation to the citizens of this nation. I commend my colleague MIKE THOMPSON for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, salmon have been an important source of sustenance for the native peoples of the Pacific coast for thousands of

years. The modern fishing industry on the West Coast began in my district with the salmon fishery on San Francisco Bay. Salmon from the Bay were harvested to feed the forty-niners headed for the gold fields of the Sierra Nevada mountains. San Francisco Bay is still the migratory route for one of the largest runs of salmon on the Pacific Coast.

Our salmon have suffered mightily over the past century, as spawning and rearing habitat within their natal streams and rivers has been lost. We have lost about 80 percent of the productive capacity of salmon streams in the West Coast as a direct result of various causes of watershed destruction.

According to a 1991 comprehensive scientific study by the American Fisheries Society (AFS), at least 106 major populations of West Coast salmon and steelhead are already extinct. Other studies place the number at over 200 separate stock extinctions in the Columbia River Basin alone. The AFS report also identified 214 additional native naturally-spawning salmonid runs at risk of extinction in the Northwest and Northern California: 101 at high risk of extinction, 58 at moderate risk of extinction, and another 54 of special concern.

The productive capacity of the salmon resource has been enormous. Even as recently as 1988, and in spite of already serious existing depletions in the Columbia River and elsewhere, the Northwest salmon fishing industry (including both commercial and recreational components) still supported an estimated 62,750 family wage jobs in the Northwest and Northern California, including my district, and generated \$1.25 billion in economic personal income impacts to the region.

H.R. 1157 continues the program of Federal matching assistance to the West Coast states to rebuild this important fishery. The bill would authorize funding for states and tribal governments to restore damaged and degraded salmon habitat in a scientifically based and cost-effective manner. Emphasis would be placed on the recovery of salmon runs listed under the Endangered Species Act to prevent their extinction and eventually permit the lifting of the restrictions that are set in place when a species is listed. Funds will be spent only for projects approved as part of state and tribal restoration plans.

H.R. 1157 is an investment in a healthful food source, an industry of hard working men and women, and a precious element of our ecosystem and natural heritage. I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1157, and I urge my colleagues to support the preservation and restoration of West Coast salmon.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1157, the Pacific Salmon Recovery Act. Passage of this important bill that is vital to preserving our rapidly disappearing natural resources on the West Coast. This important bill would authorize funding to protect and restore salmon and steelhead populations in the Pacific Coast states of California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, on our nation's Pacific Coast, many species of salmon and trout are listed as threatened or endangered, and that number will continue to grow if we do not take steps to reverse this trend now. I urge passage of H.R. 1157, which provides financial assistance to states and tribal governments for salmon and trout restoration.

The salmon population has been declining on the West Coast for many years. This is due

to habitat destruction, urban development, water diversions, land use and industry practices. Approximately 25 species are listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, with additional species being considered for addition to the list. This bill will ensure that activities funded under the Endangered Species Act are conducted in a manner that will have long-term positive benefits for salmon conservation and habitat restoration.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important issue to my Congressional district, which includes California coastal lands in San Mateo and San Francisco Counties. The decline in Salmon populations has been widely felt throughout the region, from the coastal streams of San Mateo and throughout the State. Local governments and private citizens would like to continue efforts to restore salmon habitat but need assistance from the Federal government to do this.

H.R. 1157 will allow states and tribal governments to carry-out watershed evaluations and assessments and to develop plans to implement improvements. It will also fund research to ensure that the restoration is based on good sound data. Most importantly, it will offer assistance to educate private landowners on methods to restore the salmon and trout habitat on their land. The funding will also teach them land use and water management practices so they can continue to use their property without negatively affect these species.

This bill authorizes \$200 million a year for three years, with oversight to ensure that the funds will be used where they are most needed. The funding will be in the form of matching grants to states and tribal governments. It also requires that states provide matching grants and report annually to Congress on the use of these funds and their efforts to restore salmon and trout populations.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1157 has widespread support, conservationists, fish producing states and local governments and local landowners alike, all share a common goal—the restoration of the salmon and trout populations along the Pacific Coast. I urge passage of the Pacific Salmon Recovery Act. The legislation will ensure that communities in San Mateo and all across California, Washington, Oregon and Alaska receive financial assistance to begin the important work of restoring salmon and trout populations in rivers and tributaries along the Pacific Coast.

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1 shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered as read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as read.

The Clerk will designate section 1. The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pacific Salmon Recovery Act".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. SALMON CONSERVATION AND SALMON HABITAT RESTORATION ASSISTANCE.

(a) **REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.**—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary of Commerce shall provide financial assistance in accordance with this Act to qualified States and qualified tribal governments for salmon conservation and salmon habitat restoration activities.

(b) **ALLOCATION.**—Of the amounts available to provide assistance under this section each fiscal year (after the application of section 3(g)), the Secretary—

(1) shall allocate 85 percent among qualified States, in equal amounts; and

(2) shall allocate 15 percent among qualified tribal governments, in amounts determined by the Secretary.

(c) **TRANSFER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall promptly transfer—

(A) to a qualified State that has submitted a Conservation and Restoration Plan under section 3(a) amounts allocated to the qualified State under subsection (b)(1) of this section, unless the Secretary determines, within 30 days after the submittal of the plan to the Secretary, that the plan is inconsistent with the requirements of this Act; and

(B) to a qualified tribal government that has entered into a memorandum of understanding with the Secretary under section 3(b) amounts allocated to the qualified tribal government under subsection (b)(2) of this section.

(2) **TRANSFERS TO QUALIFIED STATES.**—The Secretary shall make the transfer under paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) to the Washington State Salmon Recovery Board, in the case of amounts allocated to Washington;

(B) to the Oregon State Watershed Enhancement Board, in the case of amounts allocated to Oregon;

(C) to the California Department of Fish and Game for the California Coastal Salmon Recovery Program, in the case of amounts allocated to California;

(D) to the Governor of Alaska, in the case of amounts allocated to Alaska; and

(E) to the Office of Species Conservation, in the case of amounts allocated to Idaho.

(d) **REALLOCATION.**—

(1) **AMOUNTS ALLOCATED TO QUALIFIED STATES.**—Amounts that are allocated to a qualified State for a fiscal year shall be reallocated under subsection (b)(1) among the other qualified States, if—

(A) the qualified State has not submitted a plan in accordance with section 3(a) as of the end of the fiscal year; or

(B) the amounts remain unobligated at the end of the subsequent fiscal year.

(2) **AMOUNTS ALLOCATED TO QUALIFIED TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.**—Amounts that are allocated to a qualified tribal government for a fiscal year shall be reallocated under subsection (b)(2) among the other qualified tribal governments, if the qualified tribal government has not entered into a memorandum of understanding with the Secretary in accordance with section 3(b) as of the end of the fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 2?

Hearing none, the Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. RECEIPT AND USE OF ASSISTANCE.

(a) **QUALIFIED STATE SALMON CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To receive assistance under this Act, a qualified State shall develop and submit to the Secretary a Salmon Conservation and Salmon Habitat Restoration Plan.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—Each Salmon Conservation and Salmon Restoration Plan shall, at a minimum—

(A) be consistent with other applicable Federal laws;

(B) be consistent with the goal of salmon recovery;

(C) except as provided in subparagraph (D), give priority to use of assistance under this section for projects that—

(i) provide a direct and demonstrable benefit to salmon or their habitat;

(ii) provide the greatest benefit to salmon conservation and salmon habitat restoration relative to the cost of the projects; and

(iii) conserve, and restore habitat, for—

(I) salmon that are listed as endangered species or threatened species, proposed for such listing, or candidates for such listing, under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); or

(II) salmon that are given special protection under the laws or regulations of the qualified State;

(D) in the case of a plan submitted by a qualified State in which, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, there is no area at which a salmon species referred to in subparagraph (C)(iii)(I) spawns—

(i) give priority to use of assistance for projects referred to in subparagraph (C)(i) and (ii) that contribute to proactive programs to conserve and enhance species of salmon that intermingle with, or are otherwise related to, species referred to in subparagraph (C)(iii)(I), which may include (among other matters)—

(I) salmon-related research, data collection, and monitoring;

(II) salmon supplementation and enhancement;

(III) salmon habitat restoration;

(IV) increasing economic opportunities for salmon fishermen; and

(V) national and international cooperative habitat programs; and

(ii) provide for revision of the plan within one year after any date on which any salmon species that spawns in the qualified State is listed as an endangered species or threatened species, proposed for such listing, or a candidate for such listing, under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(E) establish specific goals and timelines for activities funded with such assistance;

(F) include measurable criteria by which such activities may be evaluated;

(G) require that activities carried out with such assistance shall—

(i) be scientifically based;

(ii) be cost effective;

(iii) not be conducted on private land except with the consent of the owner of the land; and

(iv) contribute to the conservation and recovery of salmon;

(H) require that the qualified State maintain its aggregate expenditures of funds from non-Federal sources for salmon habitat restoration programs at or above the average level of such expenditures in the 2 fiscal years preceding the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(I) ensure that activities funded under this Act are conducted in a manner in which, and in areas where, the State has determined that they will have long-term benefits.

(3) **SOLICITATION OF COMMENTS.**—In preparing a plan under this subsection a qualified State shall seek comments on the plan from local governments in the qualified State.

(b) **TRIBAL MOU WITH SECRETARY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To receive assistance under this Act, a qualified tribal government shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Secretary regarding use of the assistance.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—Each memorandum of understanding shall, at a minimum—

(A) be consistent with other applicable Federal laws;

(B) be consistent with the goal of salmon recovery;

(C) give priority to use of assistance under this Act for activities that—

(i) provide a direct and demonstrable benefit to salmon or their habitat;

(ii) provide the greatest benefit to salmon conservation and salmon habitat restoration relative to the cost of the projects; and

(iii) conserve, and restore habitat, for—

(I) salmon that are listed as endangered species or threatened species, proposed for such listing, or candidates for such listing, under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); or

(II) salmon that are given special protection under the ordinances or regulations of the qualified tribal government;

(D) in the case of a memorandum of understanding entered into by a qualified tribal government for an area in which, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, there is no area at which a salmon species that is referred to in subparagraph (C)(iii)(I) spawns—

(i) give priority to use of assistance for projects referred to in subparagraph (C)(i) and (ii) that contribute to proactive programs described in subsection (a)(2)(D)(i);

(ii) include a requirement that the memorandum shall be revised within 1 year after any date on which any salmon species that spawns in the area is listed as an endangered species or threatened species, proposed for such listing, or a candidate for such listing, under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(E) establish specific goals and timelines for activities funded with such assistance;

(F) include measurable criteria by which such activities may be evaluated;

(G) establish specific requirements for reporting to the Secretary by the qualified tribal government;

(H) require that activities carried out with such assistance shall—

(i) be scientifically based;

(ii) be cost effective;

(iii) not be conducted on private land except with the consent of the owner of the land; and

(iv) contribute to the conservation or recovery of salmon; and

(I) require that the qualified tribal government maintain its aggregate expenditures of funds from non-Federal sources for salmon habitat restoration programs at or above the average level of such expenditures in the 2 fiscal years preceding the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Assistance under this Act may be used by a qualified State in accordance with a plan submitted by the State under subsection (a), or by a qualified tribal government in accordance with a memorandum of understanding entered into by the government under subsection (b), to carry out or make grants to carry out, among other activities, the following:

(A) Watershed evaluation, assessment, and planning necessary to develop a site-specific and clearly prioritized plan to implement watershed improvements, including for making multi-year grants.

(B) Salmon-related research, data collection, and monitoring, salmon supplementation and enhancement, and salmon habitat restoration.

(C) Maintenance and monitoring of projects completed with such assistance.

(D) Technical training and education projects, including teaching private landowners about practical means of improving land and water management practices to contribute to the conservation and restoration of salmon habitat.

(E) Other activities related to salmon conservation and salmon habitat restoration.

(2) **USE FOR LOCAL AND REGIONAL PROJECTS.**—Funds allocated to qualified States under this Act shall be used for local and regional projects.

(d) **USE OF ASSISTANCE FOR ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE OF JURISDICTION OF RECIPIENT.**—Assistance under this section provided to a qualified State or qualified tribal government may be used for activities conducted outside the areas under its jurisdiction if the activity will provide conservation benefits to naturally produced salmon in streams of concern to the qualified State or qualified tribal government, respectively.

(e) **COST SHARING BY QUALIFIED STATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A qualified State shall match, in the aggregate, the amount of any financial assistance provided to the qualified State for a fiscal year under this Act, in the form of monetary contributions or in-kind contributions of services for projects carried out with such assistance. For purposes of this paragraph, monetary contributions by the State shall not be considered to include funds received from other Federal sources.

(2) **LIMITATION ON REQUIRING MATCHING FOR EACH PROJECT.**—The Secretary may not require a qualified State to provide matching funds for each project carried out with assistance under this Act.

(3) **TREATMENT OF MONETARY CONTRIBUTIONS.**—For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(H), the amount of monetary contributions by a qualified State under this subsection shall be treated as expenditures from non-Federal sources for salmon conservation and salmon habitat restoration programs.

(f) **COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each qualified State and each qualified tribal government receiving assistance under this Act is encouraged to carefully coordinate salmon conservation activities of its agencies to eliminate duplicative and overlapping activities.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—Each qualified State and qualified tribal government receiving assistance under this Act shall consult with the Secretary to ensure there is no duplication in projects funded under this Act.

(g) **LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—

(1) **FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—Of the amount made available under this Act each fiscal year, not more than 1 percent may be used by the Secretary for administrative expenses incurred in carrying out this Act.

(2) **STATE AND TRIBAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—Of the amount allocated under this Act to a qualified State or qualified tribal government each fiscal year, not more than 3 percent may be used by the qualified State or qualified tribal government, respectively, for administrative expenses incurred in carrying out this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 3?

Hearing none, the Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

SEC. 4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

(a) **QUALIFIED STATE GOVERNMENTS.**—Each qualified State seeking assistance under this Act shall establish a citizens advisory committee or provide another similar forum for local governments and the public to participate in obtaining and using the assistance.

(b) **QUALIFIED TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.**—Each qualified tribal government receiving assistance under this Act shall hold public meetings to receive recommendations on the use of the assistance.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

SEC. 5. CONSULTATION NOT REQUIRED.

Consultation under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) shall not be required based solely on the provision of financial assistance under this Act.

SEC. 6. REPORTS.

(a) **QUALIFIED STATES.**—Each qualified State shall, by not later than December 31 of each year, submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives an annual report on the use of financial assistance received by the qualified State under this Act. The report shall contain an evaluation of the success of this Act in meeting the criteria listed in section 3(a)(2).

(b) **SECRETARY.**—

(1) **ANNUAL REPORT REGARDING QUALIFIED TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.**—The Secretary shall, by not later than December 31 of each year, submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives an annual report on the use of financial assistance received by qualified tribal governments under this Act. The report shall contain an evaluation of the success of this Act in meeting the criteria listed in section 3(b)(2).

(2) **BIANNUAL REPORT.**—The Secretary shall, by not later than December 31 of the second year in which amounts are available to carry out this Act, and of every second year thereafter, submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives a biannual report on the use of funds allocated to qualified States under this Act. The report shall review programs funded by the States and evaluate the success of this Act in meeting the criteria listed in section 3(a)(2).

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given that term in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)).

(2) **QUALIFIED STATE.**—The term “qualified State” means each of the States of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho.

(3) **QUALIFIED TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term “qualified tribal government” means—

(A) a tribal government of an Indian tribe in Washington, Oregon, California, or Idaho that the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, determines—

(i) is involved in salmon management and recovery activities under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(ii) has the management and organizational capability to maximize the benefits of assistance provided under this Act; and

(B) a village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) that the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, determines—

(i) is involved in salmon conservation and management; and

(ii) has the management and organizational capability to maximize the benefits of assistance provided under this Act.

(4) **SALMON.**—The term “salmon” means any naturally produced salmon or naturally produced trout of the following species:

(A) Coho salmon (*oncorhynchus kisutch*).

(B) Chinook salmon (*oncorhynchus tshawytscha*).

(C) Chum salmon (*oncorhynchus keta*).

(D) Pink salmon (*oncorhynchus gorbuscha*).

(E) Sockeye salmon (*oncorhynchus nerka*).

(F) Steelhead trout (*oncorhynchus mykiss*).

(G) Sea-run cutthroat trout (*oncorhynchus clarki clarki*).

(H) For purposes of application of this Act in Oregon—

(i) Lahontan cutthroat trout (*oncorhynchus clarki henshawi*); and

(ii) Bull trout (*salvelinus confluentus*).

(I) For purposes of application of this Act in Washington and Idaho, Bull trout (*salvelinus confluentus*).

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term Secretary means the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 8. REPORT REGARDING TREATMENT OF INTERNATIONAL FISHERY COMMISSION PENSIONERS.

The President shall—

(1) determine the number of United States citizens who—

(A) served as employees of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission or the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission; and

(B) worked in Canada in the course of employment with that commission;

(2) calculate for each such employee the difference between—

(A) the value, in United States currency, of the annuity payments made and to be made (determined by an actuarial valuation) by or on behalf of each such commission to the employee; and

(B) the value, in Canadian currency, of such annuity payments; and

(3) by not later than September 1, 2001, submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate a report on the determinations and calculations made under paragraphs (1) and (2).

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated \$200,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004 to carry out this Act. Funds appropriated under this section may remain until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) **PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.**—In the case of any

equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only equipment and products made in the United States.

(b) **NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.**—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) **REPORT.**—Any entity that receives funds under this Act shall report any expenditures of such funds on items made outside of the United States to the Congress within 180 days of the expenditure.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, contrary to popular belief, this amendment does not mandate that all salmon eggs must be made in America, but this amendment has been added to other authorization spending bills that urges that those recipients of Federal monies, whenever possible, utilize those funds when spending those funds on American-made goods, products, and services that are made by American hands.

In addition, it requires there be a notice of same to recipients of assistance under this bill.

Finally, after having dispensed with and expended such funds so authorized, it says there shall be a report made to Congress to see if people receiving American money are in fact, wherever possible, utilizing those funds to buy American-made goods and products made by American hands.

I urge that the committee accept it and keep it in conference.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

We have no opposition to his amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I have no comment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, hearing no comment, I take that as no objection, as well.

With that, I ask for an aye vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. OTTER

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. OTTER:
Add at the end the following:

**SEC. . . SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING
BIPARTISAN JULY 2000 GOALS.**

It is the sense of the Congress that the Congress supports the bipartisan July 2000 goals, objectives, and recommendations of the Governors of Idaho, Montana, Oregon and Washington to protect and restore salmon and other aquatic species to sustainable and harvestable levels while meeting the requirements of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Clean Water Act, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, tribal treaty rights, and executive orders and while taking into account the need to preserve a sound economy in Alaska, California, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST). I also want to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), the sponsor of House Resolution 157, for working to craft this important bipartisan piece of legislation authorizing \$200 million in assistance to the States, tribes, and local entities for on-the-ground salmon recovery projects.

House Resolution 1157 will ensure that important salmon research, data collection, monitoring supplementation, and other activities will be given priority. It also finally calls for the States to establish specific goals and timelines for salmon recovery projects, and to measure whether or not these activities are actually achieving success.

I am cosponsoring House Resolution 1157 because it focuses money where it is proven to be the most effective, and that is at the local and the State level.

Mr. Chairman, it has been reported that close to \$1 billion in public funds are now being spent directly to recover salmon runs in the Pacific Northwest each year. A small portion of that comes from the States, but the largest chunks are being funded through the electrical power bills of Pacific Northwest residents, and from Federal agencies.

Through the budgets of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Environmental Protection Agency, and through the Pacific Salmon Treaty with Canada, many, including me, are skeptical that a sufficient return on this huge Federal investment is being realized. Too much money now goes to Federal bureaucracies for permitting, regulating, and enforcing activities against people who are actually improving the life of the salmon.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we need better coordination. We need to seek more realistic, unified goals and better peer-reviewed science before salmon do go extinct.

Better coordination and more effective work is already happening on the State and local level, and it deserves the support of this Congress. That is why today I am introducing an amendment that simply recognizes a docu-

ment produced last July by the Governors of the great State of Idaho, the States of Montana, Oregon, and Washington, two Democrats and two Republicans, setting out a list of goals, objectives, and recommendations on how the region can come together to recover the Pacific salmon.

These bipartisan recommendations are philosophically in sync with the goals of this legislation, House Resolution 1157. It also encourages the development of local salmon recovery plans that avoid duplication and top-down planning, with peer-reviewed science and measurable standards.

The Governors' plan acknowledges that while human activities may influence fish and wildlife survival, humans are not the only cause for salmon decline. It encourages more study to address the role of the Pacific Ocean on salmon, and calls for the management of flesh-eating predators; that is, the predators that eat the fish as they migrate to the ocean. It responsibly encourages hatchery supplementation, and many important habitat improvements, and it does so without advocating the removal of the four lower Snake dams.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, restates the first goal of the Governors' plan, which is to recover salmon according to the applicable laws, while also adhering to the laws which ensure the continued reliable and affordable power sources that millions of families and businesses in the Pacific Northwest rely on.

It also understands the need to balance salmon recovery with the economic vitality of Alaska, California, Idaho, Montana, and Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment and the passage of House Resolution 1157.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we do not intend to express any objection to the gentleman's amendment, but I do think it appropriate to comment that the recommendations, the goals, the suggestions of the Governors encapsulated in the report to which the gentleman's amendment is addressed are not the sole things that we need to consider to be done in regard to salmon recovery. I just think it is important for us to note that.

The way I read the amendment, it does not purport to say that these are the only things that need to be done for all time in our efforts. There are certainly other things that I think need to be done, and I know there are others who also think there is more to be done. So it is important for others to be aware that passage of this amendment will not be the end of our efforts in this Chamber to restore these runs.

□ 1145

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH
Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

In section 7, after paragraph (1) (page 16, after line 12) insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs of section 7 accordingly):

(2) NATURALLY PRODUCED SALMON AND TROUT.—(A) Each of the terms “naturally produced salmon” and “naturally produced trout” does not include any genetically engineered fish.

(B) In subparagraph (A)—

(i) except as provided in clause (ii), the term “genetically engineered fish” means—

(I) a fish that has been altered at the molecular or cellular level by means that are not possible under natural conditions or processes (including recombinant DNA and RNA techniques, cell fusion, microencapsulation, macroencapsulation, gene deletion and doubling, introducing a foreign gene, and changing the positions of genes), other than a means consisting exclusively of breeding, conjugation, fermentation, hybridization, in vitro fertilization, or tissue culture; and

(II) a fish made through sexual or asexual reproduction (or both) involving a fish described in clause (i), if it has any of the altered molecular or cellular characteristics of the fish so described; and

(ii) such term does not include a fish produced by traditional breeding technologies in fish hatchery operations.

Mr. KUCINICH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I fully support this legislation, but I am concerned that there is some problems with it on a technical nature that ought to be called to the attention of this House.

In the eligible activities section of the bill, salmon-related research and salmon supplementation and enhancement are two areas that I want to alert the Members of this House.

These are two areas that could be applied to genetic engineering and to genetic engineering research. My amendment perfects this bill to ensure that salmon for purposes of this legislation does not include genetically engineered varieties. However, the amendment explicitly addresses that this does not impact traditional breeding at fish hatcheries. We make sure that is excluded.

Allowing the diversion of Federal money for research into this technology may only exacerbate the environmental challenge of protecting Pacific salmon. There are already over 35 species of genetically engineered fish currently being developed around the world.

Genetically engineered fish contain genes from fish, from humans, and from insects. According to several fish ecologists from the University of Minnesota and Purdue University, there may be negative environmental impact

on wild populations of fish. Studies show that genetically engineered fish are more aggressive, consume more food, and attract more mates than wild fish.

These studies also show that GE fish will attract more mates, their offspring will be less fit, and less likely to survive. As a result, some scientists predict that genetically engineered fish will cause some species to become extinct within only a few generations.

No Federal environmental laws specifically govern the regulation of genetically engineered fish. Concerned about the lack of existing law specifically covered genetically engineered fish, the State of Maryland recently passed a law imposing a moratorium on the growing of genetically engineered fish in State waterways that flow into other bodies of water.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I rise in opposition to the amendment, not because it is not well thought out and it is the direction that we need to move in, but we were unaware of this amendment until late last night.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for his efforts and for this amendment. This bill fundamentally is a restoration project to bring back three species of fish in the Pacific Northwest.

The funding is critical. If some of this funding is drawn away to try to detect or determine whether or not fish are genetically altered or they are hybrid fish grown in aquaculture ponds or they are wild species moving into the new restoration areas, I think that will take away from the legislation.

What I would like to offer the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is that I and our staff on the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans will work with the gentleman. We will schedule a series of hearings.

We recognize that introducing genetically altered species of any kind is a very dangerous road to go down, and so I compliment the gentleman on his efforts. We will work to develop legislation separate from this bill today to deal with the problem, not only with genetically altered species of fish, but with the full range of flora and fauna.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and I will consider your kind offer to hold hearings. I need your help in working on a bill on this. I would certainly withdraw the amendment, and I would also ask the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) to work with me on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly respect the work that the gentlemen have put into this, and I know that if we all work together in a bipartisan way, we can protect our fish, our wildlife flora and fauna.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to work with the

gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) on this.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. HOOLEY OF OREGON

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon:

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. . REPORT ON EFFECTS ON PACIFIC SALMON STOCKS OF CERTAIN TIMBER HARVESTING IN CANADA.

The Secretary, in conjunction with other Federal agencies, shall by not later than December 31 of each year report to the Congress to the best of the ability of the Secretary regarding the effects on Pacific Salmon stocks of timber harvesting on publicly owned lands in British Columbia.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, as an original cosponsor of the underlying bill, I am extremely pleased that the House is moving so expeditiously to give Oregon and other Western States greater resources to protect our Pacific salmon stocks.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) for all of their hard work on this great piece of legislation. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON.)

The bipartisan manner in which they have brought this legislation before us is an example of how Members from both sides of the aisle can come up with a commonsense approach to a common issue.

It shows that we can actually move forward and achieve a consensus that benefits our communities, our industries, and our surrounding environment.

With that said, the amendment I have is a measure which I believe strengthens the underlying intent of this legislation.

What it does is simply requires the Secretary of Commerce to report to Congress on an annual basis the effect that timber harvesting on public lands in British Columbia has on Pacific salmon stocks.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that ecosystems are not constrained by geographical borders. It is not just the rivers and tributaries of the Western United States that are an essential habitat for salmon; the Canadian province of British Columbia is home to hundreds of stocks of salmon as well.

It is a vital component of the broader ecosystem that we are seeking to protect. I think it is completely reasonable for this body to, at the very least,

consider the impact that logging practices on public lands in British Columbia have on Pacific salmon stocks.

After all, we are authorizing up to \$600 million over the next 3 years to protect these fish and their habitats, many of which are closely linked with our neighbor to the North.

The truth is that watersheds in British Columbia vital to the survival of all stocks of Pacific salmon are regularly affected by logging practices that are expressly prohibited under Canadian law and International Treaty.

Even though the Canadian Fisheries Act requires provincial governments in Canada to maintain buffers against fish-bearing streams on public lands, in British Columbia logging companies are not only allowed to cut right to their banks but to drag logs across them.

This practice may destroy salmon redds, make habitat inhospitable for fish by destroying the food web. It also increases the sedimentation which clogs the gills of fish and smothers salmon eggs and raises water temperature which kills immature salmon.

As a result, 142 stocks of salmon are now extinct in British Columbia, while another 624 are at high risk.

Because these practices are harmful to all salmon, not just those in American waters, I believe it is well within the realm of authority for Congress to ask the Secretary of Commerce, in conjunction with other Federal agencies, to annually report to Congress the effects of this logging practice on specific salmon stocks.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment asking Canada to enforce its own laws. I am confident that if confronted with the damages its policies are incurring to salmon stocks, the Canadian government will begin to enforce their own act with the Pacific Treaty.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and will ask the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) to enter into a colloquy.

Is it the gentlewoman's intent, I want to make this clear, that this report done by the Secretary of Commerce, that the funding for that come out of the Department of Commerce and not come out of funds appropriated in this bill for salmon habitat restoration?

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Absolutely.

Mr. SIMPSON. I appreciate the gentlewoman's amendment. We do not intend to oppose the amendment. There are many things that do affect salmon, one of those being logging practices, not only in the United States and in Canada, but also the predators, the ocean conditions, dams, many other things, and all of those things should be looked at along with those issues relative to logging practices in Oregon.

Let me tell the gentlewoman, there is one issue that we have not dealt with, and that is the differences between the agencies of the Federal Government and how they deal with this. In the Stanley Basin of Idaho, let me give you this example. In the Stanley Basin of Idaho, several years ago an illegal stream was dug around the Salmon River. It was dug illegally admittedly.

Today, there is conflict going on between the EPA, which is telling the new landowner to fill in that illegally dug channel, and Fish and Wildlife who is saying do not fill in that channel, because there are spawning salmon in that channel.

The landowner is stuck in the middle, the new landowner is stuck in the middle, and he refuses to fill it in. So we have not only all these other things, but we have some conflicts in the Federal agency that needs to be addressed also.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her amendment, and we do not intend to oppose it.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H.R. 1157, I rise in support of the gentlelady from Oregon's amendment.

We have a problem. As everybody knows, ecosystems do not adhere to political lines. The border that lies between the United States and Canada, a political line, may also be contributing to the demise of dozens of species of salmon.

Canada does not share the same type of environmental laws that protect salmon as we have. The Northwest, and every other region in the United States, must comply with the Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act. While the United States still has its fair share of endangered species, we have the mechanisms in place to give many of these species a fighting chance.

Canada on the other hand, does not have these sort of guidelines. Harmful logging practices may be killing endangered salmon by the thousands. Ms. HOOLEY'S amendment simply asks the Department of Commerce to conduct a study that would be reported to Congress what effect Canada's logging practices have on these endangered salmon.

Until we know how great an impact these practices have on international fish stocks, will we be able to address the problem

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this responsible amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there other amendments? If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER) having assumed the chair, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, re-

ported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1157) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide financial assistance to the States of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho for salmon habitat restoration projects in coastal waters and upland drainages, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 163, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 6, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—418

Ackerman	Boucher	Cramer	Eshoo	Lampson	Rangel
Aderholt	Boyd	Crane	Etheridge	Langevin	Regula
Akin	Brady (PA)	Crenshaw	Evans	Lantos	Rehberg
Allen	Brown (FL)	Crowley	Everett	Largent	Reyes
Andrews	Brown (OH)	Cubin	Farr	Larsen (WA)	Reynolds
Armye	Brown (SC)	Culberson	Fattah	Larson (CT)	Riley
Baca	Bryant	Cummings	Filner	Latham	Rivers
Bachus	Burr	Cunningham	Fletcher	LaTourette	Rodriguez
Baird	Burton	Davis (CA)	Foley	Leach	Roemer
Baker	Buyer	Davis (IL)	Ford	Lee	Rogers (KY)
Baldacci	Callahan	Davis (FL)	Frank	Levin	Rogers (MI)
Baldwin	Calvert	Davis (JO ANN)	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher
Ballenger	Camp	Davis (TOM)	Frost	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Barcia	Cannon	Deal	Gallegly	Lewis (KY)	Ross
Barr	Cantor	DeFazio	Ganske	Linder	Rothman
Barrett	Capito	DeGette	Gekas	Lipinski	Roukema
Bartlett	Capps	Delahunt	Gephardt	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard
Barton	Capuano	DeLauro	Gibbons	Lofgren	Rush
Bass	Cardin	DeLay	Gilchrest	Lowey	Ryan (WI)
Bentsen	Carson (IN)	DeMint	Gillmor	Lucas (KY)	Ryun (KS)
Bereuter	Carson (OK)	Deutsch	Gilman	Lucas (OK)	Sabo
Berkley	Castle	Diaz-Balart	Gonzalez	Luther	Sanchez
Berman	Chabot	Dicks	Goode	Maloney (CT)	Sanders
Berry	Chambliss	Dingell	Goodlatte	Maloney (NY)	Sandlin
Biggert	Clay	Dingelt	Gordon	Manzullo	Sandlin
Bilirakis	Clayton	Dooley	Goss	Markey	Sawyer
Bishop	Clement	Doolittle	Graham	Mascara	Saxton
Blagojevich	Clyburn	Doyle	Granger	Matheson	Scarborough
Blumenauer	Coble	Dreier	Graves	Matsui	Schakowsky
Blunt	Collins	Duncan	Green (TX)	McCarthy (MO)	Schiff
Boehlert	Combest	Dunn	Green (WI)	McCarthy (NY)	Schrock
Boehner	Condit	Edwards	Greenwood	McCollum	Scott
Bonilla	Conyers	Ehlers	Grucci	McCrery	Sensenbrenner
Bonior	Cooksey	Ehrlich	Gutierrez	McDermott	Serrano
Bono	Costello	Emerson	Gutknecht	McGovern	Sessions
Borski	Cox	Engel	Hall (OH)	McHugh	Shadegg
Boswell	Coyne	English	Hall (TX)	McInnis	Shaw
			Hansen	McIntyre	Shays
			Harman	McKeon	Sherman
			Hart	McKinney	Sherwood
			Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Shimkus
			Hastings (WA)	Meehan	Shows
			Hayes	Meek (FL)	Shuster
			Hayworth	Meeke (NY)	Simmons
			Hefley	Menendez	Simpson
			Heger	Mica	Skeen
			Hill	Millender-McDonald	Skelton
			Hilleary	Miller (MI)	Slaughter
			Hilliard	Miller (NJ)	Smith (MI)
			Hinchey	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
			Hinojosa	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
			Hobson	Mink	Snyder
			Hoefel	Mollohan	Solis
			Hoekstra	Moore	Souder
			Holden	Moran (KS)	Spence
			Holt	Moran (VA)	Spratt
			Honda	Morella	Stark
			Hooley	Murtha	Stearns
			Horn	Myrick	Stenholm
			Houghton	Nadler	Strickland
			Hoyer	Napolitano	Stump
			Hulshof	Neal	Stupak
			Hunter	Nethercutt	Sununu
			Hutchinson	Ney	Sweeney
			Hyde	Northup	Tancredo
			Inslie	Norwood	Tauscher
			Isakson	Nussle	Tauzin
			Israel	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
			Issa	Obey	Taylor (NC)
			Istook	Olver	Terry
			Jackson (IL)	Ortiz	Thomas
			Jackson-Lee	Osborne	Thompson (CA)
			(TX)	Ose	Thompson (MS)
			Jefferson	Otter	Thornberry
			Jenkins	Owens	Thune
			Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Thurman
			Johnson (IL)	Pallone	Tiahrt
			Johnson, Sam	Pascarell	Tiberi
			Jones (NC)	Pastor	Tierney
			Jones (OH)	Payne	Toomey
			Kanjorski	Pelosi	Towns
			Kaptur	Pence	Trafcant
			Keller	Peterson (MN)	Turner
			Kelly	Peterson (PA)	Udall (CO)
			Kennedy (MN)	Petri	Udall (NM)
			Kennedy (RI)	Phelps	Upton
			Kerns	Pickering	Velazquez
			Kildee	Pitts	Visclosky
			Kilpatrick	Platts	Vitter
			Kind (WI)	Pombo	Walden
			King (NY)	Pomeroy	Walsh
			Kingston	Portman	Wamp
			Kirk	Price (NC)	Waters
			Kleczka	Pryce (OH)	Watkins (OK)
			Knollenberg	Putnam	Watson (CA)
			Kolbe	Quinn	Watt (NC)
			Kucinich	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
			LaFalce	Rahall	Waxman
			LaHood	Ramstad	Weiner

Weldon (FL)	Wicker	Wu
Weller	Wilson	Wynn
Wexler	Wolf	Young (AK)
Whitfield	Woolsey	Young (FL)

NAYS—6

Brady (TX)	Hostettler	Royce
Flake	Paul	Schaffer

NOT VOTING—8

Abercrombie	Fossella	Tanner
Becerra	John	Weldon (PA)
Ferguson	Johnson, E. B.	

□ 1222

Mr. BRADY of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. NADLER and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1157, PACIFIC SALMON RECOVERY ACT

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 1157, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 1157, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2052, SUDAN PEACE ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 162 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 162

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2052) to facilitate famine relief efforts and a comprehensive solution to the war in Sudan. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the

chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Each section of the bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 162 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2052, the Sudan Peace Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. This is a completely fair rule. In fact, as I stated before, it is an open rule allowing all Members the opportunity to present amendments and, obviously, to debate this very important issue.

The current situation in Sudan, Mr. Speaker, is extremely grave. More than 2 million men, women, and children have perished due to war-related causes; and more than 3 million men, women, and children have been forced from their homes. Thousands of children have been abducted and forcibly converted to practices that they reject, and slavery has become an institution of the so-called National Islamic Front. Many of these same men, women, and children have suffered harsh beatings and torture.

In the face of this horrific tragedy, the Government of Sudan has continually blocked the efforts to provide aid to the people who need it most. Famine has been a constant, and the World Food Program has record that 3 million Sudanese will require emergency food aid this year alone. The situation is clearly intolerable, and we should do what we can to provide relief to the millions of displaced people in Sudan.

In addition to the human rights abuses in their own region, the Government of Sudan has also, rightfully so, been considered a rogue state by much

of the international community because of its support for international terrorism. The Government of Sudan has supported acts of international terrorism and allows the use of its territory for terrorist groups. The government there has been a safe haven for major terrorist figures. To preserve the safety of our Nation and to help with the safety and the security of the world, the international community, we must continue to send the message that support for terrorist activities is simply unacceptable.

The underlying legislation, the Sudan Peace Act, condemns the prosecution of the war by the National Islamic Front government and the associated human rights abuses. The legislation also acknowledges the role that oil has played in the war, expresses this Congress' support for an internationally sanctioned peace process, and urges the President to make previously appropriated funds available to the National Democratic Alliance. Additionally, the legislation requires businesses engaged in commercial activity in Sudan to publicly disclose the extent of their activities before raising money in American capital markets.

The underlying legislation has broad bipartisan support. The Bush administration has made Sudan a priority by announcing its intent to dispatch a special envoy; and I believe that now it is our turn, Congress' turn, to make Sudan a priority by passing this important piece of legislation.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and all those who have worked so hard to bring this important piece of legislation to the floor. I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to support both this open rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the customary time.

This is an open rule. It will allow for consideration of the Sudan Peace Act. As my colleague has described, this rule will provide 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule. This is the normal amending process in the House.

Mr. Speaker, at a recent hearing of the Committee on International Relations, Secretary of State Colin Powell described Sudan as one of the world's greatest tragedies. Sudan is a nation of about 35 million people. It is on the northeast coast of Africa, south of Egypt and north of Kenya. It is blessed with rich natural resources. However, an 18-year-old civil war and a very oppressive government have conspired to create widespread hunger, famine, and suffering.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I have been to Sudan three times. There are Members of this Congress who have been there more, such as my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

My last trip was in May of 1998. During that trip, I witnessed a level of human misery as great as any I have ever seen. I saw vultures cleaning the bones of cattle and people killed by slave raiders. I saw a man who had just buried his entire murdered family. I saw people who had nothing to eat but the roots of water lilies in malaria-infested swamps. I saw children in aid stations who were too weak to cry.

Mr. Speaker, in some ways conditions have worsened since that trip; although it is hard to imagine that could be possible. Famine still threatens a large part of the population. Human rights conditions are shocking, and the practice of slavery continues. What has happened is that the development of oil fields in the southern part of Sudan has contributed to more suffering as people and whole villages are removed to make way for oil drilling and the oil revenues to fuel the war machine.

Mr. Speaker, the Sudan Peace Act takes a series of steps to promote peace in this land of tragedy. It requires companies that trade their securities on U.S. stock exchanges to disclose information about their business dealings in Sudan. It also urges the administration to take steps to relieve suffering and to end the civil war in Sudan.

Although I support the purpose of the bill, I am concerned about some of the language, especially the language that criticizes the efforts of Operation Lifeline Sudan. This is a food relief effort that is carried out by UNICEF, the World Food Program, and other organizations.

The bill proposes cutting U.S. assistance to Operation Lifeline Sudan and redirects funds to other relief efforts. Operation Lifeline Sudan serves about 90 aid stations every month. The government of Sudan bans flights to air strips in about one-fifth of the areas that need help. However, Operation Lifeline Sudan is able to gain access to most of these areas by road or by using permitted air strips. The ban actually blocks delivery to only four out of 90 destinations on an average of every month. The real access problem is the result of ongoing fighting and poor road infrastructure.

I am afraid that directing U.S. support away from Operation Lifeline Sudan to other agencies without the experience and the ability of the United Nations food relief organizations would not improve food delivery to Sudan and could make matters worse. These organizations are doing an outstanding job under very, very difficult conditions.

Finally, I wish to offer my support for an amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and myself. This

amendment would block businesses that develop oil or gas in Sudan from raising capital or trading securities in the United States. Threatening Sudan's oil development should provide an immediate incentive to bring all warring parties to the negotiating table. This concept was recommended by the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I support this open rule. Despite my concerns, I support the bill and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me this time. The widespread, systematic, heinous, and brutal crimes committed against the Sudanese people, the rape, the slavery, the mutilation, the systematic killing of millions throughout the years in what many assert is a deliberate campaign of genocide by the regime in Khartoum demands action by the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to render their full support to the Sudan Peace Act before us today. When the question is posed: What can the people of the free world and, in particular, the U.S. Government do about one of the world's most tragic situations? What can be done about slavery and genocide in Sudan? We should start by calling things as they are for what they are.

This is why the Sudan Peace Act condemns the gross violations of human rights, the ongoing slave trade in Sudan, and the pivotal role played by the Sudanese regime in aiding and abetting these practices. There are those who may be willing to initiate and expand oil operations in southern Sudan that will generate billions of dollars in annual revenue for the terrorist regime in Khartoum. However, the U.S. must stand firm in the face of egregious violations of international legal and moral standards.

The Sudan Peace Act seeks to deter the financing of the regime from access to U.S. capital markets by establishing disclosure requirements on business activities in Sudan, and prohibiting securities trading in the U.S. until such requirements are met. The information to be provided to the Securities and Exchange Commission regarding the nature and the extent of the commercial activity with this pariah state, the identity of Sudanese government agencies involved in such businesses, and the linkage to religious persecution and other human rights violations shall be made available to the public. All of this, in conjunction with reporting requirements detailing the sources and the status of Sudan's financing and the construction of the infrastructure and the pipelines for oil exploitation, will put the spotlight on those who help to prolong the oppression and the suffering. We will finally place the spotlight on those oppressors.

These are the people who help to propagate slavery, those who persecute the religious movement, and other religious human rights abuses. We are going to stop providing a financial lifeline to the Sudanese regime.

The U.S. must also help ensure that the humanitarian assistance sent to Sudan is not being manipulated and is in fact reaching the intended recipients so we can help alleviate some of the suffering in this war-torn nation.

The Sudan Peace Act has various provisions to address this critical issue, including reporting requirements and the development of contingency plans for the distribution of aid to the affected areas should the Sudanese regime impose any type of ban on air transport relief flights.

This bill seeks to provide a comprehensive approach to the war in Sudan and to facilitate a process which will help bring justice to the victims of the genocide and achieve this much-desired goal of peace. I, therefore, ask my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2052.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Sudan Peace Act. The National Islamic Front, which rules the Sudan, is one of the most degenerate and depraved regimes this world has ever known. It kidnaps, rapes, tortures, bombards; and yes, in this 21st century, enslaves its own civilians. It manipulates, blocks, and even bombs relief flights to advance its war aims. It attempts to destabilize the governments of its neighbors, including by assassination. And it sponsors terrorism abroad, including against the United States.

The situation in the Sudan is not only a humanitarian crisis, it is a crisis of humanity. Its extreme severity and sheer depravity call for international action. And it calls especially for United States leadership, which this bill provides.

While I support the appointment of a diplomatic envoy to advance the peace process, let me underscore that only international pressure has moved the thugs of Khartoum to make even the slightest gesture towards peace. They have been mostly empty gestures and lies at that.

This bill has it right. Only international sanctions and pressures can affect this regime's unconscionable behavior. This bill will also have the Secretary of State report on war crimes from all sides. In my view, it is evident that the Sudanese regime are genocidal war criminals.

The disclosure requirement on business activities make it clear that the line has to be drawn somewhere, and I fully support it. National interests cannot be determined simply by the color of money. But let us be realistic about any prospects for progress.

On May 25, the regime said they will cease bombing, and within a week they were bombing in the south and the western Nuba mountains. In the last couple of days, the government came close to hitting two World Food Program food planes, and bombed the civilian areas that were intended recipients of that aid in Bahr al-Gazal.

Mr. Speaker, we are morally obliged to do what we can to help the hungry, the abused, the besieged, and enslaved people of the Sudan. Let us have no illusions as to their intent, but let us do what we can. Let us pass the Sudan Peace Act.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying bill. I just want to say a few numbers loud and clear for everyone to hear. Over 2 million people are dead. Over 4 million people have been displaced.

Mr. Speaker, these are not just numbers. These are individuals. These are people: women, children, mothers, fathers, brothers, and sisters. We hear these numbers from far away, from Africa here in Washington; and for too long the plight of these oppressed people in the Sudan has just been ignored. It is imperative that we recognize the total devastation that has been going on and that we take serious action against these oppressors.

This is a civil war in the Sudan that has been going on for 14 years and wreaking devastation on the Sudanese people. The National Islamic Front government of the Sudan has been on a rampant campaign against its own people. The Sudan Islamic fundamentalist regime has brought killings, evictions, and slavery to its own people. The regime is on a deliberate campaign of genocide against the black Christians and other non-Islamic people in southern Sudan. Eyewitnesses have testified over and over again before Congress about the Sudanese government's active efforts to promote slavery, torture, rape, mutilation, and killing.

Mr. Speaker, myself and other House Members have been taking action to bring this genocide into the limelight and focusing our efforts on stopping this brutality. H.R. 2052 is a good bipartisan measure that will facilitate famine relief efforts and a comprehensive solution to the war in the Sudan.

Mr. Speaker, although the Islamic government has claimed that they will end the bombing of civilian targets, as was previously stated by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the evidence is directly in conflict with that claim.

The impending famine in the south and the improved military technology of the government threaten millions more of these poor, defenseless civilians in southern Sudan.

Mr. Speaker, we need this bill, and I encourage all my colleagues to vote for

the rule and to vote in support of the underlying bill. Most importantly, I encourage my colleagues to continue their engagement on this issue. To simply vote for this bill and forget about the problem is not doing enough. We must remain engaged.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support not only of the rule but the underlying bill. I rise to support as well the leadership of the ranking member of the Committee on Rules who I know has had a long-standing history on this issue; as has the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) on the majority side.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this particular legislation sponsored by the gentleman from (Mr. TANCREDO) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

□ 1245

I thank them both for their leadership, because this is a vital legislative initiative. I am gratified that the House will consider an important piece of legislation that condemns slavery and human rights abuses in Sudan, human rights that have been violated time and time again.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that Sudan and the Sudanese people have chosen not to listen, and when I say the Sudanese people, those who are governing, because there are those who have been put upon and who have been brutalized because of the failure to understand that all people are created equal. I am thankful that the legislation sets conditions of genocide as it relates to the Convention on Genocide. Genocide and war crimes must be addressed by the international judicial entities to ensure that justice is achieved. I am delighted that this legislation calls for the United Nations to be used as a tool for peace and condemns slavery by all combatants. It permits a revision of Operation Lifeline Sudan; encourages support for an internationally sanctioned peace process authorized by the Secretary of State to support the peace process; provides transparency for foreign companies operating in Sudan that have capital markets in the United States; and it condemns the bombing of innocent civilians.

As the ranking member of the full committee and the chairman of the full committee, both the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) have been on the forefront of human rights. They realize that we have tried to work continuously to be able to address the issue of what is going on in Sudan, the violence in Sudan. Numbers of Congresspersons have visited Sudan, including the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), who have gone in on

foot, by plane, bus and train, attempting to work with those and attempting to create peace. Yet no one is listening.

Tens of thousands of people have died a slow and painful death by starvation as a result of the actions by the government in Khartoum preventing food from getting to the people in need. Will anyone listen? Do they realize that families are being destroyed? That children are dying? That Christians who want nothing else but to be able to practice their faith and live in peace are being destroyed and killed? Not only is the government of Sudan a terrorist regime but also a genocidal one, responsible for slavery, bombing raids against humanitarian targets, massacres and deliberate starvation in the southern part of the country where Sudan's religious and racial minorities reside. Two million people have died, Mr. Speaker.

I would simply say as I was able to pass legislation dealing with children soldiers, prohibiting them and requiring a study by the State Department authorization bill, H.R. 1646, this bill sends a loud and resounding sign, no more, no more. No more brutalization, no more loss of life. Peace in the valley. The Sudanese people must be free and the Sudanese government must be taught a lesson.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2052, The Sudan Peace Act. I am gratified that the House will consider an important piece of legislation that condemns slavery and human rights abuses in Sudan. I am a co-sponsor of this critical legislative initiative because I believe we must confront the atrocities being committed in the Sudan.

Let me be clear on what the Act does do. First we must be thankful that the legislation sets the conditions of genocide as it relates to the Convention on Genocide. Genocide and war crimes must be addressed by the international judicial entities to ensure that justice is achieved. But the bill does a great deal more to ensure peace. It calls for the United Nations to be used as a tool for peace; condemns slavery by all combatants; it permits a revision of Operation Lifeline Sudan; encourages support for internationally sanctioned peace process authorized by the Secretary of State to support the peace process; provides transparency for foreign companies operating in Sudan that have capital markets in the United States; and it condemns the bombing of innocent civilians.

The bill does not amend our Federal securities laws or call for capital market sanctions, or importing sanctions. It does not address those issues because we are focused on stopping the atrocities from continuing in the Sudan.

The staggering scale of atrocities in Sudan has caused me and several other Members of Congress to support this measure. Tens of thousands of people have died a slow and painful death by starvation as a result of the actions by the Khartoum preventing food from getting to the people in need. Not only is the Government of Sudan a terrorist regime but also a genocidal one responsible for slavery, bombing raids against humanitarian targets, massacres, and deliberate starvation in the

southern part of the country where Sudan's religious and racial minorities reside. An estimated 1.9 million people have died of causes linked to Sudan's 17-year-old civil war. Over 4.3 million have been uprooted. These are simply egregious human rights abuses that must be addressed by the United States together with the international community.

While the current stage of this conflict, being waged primarily between the National Islamic Front (NIF) and other warring factions. The Government of Sudan has waged a brutal campaign against civilians. Although the National Islamic Front government recently pledged to end bombing of civilian targets, there is little evidence that the conflict is nearing resolution. Indeed, the improved military technology of the government, combined with an impending famine in the south, threaten to virtually destroy the population of southern Sudan by the year's end.

H.R. 2052 addresses this situation in a comprehensive manner. The legislation actually requires the Secretary of State to reinvigorate international diplomatic peace efforts that are desperately needed to bring closure to the fighting and an end to the atrocities. We need the foreign policy team of America to help play a constructive role in the Sudan.

The legislation also creatively requires all businesses trading securities in the United States capital markets and operating in Sudan to disclose fully the extent of their involvement in Sudan. This will provide transparency to the nature of business being done in the Sudan. This is an important step, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just add that we must rid the use of child soldiers in conflict. Children used as soldiers are unacceptable. As a result of an amendment that I offered and was adopted during consideration of the H.R. 1646, the State Department authorization bill, the United States will now begin to collect specific information on those nations that use children as children soldiers. If children continue to be used in this conflict as soldiers, the world community will not only know but the United States will formally have the opportunity to raise this matter with the Sudanese government.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2052, the Sudan Peace Act, reflects bipartisan support to end the atrocities being committed in the Sudan. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, Edmund Burke, who was a distinguished politician in England, said it best when he said that the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing. So, Mr. Speaker, let us not be idle this afternoon.

The size of Sudan's population is about 35 million people. This event has been going on, off and on, since 1955. This is something that we should take quite seriously and try to come to grips with in this House to do something constructively. The humanitarian crisis in southern Sudan is considered one of the worst in decades. Efforts at national, regional and international levels to bring peace and sta-

bility to the region have so far been unsuccessful, and outbreaks of fighting and mass population displacements continue to occur. This vicious operation against citizens has resulted, as mentioned before, in the loss of 2 million souls and left 4 million homeless.

These statistics fall in this House, but they are so meaningful. The 14-year recent civil war has also brought drought and raids that have been backed by the government. They back these militias. They have disrupted the distribution of food aid and obstructed assessments of need in severely affected areas. In short, we are not able to discern the exact need. We only know as we stand on the House floor today that it is great.

The Sudan Peace Act does several things that attempt to address the many complicated issues that are facing the people of Sudan. First of all, the reporting requirement included in this bill would serve as a deterrent to foreign companies raising money in United States markets for oil development activities in Sudan, activities which undoubtedly have an effect on human rights and religious freedom. The thriving oil industry in Sudan, according to the International Monetary Fund, has allowed the Sudanese government to double its military budget. Some believe that because of the prosperity of the oil export, the National Islamic Front, NIF, which is the controlling governmental authority, is not interested in negotiating seriously to end this war.

More importantly, it condemns the war being waged by the NIF government in Khartoum. The NIF views itself as the protector of Islam in Sudan. Any political dissent is seen as being anti-Islam and any action against religious opposition is understood as justified in what the NIF believes is a holy war.

According to a March 2001 report by the congressionally established U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, quote, the government of Sudan continues to commit egregious human rights abuses, including widespread bombing of civilian and humanitarian targets, abduction and enslavement by government-sponsored militias, manipulation of humanitarian assistance as a weapon of war and severe restrictions on religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not the total solution to the humanitarian crisis in Sudan, but, rather, in a small way, it is a contribution to a larger effort which we should embark on here in Congress, an effort that will bring a long-term commitment to a suffering people whom we do not know but whose human freedom we take seriously today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY).

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Ohio for yielding me the time. I rise in support of the rule and the Sudan Peace Act. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is not enough.

I traveled to Sudan in the year 1989 with our late colleague Mickey Leland, with our late colleague Bill Emerson, and with GARY ACKERMAN. I saw firsthand the human devastation in that country. And here we are in the year 2001 witnessing the same civil war, the same devastation and basically the same participants. Sadeq al-Mahdi was in charge in Khartoum when we were there, but he was replaced later that year by Lieutenant Colonel Bashir, who is still in power. John Garang was then and is now the leader of the SPLA.

We traveled after we left Khartoum to the south to Muglad and Waw, a couple of the camps down there. I cannot describe to you the feeling of looking out at a crowd of thousands and thousands of people who are not sure where their next meal is going to come from. One of the NGO officials at the time said, "Congressman, would you like to see our hospital?" I became encouraged for a moment. I was going to see a medical facility. They took me to their medical facility, which was a great big tent. It was large, and it was air-conditioned, just to keep people alive, but the medical facility was primitive at best. It became clear to me why it was so difficult to get medical personnel from the continent and elsewhere in the world to donate their time and to go there. The NGO officials explained to me that initially they had an outpouring of support from volunteer medical personnel from around the world but once they got there, the situation was so primitive as far as what they had to work with that they would get discouraged and leave.

Now, I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we do something more than just have the Sudan Peace Act. I think that the United States role has to be much more, and I am not talking about military intervention, but we have become involved in negotiation for peace in many other areas of the world where there is much less human devastation. We became heavily involved in the situation in Ireland, and especially because of my heritage I am very happy that we did that, and we made significant progress with the Good Friday Accords. We are not where we want to be but we are making progress. That is because the President of the United States got directly involved and got people together and we made significant progress.

We have been doing that for years in the Middle East. We are not where we want to be in the Middle East, but we have made significant progress, most notably starting with the Camp David Accords back during the Carter administration and we have moved step by step. We are much better off today than we were a generation ago, but we have a lot of work to do.

Bosnia. We keep going down the list. We got directly involved.

Why is Africa the forgotten continent when there is so much more human devastation there? Compare it,

for example, to the situation in Ireland, which I feel very deeply about. From the time that the current trouble started in 1969, 3,000 innocent people have died. That bothers me a lot. But in this one nation on the forgotten continent of Africa, in a shorter period of time, less than two decades, 2 million people have died. Two million innocent men, women and children have died. The year before Mickey led that delegation in 1989, 280,000 people starved to death in that one country in that one year.

Why is this the forgotten continent? Why can we not become more directly involved? Members might ask me, what am I suggesting? I am suggesting that the President of the United States make this a priority. When I say that, I am not directing anything at the current President. He just started his term, so this is a new suggestion to him. Other Presidents, Democratic and Republican before, have not done that. I am suggesting that he do that and focus on this international issue, get Bashir and Garang to the negotiating table, get a cease-fire, and I think if we have the leadership of the President of the United States, the leader of this country and the leader of the free world, we can get the international attention that we need to stop the human devastation in Sudan.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Department of State released a statement on Friday to report that the National Islamic Front government of Sudan launched a series of aerial bombings in southern Sudan 1 week ago. These attacks clearly targeted civilian areas, an act Khartoum pledged not to do only 2 weeks prior to the bombings.

Mr. Speaker, while the Sudan Peace Act condemns human rights violations by all sides of this four-decade-old conflict, it is important to note that it recognizes that the NIF government bears the greatest responsibility for the violations. The NIF has continually blocked humanitarian relief efforts and apparently now bombs civilian areas.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the American people know that the heart of this conflict has deep religious origins. As the gentlewoman from Texas said only moments ago, last year the State Department designated Sudan as a country of particular concern because the NIF commits what is commonly believed to be the world's worst acts of religious persecution.

As a Christian, Mr. Speaker, it particularly grieves me to report that the worst of these acts of persecutions are against Christian believers in Sudan. Christian southern Sudanese are sexually abused, beaten and forced into religious conversion. Matthias Akabd was arrested in January of 1995 along

with his wife and his infant son. They have not been heard from since. The Akabd family is merely one example of tens of thousands of persecuted Christians in southern Sudan who are discriminated against, stripped of their freedom, enslaved, imprisoned, tortured and even killed.

As the Good Book says, Mr. Speaker, "Remember those who are in prison as if we were their fellow prisoners and those who are mistreated as if we ourselves were suffering."

Mr. Speaker, by supporting the Sudan Peace Act, the Congress will do much today to fulfill this noble commission.

□ 1300

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen who have worked on this very, very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the passage of the bill, and I am thankful for this opportunity to give my support. The situation in Sudan came to my personal attention as a result of constituent case work, diligently completed by Karen Kinkel of my Iowa district office staff.

In April of 1999, we received a letter from a constituent, Paula Friederich of Ames, regarding her passionate concern for a group of children now commonly referred to as the "Lost Boys of the Sudan." Paula and her husband, Dr. Jim Friederich, expressed their desire and their commitment to assist financially the plight of two of these lost boys in particular.

The Friederichs had recently learned of the war in the Sudan from a young man named Madul Aguan, who is currently a senior at Iowa State University. I submit for the RECORD today a copy of the experience of how he escaped as a young lad of 8 years old. His father had been killed, who was a Dinka chief, when the war that raged separated him from his mother. Then they came back and were going to take the children, and he escaped over into Ethiopia into a refugee camp.

The experience of what he went through is just heartrending. By force he was returned to the Sudan and then he was shot, broken ribs and wounded severely, and he survived that. Then he went to another refugee camp. To make a long story short, he finally landed in the United States with help from the State Department and many other entities. So he landed there and as a youngster was going to school in Kansas City, sleeping on a mattress in a leaky basement but kept pushing on. He said, I have freedom. It is okay. I have freedom.

Then he landed up in Ames. Now he is in the State University where he met

the Friederichs and told them of his brother and his nephew that were having a similar situation. So the Friederichs set out to help. They worked with us and we worked with them, and the work went on and on and on.

Last winter, on a cold night in Des Moines, Iowa, off the airplane came the brother and the nephew. The brother and the nephew, which I will show here, Aguan in the middle, had not seen each other for 15 years, little children at the time, and here they were. They came and they were reunited in the United States. They are in a warm home with loving care, getting an education and moving forward in their lives.

That experience to me and for all of us should be a reminder that being in Congress is a lot more than just casting a vote here and there. Sometimes the most rewarding experiences that we can have are for our constituents and the positive role that plays, and such an important factor in their life. I am hopeful today we will not only pass this rule and this bill that will help bring this to an end, I would encourage everybody that is listening and thinking about it, give it their wholehearted support. It is the right thing to do.

In 1986, when Aguan was 8 years old, Northern Sudanese troops attacked his village of Lou Mawein in Southern Sudan. Aguan's father, a Dinka chief, had been assassinated in 1983. In the confusion of this battle, Aguan was separated from his mother. After two days of attacks from the northern troops, the Sudanese Peoples Liberation Army (SPLA), in Aguan's words, "came into the village to bury the dead, tend to the wounded and gather up the children who parents were killed or lost". At this time, Aguan began walking, barefoot, to an Ethiopian refugee camp. It is my understanding that many other children did not survive the journey to Ethiopia, dying when attacked by crocodiles as they passed through the Gilo river. During the last three days of his journey, Aguan had no food or water. Aguan stayed in an Ethiopian refugee camp for five years, until Ethiopia had its own civil war. As a result of this war, Aguan was forced to return to southern Sudan, which was once again attacked by northern troops. With the assistance of the United Nations, Aguan went to Kapoeta to be protected by the SPLA. However Kapoeta was attacked, and Aguan was short. The bullet broke his ribs, collapsed his lung and caused internal bleeding. He was taken by the Red Cross to Lokichoggio, Kenya for surgery. At this time, Aguan was placed in the Kakuma refugee camp, in northern Kenya.

According to Aguan the conditions in the camp were inhumane. The water was polluted and there was little food. The tents were overcrowded. After two years, Aguan went to Nairobi for medical exams. Following results of the exam, he began the process of obtaining a referral as a refugee for resettlement. When he was approved for resettlement as a refugee by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Aguan immigrated to the United States. This was made possible through the primary assistance of the Joint Voluntary Agency and the Red Cross. Aguan worked to

put himself through high school in Kansas City, Missouri, sleeping on a mattress in a leaky basement for three years. Aguan told the Friederich's he was just "happy to be free".

Following high school graduation, Aguan attended the Des Moines Area Community College for one year before transferring to Iowa State University, where he now majors in International Law. Aguan plans to attend law school following graduation.

This story of Aguan's escape from the Sudan that was shared with Jim and Paula Friederich. Aguan then asked the Friederich's if there was any way they could help him bring two surviving family members, a brother and a nephew, to the United States for the purpose of family reunification.

I brought this inquiry to the attention of the appropriate African Population, Refugee and Migration Bureau (PRM) representative of the State Department which coordinates overall United States Government policy on assistance, protection and resettlement of refugees. Refugee resettlement involves the White House, National Security Council, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of State, Department of Health and Human Services, the International Organization for Migration, the Joint Voluntary Agency (Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and the United States Congress.

After working for over two years to facilitate communication with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the State Department on behalf of Aguan and the Friederich's, Aguan's brother and nephew were located, and were granted approved for refugee resettlement in September 2000. They arrived at the Des Moines International Airport in January of 2001. Aguan had not seen his brother in over fifteen years. He last saw his nephew eight years ago. Aguan's brother and nephew have similar stories of how they survived and escaped and the war in southern Sudan.

I believe that this reunion would not have been possible without the assistance of the aforementioned federal agencies, coupled with the concern and involvement of the Friederich's, and the persistent work of my casework staff.

Members on both sides of the aisle, there is a civil war in the Sudan that has been raging for the past 18 years. As a result of this war, children are lost from their families, and many are sold into slavery. The fortunate ones escape to surrounding countries, but often with little hope for a future. I have been touched by this story. It is my desire to bring an end to this war, and now is the time to take action on behalf of the helpless who remain in Sudan. Please join me in support of H.R. 2052.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), a man who has spent a lot of time on this issue. He has traveled to Sudan. He is an expert on so many countries in Africa.

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the rule and would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), who chairs a hunger

committee, for his tireless work not only in Africa but around the world where he travels at his own danger in some instances to investigate and bring back the report of what is going on.

I would also certainly like to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who has given all of the support that we need for issues in the continent of Africa. I would also like to mention the work of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), who is the sponsor of the Sudan Peace Act.

The first congressional delegation that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) went on was a trip with me and Senator BROWNBACK to southern Sudan. It was quite a way to initiate congressional travel. I told him that it was not always like this when Congresspeople travel.

His interest, his curiosity, his want to learn inspired him to move this bill.

Also a long-time warrior, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), has spent many, many, many hours and days and months traveling, working for the benefit of people throughout the world and in Sierra Leone and in Sudan.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, has done an outstanding job. So I think this is a great opportunity for a bipartisan move to talk about probably the worst scourge on the Earth today, a pariah government, a government which bombs its own people, starves its own people, tortures its own people.

There are other people, too, like Charles Jacobs from the anti-slavery movement and Nina Shay from a commission to deal with religious discrimination.

What I think is finally happening is that America, the world, is starting to see about this tragedy of Sudan: 1.9 million people dead, 4.4 million people displaced. Finally, it has been too long but I hope that the new administration will have vigor to see us change the pariah government in Khartoum so people can have the ability to live a normal life.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT).

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank several people that have worked so hard concerning the Sudan Peace Act. I do support the rule.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for their leadership and strong support. I was one of the authors of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, which set in place the framework for U.S. action against violations of religious freedom around the world.

The Sudan Peace Act is a worthy successor to that act, and I am proud

to be an original cosponsor. The tragedies of Sudan are truly unspeakable, though we must attempt to make them clear to the world. Some 2 million people dead in the war, millions more displaced; women and children abducted and raped by government-backed militia; torture of dissidents; bombing of hospitals and schools. It is an endless litany of suffering.

This act clearly condemns these atrocities perpetrated by an extremist and heartless regime. This act strengthens our ability to provide assistance to the suffering civilians of Sudan, particularly in areas barred from relief by the government. It reinforces our commitment to negotiating peace; and of tremendous importance, it requires that businesses that want to raise capital from American investors disclose any dealings in oil development in Sudan. That oil is blood oil. It has enriched the war machine of the government and emboldened Khartoum to believe that it will enjoy limitless funds to crush its own people into submission.

I urge all my colleagues to denounce these atrocities and vote for the Sudan Peace Act.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that the rule is a good rule. It is in good shape. It is open. The bill is not a perfect bill. It is very hard to pass a perfect bill on an issue like Sudan, where millions of people have died. They have fought for years. I am particularly impressed and glad that in the bill when it talks about the broad bipartisan support of this bill from the House of Representatives, it condemns violations of human rights by all sides to the conflict.

I know that for the most part today, what we have heard is the very, very serious and very troubling human rights violations coming from the north and coming from the government, but there is blood in the south as well. Tribes fight tribes. Leaders use innocent people, and there is blood on both sides. I hope that this bill will not only address some of those issues but will go a long way in helping bring this terrible war to an end.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I commend all of my colleagues who have spoken so eloquently on this very, very important subject and join them in urging the House to obviously support this open rule, but also the underlying legislation.

We, I hope, speak on this moral issue in a very united fashion this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2052.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). Pursuant to House Resolution 162 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2052.

□ 1313

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2052) to facilitate famine relief efforts and a comprehensive solution to the war in Sudan, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, firstly I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), a member of the Subcommittee on Africa that I chair, for introducing the Sudan Peace Act.

The ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), has been a strong supporter of this legislation, as has the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). I want to thank them for their assistance.

I would also like to thank the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), for his efforts on behalf of this bipartisan bill.

As we have heard during the debate on the rule, Sudan is suffering through what is probably today the longest civil war in the world. The fighting between the radical government in the north and forces in the south has led to suffering on such a massive scale that it is estimated today that close to 2 million Sudanese have died of war-related causes since 1983.

There are 4 million Sudanese internally displaced in that country, 2 million living in squatter areas in Khartoum. Over 3 million Sudanese will require emergency food aid this year if they are to survive.

□ 1315

Famine is a constant in Sudan. At a March hearing of the Committee on International Relations, Secretary of State Colin Powell said that Sudan is one of the greatest tragedies on the face of the Earth. There is no greater tragedy, he said.

Well, I think Secretary Powell is right. He recently traveled to Africa, where Secretary Powell consulted with African leaders about the crisis in Sudan. Early signs indicate a strong administration commitment to addressing this crisis, and this legislation is designed to bolster the administration's effort.

The Sudan Peace Act condemns violations of human rights on all sides of the conflict. However, it recognizes that it is the Sudanese government and groups under its control that bears by far the greatest responsibility for human rights violations.

The Sudanese regime regularly blocks humanitarian relief efforts and bombs humanitarian and civilian centers. Southern Sudanese are victimized by slave raids, which this legislation recognizes as government-backed, as well as by religious persecution, which is commonly believed to be the worst religious persecution in the world.

Last year, the State Department again designated Sudan as a country of particular concern due to its systematic and egregious violations of religious freedom. Sudanese forced into slavery are subject to all forms of physical abuse, including beatings and sexual abuse, and forced religious conversions.

Congress has gone on record before expressing concern over the strife and human suffering that is occurring there in this country. In 1999, the House of Representatives passed a resolution condemning the Sudanese government for "its genocidal war" in southern Sudan. The Sudan Peace Act condemns the government of Sudan in the strongest possible terms, finding again that its acts constitute what we term genocide.

Here are some of the particulars in the bill. The bill requires companies with operations in Sudan to disclose the nature of their Sudanese operations before they are permitted to trade their securities in U.S. capital markets. This disclosure includes the nature of those operations and their relationship to violations of religious freedom and other human rights in Sudan. This should prove to be a useful tool in alerting American investors to the troubling nature of their potential investment, particularly in the energy sector.

Over the last several years, non-U.S. companies have raised money in the U.S. to develop Sudanese oil fields, located primarily in the south. Oil reserves have allowed Khartoum to double its military expenditures, giving it the means to prosecute its war more aggressively.

The second thing the bill does is it urges the administration to make available to the National Democratic Alliance \$10 million in previously appropriated funds. This funding should be used to help build the civil society that has been devastated in the south and which is essential to the region's long-term future.

The third aspect of the legislation is that it requires the administration to develop a contingency plan to operate its humanitarian relief efforts outside Operation Lifeline Sudan, and that is the United Nations sponsored humanitarian aid operation that has been shamelessly manipulated by the government of Sudan to advance its war aims, leading to widespread death by starvation and other causes. So what has in fact happened with Operation Lifeline Sudan, the government in Sudan has directed do not bring this relief into the south; we will direct you as to where you are allowed to take the food aid. So, again, this will develop a contingency plan to operate outside and around that Operation Lifeline Sudan.

The Subcommittee on Africa has held several hearings on Sudan over the last few years. This crisis has increasingly caught the attention of the American people. The Sudan Peace Act is an effort to bring further attention to the suffering in Sudan and help along a resolution to this long-running conflict.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Sudan Peace Act. I first would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), for introducing the measure. I want to express my special appreciation to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), the ranking Democratic member of the Subcommittee on Africa, for his many years of tireless efforts to bring to the attention of the Congress and the American people the Sudanese crisis. I also want to commend my friends, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), for moving this legislation forward and for their deep commitment to the issues.

Mr. Chairman, it appears unreal that at the beginning of the 21st century we again are talking about genocide and slavery, but it is genocide and slavery which characterizes the situation in the Sudan. This is a long-standing crisis. It originated in the early 1950s, and it became particularly severe since the mid-1980s.

The Islamic government of Sudan is perpetrating genocide on its own people. This crisis represents the most comprehensive attack against Christians any place on the face of this planet today; mass rapes, large scale forced

starvation, kidnapping, and, as has been stated time and time again in this debate, we have over 2 million innocent men, women, and children who have been killed in this process, over 4 million internally displaced.

This legislation, which I hope will get the unanimous support of this body, calls for our Secretary of State to collect evidence on war crimes and crimes against humanity. It is inconceivable that the perpetrators of these gigantic scale atrocities should escape appropriate punishment.

A special word needs to be said, Mr. Chairman, about the oil companies that play a significant coal in this nightmare. I am pleased to say that there are no American oil companies involved, but it pains me to no end to indicate that an oil company from Sweden, an oil company from Canada, and, much less surprisingly, oil companies owned by Malaysia and Communist China, are providing the funds to this outrageous government to pursue and perpetrate its atrocities.

We will bring the light of day on the activities of these companies, and we will make it very clear for any potential American investors what the nature of their investments would be buying in atrocities in the Sudan.

I truly believe that Congress acts never more nobly than when it rises to deal with human rights abuses anywhere on this planet. The Sudan Peace Act is one such example, and I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the vice chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of the African subcommittee, for yielding and commend him for his outstanding leadership on behalf of the suffering individuals, not just in Sudan, but in other countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, who have been victimized by human rights abuse.

I want to especially thank on this bill my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), and all of the bipartisan sponsors of this Sudanese Peace Act. Is a step clearly in the right direction. It is an outstanding bill. It tries to advance the ball so that there will be peace.

We have lost 2 million Sudanese people, many of them women and children who have been slaughtered. Food has been used as a weapon in Sudan by the Khartoum government. We know that Operation Lifeline, very often efforts to feed those in the south have been vetoed by Khartoum because they wanted to deny access to food and medicines.

Back in 1996, Mr. Chairman, we had a series of hearings really on what was happening in Sudan, the first hearing

of its kind on slavery. At that point, people objected and said what are you talking about? Shadow slavery, the buying and selling of people, not unlike what we had in the United States and in other western countries before the civil war. A horrific practice. Yet it was going on in modern day Sudan. Thankfully, there is an effort. At least there is exposure now. People understand that this has occurred.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) mentioned this forced religious conversion. I have met people who have lost their children through forced Islamization, where their young men, their young boys, have been literally abducted out of their homes and brought to these camps where they are brainwashed, for want of a better word, day in and day out, to accept Islam. That is not what conversion is all about.

But this civil war is being financed, and it is not a civil war, it is a slaughter, increasingly by oil monies. I just bring to the attention of members that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) will be offering an amendment at the appropriate time that will deny the access of those companies to the capital markets of the United States, like Talisman.

Talisman is an oil company that, unfortunately, like some of the others coming out of China and elsewhere, that are building up the capability of the Sudanese government to get real dollars, hard currency, which is now funding this slaughter of women and children and men. They have doubled their military spending. For example, since 1998 much the oil revenues have amounted to about \$500 million, and that is going to grow as a direct result of their ability to get cash at the New York Stock Exchange and elsewhere to fund this slaughter of innocent people.

This war might have been over, it certainly would have been much reduced, had it not been for oil money. If we really want to be peacemakers, it seems to me we need to deny the access, turning off that spigot to the best of our ability to deny the killers, the murderers, the rapists, the ability to do business as usual.

Again I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who has done great work on this, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). Of course, the Bachus amendment, which will be coming up shortly, is deserving of my colleagues' support.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of the African subcommittee, for yielding and commend him for his outstanding leadership on behalf of the suffering individuals, not just in Sudan, but in other countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, who have been victimized by human rights abuse. I want to thank Chairman HYDE for his leadership in pushing this legislation.

And I want to especially thank my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr.

TANCREDO) the prime sponsor of the bill and all of the bipartisan sponsors of the pending Sudanese Peace Act. Is a step clearly in the right direction. It is an outstanding bill. It tries to advance the ball so that there will be peace.

We have lost 2 million Sudanese people, many of them women and children who have been slaughtered. Food has been used as a weapon in Sudan by the Khartoum government. We know that Operation Lifeline has often been stymied in efforts to feed those in the south. Amazingly the dictatorship has veto power over both where and whom humanitarian relief and food dispersements can be made. Khartoum is guilty of denying access to food and medicines by untold numbers of starving and emaciated people.

Back in 1996, Mr. Chairman, I chaired a series of hearings on Sudan. We convened the first hearing of its kind on slavery in Sudan. At that point, some people objected, were in disbelief and denial and said what are you talking about? Chattel slavery—the buying and selling and ownership of people, not unlike what we had in the United States and in other western countries before the civil war was—is thriving in Sudan.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) mentioned forced religious conversion and at hearings I chaired we heard from victims of the egregious practice. I have met mothers who have lost their children through forced Islamization, where their young children were literally abducted out of their homes and brought to camps where they were brainwashed. That is not what conversion is all about. Now we know that the Sudanese genocide is being financed, by oil—petrol dollars. I just bring to the attention of members that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) will be offering an amendment at the appropriate time that will deny the access of oil companies to our capital markets of the United States, if they are doing business in Sudan.

Talisman of Canada is an oil company that, unfortunately, like some of the others based in China are building up the capability of the Sudanese government to get boatloads of money, hard currency, which is now funding the slaughter of women and children and men. As a direct result of oil revenue, Sudan has doubled its military spending. Since 1998 the oil revenues per year have amounted to about \$500 million, and that is going to grow as a direct result of Sudan's oil revenue and its ability to procure funds from U.S. equity sources.

Had it not been for oil revenues, the Sudanese genocide might have been over. It almost certainly would have been less lethal had it not been for oil money. If we really want to be peacemakers, it seems to me we need to deny Sudanese access to cash. We must turn off that spigot. We must deny the killers, the murderers, the rapists, the ability to conduct the business of genocide.

Again I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO). The Chairman of the Full Committee, Mr. HYDE, always a champion of human rights and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who has also done great work on this vital cause.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), one of our colleagues who has devoted years of his life to this issue and who

has been a nationally recognized leader on the subject of Sudan.

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that very kind introduction. I appreciate the support that the gentleman has given this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Sudan Peace Act, H.R. 2052. I certainly would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), for introducing this legislation. He has traveled, as I mentioned, to Sudan with me a year or so ago, with Senator BROWBACK, and saw firsthand the conditions and has been a strong advocate for change there.

As you know, it is a very sad situation in Sudan, and we have many people, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). We have on our side, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and others who have fought.

But we also have people outside the anti-slavery organization, Charles Jacobs and Mrs. Nina Shay and others. But I also would like to commend the NAACP that at its last several conventions talked about this problem of slavery and has opposed the government of Sudan, and for the talk show host, Joe Madison, who has really given his listening audience an opportunity to hear about the Sudan and has gotten a great new constituency, and Reverend Fauntroy here in Washington, Reverend Jessie Jackson, who intends to go to Sudan soon, and Reverend Al Sharpton, who has been there.

□ 1330

We have seen more people become involved.

But this issue is not a simple issue of north versus the south. There are many very good Northerners who want to see the end of this war, also. We have many people in the Muslim faith who do not support the National Islamic Front government. The fact is that it is a bad government. They are really perpetrating misery on their people, and it is a strong, small group of people who have just been holding power against people of good will.

So the bombings continue, and aerial bombings were reintroduced just last week. The government made an official statement that they were going to end aerial bombings 2 weeks ago, and last week said they have rescinded that and they are starting bombing again.

They take these Antonovs, these Soviet-built planes, and it disrupts the community because the community hear the planes and they keep wondering, when are the planes coming, therefore making it difficult to have a normal life. The planes on occasions hit churches and schools and hospitals.

Another thing that is happening is many of the educated south Sudanese,

many are lacking education now. The schools are not adequate. Therefore, the people of the south are losing out on education.

This is a horrible, horrible situation, beginning back in 1956 when it was the first African country to receive its independence; a proud country, a country that fought victoriously against Egypt and the British to retain its independence.

The people there are good people, but they are being treated horribly by a terrible government. Slavery still goes on. People are still being starved as a weapon. We need to have a strong reassertion that this government must be changed.

We must ask the Bush administration and Secretary Powell, who has spoken out against this, and he has spoken out about Sudan more than any other area in Africa, we want him to continue to push. We want to see capital market access cut off from foreign countries trying to get funds from our capital markets to continue to use this blood money.

We would like to see the end to slavery, and youngsters like Ms. Vogel's class out in Colorado who raise funds and send them over with church groups to repatriate slaves with their families.

So we have a lot of work to do. We have heard the statistics: close to 2 million dead, and as a result, there have been over 4.3 million people displaced. We need to have a strong envoy to go there and to tell the Khartoum government that time has run out. We no longer will allow this to go on. It has gone on too long.

There is no reason in this new millenium, when we have supersonic transports and people going to outer space and living in outer space, that we would have on Earth a country that uses weapons of war against its own people, primarily women and children.

We must have a movement in this country to focus on Sudan. We must make this a number one priority. I would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this peace act.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, although I do not contest for 1 minute the sincerity and the good intentions of the many, many cosponsors. I do not question the problems that exist in Sudan. There is no doubt that it is probably one of the most horrible tales in human history.

But I do question a few things. First, I question whether this is a proper function for our government. I raised this question in the committee, suggesting that it could not be for national security reasons, and it more or less was conceded this has nothing to do with national security but it had to do with America's soul. I was fas-

cinated that we are in the business of saving souls these days.

But I do have serious concerns about its effectiveness, because we have a history of having done these kinds of programs many times in the past, and even in Africa. It was not too many years ago that we were in Somalia and we lost men. Our soldiers were dragged in the streets. It was called nation-building. This is, in a way, very much nation-building, because we support one faction over the thugs that are in charge.

I certainly have all the sympathy and empathy for those individuals who are being abused, but the real question is whether or not this will work. It did not work in Somalia. We sent troops into Haiti. Haiti is not better off. How many men did we lose in Vietnam in an effort to make sure the people we want in power were in power?

So often these well-intended programs just do not work and frequently do the opposite by our aid ending up in the hands of the supposed enemy. I seriously question whether this one will, either. Maybe in a year or 2 from now we will realize that this is an effort that did not produce the results that we wanted. It is a \$10 million appropriation, small for what we do around here, but we also know that this is only the beginning, and there will be many more tens of millions of dollars that will be sent in hopes that we will satisfy this problem.

Members can look for more problems to solve, because right now there are 800,000 children serving in the military in 41 countries of the world. That is another big job we would have to take upon ourselves to solve considering our justification to be involved in Sudan.

Mr. Chairman, with HR 2052, the Sudan Peace Act, we embark upon another episode of interventionism, in continuing our illegitimate and ill-advised mission to "police" the world. It seemingly matters little to this body that it proceeds neither with any constitutional authority nor with the blessings of such historical figures such as Jefferson who, in his first inaugural address, argued for "Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none." Unfortunately, this is not the only bit of history which seemingly is lost on this Congress.

Apparently, it is also lost on this Congress that the Constitution was a grant of limited power to the federal government from the citizens or, in other words, the Constitution was not designed to allow the government to restrain the people, but to allow the people to restrain the government. Of course, the customary lip service is given to the Constitution insofar as the committee report for this bill follows the rule of citing Constitutional authority and cites Art. I, Section 8, which is where one might look to find a specific enumerated power. However, the report cites only clause 18 which begs some further citation. While Clause 18 contains the "necessary and proper" clause, it limits Congress to enacting laws "necessary and proper" to some more specifically (i.e. foregoing) enumerated power. Naturally, no such "foregoing" authority is cited by the advocates of this bill.

Without Constitutional authority, this bill goes on to encourage the spending of \$10 million of U.S. taxpayers hard-earned money in Sudan but for what purpose? From the text of the bill, we learn that "The United States should use all means of pressure available to facilitate a comprehensive solution to the war in Sudan, including (A) the multilateralization of economic and diplomatic tools to compel the Government of Sudan to enter into a good faith peace process; [note that it says "compel . . . good faith peace"] and (B) the support or creation of viable democratic civil authority and institutions in areas of Sudan outside of government control." I believe we used to call that nation-building before that term became impolitic. How self-righteous a government is ours which legally prohibits foreign campaign contributions yet assumes it knows best and, hence, supports dissident and insurgent groups in places like Cuba, Sudan and around the world. The practical problem here is that we have funded dissidents in such places as Somalia who ultimately turned out to be worse than the incumbent governments. Small wonder the U.S. is the prime target of citizen-terrorists from countries with no real ability to retaliate militarily for our illegitimate and immoral interventions.

The legislative "tools" to be used to "facilitate" this aforementioned "comprehensive solution" are as frightening as the nation-building tactics. For example, "It is the sense of the Congress that . . . the United Nations should be used as a tool to facilitate peace and recovery in Sudan."

One can only assume this is the same United Nations which booted the United States off its Human Rights Commission in favor of, as Canadian Sen. Jerahmiel S. Grafstein, called them recently, "those exemplars of human rights nations . . . Algeria, China, Saudi Arabia, Uganda, Armenia, Pakistan, Syria and Vietnam."

The bill does not stop there, however, in intervening in the civil war in Sudan. It appears that this Congress has found a new mission for the Securities and Exchange Commission who are now tasked with investigating "the nature and extent of . . . commercial activity in Sudan" as it relates to "any violations of religious freedom and human rights in Sudan." It seems we have finally found a way to spend those excessive fees the SEC has been collecting from mutual fund investors despite the fact we cannot seem to bring to the floor a bill to actually reduce those fees which have been collected in multiples above what is necessary to fund this agencies' previous (and again unconstitutional) mission.

There is more, however. Buried deep within the bill in Section 9 we find what may be the real motivation for the intervention—Oil. It seems the bill also tasks the Secretary of State with generating a report detailing "a description of the sources and current status of Sudan's financing and construction of infrastructure and pipelines for oil exploitation, the effects of such financing and construction on the inhabitants of the regions in which the oil fields are located." Talk about corporate welfare and the ability to socialize the costs of foreign competitive market research on the U.S. taxpayer!

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this bill truly has it all—an unconstitutional purpose, the morally bankrupt intervention in dealings between the affairs of foreign governments and their respec-

tive citizens in our attempt to police the world, more involvement by a United Nations proven inept at resolving civil conflicts abroad, the expansion of the SEC into State Department functions and a little corporate welfare for big oil, to boot. How can one not support these legislative efforts?

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill for each of the above-mentioned reasons and leave to the ingenuity, generosity, and conscience of each individual in this country to make their own private decision as to how best render help to citizens of Sudan and all countries where human rights violations run rampant.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me, and I am grateful to him and to the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

I thank the ranking member, and I must knowledge the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) as a one-man watchdog for human rights in the world, for which this body and our country are both grateful.

Mr. Chairman, here we have in this bill the first forward movement to do more than condemn. The unspeakable litany of violations in Sudan leave out none. I do not, therefore, want to go down them.

I do want to take issue with the last speaker. I am not sure about our national security, but I do believe that doing something about Khartoum is vital to the strategic U.S. interests in the world. Oil is the engine that is driving the war in the north against the southern Sudanese. They are winning the war. This war is almost over, if we do not do something about it. The southern Sudanese have been so weakened that time is running out.

In Khartoum, we see a regime that will soon be a mid-sized oil exporter at a time when the U.S. and the world have escalated oil needs. It is very important to build on the Clinton sanctions that have been in place since 1997.

I support the amendment, but minimally it seems to me we have to begin to focus, to scrutinize access to our markets. One way to do that is if we say that if they want access to our markets, tell us about their business operations in Sudan. If they want to get access, at least tell us. If we can deny them access constitutionally and legally, I would be for that.

Investors need to be forewarned that indeed we are trying to have significant impact on investments, and since we have reached our own folks, we ought to reach the multinationals, if for no other reason than to level the playing field.

Let me speak to another strategic interest. When is terrorism in the world not a strategic interest of the United States of America? Here we have a major supporter and exporter of international terrorism in Sudan, and we

have felt Sudan in our own country. The region has felt Sudan in multiple ways. Ask the President of Egypt, Mr. Mubarak, whose life was attempted on from the exporting of terrorism from this regime. We have very important strategic interests.

In fact, the last time the world gathered in this way, the last time we confronted a nation and tried to get worldwide support, was of course the sanctions against South Africa, which significantly weakened apartheid. Mr. Chairman, what is happening in Sudan is far more complicated, and if I may say so, far worse than the despotism we saw in South Africa.

When the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and I came to the floor just over a year ago, we were the only two on a special order trying to kind of wake up the consciousness not so much of this body, which had already passed a resolution of condemnation, but hoping that the world out there was looking at us somehow.

I want to simply praise the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for pioneering leadership when absolutely nobody was listening. Since then, since that special order, there have been hearings, press conferences involving the leadership on both sides of the aisle. There have been Sudanese, southern Sudanese ex-slaves who had come to the House of Representatives. We are getting somewhere if we take the leadership for which our Nation is known in the world.

Therefore, we must minimally pass this bill and go on to pass the amendment, if we possibly can. Let us make this start now. Let us signify by this bill that we have only begun to fight for southern Sudanese freedom.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), who authored this legislation and who, along with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), wrote the Sudan Peace Act.

(Mr. TANCREDO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I thank the committee chairman for bringing this bill forward. I thank the leadership for allowing this bill to come forward. I also want to thank the thousands and thousands of people that have communicated with Members of this body from all across this land in support of this piece of legislation.

It is amazing to me, as the gentlewoman just said a minute ago, how things have changed in such a short period of time; how hard it was a few years ago, and I know how hard it must have been for the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) years before that, because of course he was involved with this before any of us were. But I know how hard it was just a short 2½ years ago to get anybody to pay the slightest bit of attention to the issues in Sudan.

It is undeniably true what many of my colleagues have said, that the problems there are incredibly difficult problems to deal with; very intricate, very interwoven, and many-many-faceted. It is not a simple solution by any stretch of the imagination, nor do I believe in all honesty, Mr. Chairman, that if we were to pass this bill today, which I certainly hope we do, that peace will break out tomorrow in Sudan.

What this bill is is simply another arrow in the quiver; our accumulation of power, if you will, resources, leverages, whatever we want to call it, to bring to bear in this country to force peace to occur. That is really what we have to do.

Many colleagues have come to me, not just colleagues here on the floor but certainly people in my own district, and asked the question, why now? What is the deal? What is the issue with Sudan? Why are we concerned about Sudan? Frankly, I do not have an awful lot of constituents who have Sudan on the top of their plate, so I do get questions about this.

I first of all try to explain the effect of going over there and the effect that trip had on me. When the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and Senator BROWNBACK and I landed in a little town called Yei and walked through this village, we had literally hundreds of people surrounding us and trying to get closer and closer to us because they thought, they hoped, they prayed, that if they stayed close enough to us, close to these American Congressmen who were there, that somehow perhaps the bombs would not fall on them, that the Antonovs would not come and bomb them at the time.

Of course, the look in their eyes, this look of desperation, of course that affected me, absolutely. I am a human being. My heart went out to them. I said then at that time to myself and to them, "I will do everything I can. I will do what I can."

This bill is I guess the end result. It will not be the end result, but it is a result of that promise I made. But beyond that, Mr. Chairman, when people ask, why Sudan, why now, I only refer them to the comment made to General Colin Powell. Secretary Powell, when I did ask him in the Committee on International Relations what the administration was prepared to do to bring peace to this troubled land, he responded that he did not have a plan at his disposal, since he had only been in his position a relatively short time.

□ 1345

He said, and I quote, I believe there to be no greater human tragedy being played out on the face of the Earth.

What more do we need to answer the question, why Sudan? Why now? The greatest human tragedy being played out on the face of the Earth.

There are many issues with which we can become involved in Sudan in a more technical way than even this bill

lays out. I hope and I pray that, in fact, we can encourage the leadership in both the north and the south to earnestly begin discussions leading to peace, because I fear in my heart of hearts that the people, I know the people of Sudan both north and south want peace.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that the leadership in the north or the south want peace, because, in fact, you know, a war that has gone on this long establishes the status quo and in it people begin to achieve positions of power.

It is difficult to conceive a world in which war is not going on and, therefore, the power they wield is not able to be wielded. So we must be fearful of this reticence on the part of both the north and the south to move toward peace.

We must force that. We must force that movement, and we can do so with this bill and with the appointment of a special envoy, which I believe is in the offering.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will support this piece of legislation as just one more step in the road to peace, so we can all answer our constituents and others when they say to us, why Sudan, why now. Just tell me if not now, when? How many more dead before you act?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have no additional speakers, but I would like to say a few words before we close debate on this issue. I was profoundly disturbed by my colleague's remark who asked why do we deal with this issue? Well, we deal with this issue because, as so many other issues in this century, it is a fundamental issue of human rights.

I predict that the issue of human rights will be the dominant issue of the 21st century. Not long ago, we were dealing with hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians being pushed out of their ancestral homes in Kosovo, and there were people on the floor of this body who questioned the relevance of our involvement in trying to see to it that these people, little children, old women, young families, were just pushed out of their home, because of their ethnicity and because of their religion.

In that case, it was Muslims who were persecuted by Milosevic and his thugs. In this instance, it is principally Christians who are being persecuted, harassed, raped, killed on a large scale by fundamental lifts Muslims.

I cannot think of a more noble cause for the Congress of the United States than to debate these issues and perhaps to try to help in whatever way we can. Now, there are some who are particularly preoccupied with the minutiae and the complexities of our tax legislation. And that is an appropriate subject for us to discuss. But to question on the floor of the House of Representatives the appropriateness of dealing with a genocide, a genocide means the killing of whole peoples.

We are talking about the killing of 2 million black citizens of the Sudan, men, women and children, whose sole crime is that they are not Muslims. We are dealing with the displacement of 4 million black citizens of Sudan who are pushed out of their villages and are in many instances on the verge of starvation.

To ask whether it is appropriate for the Congress of the United States to deal with these issues boggles the mind. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is an issue of very high priority for this body.

It would be high priority only if it would be a human rights issue, but as the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) so correctly pointed out, the Sudanese government is one of the prime sponsors of international terrorism.

Is there anybody in this body who does not feel, in the wake of the bombing of American embassies, that international terrorism is not a concern of this body? I want to again commend the people who have played a key role in this measure. I want to encourage all my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Middle East and South Asia.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa; the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO); and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for their leadership; and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, for his poignant expressions in regard to this bill and for their persistent attention and energy, for bringing the deplorable situation in Sudan to our attention.

This bill makes funds available for humanitarian assistance to the Sudanese people, to facilitate our State Department and U.N. efforts to help the Sudanese government and opposition forces in reaching a settlement and in sanctioning belligerents who continue to engage in crimes against humanity.

The civil war in the Sudan continues to be a slow-motion genocide. Southern Sudanese are dying each and every day, while hundreds of thousands are at risk from famine and malnutrition.

There are no winners in the Sudan, north or south. If a young man from Sudan wishes to be admitted to a university, he must first join the army. And in the army, he has a good chance of being killed in an immoral, pointless war. And even if the young man survives, he may have to live with memories of atrocities that he has seen or in

some cases even been involved in. Either way, this war in the Sudan is a cancer that is destroying the once vibrant culture of Arab Sudan at the same time that it wreaks havoc in the African south.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to support this measure. I want to commend Secretary Powell for his recent trip to Africa and for his intention to devote considerable more attention to the Sudan.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to again to salute the chairman of the Committee on International Relations (Mr. ROYCE) and the subcommittees, as well as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and, of course, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, for the fine work they have done in bringing this measure to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today also in support of the Sudan Peace Act. Sudan has been ravaged by civil war for over 30 years. And an estimated 2 million people have died; and as has been said before, millions more displaced due to war-related causes.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), has said, there is no greater human tragedy being played out on the Earth today, and thus we turn our attention to Sudan. As if this is not bad enough, as if the famine, the slavery, and the death is not bad enough, there is a particularly troubling situation in the evidence of religious persecution that prevails in Sudan today.

Unfortunately, we know all too well the results of religious persecution just looking back to last century with Nazi Germany. The Sudanese government policies promote Islam as the state religion and make non-Muslims unwelcome.

According to a State Department report on International Religious Freedom for 2000, the status of respect for religious freedom has not changed fundamentally in recent years, and particularly in the South, the government continues to enforce numerous restrictions.

Authorities continue to restrict the activities of Christians, followers of traditional indigenous beliefs and other non-Muslims. Though the government says it respects all religions, the 1994 Societies Registration Act gives churches more freedom, Islam influences all laws and policies.

According to the State Department, the Government of Sudan denies permission to build churches, and there have been claims of harassment and arrest of citizens because of their religious beliefs and practices.

The law prevents the building of new churches or proselytizing by non-Muslims.

Missionaries claim to be harassed continually and prevented from doing the work. The atrocities in Sudan cannot and should not be tolerated.

The individual freedoms familiar to us in America embodied in the Jeffersonian principles of religious freedom and individual dignity must be restored to the Sudanese people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the Sudan Peace Act.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking the committee for bringing this bill to the floor; thanking my colleagues that have risen to speak on this bill today.

Mr. Chairman, we are a great Nation. We are a Nation of people that have led the world in compassion and concern. We are a Nation of people that have always raised our voice for freedom, fair and decent treatment, safety and security for all the nations and all the people's of the world.

It comes as no surprise to anybody in this Chamber to be reminded of the times when we raised our voice on behalf of the people that were victimized in Bosnia, Kosovo, Rwanda, and Somalia, but the over 2 million people in Sudan who have been slaughtered represents more victims than all of those nations combined.

The horror, the torture, the terror, and the slavery is unspeakable. We are counseled too many times to not speak about them.

How do we draw a picture of this violence and its scope and its breadth? How do we tell a world that it must not tolerate the horrible petrifying insanity of it all?

I have selected one story of one victim. Mr. Chairman, this story is going to break your heart; but the story is true. It is true in the lives of millions of people in Sudan. It will illustrate to you why we must demand, intercede, and prevent this from continuing.

The young woman saw her baby's throat slit by an intruder. She then saw the baby's head severed completely from its body. After she was raped, she was forced to carry the baby's head on a march north and was eventually ordered to throw her child's head into a fire before she was forced into slavery.

□ 1400

She eventually escaped that bondage and found a way to freedom and safety. But can one know, can one imagine the horror of the memories, the fear in her heart for others that she left behind that she loved so much who she must know are going through these same experiences.

This cannot be tolerated. No nation on this Earth can fail to raise its voice. We must raise our voice today, and we do. Mr. Chairman, I am going to predict that every person in this Chamber today is going to cast a vote that is

going to be a vote on behalf of these families, these babies, these mothers, and these people.

I pray, Mr. Chairman, with all my heart that we need never again be required to revisit this issue on behalf of these poor souls.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank Chairmen HENRY HYDE and ED ROYCE, Congressmen TOM TANCREDO, TONY HALL and all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have fought so hard to bring national and international attention to the heinous, on-going crisis in the Sudan.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2052, the Sudan Peace Act. In America, our problems pale in significance to the war, slavery and famine in the largest country in Africa. Two million men, women and children have died in a war that has no end in sight. Millions more are displaced from their homes, often hungry and poor—searching for new homes and not knowing where their next meal will come from. They are refugees within their own country and surrounding nations. They cry for help. They beg for mercy. They look for any aid anyone can offer.

Secretary of State Colin Powell testified to Congress this past March, saying the Sudan is "the greatest tragedy on the face of the earth."

Can any one of us here in this chamber picture himself captured and forced into slavery, traded for pennies or food? We are so blessed in this great land of ours—it is impossible to envision ourselves as captive slaves. But slavery is a way of life for people in southern Sudan who must live every day in fear of government-sanctioned raiding parties.

Abraham Lincoln once said: "Whenever I hear anyone arguing for slavery, I feel a strong impulse to see it tried on him personally." President Lincoln knew the evils of slavery in America, and the hypocrisy connected with those who would argue in its favor. But the end of slavery within our borders has not transcended to the Sudan—where slavery plagues society.

The National Islamic Front government's unrelenting efforts to oppress and even eliminate the predominantly black, Christian and southern Sudanese people must be stopped. They have consistently interfered with the delivery of food and medicine into southern Sudan. Government troops have repeatedly bombed international relief sites, schools and other civilian areas in an attempt to disrupt distribution of desperately-needed humanitarian supplies. This is unconscionable. The Sudan Peace Act before us today encourages the development of alternative means to get food and medicine to the people of these regions. It also requires business disclosures so investors will be informed of exactly who and what they are supporting.

My colleagues, we must work to ensure that every effort is made to get humanitarian aid to an oppressed and starving populace. The peace process must be encouraged. Slavery must be condemned in no uncertain terms. The Sudan Peace Act does all of this—and more. I urge passage of this bill to help the men, women and children in the Sudan who cry unceasingly, day by day, for help.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in tremendous support of H.R. 2052, The Sudan Peace Act. This bill will decrease the suffering in which the terrible atrocities are inflicting on the people of The Sudan.

The Sudan Peace Act declares that Congress denounces any human right violations by all sides of the conflict in Sudan (including the Government of Sudan). It directs the U.S. representative to the United Nations to seek to end the veto power of the Sudanese government over the relief programs to Sudanese civilians. Further, it revises Operation Lifeline Sudan (OLS); provide additional support for internationally sanctioned peace process written by the secretary of state to support the peace process, and condemns the bombing of innocent civilian targets.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation requires all businesses that operate in Sudan and trade securities in the U.S. to file disclosure forms with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Thus if these businesses fail to file disclosure forms, the Securities and Exchange Commission will prohibit them from trading securities in U.S. markets. In addition, the State Department, is required within six months of enactment, to report to Congress on income generated by the development of Sudan's oil-producing sector. Finally, the act urges the use of \$10 million provided in the FY 2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act.

The civil war in Sudan has raged for nearly twenty years, mainly between the National Islamic Front government in the north and Christians and animist rebels in the south, killing more than two million Sudanese directly or through malnutrition and starvation.

In particular, by regularly outlawing relief flights of the United Nations' Operation Lifeline Sudan, the Sudanese government has manipulated the receipt of food and use starvation as a weapon of war. The government also has been accused of supporting raiding and enslaving parties to disrupt areas of the country outside its direct control. As a result, millions have been rendered homeless thereby creating one of the world's largest refugee problems.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore strongly encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2052, the Sudan Peace Act. With thousands of Sudanese people suffering due to starvation, lack of malnutrition, enslavement, and wide scale bombing of civilian targets, it is my sincere hope that through legislation we will establish peace in The Sudan.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak out against the horrible atrocities taking place daily in the Sudan as a result of the eighteen-year civil war and in support of H.R. 2052, the Sudan Peace Act. I would like to commend my colleague, Mr. TANCREDO, and others for introducing this very important legislation.

Under the Sudan Peace Act, Congress condemns violations of human rights abuses on all sides of the conflict in Sudan, and calls on the President to make funds available for humanitarian assistance. This legislation expresses the sense of Congress that the United Nations should be used as a tool to facilitate peace and recovery in Sudan. It calls for an investigation into the practice of slavery, condemns the aerial bombardment of civilians, and prohibits business entities engaged in commercial activities in Sudan from trading their securities in U.S. capital markets unless they make public disclosure of their activities in Sudan.

It is time for the United States to take a strong stand against this egregious situation in the Sudan and work together with the inter-

national community to bring peace to the region. Slavery, aerial bombardment of civilians, and other human rights abuses victimize the people of Sudan. I believe that the United States must use diplomatic means to bring an end to the civil war and these serious human rights abuses.

Since the current conflict erupted in 1983, Sudan has been at war intermittently from the time its independence was obtained in 1956. An estimated 2.2 million people have died as a result of war-related causes, such as, oil production and religious persecution. More than 4 million people, mostly southern Sudanese, have been displaced from their homes.

I commend President Bush on his appointment of Andrew Natsios, as special humanitarian coordinator for Sudan to facilitate U.S. assistance. But I again urge the President to appoint a Special Envoy to Sudan, who will be afforded the independence necessary to do the required job of facilitating the peace process. Mr. Natsios' appointment demonstrates that the United States is taking a leadership role in resolving the situation in the Sudan, however we as a nation must continue our efforts to bring an end to the atrocities in the Sudan.

Also, I applaud Secretary of State Powell for recognizing the tragedy that is underway in Sudan and for ordering a review of Administration policy. To begin with, the U.S. should use every means at its disposal to bring the military hostilities to an immediate end.

At the same time, we should apply every bit of moral persuasion and condemn in the loudest possible voice the unspeakable violations of human rights being perpetrated against the weakest members of that society.

No one has done more to express the outrage of Americans or worked harder to end the suffering in the Sudan than my dear friend Joe Madison who has worked endlessly to end the pain and suffering of slavery in Sudan. Joe along with others has diligently worked to inform the American public about the human rights abuses taking place in Sudan. He has traveled to the Sudan region many times on slave redemption missions freeing slaves and working to end slavery. Mr. Madison is truly a freedom fighter and I commend him on his efforts.

In the Sudan the world is faced with a human rights nightmare of the first order. We have the opportunity, indeed the responsibility, to use our international leadership to bring peace to the region by ending both the civil war and the heartbreaking enslavement of women and children which has intensified as a result of the hostilities.

As a nation with first-hand knowledge of the savagery of slavery, of the misery to its victims, and the suffering of future generations, we must recoil in horror at the practice of slavery in Sudan. Our ultimate goal must be to work with the international community to end the brutal civil war, which is the root cause of these atrocities and bring peace to the country of Sudan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer support for H.R. 2052, the Sudan Peace Act, which will help facilitate solutions to the problems of famine and war in Sudan. First, let me say a special thanks to all the sponsors, especially TOM TANCREDO, and the Committee on International Relations as well as the Subcommittee on Africa, for their hard work and leadership in developing this bill. I

would like to also commend House leadership for bringing this bill to the House floor.

The crisis in Sudan has resulted in two million casualties due to famine and the continuing war. The 18-year civil war in Sudan has fueled an on-going religious conflict between Muslims and Christians and has challenged our relations with Sudan due to its human rights violations and support of international terrorism. Despite this, I am hopeful this bill can help to address the problems and bring forth a peaceful resolution to the current situation. With that said, H.R. 2052 should be supported by the House and Senate chambers.

In fiscal year 2000, the United States provided a total of \$93.7 million in assistance to Sudan. These funds go to help create a civil administration, assist in conflict resolution and provide support for non-governmental organizations. Our financial assistance has eased the hardship for those in need of food assistance.

Congress should adopt this legislation so we can help Sudan and improve our relationship with them as well.

Again, I want to express my thanks to TOM TANCREDO, and the Committee on International Relations, and the Subcommittee on Africa for their dedication and effort on this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 2052.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for H.R. 2052, the Sudan Peace Act. The atrocities in the Sudan deserve immediate attention and aid from the United States. It is our duty as the "world's only superpower" to stand up for those who cannot stand up for themselves.

Many articles have been written in recent months regarding the growing support for U.S. intervention in the Sudan. What struck me most about these articles was their emphasis on how this cause has attracted broad support across political lines. As Newsweek noted:

The Muslim government's alleged persecution of southern Christians is the key issue for many of the rebels' fiercest U.S. supporters. For prominent African-Americans like Coretta Scott King, the hot button is Khartoum's toleration of slavery and the use of slave-raiding privateers as paramilitary forces in the war against the south. For other activists the overriding concern is the government's ethnic-cleansing campaign against southern peoples such as the Dinka. Late last year the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum joined the fight, declaring through its "committee on conscience" that Khartoum's atrocities against the southerners warranted an unprecedented "genocide warning."

It is not surprising that the fighting in Sudan has attracted attention from such divergent populations. All humans should be outraged by the 18 year war that has taken over 2 million lives and destroyed countless homes, crops, medical facilities, and churches. Equally appalling is the Khartoum's refusal to allow humanitarian aid. They have even gone so far as to directly target international humanitarian relief agencies such as the Red Cross and Doctors Without Borders by aerial bombings.

Christians have been persecuted, thousands of non-Muslims have been forced into slavery, the destruction of crops has caused thousands more to starve. Additionally, the areas north and south of the oil development center have been the site of the most heinous crimes. In

order to clear the region to facilitate oil production and thus bring in money for their government, the military annihilates whole villages. According to one report the Sudanese military first attacks a village with bombs to scatter villagers. Then troops and helicopter gunships enter—torching homes and food-stuffs and killing all they come across. It is not uncommon for the elderly and young to burn alive in their homes.

I am ashamed that our wonderful, caring nation has not taken a large role in stopping this barbarism. Apparently former Secretary of State Madeline Albright's reasoning was that the cause was "not marketable to the American people." Marketable or not, this does not excuse our relative indifference as a nation to our fellow men and women being tortured and slain in the Sudan. I am proud that today we are taking a stand—facilitating humanitarian aid, holding businesses accountable for their activities in the Sudan oil trade that fund the government's heinous behavior, and most importantly directing the State Department to take an active role in implementing peace in Sudan.

I am happy that so many of my colleagues and fellow Americans are in such strong support of this legislation, but even if they weren't it would still be the right thing to do. "Marketable" or not, the United States must work towards ending the atrocities in the Sudan.

Mr. FALCOMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the legislation before us, H.R. 2052, which, among other things, condemns the National Islamic Front Government of Sudan; calls for increased diplomatic peace efforts including the appointment of a Special Envoy; supports the famine relief efforts of Operation Lifeline Sudan; and requires foreign companies doing business in Sudan to publicly disclose their activities if they seek access to U.S. capital markets.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, Mr. TANCREDO, for introducing this important measure. I also wish to recognize the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, the Ranking Democrat of the House International Relations Africa Subcommittee, for his longtime leadership and extensive work to bring peace to Sudan, as well as other nations in the region. I further commend the Chairman and the Ranking Democratic Member of the House International Relations Committee, Mr. HYDE and Mr. LANTOS, for bringing this matter to the floor. I am honored to join my colleagues in support of this bi-partisan legislation.

Mr. Chairman, we must do all that we can to stop the senseless tragedy in Sudan. Although the civil war has gone on for four decades, since 1983 the conflict has heightened and resulted in an humanitarian disaster. The Government of Sudan is responsible and must be condemned in the strongest terms of committing genocide against its own people.

By aerial bombardment of civilians, mass slavery, rape, unspeakable war crimes and obstruction of humanitarian relief efforts—over two million Sudanese have died at the hands of the government in Khartoum. These atrocities have been compounded by the displacement of four million other Sudanese, who have been driven from their homes.

Mr. Chairman, last month Secretary of State Colin Powell visited Sudan, committing the United States to make peace in that nation a priority.

The legislation before us will significantly assist those efforts by holding the Government of Sudan accountable for its humanitarian violations and calling for their immediate end; urging U.S. leadership of multilateral and bilateral peace processes in Sudan; and encouraging disinvestment in foreign firms doing business in Sudan, particularly those oil companies whose activities are directly contributing to the escalation of war in Sudan.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge our colleagues to adopt this important legislation.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, three weeks ago, I received two conflicting messages regarding the situation in Sudan. One was a May 24 press release from the Sudanese embassy announcing, with great fanfare, that the Government of Sudan had taken "a unilateral step toward peace" by declaring an immediate halt to aerial bombing attacks in the south and the Nuba Mountains.

The other message, from Catholic clergy members, reported that the priests living in southern parts of the El Obeid Diocese had been driven into the bush by "ferocious assaults by Sudanese government forces."

As additional reports filtered out of this remote area of the Nuba Mountains from a variety of sources, it became clear that the Government of Sudan had launched a massive ground and air attack while it was simultaneously issuing press releases about its commitment to peace.

Government forces burned more than 2,000 homes during this attack. They apparently hope to starve the local population, still at large, into concentration camps called, in the best Orwellian tradition, "Peace Villages."

This contrast between word and deed underlines the importance of today's consideration of the Sudan Peace Act. I am grateful to Mr. TANCREDO for introducing it, and also to Mr. ROYCE and Mr. PAYNE for their excellent leadership of the Africa Subcommittee. The Committee on International Relations ordered the bill favorably reported on June 6, 2001.

I would also like to call attention to the tireless work of the Catholic Bishops Conference, the Commission on International Religious Freedom, the NAACP, and countless individuals and organizations across the country that have given this matter the profile and attention it deserves.

The measure before us is more than symbolic. It will give the President the discretion he needs to reprogram and reallocate quickly any portion of humanitarian resources the United States currently gives to Operation Lifeline Sudan. Despite efforts to carry out its humanitarian mission without interference, Operation Lifeline Sudan has frequently been manipulated by the government of Sudan. We should make no mistake: the denial of food is used as a weapon of war in Sudan. This provision suspends our government's standard but often time-consuming notification procedures if the President deems it necessary to deliver life-saving assistance by other means.

In addition, this measure will shed light on those international companies doing business in Sudan as well as how that business may support the government's war-fighting ability. This is not a sanction, but a beam of light directed at some of the hidden aspects of the global economy.

Given the nationwide, grassroots effort by Americans of all political parties and races to raise awareness about the suffering of the

people of Sudan, it is only proper that investors should know whether a particular company is doing business in Sudan.

The Sudan Peace Act is important in what it does, but also in what it does not do. It does not in any way hinder the executive branch in its responsibility to conduct the foreign affairs of this nation.

In his first appearance before this Committee as Secretary of State, Secretary Powell stated that Sudan was a tragedy that would command his full attention. In characteristic fashion, the Secretary appears to be backing up what he said.

Against expectations from some in the media, Secretary Powell has taken an early trip to Africa and has focused to a considerable extent on the conflict in Sudan. He has indicated that the Administration will soon appoint an experienced and capable special envoy. He has been unequivocal in his remarks regarding the ongoing abuses in Sudan. He has committed \$3 million to improve the capabilities of the rebel alliance to hold its own at the bargaining table.

In short, we are beginning to see the attention we have urged. This measure supports and encourages those efforts without being unduly prescriptive to Administration officials, some of whom already know a thing or two about dealing with rogue nations.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD an exchange of letters between Chairman OXLEY and myself concerning the bill under consideration, H.R. 2052, the Sudan Peace Act.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 6, 2001.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations, Washington, DC.

DEAR HENRY: I understand that the Committee on International Relations today ordered H.R. 2052, the Sudan Peace Act, reported to the House. As you know, the Committee on Financial Services was granted an additional referral upon the resolution's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction over securities and exchanges under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Because of the importance of this matter, I recognize your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and will waive consideration of the resolution by the Financial Services Committee. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the resolution, the Financial Services Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 2052. In addition, the Committee on Financial Services reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the resolution that are within the Financial Services Committee's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Financial Services for conferees on H.R. 2052 or related legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS,

Washington, DC, June 6, 2001.

Hon. MICHAEL OXLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MIKE: I have received your letter concerning H.R. 2052, the Sudan Peace Act. It is our intention to take this bill to the floor in an expeditious manner. We understand that language in the bill, as ordered reported, falls within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services.

We recognize your jurisdiction over this subject matter, and appreciate your willingness to waive your right to consider this bill without waiving your jurisdiction over the general subject matter. I will support the Speaker's naming members of your committee as conferees on the matter should it proceed to conference.

As you have requested, I will include this exchange of letters in the Record during consideration of the bill.

I appreciate your assistance in getting this important bill to the floor.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Sudan Peace Act (H.R. 2052). I would like to thank Congressman TANCREDO for introducing this important legislation and Representatives DONALD PAYNE, TOM LANTOS, and FRANK WOLF for their active roles in pushing Sudan to the top of the foreign policy agenda. It is important for Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, to speak out in a collective voice against the suffering of the people of Sudan.

Sudan's civil war and the Sudanese Government's genocidal policies have taken a terrible toll on the civilians of that country. The horror that afflicts Sudan is staggering: over 2 million people have been killed and another 5 million driven from their homes. The situation in Sudan is rapidly getting worse and must be seriously addressed before the scale of death and destruction increases. Clearly, there must be international pressure to promote a just and lasting peace to this tragic conflict.

Sudan has one of the worst human rights records in the world. According to the U.S. State Department, the Government of Sudan continues to abuse human rights including the bombing of civilian and humanitarian targets, abduction and enslavement by government-sponsored militias, and manipulation of humanitarian assistance as a weapon of war.

The Sudan Peace Act offers the beginning of a framework for a solution to ending the crisis. The bill requires all businesses trading securities in the United States capital markets and operations in Sudan to disclose fully the extent and nature of their operations, particularly oil operations, which are fueling the constant attacks against the southern Sudanese. The legislation also strongly condemns the human rights abuses committed by the Government of Sudan, continues support for humanitarian assistance distribution through Operation Lifeline Sudan, and urges the President to use \$10 million appropriated last year to assist the Sudanese opposition, the National Democratic Alliance (NDA).

I am encouraged by the Bush administration's recent statements that it will soon appoint a high-profile Special Envoy to Sudan to serve as a catalyst in the stalled peace talks. The appointment of an envoy could be the difference in bringing peace to Sudan.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bipartisan legislation to help end the campaign of violence against the people of Sudan.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The bill shall be considered by section as an original bill for the purpose of amendment; and pursuant to the rule, each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 2052

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Sudan Peace Act".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Government of Sudan has intensified its prosecution of the war against areas outside of its control, which has already cost more than 2,000,000 lives and has displaced more than 4,000,000 people.

(2) A viable, comprehensive, and internationally sponsored peace process, protected from manipulation, presents the best chance for a permanent resolution of the war, protection of human rights, and a self-sustaining Sudan.

(3) Continued strengthening and reform of humanitarian relief operations in Sudan is an essential element in the effort to bring an end to the war.

(4) Continued leadership by the United States is critical.

(5) Regardless of the future political status of the areas of Sudan outside of the control of the Government of Sudan, the absence of credible civil authority and institutions is a major impediment to achieving self-sustenance by the Sudanese people and to meaningful progress toward a viable peace process.

(6) Through the manipulation of traditional rivalries among peoples in areas outside of its full control, the Government of Sudan has used divide-and-conquer techniques effectively to subjugate its population. However, internationally sponsored reconciliation efforts have played a critical role in reducing human suffering and the effectiveness of this tactic.

(7) The Government of Sudan utilizes and organizes militias, Popular Defense Forces, and other irregular units for raiding and enslaving parties in areas outside of the control of the Government of Sudan in an effort to disrupt severely the ability of the populations in those areas to sustain themselves.

The tactic helps minimize the Government of Sudan's accountability internationally.

(8) The Government of Sudan has repeatedly stated that it intends to use the expected proceeds from future oil sales to increase the tempo and lethality of the war against the areas outside of its control.

(9) By regularly banning air transport relief flights by the United Nations relief operation, Operation Lifeline Sudan (OLS), the Government of Sudan has been able to manipulate the receipt of food aid by the Sudanese people from the United States and other donor countries as a devastating weapon of war in the ongoing effort by the Government of Sudan to starve targeted groups and subdue areas of Sudan outside of the Government's control.

(10) The acts of the Government of Sudan, including the acts described in this section, constitute genocide as defined by the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (78 U.N.T.S. 277).

(11) The efforts of the United States and other donors in delivering relief and assistance through means outside of OLS have played a critical role in addressing the deficiencies in OLS and offset the Government of Sudan's manipulation of food donations to advantage in the civil war in Sudan.

(12) While the immediate needs of selected areas in Sudan facing starvation have been addressed in the near term, the population in areas of Sudan outside of the control of the Government of Sudan are still in danger of extreme disruption of their ability to sustain themselves.

(13) The Nuba Mountains and many areas in Bahr al Ghazal and the Upper Nile and the Blue Nile regions have been excluded completely from relief distribution by OLS, consequently placing their populations at increased risk of famine.

(14) At a cost which has sometimes exceeded \$1,000,000 per day, and with a primary focus on providing only for the immediate food needs of the recipients, the current international relief operations are neither sustainable nor desirable in the long term.

(15) The ability of populations to defend themselves against attack in areas outside of the control of the Government of Sudan has been severely compromised by the disengagement of the front-line states of Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Uganda, fostering the belief among officials of the Government of Sudan that success on the battlefield can be achieved.

(16) The United States should use all means of pressure available to facilitate a comprehensive solution to the war in Sudan, including—

(A) the multilateralization of economic and diplomatic tools to compel the Government of Sudan to enter into a good faith peace process;

(B) the support or creation of viable democratic civil authority and institutions in areas of Sudan outside of government control;

(C) continued active support of people-to-people reconciliation mechanisms and efforts in areas outside of government control;

(D) the strengthening of the mechanisms to provide humanitarian relief to those areas; and

(E) cooperation among the trading partners of the United States and within multilateral institutions toward those ends.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(2) GOVERNMENT OF SUDAN.—The term "Government of Sudan" means the National Islamic Front government in Khartoum, Sudan.

(3) OLS.—The term "OLS" means the United Nations relief operation carried out by UNICEF, the World Food Program, and participating relief organizations known as "Operation Lifeline Sudan".

SEC. 4. CONDEMNATION OF SLAVERY, OTHER HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES, AND TACTICS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SUDAN.

The Congress hereby—

(1) condemns—

(A) violations of human rights on all sides of the conflict in Sudan;

(B) the Government of Sudan's overall human rights record, with regard to both the prosecution of the war and the denial of basic human and political rights to all Sudanese;

(C) the ongoing slave trade in Sudan and the role of the Government of Sudan in abetting and tolerating the practice;

(D) the Government of Sudan's use and organization of "murahallin" or "mujahadeen", Popular Defense Forces (PDF), and regular Sudanese Army units into organized and coordinated raiding and slaving parties in Bahr al Ghazal, the Nuba Mountains, and the Upper Nile and the Blue Nile regions; and

(E) aerial bombardment of civilian targets that is sponsored by the Government of Sudan; and

(2) recognizes that, along with selective bans on air transport relief flights by the Government of Sudan, the use of raiding and slaving parties is a tool for creating food shortages and is used as a systematic means to destroy the societies, culture, and economies of the Dinka, Nuer, and Nuba peoples in a policy of low-intensity ethnic cleansing.

SEC. 5. USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.

The Congress urges the President to promptly make available to the National Democratic Alliance the \$10,000,000 in funds appropriated for assistance to such group under the heading "OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" in title I of H.R. 5526 of the 106th Congress, as enacted into law by section 101(a) of Public Law 106-429.

SEC. 6. SUPPORT FOR AN INTERNATIONALLY SANCTIONED PEACE PROCESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress hereby recognizes that—

(1) a single viable, internationally and regionally sanctioned peace process holds the greatest opportunity to promote a negotiated, peaceful settlement to the war in Sudan; and

(2) resolution of the conflict in Sudan is best made through a peace process based on the Declaration of Principles reached in Nairobi, Kenya, on July 20, 1994.

(b) UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC SUPPORT.—The Secretary of State is authorized to utilize the personnel of the Department of State for the support of—

(1) the ongoing negotiations between the Government of Sudan and opposition forces;

(2) any necessary peace settlement planning or implementation; and

(3) other United States diplomatic efforts supporting a peace process in Sudan.

SEC. 7. MULTILATERAL PRESSURE ON COMBATANTS.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United Nations should be used as a tool to facilitate peace and recovery in Sudan; and

(2) the President, acting through the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, should seek to—

(A) revise the terms of OLS to end the veto power of the Government of Sudan over the

plans by OLS for air transport relief flights and, by doing so, to end the manipulation of the delivery of relief supplies to the advantage of the Government of Sudan on the battlefield;

(B) investigate the practice of slavery in Sudan and provide mechanisms for its elimination; and

(C) sponsor a condemnation of the Government of Sudan each time it subjects civilians to aerial bombardment.

SEC. 8. DISCLOSURE OF BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN SUDAN.

(a) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—No entity that is engaged in any commercial activity in Sudan may trade any of its securities (or depository receipts with respect to its securities) in any capital market in the United States unless that entity has disclosed, in such form as the Securities and Exchange Commission shall prescribe—

(1) the nature and extent of that commercial activity in Sudan, including any plans for expansion or diversification;

(2) the identity of all agencies of the Sudanese Government with which the entity is doing business;

(3) the relationship of the commercial activity to any violations of religious freedom and other human rights in Sudan; and

(4) the contribution that the proceeds raised in the capital markets in the United States will make to the entity's commercial activity in Sudan.

(b) DISCLOSURE TO THE PUBLIC.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall take the necessary steps to ensure that disclosures under subsection (a) are published or otherwise made available to the public.

(c) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise the authorities he has under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act to assist the Securities and Exchange Commission in carrying out this section.

SEC. 9. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall prepare and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report regarding the conflict in Sudan. Such report shall include—

(1) a description of the sources and current status of Sudan's financing and construction of infrastructure and pipelines for oil exploitation, the effects of such financing and construction on the inhabitants of the regions in which the oil fields are located, and the ability of the Government of Sudan to finance the war in Sudan with the proceeds of the oil exploitation;

(2) a description of the extent to which that financing was secured in the United States or with involvement of United States citizens;

(3) the best estimates of the extent of aerial bombardment by the Government of Sudan, including targets, frequency, and best estimates of damage; and

(4) a description of the extent to which humanitarian relief has been obstructed or manipulated by the Government of Sudan or other forces.

SEC. 10. CONTINUED USE OF NON-OLS ORGANIZATIONS FOR RELIEF EFFORTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the President should continue to increase the use of non-OLS agencies in the distribution of relief supplies in southern Sudan.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report describing the progress made toward carrying out subsection (a).

SEC. 11. CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR ANY BAN ON AIR TRANSPORT RELIEF FLIGHTS.

(a) PLAN.—The President shall develop a contingency plan to provide, outside the auspices of the United Nations if necessary, the greatest possible amount of United States Government and privately donated relief to all affected areas in Sudan, including the Nuba Mountains and the Upper Nile and the Blue Nile regions, in the event that the Government of Sudan imposes a total, partial, or incremental ban on OLS air transport relief flights.

(b) REPROGRAMMING AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in carrying out the plan developed under subsection (a), the President may reprogram up to 100 percent of the funds available for support of OLS operations (but for this subsection) for the purposes of the plan.

SEC. 12. INVESTIGATION OF WAR CRIMES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall collect information about incidents which may constitute crimes against humanity, genocide, war crimes, and other violations of international humanitarian law by all parties to the conflict in Sudan, including slavery, rape, and aerial bombardment of civilian targets.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall prepare and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report on the information that the Secretary of State has collected under subsection (a) and any findings or determinations made by the Secretary on the basis of that information. The report under this subsection may be submitted as part of the report required under section 9.

(c) CONSULTATIONS WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS.—In preparing the report required by this section, the Secretary of State shall consult and coordinate with all other Government officials who have information necessary to complete the report. Nothing contained in this section shall require the disclosure, on a classified or unclassified basis, of information that would jeopardize sensitive sources and methods or other vital national security interests.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to other sections of the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. BACHUS:

Insert the following after section 8 and redesignate the succeeding sections, and references thereto, accordingly:

SEC. 9. PROHIBITION ON TRADING IN U.S. CAPITAL MARKETS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—The President shall exercise the authorities he has under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act to prohibit any entity engaged in the development of oil or gas in Sudan—

(1) from raising capital in the United States; or

(2) from trading its securities (or depository receipts with respect to its securities) in any capital market in the United States.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, an entity is "engaged in the development of oil or gas in Sudan" if that entity is directly engaged in the exploration, production, transportation (by pipeline or otherwise), or refining of petroleum, natural gas, or petroleum products in Sudan.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, there was an article on the front page of the

Washington Post on Monday, and it says, "Oil money is fueling Sudan's war". It goes on to say that Arab is killing non-Arab or African and Muslims are killing Christians. But one thing is in common, and that is that, and it says, Nile Blend crude is fueling this entire war.

It talks about the four oil companies that are in Sudan drilling for oil, turning the proceeds of that development over to the government. The government is hiring guns and arms and airplanes and helicopter gunships, and they are bombing the people of Sudan.

The quote in that article is the fighting follows the oil. If you can stop the oil revenue, you have a chance at stopping the fighting. That is exactly what this amendment does.

In fact, I offered this amendment to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, this amendment and a disclosure amendment, which the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) offered; and he got the disclosure amendment included in this bill.

I will introduce at this time a report of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, a bipartisan commission. They recommended that this Congress do two things. One is require disclosure, and that is in the bill; and, number two, that we stop these five oil companies from raising funds in the United States to develop these oil fields. They said that both would be necessary. So with this amendment, we will add the other half of what is a necessary action.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD pages 131 and 132 of that report, as follows:

REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION
ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The U.S. government should strengthen economic sanctions against Sudan and should urge other countries to adopt similar policies. The United States should prohibit any foreign company from raising capital or listing its securities in U.S. markets as long as it is engaged in the development of oil and gas fields in Sudan. The U.S. government should not issue licenses permitting the import of gum arabic from Sudan to the United States.

U.S. economic sanctions against Sudan should be strengthened and not reduced. They should be strengthened by (a) prohibiting access to U.S. capital markets for those non-U.S. companies engaged in the development of the Sudanese oil and gas fields, and (b) not issuing further licenses for the import of gum arabic to the United States.

The Commission is aware of the current debate both internationally and in the United States on the effectiveness of economic sanctions generally. Unilateral economic sanctions by the United States have not prevented foreign investment in Sudan's oil business, which has, in turn, provided the Sudanese government with significant financial support for its egregious human rights and humanitarian abuses. However, it has not been established that U.S. sanctions have been completely ineffective. They can continue, for example, to slow the rate of increase of foreign investment in Sudan and oil revenues to the Sudanese government. One way to increase the potential effectiveness of the sanctions is to convince other economic powers to adopt similar policies. In this re-

gard, the Commission urges the U.S. government to encourage economic pressure on the Sudanese government in its bilateral relations at all levels with countries that engage in substantial trade with or provide significant foreign investment in Sudan.

Current sanctions prohibit investment by U.S. companies in Sudan. They also prohibit transactions between U.S. companies and the Greater Nile Petroleum Operating Company (Sudan's oil consortium) or Sudapet (Sudan's petroleum company).

In the absence of multilateral economic sanctions, however, preventing access to U.S. capital markets by foreign companies engaged in the oil-development business in Sudan targets a specific weakness in the current U.S. sanctions regime. The Commission recommends that foreign corporations doing business with Sudan's petroleum industry be prohibited from issuing or listing its securities on U.S. capital markets.

The Commission does not lightly recommend these significant restrictions on U.S. capital markets access, but believes that the specific conditions in Sudan warrant them. The government of Sudan is committing genocidal humanitarian and human rights abuses. There is a direct connection between oil production and those abuses. Foreign investment is critical to the development of Sudan's oil fields and maintaining oil revenues. Expanding U.S. sanctions in the area of capital markets access specifically targets what is likely the most significant resource that the Sudanese government has to prosecute the war.

Moreover, the issue of continuing economic sanctions against Sudan is one of principle as well as effectiveness. Reducing sanctions against Sudan at this time—after the Sudanese government has made no concessions but rather has increased its civilian bombings and other atrocities—would be to reward it for worsening behavior. This will send the wrong message to the government of Sudan and the international community.

With respect to licenses granted in 1999 and 2000 to permit U.S. imports of gum Arabic, the purpose of granting those licenses was to allow U.S. importers time to identify alternative sources of supply. Because a reasonable amount of time has elapsed, no further licenses should be granted, and efforts should be continued to identify alternate suppliers of this product.

If the government of Sudan demonstrates substantial, sustained, and comprehensive improvement in the human rights conditions for people throughout the country, the U.S. government should seriously re-evaluate its sanctions regime.

Companies that are doing business in Sudan should be required to disclose the nature and extent of that business in connection with their access to U.S. capital markets.

There is a significant, undesirable gap in U.S. law regarding Sudan and other CPC countries: In many cases, foreign companies that are doing business in Sudan can sell securities on U.S. markets without having to disclose fully (1) the details of the particular business activities in Sudan, including plans for expansion or diversification; (2) the identity of all agencies of the Sudanese government with which the companies are doing business; (3) the relationship of the business activities to violations of religious freedom and other human rights in Sudan; or (4) the contribution that the proceeds raised in the U.S. debt and equity markets will make to these business activities and hence, potentially to those violations. Across-the-board full disclosure of these details would prompt corporate managers to work to prevent their companies from supporting or facilitating these violations. It also would aid (1) U.S. in-

vestors in deciding whether to purchase the securities; (2) shareholders in exercising their ownership rights (including proposing shareholder resolutions for annual meetings and proxy statements); (3) the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control in enforcing existing sanctions; and (4) U.S. policymakers in formulating sound policy with respect to Sudan and U.S. capital markets. The Commission recommends that the United States require such disclosure.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this, the question was asked, should we get involved? I would like to remind my colleagues of a story in the book of Esther where Esther is asked by Mordecai, "Do you think if you hold your peace at a time like this that you shall escape judgment?" Let me tell, my colleagues, it is a time such as this. It is a time when millions of people are being slain, where genocide is going on.

Mordecai also reminded Esther that she had been placed in a position of leadership and just to make such decisions as this. I believe that. I believe that those who serve here have been placed in a position of trust and leadership, and I think that, if we do not act, and we do not act decisively, I do not think that we can expect to escape. We have been placed here for a reason. We ought to undertake that obligation. That trust has been placed in us.

People have said to me, well, what will this interfere with? What will this do? We deny U.S. oil companies the right, and we should, to go over to Sudan and drill. We say, if you go over there, we will put you in jail. If you go over there, we will fine you. You should not be engaged in that activity.

But the paradox is that a foreign oil company can go over there. They can develop these oil fields. What they do with helicopter gunships and jet planes, they clear the land of people. They burn down the houses on the oil concessions and kill the people that live there and develop the oil. We need to say to those five oil companies, if they are going to do that, they are not going to raise money in the United States capital markets.

This will be a meaningful, positive step. I commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO). I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE). I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). Let me say that by putting this amendment in the bill, it will be another decisive case in drying up the flow of oil revenue, which is blood money, which is resulting in the death of millions of people.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for this very important amendment, which I strongly support and urge all of our colleagues to support.

This amendment deals with the operation of foreign oil companies in the Sudan. The complicity of the foreign oil industry in this human destruction is one of the most shameful factors in this 17-year-old slaughter.

Canadian-owned Talisman Oil Company has publicly admitted that, in the year 2000, its Greater Nile Petroleum Operating Company's airstrips were used for offensive military purposes by military aircraft of the government of Sudan against innocent men, women and children who live in the south of the country.

We should not allow oil companies that are helping to prolong this bloody slaughter to raise capital or trade securities in the United States.

The call for sanctions in this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is consistent with efforts by the American people to send a strong message to oil companies doing business in Sudan. Major public institutional investors, such as the City of New York or the Texas Teachers Pension Fund, have divested themselves from Talisman Oil in protest of its explicit dealings with the Sudanese government.

Recently, a European coalition on oil in Sudan was launched, indicating that the campaign has now reached Europe to end the role of oil companies in the ongoing destruction of the Sudanese people.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge all Members to support this amendment, because it would be shameful to allow foreign oil companies to raise funds which are ultimately used for the genocide of the Sudanese people.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we are in a full committee markup, and I ran out because I wanted to be here when this bill came up. One, I rise in strong support of the bill. I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and also Senators BROWBACK and FRIST and the others over in the Senate for their good work.

I also rise in strong support of the amendment because oil is basically fueling this, bringing about death. There have been 2.2 million people that died in Sudan in the last 15 to 16 years. Every major terrorist group operating in the Middle East has an operation, a training camp outside of Khartoum. Disease, the sleeping sickness and so many of the diseases are running rampant in Sudan, particularly in the southern Sudan.

So the passage of this bill will send a message that the American people and the Congress care deeply about stopping the fighting, stopping the death, stopping the oil and stopping slavery. This is one of two or three countries in the world today where there is actually organized slavery.

So I just want to thank the committee and both sides of the aisle for

bringing this up and for the good work. When the people in Sudan find out tomorrow, through whatever sources that they find out, that this bill passed, hopefully by an overwhelming vote, hopefully with almost no "no" votes, it will send a message that the American Congress and the American Government cares, and we are committed to doing everything we can.

The Tancredo bill and this bill will do it, and the amendment, to bring about a just, and I stress the word "just", and a lasting peace.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Colorado, Mr. TANCREDO, for his hard work on this legislation. We are considering this legislation today because of his leadership and persistence. He has been solid on Sudan issues and it is a pleasure to work with him to help bring a just peace to Sudan.

I also want to thank my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, the ranking member of the Africa subcommittee. I know he and Mr. TANCREDO worked together on this legislation and his commitment on Sudan throughout the years' has been outstanding.

I also want to thank Mr. ROYCE, the chairman of the Africa subcommittee, and Mr. HYDE, chairman of the International Relations Committee, for bringing the Sudan Peace Act to the floor for a vote today.

The Sudan Peace Act is good legislation and I believe that passing this legislation today will be a step forward in helping to end the suffering, death and destruction in Sudan.

I have been to Sudan four times since 1989, most recently visiting southern Sudan in January of this year. I have seen the conditions on the ground first-hand.

Since 1983, the government of Sudan has been waging a brutal war against factions in the south who are fighting for self-determination and religious freedom. More people have died in Sudan than in Kosovo, Bosnia, Somalia and Rwanda combined with the war resulting in over 2 million deaths and 4 million displaced people. Most of the dead are civilians—women and children—who die from starvation and disease caused by the war.

The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum has issued a genocide warning for Sudan. The Holocaust Museum's warning is a hallowed reminder of our very moral standing as human beings and compels us to never again be silent witnesses to the mass enslavement, mass starvation, mass murder of a people.

The Sudanese Government routinely attacks civilian targets, such as hospitals, churches, feeding centers, and uses aerial bombings to intimidate and kill the southern population. In the past several months, numerous hospitals, schools and feeding areas in the south have been bombed by the government, killing numerous innocent men, women and children.

By conservative estimates, the U.S. Committee on Refugees (USCR) confirms that the Government of Sudan bombed innocent civilians in southern Sudan over 167 times last year.

This year alone, the USCR confirms 20 bombings of civilians in southern Sudan, although this number now is certainly much higher. Recently, a Sudanese Government Antonov bomber dropped at least 16 bombs on the town of Narus, killing a 9-year-old child.

This year during the Easter holiday, the Government of Sudan bombed innocent civil-

ians in the Nuba Mountains. The Roman Catholic Bishop of the area, Bishop Macram Gassis, was on the ground and witnessed the attack. Bishop Gassis writes on the attack:

It was Easter Monday, and I had just completed my Easter pastoral visit to my parishes in the Nuba Mountains—among the most important of my periodic visits during the year. At the airstrip, my personnel were loading our plane for departure when the Antonov bomber was spotted above the field. Everyone scattered and fell to the ground as four to six shells (by our calculations) fell some 500 feet from the end of the runway. . . .

And the bombing continues. According to the Associated Press, just a few days ago, the Khartoum regime reportedly killed 4 people in a bombing attack during a delivery of aid by the World Food Program. The bombing and killing of innocent civilians must stop and this legislation rightly condemns the Government of Sudan for its wonton bombardment of civilians.

Fueling Khartoum's ability to conduct its genocide against southern Sudan is oil. Today, major international oil companies are generating billions of dollars of annual revenue for the Khartoum regime. Khartoum has openly pledged to use this revenue for modern bombers, helicopter gun ships and other weapons in its war against the people of southern Sudan. Indeed, the June 11, 2001, Washington Post reports that because of its new oil revenue, the Government of Sudan has doubled its military spending since 1998 totaling \$327 million in 2000.

In a recent speech I made at the U.S. Holocaust Museum, I said:

The U.S. Commission on Religious Liberty has bravely called on the President to limit oil companies that finance the regime from access to U.S. capital markets. Here in this museum, in the literal shadow of exhibits of the slave labor practices of many German companies, in the face of what we know about the victimization of Jews at the hands of European banks, insurance companies, art galleries and other institutions, a clear message must be sent to the following oil companies: Talisman of Canada, the China National Petroleum Company, Petronas of Malaysia, Lundin of Sweden, Total/Fina/Elf of France, OMV of Austria—Enter into oil contracts with the genocidal regime in Sudan, and produce revenue for it, only at grave risk of losing—financially and otherwise—far more than you can possibly gain from those contracts.

This legislation takes a significant step in addressing the connection between oil and the Sudan Government's atrocities by stating that no company can list securities on U.S. exchanges unless a company fulfills comprehensive disclosure requirements about its business activities in Sudan.

While the acting chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), Laura Unger, has initiated several new disclosure requirements applying to companies invested in Sudan, the SEC requirements in this legislation go a long way toward ensuring the world knows what companies are aiding and abetting the regime in Khartoum.

Slavery exists today in the 21st century and this legislation rightly condemns the Government of Sudan's role in the ongoing slave trade. The Sudanese government has done nothing to stop the slavery. Slave traders from the north sweep down into southern villages and kidnap women and children who are then

sold for use as domestic servants, concubines or other purposes. This is real life chattel slavery.

The Department of State 2000 Human Rights report describes slavery in Sudan, stating:

. . . slavery persists, particularly affecting women and children. The taking of slaves, particularly in war zones, and their transport to parts of central and northern Sudan, continued. Credible reports persist of practices such as the sale and purchase of children, some in alleged slave markets . . . 10,000 to 12,000 slaves remain in captivity at year's end.

The Sudanese regime is also involved in the support of global terrorism. The National Commission on Terrorism reported in June 2000 that Sudan continues to support global terrorism by providing funding, refuge, training bases, and weapons to terrorists. The Sudan government was implicated in the 1995 assassination attempt on Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak. Nearly every major terrorist organization in the world is welcomed in Sudan.

Over the past decade, the U.S. has contributed over a billion dollars for relief and humanitarian aid for Sudan. I am glad that this legislation urges President Bush to promptly make available to the National Democratic Alliance \$10 million in non-lethal, non-military aid previously authorized by Congress.

The Bush Administration is making the right moves on Sudan, appointing USAID Administrator Andrew Natsios as special coordinator for humanitarian assistance, approving more aid for the suffering in Sudan, and indicating a willingness to make bringing a just peace to Sudan a priority. As the appointment of a special envoy for Sudan by the Bush Administration is imminent, I am hopeful that the U.S. will play a more aggressive and assertive role in achieving a real and just peace. But we also need to bear down on the Khartoum government to stop its aggression against the south and reach a lasting peace.

The actions of the Sudanese government regarding human rights abuses and religious persecution toward its own people cannot be tolerated. Far too long and in too many circumstances the repressive and intolerable governments of the world have been allowed to engage—unopposed—in widespread human rights and religious freedom violations that strike at the core of being evil. We in Congress have an obligation not to let these governments or regimes go unopposed.

The Sudan Peace Act addresses one of the greatest humanitarian issues of our day—over 2 million have died—and yet it is tough on the regime in Khartoum. I strongly support this legislation and urge a unanimous vote.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise, not only as a member of the Committee on International Relations, but as a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Just a few weeks ago, I had a chance to tour both NASDAQ and the New York Stock Exchange. These exchanges are not only the center of American capitalism and the American securities market, they will soon be the unchallenged center for a world capital market. They are critical to the large international oil companies, not just those based in the United States, but

those based in Europe and Japan as well. In fact, I think we will soon have a seamless market in which one invests through the two great exchanges of the United States in companies based anywhere in the world.

As others have said, it would simply be immoral if this great resource of the United States, our great securities markets, were to be used to raise capital, not just to do business from Sudan, but actually to support the Sudanese government. Because as others have pointed out, this is the source of money for this repressive regime. In fact, this is not just a repressive regime. This is the worst government in the world that benefits from substantial international investment. It is a country that practices a form of genocide and slavery, and that should not taint the American financial markets.

I will be back on this floor tomorrow to try to do everything I can to strengthen the American financial markets by reducing the fees that are imposed on each securities transaction. But as we strengthen these markets financially, we must also make them stronger morally and ethically. We can do that today by making sure that those companies that invest in the Sudanese oil sector do not take advantage of these increasingly important financial markets.

So I would hope that all of those who are concerned with the brutal mass murders and genocide in Sudan and all of those who are concerned with building the strongest possible financial markets in the United States would be here on this floor if a recorded vote is called to vote in favor of this amendment.

□ 1415

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, mainly because I do not think it is a good move to have the SEC internationalized to begin with, and to further internationalize it does not seem to make a whole lot of sense.

For one thing, cracking down more on foreign oil companies that are doing business in Sudan will not necessarily prohibit the benefits that may flow to the American oil companies if there is a change in government. We should not ignore that. We go to war over oil. We went to war over oil in the Persian Gulf, and certainly we had oil as an influence to send in many dollars and much equipment down into Colombia.

But just let me read from the bill. It says the Secretary of State will report back on a description of the sources and the current status of Sudan's financing and construction of infrastructure and pipelines for oil exploitation; the effects of such financing and construction of the inhabitants of the region. It goes on, which in a way does a

lot of research and benefit for our oil companies that may benefit. So I think oil is involved, but in quite a different way than I think we should be involved in dealing with the foreign oil companies today. So I am not going to support this amendment.

I would like to take another moment to mention something which is considered an esoteric point, but I consider very important, and that has to do with the authority to do these kinds of things that we are doing today, no matter how well intended. The committee report explains the authority, and the supporters of the bill says the authority comes from article one, section 8, clause 18. And they look to the right place. Article one, section 8 gives us our 18 enumerated powers that we are permitted to do. The clause 18 is the necessary and proper clause: to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

The foregoing powers were those 18 issued. To use this in a generalized sense means there is no constitution left. That means any power we want, we can do whatever we want. That was specifically designed to pass laws to enforce those 18 enumerated powers. So this bill, in spite of all the good intentions that we hope it will do, really undermines the whole concept of the Doctrine of Enumerated Powers.

And we should not take that lightly, although this generally is not of much interest to so many people because we do so much and we have such great hopes that it will always do so much good. From just observing history, recent history, the last 20, 30, 40 years since World War II, so often when we get involved and we send money to help the good guys, it is not infrequent the good things that we send in, goods and services and weapons, end up in the hands of the opposition and the enemy. So that is always a possibility once again. These commodities and services and the things that we send and the money may well end up literally being used against the people we are trying to help.

The other thing that we tend to ignore here is we concentrate on the good things that we are going to accomplish. Miraculously, we are going to solve this problem by putting \$10 million in today and \$100 million in the next 5 years, and everything is going to be solved. We do not think about it failing, because that would be a negative, and we do not want to think about that. We do not think about the Constitution, and we do not think about who pays. Somebody always has to pay. This is token. Who cares about \$10 million? When we take \$10 million out of the economy, there is somebody who suffered; somebody did not get a house or somebody lost a job. But they are not identifiable. They do not have a lobbyist. They are lost. But they are penalized. There is always a cost.

And even if we assume we have a surplus and the money is already in the

budget, we still should be concerned because we are making a choice. We are saying that we are going to take this money and take the risk of sending it over there. Maybe it will help. Maybe I am right, maybe it will not do quite as much good as we think, but we make a trade-off. We say today that we will send this money with the hope that it will do good at the expense of a domestic program. Do my colleagues think every poor person in this country has been taken care of, their medical care needs or housing? So we do make choices continuously, but we forget about that.

We never really think about the choices that we make, and there is always a trade-off. And we generally always forget about finding the point in the Constitution that gives us authority. In this case, this is the wrong authority, and it is not a proper interpretation of the Constitution as described in the committee report.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of the Bachus amendment, the amendment to prohibit any foreign company from raising capital or listing its securities in the U.S. markets as long as the company is engaged in oil and gas development in Sudan. Currently, the China National Petroleum Company, through its PetroChina subsidiary; Talisman Oil of Canada; Royal Dutch Shell, Netherlands; Lundin Oil, Sudan; and TOTAL NEL from France all list their stocks on the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ.

We have been talking about what more we can do. As we know, it is not the policy any longer to send U.S. troops abroad. If this were 50 years ago, 40 years ago, with the atrocities of this nature, we may have sent in an intervention group. We did it in Haiti, we did it in the Dominican Republic, we have done it around the world. But today is a different time, a different day, and we do not do that. So our resources are limited as to how we can force a dictatorial regime to change its ways.

I think we should cut off access to capital markets in this country. This country is the world's power economically, and the next war is going to be an economic war. We have moved ahead of the Euro, where it is 20 percent, 15 percent stronger than the Euro. This is where everyone is coming to get the money.

I wonder why some people serve in Congress. To hear a person talk about \$10 million as too much to spend, when if it was not for the Marshall Plan the world would still be trying to come out of the degradation of World War II. We spent billions and billions and billions of dollars to do the right thing because it was the right thing to do. When someone questions \$10 million that might go in to try to help a country build a social society or that a vehicle may be taken by the enemy, that is absolutely ludicrous, makes no sense; and

I do not know why some people even spend time in this House, because they have absolutely nothing to offer.

So I just think that it is imperative upon us to try to use the weapons that we have. We do not have military weapons any longer to go into countries. People wonder, well, why should we do this. Well, because this is supposed to be the land of the free, the home of the brave. We have the Statute of Liberty still standing there. We have to stand for something. When I hear people say why should we be concerned about the new independent states in Central Europe, it is because there has to be someone who is the moral leader of the world. We are in the responsible position.

It is like a basketball player. When I speak to young men like Iverson, who plays for the 76ers or a Carter, who plays with the Toronto Raptors, I say whether you like it or not, you are a role model. Young people look up to you; therefore you have a responsibility to act right, to do the right thing. Whether you like it or not, you are looked upon as something that other people want to follow. And this country is the one country in the world that other countries want to follow. We have a moral responsibility whether we like it or not.

We cannot move back from the world. We are the world, and we have a responsibility to remain the world's leader. If we cannot do any more than to cut a couple of oil companies off from Wall Street, then what can we do? This is a small thing we are acting on. It will not even have an impact on that trillion dollar industry that trades hundreds of billions of dollars daily, but it will have a massive impact on those companies who come here with blood dripping off their hands to get more money so that more blood will come dripping as they continue to push people from their lands so that they can fill their pockets with dollars.

At some point we have a moral obligation and a responsibility. The time is now. I urge support of the Bachus amendment.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to stress that this legislation is not directed against Islam. This legislation is directed against religious persecution, and this includes the issue of forced conversion. Again, I think we need to be clear. Congress is saying nothing here against the religion of Islam, which is an increasingly important part of our national fabric.

I think we need to be clear that what we are saying here with this bill and with this amendment that we are adding to the bill is that we are bringing attention to Sudan, we are addressing shortcomings in the delivery of humanitarian relief, and we are providing tools to the administration and the American public to attempt to end the massive suffering of the Sudanese people.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROYCE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, when someone stands in the well and questions the constitutionality of an amendment, then I think the Members ought to listen. I think they ought to take note, because that is a serious charge.

It would be a convincing argument if one was not familiar with the history of legislation in this body. If one was, they would know one of our first Congresses, which contained many men who signed the original constitution, that drafted it, imposed sanctions of a financial and capital nature against foreign fur trading companies. So the folks that drafted that and enumerated those powers then stood in this Congress and imposed such sanctions, and these sanctions have been imposed during several war periods.

It is particularly ironic that we would defend four foreign oil companies when we have in this body passed legislation, including fines and terms of imprisonment, if our oil companies go over there and drill. So it is quite ironic that we would impose these restrictions on our own oil companies for going overseas, and do that with a clear conscience, which I have, and yet allow their competition to go over there, kill innocent men, women and children, strafe hospitals, engage in all sorts of atrocities, and then not only look the other way when that happens, but we will allow them to raise the money to finance their operations in our capital markets, those same markets which restrict Americans from participating in and would not restrict the very bad actors who avoid the sanctions that we have now imposed. Truly an argument that I will never accept.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me again say that the underlying bill is a good bill. This is a strengthening amendment, and I rise in very strong support of it. This amendment is about stopping genocide. Mr. Chairman, the deliberate and systematic attempt to eliminate an entire people in southern Sudan, by cutting off the flow of U.S. dollars to entities that are making genocide possible.

The whole world knows, Mr. Chairman, that the Khartoum regime routinely bombs schools and hospitals, and uses enslavement, mass rape, and starvation as weapons of war against black Christians and animists in the south. The good news, until 1997, was that the south was likely to win its independence and an end to the bloodshed. However, then Khartoum got foreign companies from China, Malaysia, and even Canada to develop oil fields and build a pipeline.

□ 1430

The equation is simple: By selling oil to the west, Khartoum can buy an

army that can destroy the south and is destroying the south. We all know that the devastation is absolutely numbing and frightful. Two million people have been killed. Millions more have been wounded, and over 4 million people have been displaced.

Oil revenues have enabled the government to double spending on its war machine since 1998. The government has used roads and air strips built for oil projects to launch military attacks. As one Sudanese victim put it, "Oil has done nothing but bring us death."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and I have worked very hard to get New Jersey out of the mix with Talisman, which is a Canadian company. We held over 60,000 equities in that Talisman company as part of our New Jersey commitment to our State employees. Thankfully they got out of it, at some point kicking and screaming; but they are only one of many. There are many individual shareholders who will never read the disclosure information sent to them and maybe will not even care.

Mr. Chairman, we need to act in a collective manner that will have a high utility to say we want out. We want no part of this killing machine going on in Sudan. It is worth pointing out that the speaker of the Sudanese parliament does not make any bones about it. He said that the oil revenues will be used to buy war weapons. They are taking this oil revenue and buying guns and planes, and all kinds of other implements of destruction that are used against innocent men, women, and children.

The Talisman chief executive said that 70 percent of the oil revenue from the partnership will be going to the government. We are talking about a massive amount of money, \$500 million per year, being put into the coffers of this war machine.

Finally, let me say the Bachus-Hall-Smith amendment prohibits any foreign company from raising capital or listing its securities in U.S. markets as long as the company is engaged in oil development in Sudan. We have trade sanctions in place against Sudan, but foreign companies continue to invest in Sudan, and then they freely and openly raise money in the U.S. stock market and bond market to finance these activities.

Shame on us, Mr. Chairman, if we do not realize that we are facilitating the deaths of so many innocent children. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) should be commended as should the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and all of us who are trying to make some difference here to stop this facilitation.

Mr. Chairman, we can make a difference; and hopefully our European and other allies will follow suit. We must lead by example. That is what this amendment does.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me again say that the underlying bill is a excellent piece of

legislation. The Bachus-Hall-Smith strengthening amendment improves the Sudan Peace Act. This amendment is about stopping genocide, Mr. Chairman, the deliberate and systematic attempt to eliminate an entire people in southern Sudan, by cutting off the flow of U.S. dollars to entities that are making genocide possible.

The whole world knows, Mr. Chairman, that the Khartoum regime routinely bombs schools and hospitals, and uses enslavement, mass rape, and starvation as weapons of war against black Christians and animists in the south.

The good news, until 1997, was that the south was likely to win its independence and an end to the bloodshed. However, then Khartoum got foreign companies from China, Malaysia, and even Canada to develop oil fields and build a pipeline.

The equation is simple: By selling oil to the west, Khartoum can buy an army that can destroy the south and is indeed destroying the south. We all know that the devastation is absolutely numbing and frightful. Two million people have been killed. Millions more have been wounded, and over 4 million people have been displaced.

Oil revenues have enabled the government to double spending on its war machine since 1998. The government has used roads and air strips built for oil projects to launch military attacks. As one Sudanese victim put it, "Oil has done nothing but bring us death."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and I worked very hard a couple of years ago to get New Jersey out of complicity with genocide. We worked—and succeeded—in convincing state officials to divest its stock holdings of Talisman, which is a Canadian oil company. Before divestiture, New Jersey owned over 600,000 shares of Talisman. Thankfully, New Jersey got out, but New Jersey is only one of many institutional holders of this stock. There are many individual shareholders who own Talisman oblivious to its facilitation of genocide. Some argue mere disclosure is adequate. I respectfully disagree. Disclosure information sent to shareholders or potential buyers of the stock may or may not make any difference.

Mr. Chairman, we need to act in a collective manner in unison, if we are to help end this horrific slaughter. We want no part of this killing machine. It is worth pointing out that the speaker of the Sudanese parliament does not make any bones how oil money equals a more lethal military force. He has said that the oil revenues will be used to buy war weapons. The Sudanese dictatorship is taking oil revenues and buying weapons of every stripe to be used against innocent men, women, and children. We are talking about a massive amount of money, \$500 million per year, being put into the coffers of this war machine.

The bottom line is this I say to my distinguished colleagues. The Bachus-Hall-Smith amendment prohibits any foreign company from raising capital or listing its securities in U.S. markets as long as the company is engaged in oil development in Sudan. We have trade sanctions in place against Sudan, but foreign companies continue to invest in Sudan, and then they freely and openly raise money in the U.S. stock market and bond market to finance these activities.

Shame on us, Mr. Chairman, if we do not realize that we are facilitating the deaths of so

many innocent children. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Bachus) should be commended for crafting this humanitarian amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we can make a difference; and hopefully our European and other allies will follow suit. We must lead by example. We must be serious about ending the nightmare endured by the Sudanese people.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Bachus amendment and the underlying Sudan Peace Act. I come from Omaha, Nebraska, Mr. Chairman, and we have been blessed with new folks who have immigrated from Sudan. They have come to my office, and we have spent several hours together talking about the tragedies that these folks have lived through, escaped from and come to America, come to my hometown, and are now integral parts of our community of Omaha, Nebraska.

These stories, they are true. These people have suffered. Over the past 18 years, Sudan's Khartoum government has killed more than 2 million of its own citizens through this civilian war. This is more than the entire population of Nebraska. This is almost four times the population of this city that we stand in right now. Men, women, children, some of these folks that have come to my office that I have sat down with are young men, and to hear their stories of what they had to escape: starved, beaten, friends taken for slavery, executed because of their beliefs, whether they are Christian or a different sect of Islam. And the people they are escaping are those with the government-sponsored guns. The National Islamic Front has bombed civilian centers, camps, relief hospitals. They have blocked humanitarian aid such as food and medical supplies, tortured and killed those who refuse to convert to their brand of religion. These appalling attacks on human rights have created one of the greatest tragedies in the history of mankind.

Now this government is using profits from new oil development to accelerate this genocidal war. That is why I came here today to support the Bachus amendment. I stand up here in full support of it. This act, the Sudan Peace Act, will send a clear signal to the leaders of Sudan and those who wonder whether we care more about oil than people. It will tell the other civilized nations of the world that we also care about religious freedom, and to follow our example and stop financing this extremism.

It will open up those doing business with the Khartoum government to the crucible of public pressure and help ensure that humanitarian aid ends up in the hands of the people, not the government officials waging this war. I hope this legislation will help end the bloodshed and provide relief to those suffering Sudanese people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment and support the Sudan Peace Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHAW) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2052) to facilitate famine relief efforts and a comprehensive solution to the war in Sudan, pursuant to House Resolution 162, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 2, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]
YEAS—422

Abercrombie Bonilla Clyburn
Ackerman Bonior Coble
Aderholt Bono Collins
Akin Borski Combest
Andrews Boswell Condit
Army Boucher Conyers
Baca Boyd Cooksey
Bachus Brady (PA) Costello
Baird Brady (TX) Cox
Baker Brown (FL) Coyne
Baldacci Brown (OH) Cramer
Baldwin Brown (SC) Crane
Ballenger Bryant Crenshaw
Barcia Burr Crowley
Barr Burton Cubin
Barrett Buyer Culberson
Bartlett Callahan Cummings
Barton Calvert Cunningham
Bass Camp Davis (CA)
Becerra Cannon Davis (FL)
Bentsen Cantor Davis (IL)
Bereuter Capito Davis, Jo Ann
Berkley Capps Davis, Tom
Berman Capuano Deal
Berry Cardin DeFazio
Biggert Carson (IN) DeGette
Bilirakis Carson (OK) Delahunt
Bishop Castle DeLauro
Blagojevich Chabot DeLay
Blumenauer Chambliss DeMint
Blunt Clay DeMint
Boehlerl Clayton Diaz-Balart
Boehner Clement Dicks

Doggett Kennedy (RI)
Dooley Kerns
Doolittle Kildee
Doyle Kilpatrick
Dreier Kind (WI)
Duncan King (NY)
Dunn Kingston
Edwards Kirk
Ehlers Kleczka
Ehrlich Knollenberg
Emerson Kolbe
Engel Kucinich
English LaFalce
Eshoo LaHood
Etheridge Lampson
Evans Langevin
Everett Lantos
Farr Largent
Fattah Larsen (WA)
Fletcher Larson (CT)
Foley Latham
Ford LaTourette
Frank Leach
Frelinghuysen Lee
Frost Levin
Gallegly Lewis (CA)
Ganske Lewis (GA)
Gekas Lewis (KY)
Gephardt Linder
Gibbons Lipinski
Gilchrest LoBiondo
Gillmor Lofgren
Gilman Lowey
Gonzalez Lucas (KY)
Goode Lucas (OK)
Goodlatte Luther
Gordon Maloney (CT)
Goss Maloney (NY)
Graham Manullo
Granger Markey
Graves Mascara
Green (TX) Matheson
Green (WI) Matsui
Greenwood McCarthy (MO)
Grucci McCarthy (NY)
Gutierrez McCollum
Gutknecht McCrery
Hall (OH) McDermott
Hall (TX) McGovern
Hansen McHugh
Harman McInnis
Hart McIntyre
Hastings (FL) McKeon
Hastings (WA) McKinney
Hayes McNulty
Hayworth Meehan
Hefley Meek (FL)
Herger Meeks (NY)
Hill Menendez
Hilleary Mica
Hilliard Millender-
Hinchey McDonald
Hinojosa Miller (FL)
Hobson Miller, Gary
Hoeffel Miller, George
Hoekstra Mink
Holden Mollohan
Holt Moore
Honda Moran (KS)
Hooley Moran (VA)
Horn Murtha
Hostettler Myrick
Houghton Nadler
Hoyer Napolitano
Hulshof Neal
Hunter Nethercutt
Hutchinson Ney
Hyde Northup
Inlee Norwood
Isakson Nussle
Israel Oberstar
Issa Obey
Istook Oliver
Jackson (IL) Ortiz
Jackson-Lee Osborne
(TX) Ose
Jefferson Otter
Jenkins Owens
John Oxley
Johnson (CT) Pallone
Johnson (IL) Pascrell
Johnson, Sam Pastor
Jones (NC) Payne
Jones (OH) Pelosi
Kanjorski Pence
Kaptur Peterson (MN)
Keller Peterson (PA)
Kelly Petri
Kennedy (MN) Phelps

Pickering Udall (NM)
Pitts Upton
Platts Velazquez
Pombo Visclosky
Pomeroy Vitter
Portman Walden
Price (NC) Walsh
Pryce (OH) Wamp
Putnam Waters
Quinn Watkins (OK)
Radanovich
Rahall Whitfield

Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Flake Paul
Morella
Rush

NOT VOTING—8

Allen Filner
Dingell Fossella
Ferguson Johnson, E. B.

□ 1502

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 160, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

CONDEMNING TALIBAN REGIME OF AFGHANISTAN REQUIRING HINDUS TO WEAR SYMBOLS IDENTIFYING THEM AS HINDU

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 12, 2001, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 145) condemning the recent order by the Taliban regime of Afghanistan to require Hindus in Afghanistan to wear symbols identifying them as Hindu, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 145 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 145

Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights guarantee the freedom of religion;

Whereas on May 22, 2001, the Taliban regime of Afghanistan directed Hindus and other non-Muslims to wear a yellow identity symbol and for Hindu women to fully cover themselves in a veil;

Whereas this proposal is reminiscent of the yellow Star of David that Jews were forced to wear in Nazi Germany and Nazi-occupied areas;

Whereas Department of State spokesperson Richard Boucher condemned the Taliban action, stating that "forcing social groups to wear distinctive clothing or identifying marks stigmatizes and isolates those groups and can never, never be justified";

Whereas the Taliban regime recently defended the world by ordering the destruction of all pre-Islamic statues in Afghanistan, among them a pair of 1,600-year-old, 100-foot-tall statues of Buddha that were carved out of a mountainside;

Whereas the reprehensible policies of the Taliban are exacerbating the suffering of the people of Afghanistan who are already besieged by a devastating drought and the continued fighting in the region; and

Whereas the American people feel a great deal of sympathy for the people of Afghanistan and continue to provide humanitarian assistance to alleviate the suffering of the Afghan people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the Taliban's use of Nazi tactics to force Hindus in Afghanistan to wear symbols identifying them as Hindu;

(2) joins with people of all faiths around the world in standing against the religious persecution by the Taliban regime;

(3) demands the Taliban regime immediately revoke its order stigmatizing Hindus and other non-Muslims in Afghanistan and conform its laws to all basic international civil and human rights standards; and

(4) calls on the Government of Pakistan to use its influence with the Taliban regime to demand that the Taliban revoke the reprehensible policy of forcing Afghan Hindus and other non-Muslims to wear a yellow identity symbol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 12, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H. Con. Res. 145, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL). First, I would like to say that I appreciate the support of the chairman of our Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and the House leadership for making timely consideration of this resolution possible.

It was considered and ordered reported to the House by the full Committee on International Relations earlier this month.

This resolution we are considering condemns a recent order by the Taliban regime of Afghanistan to require Hindus in Afghanistan to wear symbols identifying them as Hindus, yellow symbols similar to the one I have on my lapel at this time.

Many of us are appalled and deeply concerned by this order. Our Nation and the rest of the world need to register the strongest possible condemnation of this outrageous regulation. As our resolution points out, the world has not been witness to anything like this since the Nazis required the Jews to wear a yellow Star of David.

The Taliban's repression of women and its intolerance of other minorities goes hand in hand with other reprehensible behavior. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Taliban provides Osama bin Laden, the terrorist kingpin, a safe haven, allowing him to reside in Afghanistan as its special guest. Bin Laden is responsible for much of the terrorist-related murder and mayhem that has shattered peace throughout the subcontinent. It is his thugs that killed our State Department employees and hundreds of other innocent people.

The Taliban and bin Laden appear to be made for one another. Moreover, the Taliban's involvement in taxing, stocking and the trafficking in opium make it responsible for much of the global misery related to drug addiction.

Finally, it is an open secret that Pakistan in many ways supports the Taliban. It is appropriate, therefore, that this resolution calls upon Pakistan to use its influence to demand that the Taliban revoke its edict that identifies Hindus and other non-Muslims.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I fully support H. Con. Res. 145 and I ask our colleagues to join us in support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 145, which was introduced by my friend and colleague from New York (Mr. ENGEL). This resolution condemns the Taliban regime of Afghanistan for their offensive and inhumane policies towards Hindus and other non-Muslims in Afghanistan, and it demands that the Taliban regime immediately revoke its edict issued on May 23 requiring Afghan Hindus to wear yellow identification badges and for Hindu women to cover themselves in a yellow veil.

This latest despicable action of this despicable regime is only the most recent of a long list of horrific human rights and religious freedom abuses committed by the Taliban against their own people. They have shut down schools, restricted education and have systematically discriminated against all women in Afghanistan.

Earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, the Taliban sparked international outrage by destroying the ancient Buddhist statues of Bamian. It is no accident that the international terrorist kingpin Osama bin Laden has found welcome haven in the land of the Taliban.

If these barbaric actions were not enough, the Taliban has now decided to emulate the most heinous and reviled regime of the 20th century, Hitler's Germany, by forcing Hindus and other non-Muslims to wear yellow identity badges.

The edict issued by the Taliban, Mr. Speaker, is reprehensible, and it clearly echoes Nazi German policies stigmatizing Jews and others. We cannot allow the Taliban to systematically oppress Afghan Hindus in such an eerily similar manner.

Afghanistan, Mr. Speaker, sits at the crossroads of Europe and Asia. For centuries, it has been one of the marketplaces of the world where traders of all countries and races and religions came together. This rich history and tradition of tolerance is being dismantled by this dark and brutal regime. The Taliban's actions, Mr. Speaker, are beyond comprehension. At a time when millions of Afghan people are on the edge of starvation and thousands of Afghan children are dying every day of

malnutrition, the Taliban are intent on driving away any international support through their offensive and inhumane policies.

Just last week, the Taliban expanded their restrictions on foreign aid workers, further limiting their movement and freedom and making it nearly impossible for its humanitarian workers to continue their efforts to bring relief to the people of Afghanistan. One must wonder if the Taliban are trying to commit genocide against their own people.

We cannot stand idly by and watch while the Taliban continued their reign of darkness and despair. We cannot countenance their deliberate attempt to undo centuries of civilization. We must find a way to stop this insane regime.

If there is one country left on Earth, Mr. Speaker, that seems to have any influence with the Taliban, it is the country of Pakistan. The government of Pakistan has been all too reluctant to use its influence with the Taliban and we are calling on the government of Pakistan to stand with the international community and call a halt to the reprehensible policies of the Taliban regime.

I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for introducing this resolution, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this resolution and as chair of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, I urge strong support for H. Con. Res. 145, and I want my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

□ 1515

This resolution was prompted by the Taliban's decree of May 22, forcing Hindus to wear identity labels such as this one on their clothing to brand and degrade this religious group even further.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this reprehensible policy is but a microcosm of the terrible actions taken by the Taliban against all minorities in Afghanistan. As the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination has stated, Afghanistan epitomizes the religious extremism, and it underscores that "the Taliban uses religion as a political tool in the interests of power and has taken an entire society hostage."

In January of this year, for example, the Taliban issued a decree to apply capital punishment to Afghans who converted from Islam to either Judaism or Christianity. Just a few months ago, in the aftermath of the Taliban's destruction of sacred statues, Amnesty

International reported that the Taliban massacred hundreds of civilians with impunity. On May 14 of this year, it was revealed that the Taliban has an ethnic cleansing manual to eliminate entirely the presence of religious minority groups in areas which are not yet under Taliban control.

Women have also felt the brunt of the Taliban's intolerance and extremism. According to Afghan women interviewed by a non-governmental organization in France, "women live like animals." Women are excluded from treatment by male doctors, who are the only ones allowed to practice medicine. Even when exceptions are made, because the woman is accompanied by her husband, doctors are still prohibited from actually touching the women, and this obviously limits the possibility of any meaningful medical treatment.

The Taliban's policy of treating women as subhuman is also reflected in decrees mandating that women must be accompanied by a male relative when leaving their homes and that they must be covered in the Taliban-approved dressing shown here. It says in Taliban-held areas of Afghanistan, women can rarely work outside the home, girls can attend only same-sex schools, and women can be beaten for not wearing this veil. It says, get up, stand up. Refusal to adhere to these rules will result in beatings.

The Taliban's intolerance and extremism has even spilled over to international humanitarian workers. Just a few weeks ago, the Taliban arrested U.N. aid workers in Afghanistan. Militants who fight for the Taliban and are loyal to terrorist Osama bin Laden have threatened to kidnap and even kill international aid humanitarian workers.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not render our unequivocal support for House Concurrent Resolution 145, we will be sending a message to the Taliban that it can continue to escalate the persecution and the repression that they are undergoing with impunity.

I ask Members to think of the Afghan women, such as this one pictured here, and vote with your conscience today. I ask you to think of the Hindus who are being required to wear yellow identification labels, such as this one. I ask Members to think about the plight of all minorities in Afghanistan and vote yes on this powerful resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 5½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the author of this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for yielding me time. I want to thank the gentleman, and the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) as well, for working with me so quickly for bringing this resolution to the floor.

As was mentioned by my colleagues, I too am wearing a yellow ribbon. In

fact, I have many yellow ribbons here, and I would like every Member of Congress to wear a yellow ribbon for today, since this resolution is on the floor today. I think if we all wore the yellow ribbons, it would be a very powerful symbolism of the fact that we stand with the oppressed people of Afghanistan, with the Hindus of Afghanistan, just the way during the terrible Nazi era, when the Jews were told that they had to wear the yellow star to identify them, to single them out from everyone else, all the Danes wore yellow stars of David and said that we are all Jews. I believe here in Congress, all of us should wear these yellow ribbons, and today we all should be Hindus and stand in solidarity with those oppressed people.

Mr. Speaker, just over 2 weeks ago, I heard the disturbing news that Afghanistan's Islamic Taliban regime had issued an edict requiring Afghan Hindus to wear yellow identification badges and Hindu women to fully cover themselves in a veil and for Hindu families to have curtains that are yellow or some such identification, clearly showing that they are different from everyone else.

This is absolutely an outrage. My colleagues have mentioned all the outrages of this Taliban regime, from Osama bin Laden getting cover there and planning his terrorist attacks all over the world from the safe confines of Afghanistan, being protected, by the Taliban's destruction of the Buddhist statues that were thousands of years old, to making it impossible for aid workers to help the starving people of Afghanistan. Indeed our country, the United States, is the leading country in terms of providing humanitarian aid for those starving people.

So what we are attempting to do here today is saying that the United States can make a difference. We can make a difference in providing humanitarian aid, so that the people of Afghanistan are not suffering because of their regime. And they are suffering, but we can make the suffering a little bit better. Also what happens in this Congress is listened to around the world. I think it is so important for us to take a moral stand.

Now, what the Taliban are doing is just an outrage that cannot be ignored. The Taliban's edict accompanies the 1999 law forbidding non-Muslims from living in the same houses as Muslims, from criticizing Muslims, and from building places of worship. This resolution calls upon, demands, that the Taliban regime immediately revokes its order stigmatizing Hindus in Afghanistan and to conform its laws to all basic international civil and human rights standards, and, of course, condemns the recent order by the Taliban regime to require Hindus to wear these different identification symbols.

Now, combined, these edicts have the effect of stigmatizing, separating, and disadvantaging the Hindus because of their religious beliefs. It should be

pointed out that when the Nazi edicts in Europe came against the Jews, initially it was just small edicts, and there were people that said, well, this is only a very minor thing, and it will pass.

I think we have learned from history that if we ignore these so-called minor things, they turn into catastrophes; and we do not want to ignore this because this is not minor, and it will get worse if the world just turns its back.

Now, to add insult to injury, according to the Taliban regime this action was taken, they say, to protect Hindus from the religious police, who often arrest Hindus for not following Muslim law or who beat Hindus for not conforming to Muslim law. This, of course, adds insult to injury, to claim they are putting in this oppressive law in order to protect the Hindu citizens. Obviously this is a bunch of nonsense.

This type of religious discrimination has no place in the world today. Forcing Hindus to wear distinctive clothing does nothing to protect Hindus from the religious police; rather it makes them more vulnerable to police and mob violence.

So, again, we cannot allow the Taliban to systematically oppress Afghan Hindus in such an eerily similar manner to the way the Nazis oppressed Jews, homosexuals, Romas, and others.

This is not the first time the Taliban has singled out Afghan Hindus. Prior to 1992, Afghanistan had a population of over 50,000 Hindus. Most fled due to anti-Hindu violence. There are now only 500 Hindus, approximately, left in Afghanistan, subject to the Taliban's edict.

The international community, including our friends and allies around the world have joined us in condemning the Taliban's edict; and Pakistan, one of only three countries recognizing the Taliban as a legitimate government, said that they deplore these discriminatory practices. That is why this resolution calls upon Pakistan to try to use its influence with Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues in solidarity with the Afghan Hindus; and again I would urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution, to come over, and we will give them ribbons so everyone can wear ribbons. Again, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who has been so gracious.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I would like to thank personally my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), for the leadership that he has demonstrated, even though he does have a beard now, like I used to have. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and I have worked on many causes together, and I would like to just begin my remarks today by reminding people that the gentleman

from New York (Mr. ENGEL) was a hero of the Muslim people in the Balkans who were finding themselves under torturous attack, and sometimes being murdered in great numbers, especially the people in Kosovo and other places in the Balkans. So today it is very fitting that the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) stands up and points out where another group of people are committing repression.

This time this is a Muslim group; but in the past, when Muslims have been attacked and their rights have been destroyed, he has been the first one to stand up and speak up for their rights. So this is not a religious determination. What we have today is a determination of principle, that we in this body stand together for human rights and are against the type of fanaticism that is demonstrated by the Taliban regime.

The same, of course, is true with the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). We have worked on many human rights issues. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and I have, of course, worked on the China policy as well; and the gentleman is one of the most renowned and most respected leaders on human rights in this body. As chairman of the Committee on International Relations, he made his mark.

But today this resolution condemns the Taliban regime, not just for what it is doing against Hindus, which is today what we were using as our hook to draw attention, and I will be wearing one of those yellow badges, but this is symbolic of the repression that the Taliban and the fanaticism that the Taliban have brought to Afghanistan.

As someone who spent considerable time in Afghanistan, I would say that I am probably the only Member of this body who actually at one point fought alongside with Afghans against the Russian troops during their long war against Russian occupation, and I found the Afghans not to be fanatics.

The Afghans were very devout in their religion, but they were not the fanatics that the Taliban portray today. In fact, I would like to let my colleagues know that, by and large, the Taliban were not and are not the Mujahadeen, which is a mistake that many people make.

Most of the Taliban leadership, as well as most of the Taliban, sat out the war against Russia in Pakistan. The Taliban means students, and they were in what supposedly were schools, although many of them were illiterate, being financed by the Saudis and the Pakistanis. That is where they were during the war, while many of the people who opposed them today were out fighting the Russians.

Many of the people who I was with are now being repressed by Afghans who were not out there fighting the Russians, who now call themselves the Taliban, as if they have some corner on the understanding of God. What the Taliban are doing is using Islam as a weapon for their own power.

We have seen this in other faiths as well. We have seen the fanatics and the charlatans use their religion, whether they are Christians or Muslims or whoever, in order to gain their own power.

□ 1530

Well, that is what has happened in Afghanistan. It is getting worse and worse, because the Taliban, ever since they have been in power, have allied themselves with the worst elements in the world, people who the Afghan people would have nothing to do with if they had some choice in their government.

Of course, as we know, 60 percent of the world's heroin has been growing in Afghanistan all of these years that the Taliban have been in power. The Taliban now tell us this year they are no longer growing any poppies, and the heroin production is down in their country. Of course, how convenient. At a time when they have a massive drought that has been going on in Afghanistan that has killed all of the crops, now they voluntarily are not growing any more poppies. How convenient. We will wait and see what happens when the water comes back whether or not they enforce this supposed edict.

Unfortunately, when we are talking about American relations with Afghanistan, what we have found over the last 8 years with the last administration, every time we had a chance to overthrow the Taliban, and I was involved with several organizations whose efforts were in that direction, the last administration, the Clinton administration, rode to the rescue at the last minute every time. That is unfortunate.

During the last 8 years while we gave refugee relief supplies to Afghanistan, those supplies, our foreign aid, the foreign aid we have been giving to Afghanistan and those poor suffering people of Afghanistan, they needed some help; but yet, the last administration saw to it that those supplies were only distributed in Taliban-controlled areas.

I can tell the Members that I fought tooth and nail, I went time and time again to the State Department, to try to see that those supplies were distributed in non-Taliban areas. But instead, the Clinton administration insisted that those supplies go to Taliban-controlled areas.

Why is that? I believe, and I have said this before, the last administration and unfortunately the United States, thus, had a covert policy of supporting the Taliban for a while, perhaps as part of some situation with Pakistan and the Saudis. I do not know.

But I would hope that the United States policy has changed, and that indeed our goal be the elimination of the Taliban regime and support for those Afghans who are struggling for their country and struggling to have a moderate and a decent government.

The Taliban had, by the way, rejected all elections as being incon-

sistent with Afghan tradition. There are a group of people today fighting against the Taliban whose goal and idea is to have an Afghanistan directed by the democratic process.

Commander Massoud and many others who fought against the Russians, Abdul Haq and his family who are fighting there, fought against the Russians, Pashtun as well as minority members, were fighting against the Taliban.

Our goal should be to be on the side of those people who want to replace that regime and to help those people. If we send supplies to Afghanistan, they should go to the people in need, whether they are with Taliban or not.

There is a group called the Knightsbridge organization headed by Ed Artis and Dr. James Law that have \$2 million worth of humanitarian supplies ready to go now to the people of Afghanistan, but they do not have the money for the transport, and they have not been given help because it might go to some non-Taliban areas.

So I would hope that we do what is right in this country, that we condemn this repression as exemplified by repression against the Hindus, but we put ourselves on the line against the Taliban and their fanaticism and support for terrorism and drug dealing.

It is time the people of Afghanistan deserve a break after these last 20 years of struggling.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), an indefatigable fighter across the globe.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), a strong voice for freedom and human rights, and my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), who, as the previous speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), pointed out, has been such a strong, strong courageous voice for human rights wherever they are undermined in the world.

Mr. Speaker, this week our Nation closed a chapter on the deadliest act of terrorism ever perpetrated on American soil. We were reminded again of the dangers of fanaticism, its assault on civil society, its attack on our values, its rejection of the rule of law. We were confronted again by the evil that works within the zealot's heart, where basic human decency is drowned in a sea of arrogance, ideology, and hatred.

As we attempt to heal the wounds caused by this madman at home, let us recognize that as the leader for democracy, freedom, and human rights throughout the world, we must fight fanaticism, bigotry, and hatred wherever it rears its head. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this critically important resolution introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Today the people of Afghanistan toil under the boot of the brutal Taliban regime, whose crimes, as have been catalogued earlier in this debate, are

legion. Since ceasing power in 1996, the Taliban has systematically denied Afghani women and girls their basic human rights. They are prohibited from attending school. They are prohibited from working outside the home. With few exceptions, they are prohibited from appearing in public with nonrelative males.

The Taliban's chokehold on the Afghani people has only tightened recently. It destroyed two ancient statues of Buddha, in spite of all the world's protests. It shut down a hospital opened by an Italian charity. It prohibited Afghani women from working with the international relief agencies, even as an estimated 4 million people are at risk of starvation this year in Afghanistan.

In an order reminiscent of Nazi Germany, the Taliban rulers decreed in May that all non-Muslims would have to wear an identifying label on their clothing to distinguish themselves.

Earlier in this debate, the experience of the Danes and the Jews was referenced. My father was born in Copenhagen. King Christian, when the edict came down from the Nazis, said "I will wear the Jewish star," and all Danes wore the Jewish star to indicate their solidarity with their Danish brethren, not distinguished by other forms of discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, through this resolution today we join the world community in condemning the Taliban regime for their flagrant human rights violations. As the leading voice for freedom and human rights throughout the world, it is our responsibility, it is our duty, it is our opportunity and our cause. We must state unequivocally the savaging of human rights by misanthropic fanaticism has no place in a civilized world, and it must not stand.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is an important statement, and we must join with others to confront this evil perpetrated by the Taliban.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), a member of our Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. It gives us an opportunity to at least condemn the Taliban in forcing the wearing of these symbols.

Sometimes I think, though, that this type of legislation is more feel-good legislation, makes us feel better, but does not do a whole lot to solve our problems. I think it would be more important to take this opportunity to think about our policy of foreign interventionism.

We have been involved in Afghanistan now for more than two decades, and have spent over \$1 billion. Last year we spent \$114 million in humanitarian aid. This year it is already \$124 million.

It is said that it is not sent to the Taliban, but the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), who is a bit of an expert on Afghanistan, just revealed to us earlier that indeed some of this money and some of this aid was designated to go to the Taliban-controlled areas.

I think more important is that regardless of the intention of where we send the aid, the aid is beneficial to the government in charge. The Taliban is in charge. They can get control of aid, of food and other commodities, and use it as weapons, and they do.

The point that I would like to make is after these many, many millions of dollars and over \$1 billion have been spent, we have come to this. They are in worse shape than ever. Yes, we can condemn what they are doing, but we should question whether or not our policy in Afghanistan has really served us well, or served the people well. It may well be that when we send aid, that it literally helps the Taliban, because they do not have to then buy food. They can take their money and use it to enforce these rules and to be a more authoritarian society, to buy weapons.

We do know that when we sent weapons in the eighties, those weapons actually ended up in the hands of the violent Taliban, and they are still in their hands to some degree. Yes, our policy is well-intended. We would like to do good and save all the suffering that is happening in this country. But quite frankly, it has not worked very well.

We should question this. I believe we should assume some responsibility in the sense that our aid does not always do what it was supposed to do and actually ends up helping the very people that we detest. I think that is exactly what has happened here. It has been specifically pointed out that some of this aid has gone into the area where the Taliban has been helped and strengthened.

All I am suggesting is, why not question this a little bit? Why should we go on decade after decade after decade expanding aid and getting these kinds of results that we all detest?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just respond to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL). While I am pleased he is supporting the resolution, he needs to gain some historical perspective. It was billions and billions of dollars of Marshall aid which resulted in the rebuilding of Western Europe and in creating our allies in NATO, and providing us with a prosperous Europe as our single most important trading partner.

So this melancholy call for isolationism is not supported by the historic evidence. The historic evidence shows clearly that in Republican and Democratic administrations, overwhelmingly United States participation in Europe and elsewhere contributed in a major way toward building democratic and prosperous societies.

I was present at the end of the Second World War, as my friend knows,

when Europe was in ruins, and it was the farsightedness of a group of Republican and Democratic leaders in this country, from Harry Truman to Senator Vandenberg, who created a framework which allowed the countries of Europe to rebuild themselves to become our powerful NATO allies, our democratic friends, and our most significant trading partners.

There is no evidence for the statement that the previous administration directed aid to go to the Taliban. This is an unsubstantiated statement. What we voted for and what I think we will vote again is to provide humanitarian assistance to the destitute people of Afghanistan. It is most unfortunate that the bulk of Afghanistan today is in the hands of this despicable regime.

But I think it is important to realize and to be true to historic facts that the bulk of our economic aid since the end of the Second World War has succeeded in creating prosperous and democratic societies ranging from Taiwan to Denmark. These were destroyed societies, poor societies, destitute societies, and American aid was critical in building them up as democratic and prosperous allies.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTOS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have time to get into the Marshall Plan, but there is a pretty strong case to indicate that the major part of the rebuilding of Europe came from private capital and not specifically from the immigration plan.

But the point that I would like to answer to is the term "isolationism." I am not a protectionist. I am not an isolationist. I am for openness, travel, trade. I vote consistently that way, so the term "isolationist" does not apply to the policies that I am talking about, because I am probably for more openness in trade and travel than most anybody in this body.

□ 1545

So the term is not isolationism.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations, my friend.

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me the time.

Firstly, let me thank the gentleman from the Bronx, New York (Mr. ENGEL), my friend and colleague, for authoring this resolution.

Let me thank the leadership and the Committee on International Relations and the leadership of the House for bringing this timely resolution to the floor so quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we must speak out quickly when tyranny raises its

ugly head; and, once again, it has raised in Afghanistan. To require any minority to wear any symbol harkens back to another age of the subjection of religious minorities, the coddling of terrorism, the destruction of world treasures.

We simply cannot let this go on without stating our opposition to that. It is shear, shear fascism. This fanaticism though has the potential to spread, unfortunately.

Having talked to some friends in the Bangladeshi community, their concerns that this could possibly spread to other moderate Muslim countries in the region is also a concern of mine.

This is a very, very difficult part of the world to begin with and to have this taking place there now is only going to exacerbate that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I will also wear this ribbon in remembrance of the Hindus of the Afghanistan.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for his strong support for this and other issues of human rights. We have worked together on many issues in Ireland, Bangladesh, and elsewhere; and we thank him for his poignant remarks today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 145 to condemn the treatment of Hindus in Afghanistan by the Taliban Government, and I wear my yellow badge.

It is a government that continues to commit blatant violations of human rights. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for introducing this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be one of the many original cosponsors. Since taking power over 90 percent of Afghanistan in the fall of 1996, the Taliban regime has restricted the freedoms of women by limiting their social participation, their work, and education. Not only do Hindu women have to wear the badge, they wear a veil. They are required to.

State Department and international human rights groups report that violence against women continues to be one of the regime's largest human rights violations. The Taliban regime has established a Ministry for the Promotion of Virtue and the Suppression of Vice to monitor how its moral laws are followed and to punish those who do not comply.

Individuals in violation have found their homes burned, livestock killed, irrigation systems destroyed. Over the past 2 years, more than a dozen politically active citizens have been arrested and killed by the Taliban regime.

Since its implementation, the protection and freedoms of women have been stripped, making women the property

of their husbands, their fathers, or the state.

Reports site acts of violence that include rape, kidnapping, and forced marriages that were in many cases perpetrated by the Taliban.

Most recently, the Taliban leaders have imposed laws mandating the public identification of all Muslims and that is this required yellow identification symbol. It echoes the feelings associated with the yellow star of David that Jews were forced to wear in Nazi Germany.

As we take a firm stand against human rights violations, we encourage other nations to recognize the Taliban leadership continues to violate United Nations Security Council resolutions and international standards as identified by Amnesty International.

As we recognize and respect the sovereignty of independent nations, we cannot remain silent when women and children are brutally murdered for not following the moral stands of a barbaric regime. We have acted to economically and politically isolate Afghanistan in efforts to eliminate human rights violations, but the world must also follow suit.

Earlier this year, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and I introduced H.R. 1152, the Human Rights Information Act, in an effort to expose human rights abusers outside the United States. As a world leader, the United States must condemn religious persecution and gender-based discrimination. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 145. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for floor managing the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for bringing this issue to the floor and indeed the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for introducing this very important issue.

Let us all support H. Con. Res. 145.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for her strong supportive remarks and for always being there on human rights situations.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), my friend and colleague.

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the cochair of the India Caucus to support this initiative. Today we all wear the yellow in emulation of the Danish king who said we are all Danes. There are not Jews and Catholics and Protestants, we are all Danes. But what this means is not that we are Hindus, but that we are all human beings.

When we fail to keep that clearly in mind, when we mix religion and gov-

ernment and get it all mixed up, we wind up with some very terrible situations. We cannot just look out at the Taliban. We have to look at ourselves, because Martin Niemoller, who was a Lutheran minister who died in the camps in the 1940s said, When they came for the Communist, I was not a Communist, so I did not stand up. When they came for the homosexuals, I was not a homosexual, so I did not stand up.

When they came for the socialists, I was not a socialist, so I did not stand up. When they came for the trade unionists and the Catholics, I did not stand up and when they came for the Jews, I did not stand up.

Then they came for me, and there was no one to stand up.

What this is about is all of us standing up for the right of people to have their own religion and to live in peace in a country where they can raise their children as they want to and not force anybody to do anything.

We must look at that separation of church and state in our own country. We will consider out here soon the issue of faith-based initiatives and what that does to the separation of church and state.

All we have to do is look at Afghanistan to see what happens when we meld the two together. That is a frightening possibility, and it starts one at a time. As it did in Germany. They did not go out and get the Jews first and grab them all. They started with a lot of other people that they did not like, and that is why this is so important that everyone wear this, not just today, but in their mind every day.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my neighbor, friend and colleague, an indefatigable fighter for human rights.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding the time to me, and I want to commend him and the majority side of the Committee on International Relations for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor.

This committee has challenged the conscience of this Congress and of our country on many occasions. Today I am sorry I missed the debate on Sudan but will be submitting a statement on the record for that.

But I also want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for his leadership in introducing this resolution. I am proud to be an original sponsor of it.

In his dear colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) calls what is happening in Afghanistan a horror, a horror. That is a perfect word for it.

The Taliban in their activities that I will talk about a bit and that our Members have addressed over and over again today, their activities there have placed them outside the circle of civilized human behavior.

It is very important that people in the rest of the world speak out; the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) gives us that opportunity here today. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

We have written, under the leadership of the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), to the President of the United States because we were concerned about this yellow badge that the Hindus were obliged to wear in Afghanistan. We are appreciating his considering our request that our Nation lead in its opposition to this dangerous, dangerous plan.

Mr. Speaker, much has been stated on the floor of this House about our commitment to religion and the free expression of religion, and that is why it is so important that we all join the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the committee and join with people of all faiths around the world in standing against the religious persecution by the Taliban regime.

The gentleman's resolution strongly condemns the Taliban's use of Nazi tactics to force Hindus in Afghanistan to wear symbols identifying them as Hindus. These are strong words. But these are terrible actions, and this is how we can meet this challenge.

So I am pleased to be, as I said, an original cosponsor. I commend the maker of the motion, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Engel). I once again applaud the Committee on International Relations for challenging the conscience of this Congress. Hopefully our whole country will rise to that challenge.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the opportunity to have the last comments.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has the right to close.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for bringing this important resolution to our attention. I trust that we will have a unanimous consent vote which would reflect the views not only of the Congress but of the American people that we do not stand for religious discrimination or persecution in any form. I urge all of my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Taliban regime is a threat to the stability not only of the Asian regime but the entire world. Our Nation needs to join with other nations that are seeking to reinstate that regime.

The former king of Afghanistan has suggested that all of the parties come together in Afghanistan for a grand as-

sembly known as a Loya Jirga. This could be an appropriate way to bring peace to that Nation.

Another method could be to work with the Northern Alliance that has been opposing the Taliban. No matter what route our Nation takes, we must help to restore stability through the formation of a representative form of government in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with our colleagues on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to approve H. Con. Res. 145.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I rise today to talk about an issue that concerns me greatly—the recent actions of the Taliban regime.

I visited Afghanistan nearly 25 years ago. I was impressed by the resilient independence of its people. I deeply lament the destruction of art and the censorship of literature.

The giant statues of Bamiyan, which I had the privilege of seeing and admiring long ago, have been demolished.

All of this is very lamentable, but the recent violations of human rights and religious freedom must be condemned as crimes of a higher order.

Last month, the Taliban Islamic militia imposed a rigid new social code requiring Hindus in Afghanistan to wear a distinctive yellow piece of cloth identifying them as Hindus. The similarities between this recent action and those of pre-war Nazi regimes are disturbing.

Even more disturbing are the other similarities between pre-war Nazi Germany and the Taliban militia.

From what we have seen, the government of Afghanistan is waging a war on its certain members of its populace—particularly women and religious minorities. Before the Taliban took power in 1996, the women of Afghanistan had relative freedom: they could work, even as professionals, dress generally as they wanted, and drive and appear in public alone. Under the Taliban, women have lost not only these "privileges" but also all their rights as persons.

Now, the women of Afghanistan must ensure that not even an inch of their flesh shows; they must screen the windows of their homes so they cannot be seen, or see.

Women can no longer work and are forbidden to go out in public without a male relative. Even in their own homes, they are not allowed to be heard; they must wear silent shoes and obey and serve silently.

The slightest violation of the Taliban law is punishable by beating and stoning, often to death.

And now the Taliban regime has turned its hatred toward religious minorities. Recently, the world watched in horror as the Taliban militia destroyed ancient Buddhist statues, simply because they were of another religion.

And now, we are witnessing the Taliban's policy to mark its religious minorities. I fear what this action will lead to.

We already know what it can lead to.

Calling the Taliban's actions a "human rights violation" is a gross understatement.

We must—the world must—condemn it.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution which not only condemns the Taliban's use of Nazi tactics, but it also demands that the Taliban regime immediately revoke its order stigmatizing Hindus and other non-Mus-

lims in Afghanistan and conform its laws to all basic international civil and human rights standards.

We must not be silent on these atrocities.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 145. Recently, the Taliban in Afghanistan has issued a decree that all non-Muslims should wear a yellow identity symbol in addition to the requirement that women must fully cover themselves in a veil. This decree, although affecting all in Afghanistan, is directly targeted toward a minority Hindu population. It is unthinkable that we, here in America, would remain silent while religious persecution is actively promoted. Furthermore, this sort of action by the regime is reminiscent of previous leaders and governments that also set out a path of differentiation between people. In many of these cases, including the Nazis coercing Jews into wearing a yellow Star of David, a small action such as this, was only the precursor for larger, more violent forms of discrimination.

In addition, the Taliban has ordered the destruction of all pre-Islamic statues in Afghanistan, including a pair of 1600-year-old, 100-foot statues of Buddha that were carved out of a mountainside.

I find no other choice but to rise up with my colleagues to condemn these actions and to condemn the Taliban. I join with all people from around the world, people of all faiths and nationalities, to denounce this latest action of religious discrimination by the Taliban in Afghanistan.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for H. Con. Res. 145. I commend my colleague Mr. ENGEL, for introducing this important piece of legislation that condemns the Taliban for requiring Hindus and non-Muslims in Afghanistan to wear identifying symbols.

The Taliban regime's policies are inhuman, and clearly resonate Nazi tactics used to stigmatize Jews during the Holocaust. The Taliban policies are reprehensible, and not only should this Congress and the international community condemn the Taliban for their action against Hindus, I also call upon Pakistan to take a stand and use its influence with the Taliban to end these reprehensible policies.

The Taliban's record on human rights and support for terrorism have been documented in several reports, including the U.S. State Department's Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000 Report. The findings in these reports on the Taliban exemplify a clear pattern of basic human and civil rights to the Afghan people, especially women, minorities and children. The statistics of violence against women and girls is simply overwhelming.

Not only is the Taliban's record on human rights atrocious, the State Department's Patterns of Global Terrorism reports that "The Taliban continued to provide a safe haven for international terrorists, particularly Osama bin Laden and his network, in the portions of Afghanistan it controlled." Not only does the Taliban house Osama bin Laden, the Taliban allows Afghanistan to be used for a base of operation for worldwide terrorist activities and training.

The people of Afghanistan are being held hostage in their own country under the terrorist regime of the Taliban. Their recent policy of requiring Hindus to wear identification badges, mandating Hindu women to fully

cover themselves in veil, demanding Hindu homes to be identified, and prohibiting Muslims and Hindus to live together all further exacerbate the current situation and indicate that the Taliban is trying to implement a genocide against their own people.

I urge Pakistan to step up to the plate and use its influence to allow Afghan Hindus to continue to live their lives and practice their religious beliefs and I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 145, which condemns the Afghanistan Government for requiring non-Muslims to wear identifying symbols and other acts of human rights violations.

A recent order by the Taliban regime of Afghanistan to require Hindus and other non-Muslims in Afghanistan to wear symbols identifying them as non-Muslim is very disturbing.

It is inconceivable that after the experience of World War II, when Jewish members of European countries were forced to wear the Star of David as a means of identifying their religious beliefs that we should see this type of action again on the part of any government.

Women, minorities, and children suffer disproportionately. The U.S. State Department's Country Report on Human Rights Practices found that violence against women and girls in Afghanistan occurs frequently, including beatings, rapes, forced marriages, disappearances, kidnappings, and killings.

Amnesty International's Report 2001, covering events from January–December 2000 and issued May 30, 2001, states in its findings on Afghanistan that:

Human rights abuses, including arbitrary detention and torture, continued to be reported in the context of the ongoing conflict between warring factions. The Taliban continued to impose harsh restrictions on personal conduct and behavior as a means of enforcing their particular interpretation of Islamic law. Fighting in the northern provinces intensified during the second half of the year as the Taleban and anti-Taleban forces fought for control of territory. Forced displacement of the civilian population was used by the Taleban to gain control of territory in areas north of Kabul, creating a severe humanitarian crisis.

The Taliban has repeatedly interfered with United Nations relief programs and workers, preventing the provision of much-needed food and emergency relief services to the people of Afghanistan.

There are more than 25 million internally displaced persons within Afghanistan, and more than 2 million refugees who have left the country.

The Taliban's Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan, headed by Mullah Mohammad Omar, is recognized as a government by only three countries, including Pakistan, the United Arab Emirates, and Saudi Arabia. Of the three, Pakistan's relations with the Taliban are the most extensive, including military and economic assistance. The anti-Taliban alliance's Islamic State of Afghanistan, headed by Burhanuddin Rabbani, is recognized as a government by other governments and the United Nations. According to the State Department's report Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000, issued in April 2001, "The Government of Pakistan increased its support to the Taliban."

According to the State Department's Patterns of Global Terrorism:

The Taliban continued to provide safehaven for international terrorists, particularly Usama Bin Ladin and his network, in the portions of Afghanistan it controlled.

On May 29, 2001, a jury in Federal District Court in Manhattan convicted four bin Laden followers on all 302 counts they faced in connection with the August 7, 1998, bombings at the U.S. Embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, which killed 224 people, including 12 Americans, and wounded thousands.

The State Department's Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000 report states:

Islamic extremists from around the world including North America, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and Central, South, and Southeast Asia continued to use Afghanistan as a training ground and base of operations for their worldwide terrorist activities in 2000. The Taliban, which controlled most Afghan territory, permitted the operation of training and indoctrination facilities for non-Afghans and provided logistics support to members of various terrorist organizations and mujahidin, including those waging jihads (holy wars) in Central Asia, Chechnya, and Kashmir.

On October 15, 1999, the U.N. Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 1267, in which it demanded that the Taliban in Afghanistan turn over Osama bin Laden, in order that he might be brought to justice, and required the Taliban to cease the provision of sanctuary and training for international terrorists and their organizations. The Taliban took no steps to comply with the Security Council's demands.

The willful act of segregating groups in any society based on their innate human differences is wrong, it was wrong in the southern United States before the civil rights movement forced a change in our Nation's policy regarding African-American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian members of our society. It was wrong for South Africa to impose apartheid on the majority African and Indian population, and it is wrong for Afghanistan. The 56th session of the United Nation's Commission on Human Rights reported that a constitutional vacuum exists in Afghanistan. The Taliban government acknowledges the need for a constitution that would encompass an inclusive process, which would enable all segments of the Afghan population to participate in working out an acceptable constitutional framework and procedures for its acceptance and approval by the Afghan people.

There continues to be a denial to women of access to education, health and employment. The rights of women have been curtailed by limitation on their freedom of movement of women, with little access to employment or education. I have also heard about refugees stories concerning refugees and reports that chronicle the abduction of women, rape, infliction of the punishment of stoning, lashing, and other forms of inhuman punishment.

I would strongly encourage the Taliban government to rethink this decision along with their treatment of women in light of the strong negative connotations that are implied by their action. I do not reject the right of the Afghanistan people to self-determination, but I do reject any attempt to abuse women or to ostracize members of their diverse society.

The road that they are traveling on has been traveled on before with dire consequences for those who attempted to enforce

laws and policies based on prejudice or fear. The intent of the government may not be to take action against these religious groups, but the end result could indeed lead to untold violence against others because they worship God in their own way.

America was willing to aid the Afghan people in their struggle for freedom from the former Soviet Union. Our Nation's support came from our shared interest in stopping the violence that was being committed against their people because of their deep faith in God expressed in their commitment to Islam.

I would ask that the Taliban not forget their history with those who were intolerant of them, and remember that a nation like the United States gains its strength from the diversity of the people who call her home.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 12, 2001, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—420

Abercrombie	Burton	DeLauro
Ackerman	Buyer	DeLay
Aderholt	Callahan	DeMint
Akin	Calvert	Deutsch
Andrews	Camp	Diaz-Balart
Armey	Cannon	Dicks
Baca	Cantor	Dingell
Bachus	Capito	Doggett
Baird	Capps	Dooley
Baker	Capuano	Doolittle
Baldacci	Cardin	Doyle
Baldwin	Carson (IN)	Dreier
Ballenger	Carson (OK)	Duncan
Barcia	Castle	Dunn
Barr	Chabot	Edwards
Barrett	Chambliss	Ehlers
Bartlett	Clay	Ehrlich
Barton	Clayton	Emerson
Bass	Clement	Engel
Becerra	Clyburn	English
Bentsen	Coble	Eshoo
Bereuter	Collins	Etheridge
Berkley	Combest	Evans
Berman	Condit	Everett
Berry	Conyers	Farr
Biggert	Cooksey	Fattah
Bilirakis	Costello	Finer
Bishop	Cox	Flake
Blagojevich	Coyne	Fletcher
BlumenaUER	Cramer	Foley
Blunt	Crane	Frank
BoehlerT	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Crowley	Frost
Bonilla	Cubin	Gallegly
Bonior	Culberson	Ganske
Bono	Cummings	Gekas
Borski	Cunningham	Gephardt
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Gibbons
Boucher	Davis (FL)	Gilchrist
Boyd	Davis (IL)	Gillmor
Brady (PA)	Davis, Jo Ann	Gilman
Brady (TX)	Davis, Tom	Gonzalez
Brown (FL)	Deal	Goode
Brown (OH)	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Brown (SC)	DeGette	Gordon
Bryant	Delahunt	Goss

Graham	Markey	Sabo
Granger	Mascara	Sanchez
Graves	Matheson	Sanchez
Green (TX)	Matsui	Sandlin
Green (WI)	McCarthy (MO)	Sawyer
Greenwood	McCarthy (NY)	Saxton
Grucci	McCollum	Scarborough
Gutierrez	McCrery	Schaffer
Gutknecht	McDermott	Schakowsky
Hall (OH)	McGovern	Schiff
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Schrock
Hansen	McInnis	Scott
Harman	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner
Hart	McKeon	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	McKinney	Sessions
Hastings (WA)	McNulty	Shadegg
Hayes	Meehan	Shaw
Hayworth	Meeks (NY)	Shays
Hefley	Menendez	Sherman
Herger	Mica	Sherwood
Hillery	Millender-	Shimkus
Hilliard	McDonald	Shows
Hinches	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Hinojosa	Miller, Gary	Simmons
Hobson	Miller, George	Simpson
Hoefel	Mink	Skeen
Holden	Mollohan	Skelton
Holt	Moore	Slaughter
Honda	Moran (KS)	Smith (MI)
Hooley	Moran (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Horn	Morella	Smith (TX)
Houghton	Murtha	Smith (WA)
Hoyer	Myrick	Snyder
Hulshof	Nadler	Solis
Hunter	Napolitano	Souder
Hutchinson	Neal	Spence
Hyde	Nethercutt	Spratt
Inslee	Ney	Stark
Isakson	Northup	Stearns
Israel	Norwood	Stenholm
Issa	Nussle	Strickland
Istook	Oberstar	Stump
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Stupak
Jackson-Lee	Oliver	Sununu
(TX)	Ortiz	Sweeney
Jefferson	Osborne	Tancredo
Jenkins	Ose	Tanner
John	Otter	Tauscher
Johnson (CT)	Owens	Tauzin
Johnson (IL)	Oxley	Taylor (MS)
Johnson, Sam	Pallone	Taylor (NC)
Jones (NC)	Pascrell	Terry
Jones (OH)	Pastor	Thomas
Kanjorski	Paul	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Keller	Pelosi	Thornberry
Kelly	Pence	Thune
Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (MN)	Thurman
Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (PA)	Tiahrt
Kerns	Petri	Tiberi
Kildee	Phelps	Tierney
Kilpatrick	Pickering	Toomey
Kind (WI)	Pitts	Towns
King (NY)	Platts	Trafficant
Kingston	Pombo	Turner
Kirk	Pomeroy	Udall (CO)
Klecza	Portman	Udall (NM)
Knollenberg	Price (NC)	Upton
Kolbe	Pryce (OH)	Velazquez
Kucinich	Putnam	Visclosky
LaFalce	Quinn	Vitter
LaHood	Radanovich	Walden
Lampson	Rahall	Walsh
Langevin	Ramstad	Wamp
Lantos	Rangel	Waters
Largent	Regula	Watkins (OK)
Larsen (WA)	Rehberg	Watson (CA)
Latham	Reyes	Watt (NC)
LaTourette	Reynolds	Watts (OK)
Leach	Riley	Waxman
Lee	Rivers	Weiner
Levin	Rodriguez	Weldon (FL)
Lewis (CA)	Roemer	Weldon (PA)
Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)	Weller
Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)	Wexler
Linder	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen	Wicker
LoBiondo	Ross	Wilson
Lofgren	Rothman	Wolf
Lucas (KY)	Roukema	Woolsey
Lucas (OK)	Roybal-Allard	Wu
Luther	Royce	Wynn
Maloney (CT)	Rush	Young (AK)
Maloney (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Young (FL)
Manzullo	Ryun (KS)	

Hoekstra	Johnson, E. B.	Lowey
Hostettler	Larson (CT)	Meek (FL)

□ 1622

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 145, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CALIFORNIA'S ENERGY CRISIS

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, the California delegation, 52 strong, including our two United States Senators, Republicans and Democrats, met with the Vice President. The subject of the meeting was energy.

Californians are reeling from the sticker shock in the bills that they are receiving. We know that the Federal Energy Commission has said that there is gouging. We know that there is gaming. Californians are hurt and hurting badly by this.

I will place into the RECORD as part of what I am saying this morning a report that has come out from CNN. It is entitled "Power of advertising fights electricity rate caps".

Well, together with the White House and the GOP majority in the House, those gouged prices from Californians are now going to be put into an advertising campaign. The dollars that we are paying are going to be placed into an advertising campaign to try to defeat price relief in California.

This is an outrage, and it is an equivalent to what the tobacco companies did as they tried to wage their war on America and say that tobacco was good. This is an outrage, and we are going to fight this.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article that I referred to earlier as follows:

POWER OF ADVERTISING FIGHTS ELECTRICITY RATE CAPS

WORRIED GOP, WHITE HOUSE GIVE BLESSING TO UTILITIES' CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN

(By Major Garrett)

WASHINGTON (CNN).—Major U.S. utility companies—at the behest of senior congressional Republicans and with White House approval—will launch a multimillion-dollar advertising campaign this week to fight federal

caps on electricity prices in California, several sources tell CNN.

No exact dollar figure has been set for the television campaign, but congressional and administration sources said the first phase will cost less than \$5 million and run only in California. Media buyers for the utilities will also purchase airtime on Spanish-language television.

"Every penny right now will be spent in the Golden State," said a source intimately involved in the ad campaign.

Over time, the utilities' ad campaign could easily cost more than \$10 million. Leading congressional Republicans have urged the entire energy industry to spend upwards of \$50 million on the ads—or about as much as the tobacco industry spent to defeat comprehensive tobacco legislation in 1998.

Congressional GOP leaders have issued dire, albeit private, warnings to the energy industry that they may not be able to block legislation imposing caps on prices or other measures designed to give the federal government a greater role in setting rates for wholesale electricity, oil or natural gas.

The ad campaign reflects a deepening sense of dread among congressional Republicans that the Bush energy policy, while long on specifics, has failed to address short-term political pressure on Republicans.

Republicans inside and outside of Congress tell CNN they are terrified about confronting a summer of Democratic attacks on energy prices as they gear up for re-election campaigns. The concerns are all the more acute because of the GOP's narrow, five-seat House majority and fear among Senate Republicans that they could lose more ground to the Democrats in next year's elections.

The final straw for many House and Senate Republicans was Mr. Bush's trip to California, which, in effect, put the issue of price caps in the spotlight.

"It was a total disaster," said an adviser to the House Republican leadership. "He came out there to let every Californian, including Republicans, know he was against price caps. Now everyone in California knows (Democratic Gov.) Gray Davis is for them and the president is not."

What's worse, several senior Congressional Republican sources told CNN, the White House returned from the trip thinking the president had the upper hand.

"It's ludicrous," said another House Republican. "Members have lost confidence in their ability to understand how this issue is affecting us."

Congressional Republicans will not play any role in the content or overall strategy of the campaign. Neither is the White House involved. But House and Senate GOP leaders have shared their concerns with top White House officials, among them Mr. Bush's senior political adviser, Karl Rove.

"The White House is aware and approving of the effort," said a senior Senate Republican aide.

House Republican leaders, beset by complaints from rank-and-file Republicans about the beating they're taking on the energy price issue, have been demanding action from energy companies to make the public case against price caps or other controls on energy markets. Chief among the advocates has been House Majority Leader Tom DeLay of Texas.

DeLay and his wife, Christine, dined with President Bush and the first lady on Wednesday. Sources close to the situation said the evening was mostly social, but they added that DeLay expressed concerns about the withering attacks the House GOP has been absorbing from Democrats on the energy issue.

NOT VOTING—12

Allen	Ferguson	Fossella
Burr	Ford	Hill

From news conferences to special orders on the House floor, Democrats have blasted Republicans as allies of big energy conglomerates and as unwilling to question high energy prices.

The White House, sources inside and outside the administration tell CNN, has gotten the message. Senior advisers convened an emergency "California energy message" meeting Thursday to discuss future strategy. The meeting involved Rove, White House counselor Karen Hughes and senior advisers from the president's economic team and the Energy Department.

The political danger for Republicans has become so pronounced that House GOP leaders pulled an energy bill sponsored by Republicans Rep. Joe Barton, R-Texas, because they could not be sure they could kill a Democratic attempt to add energy price caps in California to the legislation.

Similarly, senior Senate Republicans aides said a push for electricity price caps in California could prove unstoppable if the issue comes to the floor. With Senate Democrats eager to push other matters first—such as HMO reform—the price cap issue will probably not make it to the Senate floor until congress returns from its Fourth of July recess.

At a recent gathering of Senate Republicans, one top senator said there "wasn't five votes" among Republicans to block price caps on electricity in California.

Last week, House Majority Leader Dick Armey, R-Texas, and Conference Chairman J.C. Watts, R-Oklahoma, sparred publicly over whether to hold hearings into energy prices. Armey said the exercise was "nonsense." Watts said he wanted energy companies to at least explain price fluctuations so the public would see that Republicans were at least willing to hold them accountable to consumers.

"We're not fighting fire with fire," said one exasperated senior House Republican aide. "This is a war and if the energy companies don't step up to the plate, we can't stop bad things from happening anymore. They have to be willing to fight and fight on the air."

Before the emergency White House meeting California, top White House communications aides sent a memo to all congressional Republicans last week advising that they should no longer use the phrase "price caps" but "price controls."

The theory behind the semantics, Republicans say, is that price caps sound consumer-friendly and nonthreatening, while price controls sound bureaucratic and meddlesome. The White House has long argued that price caps in California—or anywhere else—would distort markets.

This distortion, the White House has argued, would artificially lower prices, encourage consumption and diminish the supply of energy that can be profitably brought to market.

Republican sources said several utilities will participate in the advertising and that the thrust of the pitch would be that government interference in energy markets would, in the case of California, bring more blackouts.

The campaign may, in later stages, remind viewers of the gas lines in the 1970s, which many energy economists say were brought on by price controls that drastically reduced the supply of gasoline and by consumers hoarding gasoline, frightened of never having enough.

"We've been carrying their water for a long time," one Republican said of the energy industry. "And now they're going to have to provide some air cover."

The one irony is that energy economists have of late forecast that gasoline prices—

which were feared to be headed well above \$2 per gallon—will likely drop later this summer and that the energy crisis in California may not be as acute as anticipated.

The main reason, these economists say, is that high prices for gasoline and electricity sparked widespread conservation that has boosted supplies of gasoline and taken pressure off California's electricity needs.

But that doesn't mean the political equation has changed.

"Members are scared to death," said another senior House Republican aide. "They are going to be redistricted this year and they will have to sell themselves to some new voters next year. They need to be able to tell them what they did about energy."

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

SPEAKING OUT FOR RURAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, tonight we would like to pay tribute to rural America and to particularly highlight the efforts of the 140-member Congressional Rural Caucus. We have pledged ourselves to having attempts to preserve rural America, and I commend my cochairman of this caucus, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for their leadership and dedication to the rural caucus on issues that matter to rural residents across this country.

Our job as members of the Congressional Rural Caucus is to promote economic and social policies that support the continued viability of our rural communities. In many instances throughout my State of Kansas our rural communities continue to struggle. We continue to see populations in once-thriving communities decline across the Great Plains. Of 105 Kansas counties, 61 have smaller populations today than in 1900; 82 Kansas counties have lost population since just 10 years ago; and 65 counties are predicted to lose population in the next 10 years.

Kansas communities are confronted with serious challenges of prosperity and survival. While working on the farm bill, Mr. Speaker, we hope there will be a strong component for rural development in that farm bill. And as parts of the rural caucus, I chair the task force on telecommunications. Seems awfully important for us to make certain that the provisions that are often available in more urban areas of our country are made available in rural communities as well. Our communities' survival depend upon access to increasing technology.

Mr. Speaker, by providing one voice for rural America, the Congressional

Rural Caucus will ensure that rural communities will remain viable and competitive. Our job in Congress is to raise the awareness of rural issues and to preserve that way of life. As Congress debates important issues like rural development in the farm bill, and access to telecommunication technologies, we must address the opportunities and challenges that we face in rural America.

Rural Americans across the country need us to demonstrate our commitment for a better quality of life, and I urge my colleagues to join us in this fight and to speak out for rural America.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the number one industry in the State of Montana. That is why the two pieces of legislation I introduced, along with the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) are so important to me and to rural America.

The heart of America is her rural communities. The Montana farmers and ranchers who work the soil understand that our State's motto, Oro Y Plato, gold and silver, is truly the gold of ripe wheat fields and the silver of water resources. The harvest of the farmer and rancher translate into the gold and silver of economic health in rural communities.

Families spanning generations have sustained themselves in agriculture, but it is no longer feasible. The past few years have brought disasters and record low prices to the ag economy. While safety nets are important to producers, especially in lean years, America's farmers and ranchers do not want to be dependent upon the government. So we must develop a long-term market-oriented approach to Federal farm policy to give producers the tools to help themselves and at the same time to bring much-needed economic growth to their communities. Short-term financial aid is helpful; but long-term planning, along with creative, innovative opportunities, are vital lest America's rural families lose their farms and small towns die with them.

We need to encourage producers to add value to their product. Value-added ventures will enable producers to reach up the marketing chain and capture profits generated from processing their raw commodities. Two barriers prevent producers from pooling together and adding value to their products: first, though farmers are experts in their own fields, often they do not have the technical expertise needed to launch complex value-added business ventures; second, producers are strapped for cash. Even if they had enough capital to initiate development of value-added processing, many of the combined players in the market could squeeze producer-owned entities out before they

become profitable. Something needs to be done to level the field for producers.

Developing value-added agricultural industries will bring increased economic development along with the spirit of hope to Montana and other rural States. And that is good for our pocketbooks, it is good for our communities, and it is good for our quality of life.

□ 1630

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HART). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BONIOR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HAYES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POMEROY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. EMERSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SOLVING PROBLEMS OF RURAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, in 1908, President Roosevelt charged the Country Life Commission with the task of solving the rural problem. He identified this problem as the fact that the social and economic institutions of this country are not keeping pace with the Nation as a whole almost 100 years ago, and that would just as easily describe our situation in America today.

Many people are aware that there is a farm crisis plaguing rural America. However, fewer people are aware that this crisis does not stop at the farm but extends to the whole of rural America. Crumbling infrastructure, lack of educational and employment opportunities, outmigration of youth, inadequate health care facilities, and a growing digital divide are just a few of the struggles that our rural communities must overcome. We must take steps to close that gap and to recognize

the vital contributions of rural communities to American economic, cultural, and civic life.

Just over a year ago, I joined with my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), in resurrecting the Congressional Rural Caucus. The Rural Caucus is grounded in the belief that the needs of rural America are diverse and unique. We stand united in the belief that it is past time for Congress to stand up for rural America. We must do all we can to ensure that our rural communities are not just to survive, but they may thrive as well. Only when we tailor policies which address the unique needs of rural America will we see that day.

The 107th Congress will provide numerous opportunities to speak up for rural America, but I would like to mention two in particular.

The first is the upcoming farm bill. This Congress will be updating our farm policy for the first time since 1996. We must seize this opportunity not just to rethink our commodity policies, but to pause and to reflect upon the needs of all rural citizens. An important component of the farm bill certainly is our commodity policy, but the needs of rural America go far beyond commodities. The question that we must ask with the farm bill is not how do we fix our commodity programs, although this is clearly an important question and requires our attention. Rather, we must ask ourselves: What is our social contract with rural America; and what actions do we need to take to reinforce that contract?

Our obligation and debt to our rural communities is greater than ever. We must fulfill that debt by pledging to work harder than ever to assist rural America.

I am not alone in this belief. On May 23, I joined 120 of my colleagues in sending a letter to the leadership of the House Committee on Agriculture urging them to make rural development an integral part of the upcoming farm bill.

However, the farm bill is just the beginning. The second opportunity lies in strengthening our partnership with the White House. The Rural Caucus is committed to moving forward with the White House as full partners. Together we can make great steps in strengthening our rural communities, but the White House must do their part.

We have programs that assist rural America, but they are scattered throughout departments and agencies with little coordination between them. We must recognize that decades of incremental and piecemeal efforts have resulted in policy which no longer address the realities of life in these rural communities.

Before stepping forward with a comprehensive new blueprint for rural America, we must step back to survey the landscape of rural America and our patchwork set of policies that are directed towards it. It is time to follow

the lead of other industrialized countries in the world in crafting an integrated and comprehensive rural policy. They have done it. We can do it as well.

The time has come to address the entire rich fabric of our farming and rural communities across the country and not just the single threads that bind it together. At stake is not just the continued existence of our rural communities. At stake is the very soul of this great country. If rural America dwindles away, all of America is deprived of a great asset. If rural communities turn to ghost towns, the spectre will haunt us all.

Madam Speaker, I urge Congress to support our rural communities.

APPROPRIATORS SHOULD FULLY FUND FIRE AND EMS DEPARTMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the numbers are in, and the results are overwhelming. This Congress for the first time in the history of America last year authorized and appropriated \$100 million for the American fire and emergency services community to meet their local needs. It was an historic action.

Within a 30-day time period, from April 1 until May 2, the 32,000 fire and EMS departments across this country had the opportunity of applying for matching funds to meet their local needs and to meet the national responsibilities being placed on them in our effort to prepare for an incident involving a weapon of mass destruction.

Within that 30-day time period, there were 30,000 requests for funds from over 20,000 departments, from the smallest rural department in rural America, to the largest department in our largest city. They requested funds for breathing apparatus, for training, for new technology, for communication systems, for fire apparatus. The resultant 20,000 requests totaling 30,000 specific applications asked for \$3 billion of assistance. We only appropriated \$100 million.

Madam Speaker, there will be a lot of very unhappy and disappointed fire and emergency services departments. But we have made an historic beginning, and I would encourage our colleagues to join together and request that we increase the funding for that grant program to \$300 million in this year's appropriation process so that we can continue to meet the need of our domestic defenders.

Some would say this is too much money. Madam Speaker, local law enforcement officials across this country receive \$4 billion a year from the Federal Government. While I support our local law enforcement, our fire and EMS personnel should certainly receive no less. \$100 million is a long way from \$4 billion.

So I say to our colleagues today as we understand the need that has now been documented for the first time, \$3 billion in requests from every congressional district in this country. I would ask our colleagues in the House and the other body to join together and request the appropriators to exceed the President's request of \$100 million and fully fund the authorized amount which this fiscal year is \$300 million.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to contact the appropriators and make the request to our good chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), who was a tireless advocate last session, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the subcommittee chair, to include the fully authorized amount in the appropriation process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BERRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PROTECTING AND PROMOTING THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), who organized some of us to come to the floor and discuss the importance of protecting and promoting the rights of workers to organize.

Every year our government spends tens of millions of dollars of our tax money to support efforts around the globe to promote democracy. One of the ways that we measure society's success in establishing a democratic system of government and an open so-

ciety is how well its laws protect the rights of the poor, the rights of workers, and the rights of its citizens to speak, to organize, and to act collectively on their own behalf.

This is a message that we send every day from the floor of this Congress. We condemn, as we did today, those governments that oppress workers, that shield unscrupulous employers and empower the elites of society. Democracy is not measured by how well you guard the affluent and the powerful, but by how well you protect the rights of the weakest and the most vulnerable.

Thirty-six years ago, in 1935, Congress enacted the National Labor Relations Act to address the inequality of bargaining power between the employees who do not possess the freedoms of association or liberty of contract and the employers. In the depth of the Great Depression, our government understood that working men and women could not challenge employers who, through their wealth and power and associations, could exploit labor if workers themselves were not protected in their efforts to organize. That was a decision born of decades of brutal, bloody, and crippling warfare in the mines, the factories, the wharves, and the workshops of America.

But today, as the men and women born, along with the NLRA retire, 65 years later that promise to America's working people remains unfulfilled despite many achievements by organized labor on behalf of America's working families.

Unions have made tremendous improvements in the quality of life and standard of living of their members and their families. Union workers earn 28 percent more than nonunion workers, and union women earn 31 percent more than nonunion women workers. Unions have made dramatic improvements in the economic status of minority Americans: African American union members earn 37 percent more than nonunionists, and Hispanic workers increase their earnings about 55 percent through union membership.

Ninety percent of union workers have pension benefits compared to only 76 percent of nonunion workers, and 86 percent have health care benefits compared to 74 percent of nonunion workers. Only 50 percent of the nonunion have short-term disability benefits, compared to 73 percent of union workers. And the union workers, on an average, enjoy twice the job stability of their nonunion counterparts.

American workers and their families, whether union or not, enjoy a higher quality of life, greater freedoms, greater opportunities, greater political influence and greater health because of the union movement in the United States. Because of the many hard-fought battles over the last century and a quarter, most Americans can take a weekend off. Most Americans only work 8 hours a day rather than 10 or 12. In their later years, most Americans have pension plans, health insur-

ance, as well as Social Security and Medicare that union support made possible and protects today.

Given this great heritage, many question why the number of workers who are members of unions has decreased. Perhaps unions are victims of their own success at times. They have raised the quality of life for millions who never carried a union card. But there is another explanation and the Congress needs to pay it closer attention and address the shortcomings of current labor law.

Congress sends millions of dollars to build democratic institutions in other countries, and one of the measurements of success is the creation of a free trade movement with the right to strike and engage in collective bargaining and political activity. That is a measure of political health. But it is often not the case in the United States.

Unions and the men and women who would form and join them are the victims of grossly unfair bias under the current labor laws. The decks are stacked against those seeking to create a union. The law grants numerous advantages to employers that facilitate their efforts to prevent fair elections and successful collective bargaining.

Let me give you a few examples. The Wagner Act says a laborer may not be fired for trying to form or join a union. However, the only remedy for an unlawful discharge is to grant the worker back pay and reinstatement. As anyone familiar with labor law knows, it can easily take a year or more to litigate the unlawful discharge case. While that may be fine for an employers' association, few workers can afford to go several years without a job. Nor does the back pay of money that should have been earned to compensate a worker for the damages suffered as a result of having no income for 6 months. The worker receives no compensation to account for the new clothes that the worker could not provide for his child. The worker receives no compensation for the car or home that was repossessed. These are just the beginning of some of the unfair labor practices that exist in current law in this country. We will continue this discussion.

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HART). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SOUDER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WEINER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LABOR RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to salute first of all organized labor and to talk briefly about the role that it has played and continues to play in the lives of average citizens, ordinary Americans, the role that it has played in helping to create what we call the middle class.

Every day when I pick up the paper, the first thing that I generally see is where the rights of workers are being eroded. We are continuing to downsize, outsource, privatize. There is a tremendous amount of anti-union organizing activity. We see the diminution of workers' rights and the elimination of fringe benefits. More and more people are forced into having to work part time, with not a real job where they have benefits, where they know that if they should become ill, they can go to the doctor or go to the hospital.

In a world that is increasingly connected by international trade and investment, the need for enforceable rules in the global economy to protect workers' rights and prevent a devastating drive to the bottom in labor standards has never been more critical than what it is today. Working together, countries must take steps to establish minimum international labor standards so that increasing trade competition between nations does not continue to spiral downward.

The fact is that since NAFTA was enacted in 1993, the United States has lost more than 600,000 jobs. U.S. companies have less stringent labor and environmental standards. In fact, more than 150 U.S. companies have left the U.S. for Mexico since NAFTA and are now relishing in the fact that they have avoided compliance with important worker safety and health standards. And, of course, they are getting away with paying their employees as little as \$7 a day. How can a Teamster, for example, who might make an average of \$19 an hour compete with this? The fact of the matter is that he or she cannot. And each and every time we go to the bargaining table to negotiate a

good, fair contract, we are berated with threats of companies relocating. In the end, American jobs are eliminated, our wages are suppressed, and benefits cut. Unfortunately, the World Trade Organization does not seem to be concerned with this problem.

I was pleased not long ago to listen to my colleague from North Carolina talk about reauthorization of the agricultural bill and the fact that rural America must have a real place in it. I was thinking that when we reauthorize that bill, we need to make sure that we look at some of the subsidies that we are giving to agribusiness, that we look, for example, at the tremendous subsidy that the sugar growers are getting which is keeping the cost of sugar so high in places like where I live that candy companies are going out of business, or they are talking about moving to Mexico or Argentina or someplace other than in the United States.

And so I think it is a call to arms for the workers of America to unite, to keep coming together, to keep organizing, to make sure that there is protection for the average person, the workers of this country.

WORKERS' RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to talk about the importance of workers' rights. I want to tell my colleagues a little bit about my own personal history. My parents came as immigrants to this country. Because they became a part of working America, they were also involved in the union movement. Because of that, we had protections for our family, seven brothers and sisters. Because of that protection, my father lives a better life. He lives on a fixed income with a retirement, a pension plan. My mother is well. But the fact remains that before the union came into their place of work, they suffered quite a bit. My father, in fact, was exposed to very hazardous and toxic materials and as a result became involved with the union to provide protection so that other employees there, immigrant employees who could not speak English could have clothing, appropriate clothing and even an oxygen mask that would help prevent them from being exposed to harmful chemicals.

My mother worked for many years, 20 years exactly, on her feet almost 10 hours a day and now suffers from arthritic problems and severe varicose veins. She was lucky, though, that she had the union to fall back on, to provide her protections, medical coverage not only for herself but for her seven children and I as one of those. It has not been an easy road for them, and I thank the unions for providing that safety mechanism for them and my brothers and sisters.

But the movement of the union effort needs to go on. In fact, I was very priv-

ileged as a member of the State Senate to run the industrial relations committee where I was very much involved in helping to raise the minimum wage. I am sad to report that in the Federal Government, our minimum wage is much lower than the State of California. In fact, it is at \$5.15 an hour. In California, it is \$5.75. It is still below the poverty level. In fact, if we were to raise it up a bit, we would still have to give a boost of \$1.24. We still have a long way to go. Working America needs a break.

In my opinion, we have much to do to protect women, particularly many of those that are forced to work two and three jobs at minimum wage to raise their families. Many of them have children. Many of them sorely need insurance, health coverage and many other protections that are provided to union people. Many of those individuals are seeking to organize and have not been successful because many anti-union companies or businesses are trying to erode any support so that they can collectively bargain for their rights.

I want to put my support behind efforts that I was recently involved in in California in the city of Vernon with a particular organization there that was trying to organize women and immigrants that were working to sew mattresses and blankets. Some had worked there for 30 years at the Hollander Home Fashion in Vernon and were not given any kind of retirement benefits or any kind of pension plan. Thirty years at minimum wage and not one increment. I went out there and met some of those workers. Thank God that the employer there came to his senses and they were able to work out an agreement. They now have a collective bargaining agreement that will provide protections for the some 200 or 300 workers that I saw there in Vernon.

I cannot say that about an ongoing effort right now with Pictsweet Mushroom rooms in California where farm workers are trying to get also a better medical plan, a pension plan, and the one that is being offered right now by the employer is much too small and it would require a much greater premium on the part of the worker. The California Agricultural Relations Board has upheld an unfair labor practice charged against Pictsweet by the United Farm Workers. The United Farm Workers won that, but we still need to do more. I stand here now in support of what the Pictsweet Mushroom employees are working on.

We have a long way to go for working families, especially those that are new immigrants, that are coming to this country with the realization that they want to share in the American dream. I would ask this House and body to put forward a minimum wage bill to provide protections for all workers and to work to provide more sufficient coverage in terms of OSHA, because we know that there are many, many thousands of workers that lose their lives, that go to work thinking that they are

going to have some protections in place and find out that they cannot even go home because something happened at work.

I would ask this Congress, this body, to please take note of these issues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE IMPORTANCE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FROM A HIGH TECH PERSPECTIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I come to the well of the House today to speak in favor of and to recognize the importance of collective bargaining. I would like to do it from the perspective of my particular district. I represent a high tech district in the State of Washington just north of Seattle that includes Redmond where Microsoft is located as well as many software firms. It includes a biotech corridor where some of the new medicines are being developed with our new genetic technology, Immunex and others. From that perspective, a lot of folks have thought in the new economy where we have high tech jobs and software and biotech that the importance of collective bargaining or organized labor would fade away. I just want to say today that from the perspective of the high tech economy represented by my district, the importance of collective bargaining to people remains just as large and fundamental as it always has been in this country.

I want to tell just a couple of stories as to why that is true. First the story of Northwest Hospital in my district where a large group of employees desired to be represented by the SCIU, the service employees union, from a variety of professions at the hospital. Something interesting happened when those workers decided they wanted to be represented by SCIU. What was interesting that happened is that the hospital management, unlike a lot of places, decided not to try to intimidate workers, not to try to browbeat workers, not to interfere in the decision by the workers who are really the people who ought to have the decision whether to be represented or not represented. As a result of that, the workers freely voted and indeed in this case voted to be represented by that bargaining unit. To date there has been peace and harmony and increased productivity at that hospital I think because of that peaceful relationship. It was one example about how where management took a progressive attitude to allow workers to freely voice whether or not to be represented, things worked well.

Now I want to talk about the current situation at the University of Washington where the teachers assistants have expressed a desire to be represented by a bargaining unit of the UAW. Despite, I think, their clear manifestation of a desire, the administration of the UW has felt constrained, they believe they do not have the legal authority under the Washington State legislative structure to enter into a bargaining unit at the University of Washington. Many people, myself included, believe that is a misinterpretation of Washington law.

Nonetheless, that has created a lot of tension and the lack of the ability to move forward between the management, essentially the administration of the University of Washington and the teachers assistants. It is a situation where collective bargaining has not been able to move forward at least due to the perceived belief of the University of Washington management that we have not been able to move forward in a collective bargaining agreement, much I think to the detriment of the institution as a whole.

I think it has been instructive as to why collective bargaining needs to be recognized. We have been hopeful that the administration would take another look at the interpretation of Washington law. Failing that, we have also been hopeful that the Washington legislature would do some house cleaning and simply grant very specifically to the University of Washington administration the ability to collectively bargain. I am told that our friends in the other party have blocked efforts of that in the Washington legislature. I think that is very, very shortsighted. To simply give the University of Washington management the same authority that other management anywhere in America has to enter into collective bargaining units.

I want to say today from a high tech corridor, there is good news in a bargaining situation in a hospital. There is bad news in another high tech corridor, the University of Washington. We are hopeful that that gets resolved so that the parties can move forward in this very important right of collective bargaining to organize. That is the story from the high tech world.

INTRODUCTION OF BIPARTISAN SOFTWOOD LUMBER FAIR COMPETITION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I would certainly echo the comments of those that preceded me in the well about the contributions of organized labor to all working people in the United States and join them in supporting their efforts. But I come to talk about a specific sector of the economy and specific workers, that is, people who work in the lumber and wood products industry.

Back in the 1980s, the United States Department of Commerce found that Canadian lumber is heavily subsidized.

□ 1700

The Reagan, Bush I and the Clinton administrations have all found the Canadian lumber is subsidized. Numerous Canadian sources, including the BC Forest Resources Commission, Canadian Private Wood Owners Association, Maritime Lumber Bureau have also found those subsidies. That is not in question.

The subsidies come in three primary forms. The provincial government owns 95 percent of the timberland in Canada and administratively sets the price of timber one-quarter to one-third of its market value.

Agreements allow Canadian mills long-term access to timberland in exchange for cutting to subsidize the timber. No matter what the market conditions are, they are required to harvest and process the lumber, and they lose their licenses if they do not do that.

Finally, they are really back 50 years ago or more in terms of their environmental practices. They regularly violate principles set by the Canadian national government in terms of streamside buffers; drag logs through the streams and destroy precious salmon habitat. The results of that are being reflected in crashing salmon runs off of Canada and Alaska.

In response, in 1996, the United States and Canada negotiated a softwood lumber agreement. Unfortunately, that has expired and negotiations to extend or revise the agreement have not occurred despite the fact that many of us have contacted the current administration and asked them to make this a high priority.

We have seen statistics that say a mere 5 percent increase in lumber imports, subsidized lumber imports, from Canada could cost 8,000 jobs in the Pacific Northwest. So we feel this is of the utmost priority.

I am introducing legislation tomorrow with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), bipartisan legislation, the Softwood Lumber Fair Competition Act, and I really appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) has joined me as the chief Republican sponsor. It also will have support and introduction of a number of other Democrats and Republicans from various parts of the United States.

If Canada will not do the right thing and come back to the negotiating table and the Bush administration will not take the initiative, then Congress must force the issues through enactment of such measures as the Softwood Lumber Fair Competition Act.

Our legislation is based on the import relief provisions of the Steel Revitalization Act, which has 212 bipartisan cosponsors. The legislation requires that the President take necessary steps by imposing quotas, tariff surcharges, negotiate voluntary export restraint

agreements or other measures when softwood lumber imports from Canada exceed the average volume imported monthly during the 24-month period preceding December 1995.

This will help ensure that the U.S. industry and workers are not harmed by unfair dumping of subsidized Canadian lumber.

The job losses and mill closures will accelerate if the United States does not stand up for our working families and demand that Canada trade fairly.

With the sluggish U.S. economy, we simply cannot afford to sacrifice more U.S. jobs and U.S. industries to unfair trade by the Canadians.

The President has repeatedly assured Congress that his administration will vigorously enforce U.S. trade laws. I was pleased with his recent decision to pursue a Section 201 case on steel dumping. Now it is time for the President to do more on softwood lumber issues. It has been nearly 3 months since the agreement expired, and 3 months since a number of us contacted the administration to tell them how urgent it was that they pursue these negotiations. He needs to bring the Canadians back to the negotiating table and work out an agreement which both sides can live with similar to the 1996 agreement.

The choice is clear. Canada needs to come back to the negotiating table with a good faith effort or Congress must take action.

ORGANIZED LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HART). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in praising the men and women of organized labor. Organized labor has been a key proponent in the battle for fair wages and better working conditions and safer working conditions throughout the history of our Nation. Just like my colleague from California, let me say a little background because I know people all over the country do not know that most of us represent individual districts.

I started out in high school, as we call it, a fly boy at a newspaper, and worked in my apprenticeship, graduating from college; at the same time also getting my journeyman as a union printer, and finding out in 1971 I made more as a union printer than I did as a college graduate with an undergraduate degree in business. So I stayed in the printing business and worked there and ended up helping manage a small business.

In that time, I got involved in politics, elected to the legislature, went back to law school at night but still worked in the printing business for 23 years and still kept my card in the union. With the merging now of the Typographical Union with the Communications Workers Union, I can proudly

say that I am not working at the trade but a member of the Communications Workers Union.

I tell people do not ask me to fix their phone. I cannot even run a press any more. I have been ruined by serving in Congress.

I believe that the right to bargain collectively is a basic civil right and that unions are an avenue of that fair treatment and economic stability for working people.

The right for people to bargain collectively and independently is not only important in our country but around the world because of the litmus test on the freedom that a society has.

We have seen the impact that employee groups can have in establishing more Democratic governments in institutions worldwide, with one example of the success being the Solidarity Union in Poland. In other countries that are still autocratic regimes, such as China and Vietnam, the rights of workers to organize into unions or employee groups and push for improved pay and working conditions will be the key to showing that that country is ready for real governmental and economic reforms and establishing a free society and the rule of law.

So freedom to organize is a basic civil right that free societies enjoy.

Back here in America, last year 475,000 people joined unions in 2000. Despite the fact that oftentimes this is a basic right of workers, they face intimidation from employers who break the law and try to prevent workers from organizing.

Let me read just a few statistics about what workers have to go through to exercise their rights. Twenty-five percent of employers fire workers that try to organize unions. Over 90 percent of the employers, upon hearing that their workers want to organize, force employees to attend closed-door meetings and listen to the anti-union propaganda. Whether it is true or not, no one really knows since they are closed door.

Thirty-three percent of employers illegally fire workers who tried to form unions and 50 percent of employers, half of the employers, threatened to shut down if their employees organize.

If workers in America are subject to this kind of discrimination, then we can only imagine what workers in the rest of the world have to go through when they want to join together to bargain collectively.

Before I get too far along, I have a particular piece of legislation that came out of an experience in Houston that I want to speak to. This is the second session I have introduced what is now H.R. 652, the Labor Relations First Contract Negotiation Act. This bill was introduced to enhance the rights of employees to organize and bargain collectively for improved living standards. It will require mediation and ultimately arbitration if an employer and newly-elected representative had not reached a collective bargaining agreement within 60 days.

Time after time, valid elections are held where workers choose to be represented by a union, but months and sometimes years later will go by and these workers still have no contract even though they voted for union representation.

This bill is important because what we see with the NLRB is that the delay is often justice denied, and what we would like to see is that bill come to a vote so we can debate real labor law reform on both sides of the issue. I believe passage of that bill will help with short-circuiting the delay that we have with the NLRB and actually have workers go back to work and prevent workers and employers being locked in sometimes a stalemate.

America has a great history of recognizing workers and their right to organize, but we still have a long way to go.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) for his effort today and will work with him to continue to fight for the rights of workers not only here in America but throughout the world. I know the bumper sticker I see in Houston often says, "If you like weekends, it is brought to you by unions." I think that says more than any of us can say, Madam Speaker.

SALUTE TO ORGANIZED LABOR IN OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), in the salute to organized labor in our country.

The enduring value of organized labor's contribution is best measured by what labor has done for those who are not members of labor unions. Labor unions have done much for their members: Higher wages, broader and more valuable benefits, safer and more fair working conditions. It is the collective lifting of all workers and all industries and all persons across the country that has been the lasting legacy of organized labor.

With that in mind, I think it is important that we examine what labor has achieved, how our lives would be different if labor had not been organized; what we must do in this Congress to continue the strong tradition of collectively bargaining in America, and then to consider the issues that affect each of us that labor is taking a lead in fighting and working for.

Members of the generation that has been described as America's greatest generation were born in a very different world than the one in which we live today. A person 75 years of age today was born in 1926. In 1926, when they stopped working they stopped having an income unless they were someone very affluent and very privileged. Most people worked until the

day that they died. Then labor helped to take the lead in enacting the Social Security legislation in the mid-1930s.

If one was born in 1926, they lived in a world where the day they stopped working, they stopped getting any kind of health care coverage or access to medical services if they had it at all before then.

The mid-1960s again was in the vanguard as Congress passed and President Johnson signed the Medicare legislation, which has assured generations of Americans, labor union families and nonlabor union families, the security of first class health care from the day they retire until the day that they die.

If one was born in 1926, they lived in a world where it was legal to require someone to work more than 40 hours a week without paying them overtime. It was legal to press into service children. It was legal to send them to work for long hours in dark places that were unfit for human work or human habitation. Labor was in the vanguard of changing that as well.

The strides that labor has made are based upon the ability to bargain collectively, and it is this right of collective bargaining that needs protection and support in the Congress of the United States. There are two actions that I think are important for us to consider. One we should take and one we should not take.

We should, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), has suggested and others have suggested, enact legislation that says to an employer that when the employer in bad faith refuses to bargain collectively with a duly recognized collective bargaining union, that that employer should be held responsible for the consequential damages and attorney's fees which flow from such a failure to bargain in good faith.

The way it works today is that when a union fights and wins a representation election and an employer chooses to keep on fighting rather than to start bargaining, that lost wages and lost value of benefits and expenses incurred as a result of continuing to litigate and to fight are not recoverable by the workers who won that representation election.

It is a unique anomaly in American law. In virtually every other area of contract law in America, if one has a contract and it is breached by the other side, they are made whole for the consequences of that breach. That is not true in collective bargaining legislation and it ought to be. That is the aim of legislation that I have introduced in the House of Representatives in this Congress.

□ 1715

What we should not do is pass so-called paycheck protection legislation that is designed to require of unions what we do not require of any other institution in American life, and that is that if the union wishes to become in-

involved in political activity, to express itself through education or voter registration, they have to get unanimous consent. I believe that is the wrong way to go. We should not do so. I think we should do the other legislation.

COMPACT IMPACT AID TO GUAM NOT SUFFICIENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HART). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, today I want to draw the attention of Members to the financial and economic conditions in Guam by discussing two policy and legislative items with dramatic consequences for Guam.

First of all, I want to talk about the Interior appropriations bill which was marked up today by the full Committee on Appropriations. Guam was given \$5.38 million for Compact Impact Aid. Compact Impact assistance is money that is given to the Government of Guam as a form of reimbursement for educational and social services given to migrants from the Freely Associated States, primarily the FSM, the Federated States of Micronesia, some impact from the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Republic of Palau.

These three states, that are independent nations, are in free association with the United States; and these compacts of free association have allowed these three nations to be the only independent nations on the face of the Earth to have unmonitored and unregulated migration into the United States.

Because of the geographic and developmental conditions in the Micronesian region, Guam is impacted more than any other state or territory by the unmonitored migration by the Freely Associated States in Micronesia, which continues to have dramatic impact for a number of services provided by the Government of Guam.

Since the Compacts of Free Association were first established in 1986, Guam only started to receive Compact Impact aid in fiscal year 1996, and during that time period until 1999 Guam annually received \$4.58 million from the Department of Interior's Office of Insular Affairs budget. However, the Government of Guam continues to maintain that it expends anywhere between \$15 million to \$25 million annually to provide educational and social services for migrants.

Although there continues to be differences between how the Government of Guam and how the Department of the Interior calculate these actual impact costs, the Department of Interior in a letter accompanying a report by the new Secretary of the Interior, Gale Norton, acknowledges the Department of the Interior's own best estimates of \$12.8 million annually for Compact Impact costs for Guam. This is acknowl-

edged in a letter by the new Secretary of the Interior.

It has been noted by the Governor of Guam, Carl T. Gutierrez, that Guam has spent over \$150 million for these migrants who have come to Guam since 1986, while Federal reimbursement has totalled roughly \$40 million for the same period.

Funding authority for Compact Impact assistance stems from Public Law 99-239. This is the law which governs the relationship between the United States and these three independent countries. Basically, the law states that there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after 1985 such sums as may be necessary to cover the costs, if any, incurred by the State of Hawaii, the Territories of Guam, American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands, resulting from any increased demands placed on educational and social services by immigrants from the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia.

The impact has been direct, the impact has been dramatic, right on Guam. The need for Compact Impact Aid has been documented. It is doable to fix this problem.

This situation for the Government of Guam is further aggravated by the recent passage of the President's tax cut plan. Guam and the Virgin Islands are two territories that operate under a mirror Tax Code. That is, any changes that are made in the Federal Tax Code are immediately reflected in the local tax codes, which also collect income tax. So this means that, particularly in the case of Guam, we are probably likely to experience cuts over the next year of anywhere between \$20 million and \$30 million in local revenues as a result of these tax cuts that have been introduced by President Bush and have now passed into law.

These tax cuts were conceived here for the Federal Government because of a surplus. In Guam, the Government of Guam is operating on a deficit, we are experiencing some 15 percent unemployment, and we are in the middle of an economic downturn as a result of the Japanese economic downturn and recent reductions in military spending.

So, basically, we need the Compact Impact Aid. It can be done, it is doable, it is the right thing to do, and I urge Members to consider this as the Interior appropriations works its way through.

IN SUPPORT OF UNIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to all of our Nation's hardworking men and women. I come from a working family. I come from a union family. I know what it is like to work for every penny and live from paycheck to paycheck.

Thirty-nine years ago my father put my sister and me and the family dog in the back seat of our car. My parents were in the front seat. Everything we owned was packed in a U-Haul that was connected to the back bumper of our car. We drove across country in the middle of the summer in an un-air conditioned car from upstate New York to California for my dad to get a job.

Before we got to California, we decided we would stop in Las Vegas for the night. We never left. The reason we never left is the day after we arrived in Las Vegas my dad joined the culinary union and the following day he got a job. He got a job as a waiter, which he kept for the next 33 years until he retired.

On a waiter's salary, on a union waiter's salary, my father made enough money to put a roof over our head, food on the table, clothes on our backs, and two daughters through college and law school; and the reason that he was able to do that is because of the fine wages that the unions had negotiated and fought for.

Because of the efforts of organized labor, so many doors of opportunity were opened to my family. No one has to convince me of the importance of unions in our country and the positive impact that they have on workers and business. I have had firsthand experience, and many of my fellow Nevadans have had the same experience.

Unions have had a significant impact on the city that my parents and my children and I call home. This is evident in the fact that Nevada has the highest percentage of workers that are union members in the country and our Nation's strongest economy. The culinary union Local 226 alone has more than 50,000 members and is the backbone of our community's service-oriented economy.

Las Vegas is the fastest growing metropolitan area in the country. Because of this incredible growth, the construction industry has exploded, and the building trades union members are helping to build our community. It is an oasis in the middle of the desert, thanks to them. Employers in southern Nevada recognize the importance of fostering partnerships with the unions. When workers make good wages, have good benefits and have good working conditions, productivity increases.

Southern Nevada's economy is booming and hardworking union men and women helped create this prosperity. I am proud of this strong organized labor movement in Nevada and the improvements that the unions have made for all workers.

Unions are the voice of working men and women in this country. Over the years, unions have worked to ensure that employees make liveable wages, work a 5-day workweek so they can spend time with their families, and receive overtime pay. Unions have fought and continue to fight to make sure that workers receive quality health care for themselves and their families.

Unions fight for families. Family-leave provisions allow parents to attend parent-teacher conferences, attend to sick family members or spend time with a newborn without the threat of losing their job. Through collective bargaining, unions have secured all of these benefits.

I am committed to protecting the right of our workers to both join unions and to collectively bargain, and I will fight against any attempt to erode these rights.

This country is far better off and a far better place to live and raise our families because of our unions and our right to organize. I commend the efforts of this Nation's hardworking men and women, and I pay tribute to them and organized labor today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CARSON of Indiana addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE CITY OF HOUSTON IN RECOVERY AFTER TROPICAL STORM ALLISON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, on June 5, 2001, the storm of a lifetime, Tropical Storm Allison, hit the city of Houston and the surrounding areas. I rise today to pay tribute and to acknowledge the terrible loss that our community has suffered, the loss of some 21 individuals in our community; and whether or not the count is complete, we offer and I offer my deepest sympathy to all of those who have lost loved ones.

We know now that close to 17,000 residents of the city of Houston and surrounding areas have been impacted and have to be in shelters. But what we do know is that Houston has a can-do attitude, and we have drawn together as a community.

I am delighted that my colleagues from Texas will join me in a resolution congratulating all of those individuals who sacrificed and suffered, the ones who sacrificed to help with the rescue, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Houston Fire Department, the Houston Police Department, the various Red Cross workers and volunteers, and so many others who were just passing by and became a Good Samaritan.

It was a storm of a lifetime, because those who have lived in Houston all of their life have never seen such a storm, starting first on June 5, 2001, subsiding for a while, and then starting up with all of its fury in a couple of days. The downtown was under water, the Medical Center was under water, residential areas were under water, and people

everywhere were impacted. Freeways were shut down.

But that did not stop the mighty might of those who live in the greater Houston area. Mayor Lee P. Brown did an outstanding job of gathering the troops around and encouraging us to be able to accept our fate, but yet begin to recover.

Just this past Tuesday there was a Day of Prayer. As this hit, I was in the city and was able to engage with both the Mayor and the county judge as we surveyed the area. We are grateful for the Mayor's leadership in his letter to the Governor and the Governor's leadership, Governor Perry, in immediately contacting the White House, as we worked together in making contact with the White House and the President exercising his authority and declaring this a disaster area and in an expeditious time. We thank him.

At the same time, we thank those who withstood the storm. As I traveled throughout the district on Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, as I traveled with the U.S. Coast Guard by helicopter and as well with the FEMA director, Joe Allbaugh, we all had one intent in mind, to immediately rescue and help those who were so devastated. There was a great deal of bravery, a great deal of heroism. The community did come together.

The recovery will be long. There are enormous challenges to overcome, and that is with the energy concern, the electricity concern, the telephone concern, the housing concern, the health concern, the school concern. Yes, the city has been impacted in so many ways, upwards of \$1 billion in damage. But what I can be gratified for is that there have been many efforts, corporate donations, FEMA on the ground, and the persistence of those of us who believe in helping, that we will press the point that these individuals will be able to overcome bureaucratic red tape and be declared recipients of funds that they truly need.

Let me thank my colleagues for their very kind remarks, and let me also acknowledge the various agencies like the IRS and other agencies that have noted the predicament of our community. I look forward to working with FEMA, ensuring that the reimbursement comes about.

I want to thank the Red Cross centers, the volunteer centers, Lakewood Church, Fondren Seventh Day Adventist Church, Kirby Middle School, all started by volunteers. The Sweet Home Baptist Church, the Sunnyside Multi-service, many of them initially manned by volunteers, and the Red Cross that came in subsequently. Although I know that they are not listening because they are focused on so many other important issues, let me thank them again.

□ 1730

To the arts community of Houston, they are a viable part of your community. We will work with them. To the

downtown business community that has a number of the small business entrepreneurs who made our business community vibrant, we will work with them. To the media, we will thank and work with them continuously as they provide information throughout all of the community.

Likewise, I am delighted to be able to recognize the donation of Mr. George Foreman, a native Houstonian, of \$250,000, and of course a number of the corporations, as well. We will offer a resolution of appreciation, as well as assisting the community with any other support and legislative initiatives that may be brought about.

I want to thank the Harris County delegation for their leadership in this effort, and I hope that we will be able to recover together as a community united as one.

Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the work by thousands of Houstonians to recover in the wake of the disastrous flooding that inundated Southeast Texas and to remember those lives lost over the last several days due to this tragedy.

There has not been a complete accounting of all of those who have been reported missing in the Houston area, but there are already 21 deaths, which have been attributed directly to the flooding that occurred in the city. The death toll could have been much higher had it not been for the bravery and dedication of our city's fire fighters, law enforcement officers, public works crews, and emergency management personnel. I would like to also extend thanks and appreciation to those private citizens who rushed to the aid of fellow citizens who were in danger of succumbing to the floodwaters. These heroic individuals may not all be known, but the evidence of their caring and humanity is evident in the number of those who are reported to have been lost. These Houstonians used their personal boats and watercraft to rescue neighbors, friend, family and strangers from the rising floodwaters.

My appreciation also extends to those surrounding counties that provided assistance to residents of Houston, when the city was not able to respond due to the overwhelming numbers of request.

The catastrophic flooding has left 17,000 resident of the City of Houston and surrounding area in desperate need of emergency shelter, this is in addition to the sizable Houston homeless population. Across Harris County Texas it is estimated that as many as 21,000 homes are thought to be without power, phones, and water, with about 5,000 homes having been flooded.

Reliant Energy/HL&P reported that 34,000 of their customers, who included hospitals, were without power during the flooding.

The medical personal of Memorial Herman Hospital are to be commended for their quick action to move patients to safer ground when the hospital was threatened by floodwaters. Memorial Herman Hospital is a level 1-trauma center and transplant center with multiple levels of adult, pediatric and neonatal intensive-care capabilities. The flood forced the hospital to suspend service on Saturday, and move all of its patients to safety.

I would like to thank our fellow Americans for rushing to the aid of the residents of the

City of Houston. I would like to remind us all how important it is to offer assistance to those in distress due to natural or man made disasters. Therefore, I thank President Bush for acting quickly to declare Southeast Texas a federal disaster area. The City of Houston is estimated to have a billion dollars in damage as a result of the flood.

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has also recognized the enormity of the flood in our area by providing an automatic extension from the June 15 deadline for filing or paying taxes to August 15 of this year. I thank the Director of the IRS for allowing this additional time for Houston area residents.

The flood and its severity were exacerbated by the fact that land in and around the Houston area has been subsidence of land. Many report that the area around the Medical Center area had subsided about 2 feet from 1973 to 1995. New data on subsidence in the Houston area is due to come out at the end of this month, according to the National Geodetic Survey office.

The floods economic impact to the area may be difficult to assess. There are an estimated 76,000 ATM bank machines that were effected by the flood, which may have implications for 22 states. The Pulse ATM network reported that the flood disrupted transactions when the primary and secondary power supplies was flooded in Houston. This led to the forced closing of the Bush Intercontinental Airport, suspension of Metro bus service, the flooding of major highways into and out of the city, such as I-10, Highway 59, I-45, parts of the 610 Loop, have all had a tremendous impact on the city's business community.

Houston is in recovery due to the efforts of thousands of public servants, businesses, and individual efforts. I would like to commend and thank the Houston Chronicle and KHOU-TV (Channel 11) for leading an effort which has raised almost \$6 million to aid the Red Cross' massive relief effort. Those stations that also joined in this effort are KPRC-TV (Channel 2), KRIV-TV (Channel 26), KTMD-TV (Channel 48), KLN-TV (Channel 45), and KRBE-FM (104.1).

Clear Channel Communications reported more than \$30,000 in donations and 50 to 60 truckloads of supplies, and businesses and organizations contributed \$353,000, with \$100,000 of this amount coming from Calpine Corporation.

Former heavyweight boxing champion Mr. George Foreman, a native Houstonian, donated \$250,000 to this effort.

Furthermore, I will work with local, state, and federal governments to ensure that Houston has the resources necessary to make a full recovery from the floods. I will investigate the severity of this flood and evaluate methods that can be put into place to prevent another tragedy of the magnitude from happening again.

I thank my colleagues for their support during this difficult time.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HART). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I have taken this hour under the leadership's prerogatives this evening in order to address three related subjects. I will be joined, I am sure, by some of my colleagues who also have something to say about these subjects because of their recent involvement in a meeting.

First of all, I would like to spend some time talking about the NATO Parliamentary Assembly; second, relatedly, about the subject of NATO expansion, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization expansion; and third, about two of nine applicant countries, Lithuania and Bulgaria.

It has been my privilege to participate in the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, formerly known as the North Atlantic Assembly, since 1984 on a rather regular basis. Since 1995, I have had the opportunity to chair the House delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.

This organization, the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, has now been in existence and operating efficiently and I think quite effectively for more than 40 years, first for the 12 countries of the NATO Alliance, later expanded to 16, and now 19 members.

Congress participates as a result of a statutory decision which provides for participation for both the House and Senate and bipartisan delegations that meet with our European and Canadian allies in NATO, their parliamentarians semi-annually, and in fact a third meeting that involves part of the assembly which takes place in Brussels in February, where we meet not only with our colleagues from the NATO countries but also with officials of NATO, the North Atlantic Council, the Secretary General of NATO, and more recently, with the European Union and some of its components, like the European Commission and the European Parliament.

Without a doubt, the NATO organization, NATO, has been the most effective collective defense alliance in the history of the world. It has provided the collective security to those nations of Western Europe, and it is no surprise that many countries of the former Warsaw Pact now aspire to membership not only to the European Union but to NATO itself.

The NATO Parliamentary Assembly has provided a forum for discussion, for dialogue, for research by the parliamentarians of the 16, now 19, NATO countries. It is by, all accounts, the most substantive of all of the inter-parliamentary efforts in which the House and Senate are involved.

The members of the delegation from the House and from the Senate are chosen by the leadership on both sides of the aisle to participate in this assembly, and we have always proceeded in a bipartisan fashion.

Our comments tonight are prompted by the fact that we have recently returned from one of our semiannual meetings. This one was in Vilnius, Lithuania.

Lithuania is not a member of NATO, but as the Soviet Union collapsed, as the Iron Curtain came down, as Yugoslavia began to disintegrate, we had a substantial concern and interest in assuring that these nations of the former Warsaw Pact and indeed parts of the Soviet Union were given an opportunity to benefit from participation in the NATO Parliamentary Assembly as associate members, because it was our view that if we could help them, particularly in their parliamentary bodies, move towards democratic institutions and practices, this would be a major service to those countries.

In fact, we had a very successful and very organized effort to reach out to these countries' parliamentarians and to the parliaments themselves. We called it the Rose-Ross Seminar. They were financed in significant part by the United States, through the U.S. Agency for International Development funds, but now they are supported by the assembly itself, with contributions from other countries.

The U.S. no longer has a predominant role in financing these seminars, but they were meant to help these parliamentarians and the leaders of those governments, civilian, military, to understand what it was like to participate and work in a democracy; to build democratic institutions; and, in fact, to try to provide transparency in budgeting, civilian control of the military, and eventually, of course, interoperability with NATO forces, if that is the course they chose.

Nine of those countries have chosen to aspire to and formally request membership in NATO. They range across the face of Central and Eastern Europe from the three Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania down to Bulgaria in southeastern Europe. They are known today as the Vilnius Nine, from a meeting of the nine that recently took place in Vilnius.

I notice that we are joined by one of my colleagues, who is the vice-chairman of the Political Committee of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly here in the House. My colleagues know him as the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. It is the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

I think as my colleagues appear, since they have busy schedules, we will just let them speak to any of the three subjects that are related that we wish to discuss tonight. We will talk about the assembly itself and how it operates, about the fact that we visited two of the aspiring members, and about the subject of NATO expansion.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Sanibel, Florida (Mr. GOSS).

Mr. GOSS. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his consideration in yielding to me, Madam Speaker, and I congratulate him for his leadership of the NATO parliamentarian group.

I am not sure that all Members understand, and certainly most people in

America do not understand, the extraordinary efforts we go to to reach out to parliamentarians in other countries in order to ensure that our form of democracy is well understood, and to make sure that we understand, as perhaps the only world's leading superpower now, some of the problems other countries are facing and how their legislative branches are dealing with those.

That is particularly true with our allies in NATO, the member nations, because we are dealing with a very critical subject here, and that is the national security, and in the case of NATO, the collective security of those who have signed on to NATO.

It is no secret, of course, that now that we have a number of countries that aspire to membership in NATO because of concerns about their national security that we have decisions facing us which are somewhat timely, in fact, as soon as a year from now, and in a few months in Prague next November, where decisions are going to have to be made about the enlargement, and many nations are following specific plans to try and make sure that they are eligible and in fact will be included in NATO membership and the responsibilities that that implies; in fact, not only implies but demands, because there are considerable demands in order to meet the standards of NATO.

For example, a percentage of the gross domestic product of each country has to be used for defense, collective defense. There has to be some type of interoperability. That means speaking a common language. Those types of things are very important.

I believe that it is fair to say that we have a window of opportunity right now that is not going to stay there forever. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the chairman, has just led a delegation to Vilnius, Lithuania, and to Bulgaria. These are two of the nine states that are aspirant applicants for the next round of enlargement.

We saw there a tremendous commitment among the people, among the leadership, because of the desirability to look west and join the freedom-loving democracies in that form of government, and they are willing to make sacrifices in those countries to meet the standards of operability and the standards necessary for membership to accept all responsibilities.

Some have said that the enlargement issue is a bad issue because, oh, there are cost problems, or it will upset the Russians, or a whole bunch of other arguments that we heard when the previous three countries were brought into NATO, Hungary and the Czech Republic and Poland, all of whom have been very supportive, valued additions to the NATO arrangement since their membership and coming in.

I believe that we are going to see the same thing with the other countries that are ready for enlargement. If we miss the opportunity to capture the enthusiasm that they have for the sac-

rifices they are willing to make to join NATO now, I am not sure where they go or how it will come out.

So I think the enlargement question is a critical question that needs to be boosted forth, brought to the attention of our colleagues, and made clear that it should be a critical point of the foreign policy matters of the Bush administration. I hope that is going to happen.

It is, I suppose, not coincidental that President Bush is at this very time in Europe discussing some of the other issues that are involved. Obviously, we have the missile defense questions that are of interest to our allies, and the whole question of the European security defense, what that is going to look like, because that could color our presence in the Balkans, and many other issues that are of great interest to us.

But when it comes down to the fabric, the atmosphere, the willingness, the commitment, the spirit of NATO, I think the enlargement question is the most important.

I must congratulate the gentleman from Nebraska (Chairman BEREUTER) for constantly through the years being a champion of this, leading the way, taking delegation after delegation over to meet with our colleagues in various places, and receiving those colleagues, those parliamentarians who have come back from those places to get more information from Washington.

It has been a real labor of love. It has shown great results. I think the gentleman's wisdom and vision has preceded him with the three who have already been enrolled as the enlarged members, and with the other nine aspirants out there. I believe we have now visited virtually all of them. It seems to me we are at the threshold of opportunity, and if we fail to take it, I think it is a "shame on us" situation. I thank the gentleman for the time to say that.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

At the Lithuania meeting, I think the controversial elements on our agenda included the Albanian ethnic conflict in Macedonia or the former Yugoslavia, the Republic of Macedonia.

We always talk about burden-sharing. We are concerned and interested as constructive critics over what the European Union will be doing on creating a European security and defense policy, or ESDI, some would say.

They wanted to know our views on missile defense, a limited missile defense that the President is addressing now at various points in Europe.

But I think ultimately it always comes back to, as one element in our discussion, the subject of NATO enlargement. I think it is appropriate for the gentleman and for this delegation to talk to our colleagues in the House and to the Congress in front of the American people about the U.S. role in enlargement and the advantages that brings to the Alliance, and the responsibilities we have to assure that worthy applicants, countries that have

met some of the criteria that the gentleman mentioned, have an opportunity to bring the NATO umbrella over them and to make a contribution to the collective security.

The first enlargement of NATO was an easy one when the Federal Republic of Germany took into its arms the German Democratic Republic, East Germany. As a result of the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact and the collapse of the Iron Curtain, that was an easy addition.

But then we may remember, and I am sure the gentleman does because he was involved in it, along with this Member, that it was the House of Representatives that really took the lead in pushing for the enlargement of NATO. The Senate followed us, and then the Clinton administration, in recognizing and supporting the Congress of the United States, took the leadership role within the North Atlantic Council in the meeting of our Secretary of State with their foreign ministers and our Ministers of Defense, and pushed for NATO enlargement.

□ 1745

For us, we have always said the doors are open, as long as these countries are willing to move towards democratic institutions and to assure civilian control of their military and to have no aspirations for the territory of their neighbors, to make the kind of commitments necessary for providing an adequate defense, to contribute to the NATO alliance, they ought to be eligible for membership.

So we have as a result of that, the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland as the first round of members by a decision in 1999. I think the only disappointment in the Congress is that one other country, Slovenia, which most of us had considered to be quite worthy of membership at that time and, indeed, that was the expression of the Congress, was not taken in. But they are certainly a leading candidate for the next round.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) mentioned that this decision will come before us again as a group of 19 NATO countries in Prague in 2002. My estimate is that unless the United States takes the leadership, expansion will not proceed at that time. And I think we have that responsibility. We have, within the U.S. government, I think, a leading role.

I only regret that votes on the tax cut bill kept us from visiting one other country, because Slovakia, among the first four considered for membership that took a different turn in its politics, now has made dramatic advances; and we were planning to visit Slovakia, as well as Lithuania and Bulgaria.

I might explain to my colleagues that we solicit advice from a number of sources, our State Department, people outside government, the supreme commander of Europe, General Joseph Ralston, as to the countries we might visit now as being among the front runners

for NATO membership and countries that needed to have recognition for the advances that they have taken. That is how we selected our visitation as a result of the trip to Vilnius.

I wonder if the gentleman has any reaction to the demonstrations that we saw in Vilnius, Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I think it was extremely heartening. I cannot speak with enough admiration for the respect I have for the Baltic nations and what they endured under the past years of tyranny before they were freed, and that has been freedom that has been very precious only for a decade.

Their enthusiasm is somewhat, therefore, more understandable when you are there; but the very strong ardent feeling, passion about being free and democratic and leaning West and wanting to be associated with the things we stand for and willing to shoulder the responsibility and, as I say, make the sacrifice, because there is some sacrifice, that is not one of the wealthiest Nations in the world by any means. And there is some sacrifice involved.

There was very strong support for NATO, very clear friendship, very clear understanding of what they were getting into, how much they wanted to be involved in this, and how far they were willing to go.

I have spent some time, and I congratulate our speaker for his outreach to parliamentarians in other countries as well, including the former Soviet Union, Russia.

The Speaker has reached out to the Duma and to the leadership of the Duma and has made a recent trip there. And one of the conversations that we, of course, had with our fellow colleagues in the Duma as legislators is the concern that they have that NATO is getting too close somehow to Russia.

We point out always to the parliamentarians, to the Duma, that NATO is a defense organization. It is not a defensive organization, and one of the cases we use is how well in Vilnius they have dealt with problems that were serious problems previously in the relationships with Russia.

In fact, Vilnius, has, I think, responded very, very favorably in the dealings with Belarus. I do not think anybody can say they have been anything except good neighbors and gone the extra mile to work out appropriate sovereign questions with the Belarus. In terms of the Russian interest in Lithuania itself, the concern has always been the Kaliningrad Corridor, how do you get to Kaliningrad Corridor, another part of Russia, which is on the other side, as it turns out, of Lithuania on the Baltic.

The problem of the responsibility of that has been worked out extremely proficiently, very well, and to the Russian satisfaction and to the Lithuanian satisfaction under Lithuanian leadership.

So if there is some danger to the Russians by Lithuania somehow acting responsibly and democratically and freely and joining with counterpart organizations and NATO, I fail to see what it is.

If anything, the Russians should argue that the Lithuanian neighborhood has become much more friendly to Russia since they have been aspirant to NATO because they understand the responsibilities of that.

I am not sure that the Russians are ready to accept that argument yet, but I certainly congratulate the Lithuanians.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those comments. They are exactly right. It should bring some additional stability to the region, and the Russians really should have nothing really to fear. Let me go back briefly to give a history of what has happened to the Baltic Nations.

Back in the late 1930s, we had the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop which ceded those three Baltic nations to the Soviet Union, and then they were forcibly annexed, and thousands of people were killed or sent to Siberia and then we had the Nazi invasion of the region, and they come under Nazi control before they fell back under the control of the Soviet Union.

Now, to the resounding credit and resounding yet today, the United States never recognized the annexation of these three nations into the Soviet Union. In fact, you could go up 16th Street and see some of the embassies, free Lithuania and free Estonia and free Latvia operating, and the diplomats actually got to be old men and women here waiting for freedom which finally came with their way with great difficulty.

One of our colleagues who has taken a very special interest in the NATO parliamentary assembly, participating only since the February meeting, but an even greater and longer-term interest in the Baltic Nations is our colleague from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for any comments he would like to make about NATO enlargement or Lithuania or whatever subject he would like to discuss.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) and I really am honored to have been able to travel with you and deal with issues regarding with NATO.

I have learned a lot and grown a lot, and I appreciate the wise council and expertise.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following op-ed for the RECORD:

SHOULD THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION EXPAND?

(By Congressman JOHN SHIMKUS)

As I fly 31,000 feet above Bosnia and Herzegovina, I think of its present strife. I see the steep slopes and terraced farmland. It is quiet and serene at this height, hiding national tensions that have made the Balkans the powder keg of Europe.

My return flight originated from Sofia, Bulgaria, as an official member of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. Our short trip was designed to compliment the Bulgarian people on their movement to a constitutional democracy, with rule of law and respect for human rights. We also assessed their potential as a friend and possible future ally.

Bulgaria is not only an example to the Balkans but a very stabilizing force. And in addition to being a stabilizing force for the Balkans, Bulgaria is a constructive link between occasionally feuding current NATO allies Greece and Turkey.

From the Bulgarian President to the Prime Minister, the Chairman of the Parliament to the Defense Minister, all were on message as to the importance of NATO and their hope to be included in the next round of enlargement. Our meeting occurred weeks before a competitive upcoming national election. As a politician myself, I understand the value of time. Their availability reinforced the importance they place on their Western contacts, the continuing importance of the United States in European affairs, and their appreciation of NATO membership.

Prior to Sofia, I attended the NATO Parliamentary Assembly spring session in Vilnius, Lithuania. Another strong applicant for enlargement, Lithuania is an associate member of NATO and a member of several demanding programs for NATO aspirants. They did not miss their opportunity to impress the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. (Which made this fourth generation Lithuanian very proud.)

Lithuania has also developed a constitutional democracy, the rule of law, and a respect for human rights. Lithuania has attempted to be an additive element to NATO. Immediately upon the breakout of hostilities in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo, Lithuania deployed troops in support of both NATO missions. Not constrained by the old Soviet force structure, Lithuania is moving to light infantry for deployability and forest defense. Lithuania's rapid ascent to a functioning democracy, tolerance for its Russian minority, and a willingness to put a painful 20th Century history behind it make the country a serious candidate for alliance membership.

The Lithuanian president fought against the Soviet army as a member of Lithuania's Homeland Defense. He eventually fled for freedom and gained success in the United States. His election marked a westward look by Lithuania. Lithuania's leadership is young and motivated. At the Ministerial level, the Chairman of Parliament, and the Prime Minister . . . the ages run from 38 to 53 years old.

But one of my poignant memories of the trip was the jeweler from the open air historical museum of Rumsiskas. Above the door of his shop were these words in English, "I want to be in NATO, because my family died in Siberia." Lithuania has been run over numerous times and has suffered great destruction. Most recently, Germany and the Soviet Union in World War II. No Lithuanian was untouched by those events. Yet the current government has energetically sought good relations with all of its neighbors, including Russia.

Why would Bulgaria, Lithuania, or any other country want to join NATO? Why is this important to the United States and the 20th District of Illinois?

For many years the Statue of Liberty has been a symbol of freedom, security, and economic opportunity for many immigrant families. The Statue faces east, welcoming immigrants to our shores. Now I think as she faces east, she also looks east toward Europe at these former captive nations who struggle as newly emerged democracies.

Many of us multi-generational immigrants, after years of security and freedom, take our liberties for granted. Many of us are too young to have experienced the fresh air of newly found freedom. This trip revived my senses. Not only could I smell the sweet air of freedom; I could see it, touch it, and taste it. I am a better father, citizen, and representative for it.

This will be true for NATO. For NATO to be relevant, it must expand its current protective umbrella over these new emerging democracies. By expanding, NATO will experience heightened senses—seeing, feeling, touching, and tasting freedom. We will also have a better chance that our young men and women will be spared the horrors of war. The taxpayers also may be spared the great expense of war with a little preparation and prevention.

As President Clinton said, the goal of NATO is to "expand the frontier of freedom." Hopefully President Bush will say the same with this addition: "from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, a Europe whole, free, and secure."

Mr. Speaker, the last paragraph says as President Clinton said, the goal of NATO is to expand the frontier of freedom. Hopefully President Bush will say the same, with this addition, from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea a Europe whole, free, and secure.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this special order tonight because this is occurring at the time when the President is overseas, and there are a lot of anxious people going to be hanging on every word that he says, like the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. They are going to be dissecting it, because it means so much.

I have done a couple of things in preparation for tonight, and the gentleman mentioned the rallies, and I brought some small photos from the rallies.

Mr. BEREUTER. Those rallies in support of NATO membership?

Mr. SHIMKUS. Rallies in support of NATO membership. First, I want to show some photos of times that I remember. My involvement with NATO goes back as a young second lieutenant on the German border with Czechoslovakia serving in defense of freedom under NATO auspices which I did for 3 years.

These are the photos I remember. Here is an East German border guard looking across at the people who would recognize this who remember the old pillars. And on the other side, here is the actual fence with an East German guard and the dog trailing behind as there is a patrol, as we did so often, is keep checking on each other.

These stand in stark contrast to our most recent trip, where we have photos from the rally that happened right outside the meeting arena. I wanted to make sure I had that.

There were some signs up of the people who were present. One says here, it says NATO Lithuania, good, okay. This other one, the small one says, the victims of Gulag are calling for justice.

In our trips and in my op-ed, I am not sure if there was a single family that was not touched by the occupation of all of these forces.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to relate the experience I saw, at a little booth there with the jeweler working and displaying his ware, and he had NATO, yes. My family was sent to Siberia.

His entire family never came back from Siberia, so he wanted to make sure that does not reoccur in some fashion in the future.

There was this artisan who has a very strong commitment to NATO membership for Lithuania.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Mr. Speaker, another photo is what we touched on earlier, and it actually represents the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. And it says, the Pact of Molotov-Ribbentrop is our past; NATO is our future.

I think what I have enjoyed about this brief experience into the NATO parliamentary assembly is, as I say in my op-ed piece, is really breathing the fresh air of freedom. I tried to make this point to a lot of my parliamentary colleagues from some of the other countries in that for NATO to be the NATO that I know, it has to expand. It has to have a protective umbrella over these emerging democracies.

In one of my closing statements in Vilnius, I said if not here, meaning in Vilnius, my question was where? If not now, my question is when? There is a lot of debate about the where and the when.

I will just say that we, as a Nation, have had a lot of people sacrifice for freedom. Some have actually had to fight and die, and we just celebrated Memorial Day. They understand the value of a free society and the sacrifices.

The folks who are considered the old captive nations, they have this exuberance of freedom that helps create optimism and faith in democratic ways of life, the rule of law, equal treatment, human rights. They are struggling to form a more perfect union. They are not all perfect, but one way we can definitely help is to provide that protective umbrella through a defense alliance, such as NATO, to give them some foundational support as they pursue becoming a more perfect union themselves.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I hope he will make contributions any time he feels the urge to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding further, because our colleague who was a wonderful addition to the group of parliamentarians in Vilnius because he is so familiar with the territory and the experience there made it more value-added than it normally is for a visit for those countries.

I congratulate him for his expertise and his patience in educating the rest of us on some of the issues, and food not the least of which, the gentleman is an expert on many things.

I was struck by something the gentleman said. It so happens that in Vilnius, Lithuania as in somewhat similar situations elsewhere in the Baltic nations, Latvia and Estonia, there is a KGB museum. And it was, in fact, a show place of terror and torture and inhumanity and all of the history, that painfully recent history that the gentleman has referred to and it is shown off as an example of what should not happen in a free and humanitarian civilized society.

Clearly, there were barbaric acts of torture, treachery, horrible suffering, heartbreak, all of these pieces brought to the surface and even the photographs that were lining the meeting halls, which were reminders to us of the atrocities that took place in such recent history during the Cold War under the whole very cold harsh hands, unsympathetic leadership from a foreign country.

□ 1800

The curious part of that is that, in my view, the Baltic nations have gotten over it and on their way so well and are willing to go forward and positively in the future. I think that is terrific. But I think the fact that they have that KGB museum is a reminder of why they are so anxious to be in NATO, so this can never happen again, is a perfectly rational straightforward approach.

It so happens the juxtaposition of two other countries that happened to be in on this recent trip, with the chairman's leadership, and also splitting my time partly with the Speaker in Russia, is in Russia the KGB is looked on very differently.

The KGB has undergone a name change and some cosmetic surgery and is now called the SVR and is becoming more fashionable. It is true that the present leader of Russia is a former KGBer. Mr. Putin is, in fact, a KGBer, and he has many of the KGB folks around him. There is sort of a rehabilitation of being a KGBer involved.

So if one goes from the Baltic nations in one day and goes to Russia, one gets a very different approach if one goes to the KGB museum in Moscow. It is great that the Baltic nations have gotten over it. They remember it. They are not happy about it, but they are willing to go forward in a constructive way.

It appeared to me that the juxtaposition with the Russians are, no, they are still trying to justify it, they are resurrecting it, and they are not being realistic at all about their future. To me, it is a striking problem, and it is a problem that we have to deal with with Russia. I think that we are committed to do that.

But I think it is a question of understanding rather than threat. I do not believe the Baltic nations propose in any way a threat to Russia, nor I think does the United States of America seek to propose a threat to Russia.

That is not what the enlargement of NATO is about. It is a defense organi-

zation. I say that because, also, we were under the leadership of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) in Bulgaria. Bulgaria has a very different arrangement with Russia, a very different type of situation as a former part of the Soviet bloc and has kept a different approach to dealing with Russia today, which is not as decisive a feeling as has existed in the past in the Baltic nations for all the understandable reasons.

So we have many different views and many different points of view. But the people who are looking positively into the future for their own security, whether they be the Baltic nations or the Bulgarians or the Romanians or the Slovenians or Slovaks, are looking for the guarantee of security, the stability, the idea to participate in civilized Western society and go forward with all that opportunity and pay the price of doing that in terms of the sacrifice they have to make.

That is the difference. That is our job, not only to honor the fact that we have opportunity in the open window for the aspirant nations who wish to come into NATO, but also to assure the Russians that that is not a threat to Russia.

I honestly believe our friend Jerry Solomon, who used to be our leader in these endeavors, used to joke and say the day is going to come, and we are going to be able to invite Russia into NATO. I hope that day comes to pass. If we do our job right, it may very well come to pass.

The only other point I would want to make, if the gentleman from Nebraska would indulge me for a minute more, is that I sometimes hear from others who do not entirely understand NATO today and the NATO concept, that NATO is engaged in other adventures like the Balkans, where we have basically a peacekeeping operation going on that is very delicate and somewhat dangerous and actually doing quite a good job under extraordinary difficult circumstances by NATO member countries, in fact other countries as well, Partnership for Peace countries and others.

Mr. BEREUTER. Including the Baltic Brigade, and elements of Lithuania and Poland are there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GOSS. Indeed. Mr. Speaker, in fact, one can say that the Baltic, think of that, the Lithuanian-Polish Brigade helping out, two folks that were having troubles before now working together, this shows that things are possible. But when you get through, the argument always in Russia is, but you see, you go off and do different things.

I think it is interesting that the Petersburg tasks are now being more and more assigned to the U.S., the new ESDI, the European pillar, whatever that is going to emerge as, and that that would be the place that those get parked, and that there will be a reaffirmation that the NATO is, in fact, a defense treaty organization. I think that we have work to do to stress that point.

The point to the Russians is that, if they are concerned about the European security defense initiative, they need to talk to the European Union about that because those are the folks that are about that. That is not our main issue.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to Bulgaria in a minute. But I want to comment briefly again on the Baltics because those three countries have not had it easy. There has been a significant Russian population from some of them, particularly Latvia, not so much in Lithuania. So the tensions have been there as they have moved to an independent status. The language issues. But I think they have done an admirable job of addressing those and trying to permit full participation of Russian and other non-Baltic nation ethnics into their society.

I also think it is interesting how much they look to the United States as a role model and how much we have to live up to to meet their expectations. Well, for example, there is a big American connection in so many ways and in the government of those three Baltic states. One finds U.S. citizens who have dual citizenships in the parliaments of all three countries. The President of Lithuania is a former resident of Chicago, I believe was the EPA Regional Administrator.

The very impressive President of Latvia, indeed, spent much of her career as a scientist and as a teacher in Canada and had many connections with the United States.

I know as I have gone in the past to the Baltic States, first in 1996, I think, as a part of our outreach to their parliaments with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) and our former colleague Congressman Solomon, the Omaha Lithuanian community was very interested in discussing my upcoming trip and then having to report back because they have a sister city relationship with one of the communities in Lithuania. Indeed, I have a large Latvian active community in my own major city of Lincoln.

So we have had this American association. The Scandinavian countries have provided some assistance, particularly Denmark. It has been an effort to bring them along through the Partnership for Peace Program and to participate, as the gentleman says, in peacekeeping activities in the Balkan region.

I visited Bulgaria for the first time, I think, in about 1983, and what a different place that was compared to today. They had a very different and more positive relationship with Russia, the Soviet Union, than with any other of the so-called satellite countries in the Warsaw Pact, probably because they shared more closely a religion, language, and they had no common border with the Soviet Union, perhaps the important distinction. In fact, the czar had been in there twice to in their view rescue them from the Ottoman Empire.

But in any case, I think what has happened in Bulgaria has also been equally impressive because they have embraced democracy. They have taken an interesting turn or two in the process. But their elections have been free and fair by international observers' unanimous view. They are facing another one on June 17.

So the American delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly will perhaps pay more attention to that than most Americans. But it is every expectation it is going to be a free and fair election. Perhaps the government party will have to share power.

But when they went through that election in 1997, they took a different course even more emphatically, and they became very concerned about embracing ethnic differences in their own country, about being a good neighbor to Macedonia. They have a positive relationship with two of our NATO allies, Greece and Turkey, that sometimes have their differences.

Bulgaria, in fact, has become an element of peace and stability in that region. We watched their changes there, their suffering difficulties. Their people are impatient for more economic progress. They have the problems of the mafia from other countries that plague them. But I think they are striving in a very direct fashion, and it is going to give them the kind of results that those citizens of Bulgaria want, if they have enough patience, if we help them and give them every opportunity to justify their applicant status in NATO.

Mr. Speaker, I yield again to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was impressed by our subsequent visit to Bulgaria for the reasons that the gentleman from Nebraska mentioned. Their ability to help unite our allies and work with both Greece and Turkey and the stabilizing force that they do establish in the Balkans and the ethnic diversity was very striking. Just walking down the main streets, to see the different places of worship really standing right next to each other in that part of the world, that is not happening as much as it should.

I was struck with one of our luncheons when it was asked, well, how come, Congressman SHIMKUS, House Concurrent Resolution 116 specifically talks to the Baltic nations and not all the rest of the applicants? It was a fair question. My response was there is a different attitude of Russia to the other applicants for admission than to the Baltic area. This is not to exclude the other applicants or to place them in competition with each other, but this is to say to our friends in Russia that they are treating them differently. We do not want them to be treated differently. They have no veto authority.

Our appeal is that the President, in the next day or so, continues to make the case of the open door policy, which the whole parliamentary association

reconfirmed that no one has a veto, and that geography is not going to be a determining factor.

I was also struck with the gentleman mentioning a lot of the new elected officials, especially, well, Lithuania and Latvia. He was talking about all the U.S. citizens that have gone back to be involved in the private and the public sector.

The people who have endured years under domination actually made a conscious decision in their elections to look west. In their electing of these expatriates or dual citizenship individuals, they made a conscious decision to look west. That is the critical aspect of this whole debate.

When they are looking west, we should not take the time to close the door on them. We should welcome them as they look west to democratic institutions, ethnic pluralism, human rights, and all the benefits of that.

They are making a tremendous sacrifice to meet the requirements for NATO admission by trying to get the 2 percent of their GDP. For new emerging democracies that are coming out of a centralized economic command and control economy, for them to put so many resources into getting up to NATO standards should be applauded, should be welcomed, and should be rewarded.

The last thing that I want to mention in this little section is that some of these same debates about the Baltics occurred with Poland, that it would be destabilizing, that our friends in Russia would not like it. But I think history proves that the relationship between Poland and Russia is even better today than it was before their entrance into NATO. I will stake my name on it right now that the relationship with the Baltic nations will be better with Russia after their admittances to NATO than if we prolong this over a period of years.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, in fact, the Russians have benefited economically from Poland's emergence as a market-oriented economy and as a part of the West. I have every expectation that this would happen with the Baltic nations as well. Russia uses those ports. The Baltic people are very entrepreneurial in their outlook. There is no doubt that there would be benefits to their next-door neighbor Russia as well in my judgment.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, if I may just add, the relationship has only been strengthened in Lithuania, especially with the Kaliningrad area in that there is normal everyday discussions of transportation of goods and material to the enclave there in Kaliningrad, and there has been zero incidences.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the surprises to me has been the reluctance in the past, and I think today, of some of our European NATO allies to embrace expansion. They have been very slow to expand the European Union east when that is an important element of bringing economic pros-

perity and stability to Europe, to make Europe, as we say, one, whole in one, and safe for democracy and for people to pursue their dreams and their aspirations.

We have, I suppose, some reluctance on the part of some of the European countries because they see their economic relationship, perhaps the debt that they have with Russia as a point of concern. I should say their creditors have debt, that the Russian government owes those banks.

□ 1815

I think it will take American leadership once more. Perhaps that leadership will come from this House when we insist that the door remains open. It is not a matter of whether or not NATO is going to expand, it is when, and when the countries make the necessary steps.

The GNP contributions of Bulgaria, for example, are 3 percent. We are pushing hard for some of our existing NATO membership to reach 2 percent because the quality of the forces has deteriorated in some of our NATO member countries. And we look at this in sort of amazement and concern when they are actually creating an ESDP, another entity, a rapid reaction force within the European Union.

I know the President is going to be pushed hard to be explicit about what direction, which countries should be brought in, and in my judgment at least that is not appropriate for him to make that kind of explicit statement at this point. But we want to encourage all of those members to meet the requirements, the criteria listed or otherwise, that will qualify them for membership. So I hope that, in fact, the President gets an opportunity in Warsaw, where he is expected to make comments about this, to give every encouragement to the nine aspirant countries.

Mr. GOSS. May I ask the gentleman to yield for just one moment.

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. I notice that there happen to be four of us here because of the chairman's leadership I think on this side, but this is strictly a bipartisan effort. We have colleagues on the other side of the aisle too, and they are equal players and very valuable to putting this whole message out. So I do not want anybody to think that this is a one-party initiative. This is an effort of the House, and the gentleman leads it very well.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman and appreciate his bringing that up. It has always been bipartisan. In fact, we have had presidents of the assembly itself that are Democratic colleagues on the House side; and more recently, our former senior Senator from Delaware, Senator Roth, was the president.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), who made his first visit to a

NATO parliamentary assembly meeting in Vilnius, and we welcome him to the delegation. I am interested in what a newcomer's attitudes and outlook would be about what he saw in Vilnius.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, I thank the gentleman, and he made the trip a highly successful one for this newest member of this bipartisan delegation that was in Lithuania and then in Bulgaria.

I somewhat shared with my staff that I felt it was like taking a three-credit hour, 1-week class to learn a little on NATO, a little on Europe and its politics, the European Union interaction and European history to understand all that.

Mr. BEREUTER. Surprisingly, I have been accused of working the delegation too hard. I cannot understand that, but I yield back.

Mr. REYNOLDS. From that new knowledge, and as I understand the presentation now, I have gained an appreciation of some of the general direction of NATO and our role in that important body, as well as the subject of NATO expansion and Lithuania, which was our host. I might add that our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), of Lithuanian descent, was immediately a recognized hero not only for his basketball skills but by his presence and his caring for his homeland. He also had the unique opportunity of sharing some of that with his family, which I know was very, very important to him.

When we look at the picture of not only that meeting in Lithuania but the opportunity to go to Bulgaria, it was a new enlightening experience for me to see a country that many had considered the 16th part of the Soviet Union but who have now shown not only stability for themselves but been a tremendous partner in the region of stabilization. Particularly as we arrived there, we saw the meeting with the President, the Prime Minister, the chairman of the parliament, as well as a number of ministers, and recognized the relationships they had built with their neighbors, both Greece and Turkey, and the interaction and confidence both those countries had with Bulgaria.

It was interesting looking at the democracy underway; that they have chosen to look at the Western Hemisphere as a model of where they want to pursue trade and opportunities of partnering, and also with Europe and the opportunity of trying to be successful in the admission to the European Union and to NATO. This showed me a country that is very important to the United States and, more importantly, to the world's interest with regard to the stability of the region.

I think as a candidate for both NATO and the European Union membership we have an important role in Congress in the debate over that NATO enlargement. The first measures urging enlargement during the last round came from the House in 1994, and it is time

again for the Chamber to enter the debate. Certainly Bulgaria, in the visit and the extensive conversations and meetings we had with its government, shows that they are doing everything in their power to prepare themselves to be ready to be a candidate for both the European Union but, more importantly for our mission, to NATO. And I look forward to their progress in the coming year as that is measured.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank my colleague from New York for his outstanding statement. It is obvious he has gained a lot and made a major contribution by his comments here tonight. But I am also impressed by the fact that both the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) made major contributions to the defense committee in one case and the political committee in the other case during our meetings in Vilnius.

I think maybe as we look ahead as to what our role is as a Congress, as the United States, we ought to recognize and I think emphasize to our colleagues that leadership from the United States is going to be required to expand NATO, appropriately expand it, to countries that meet the criteria.

President Bush is in Europe at this moment. He is about to make an address in Warsaw. It will be, as I understand it, a major address on NATO. It is my strong desire and hope that the President will clearly indicate that there are no new barriers or any old barriers to NATO membership and that no part of Europe would be excluded because of history or geography. In short, there is no veto. We are going to look appropriately at the northern part of eastern and central Europe, the Baltic region, and countries like Slovenia and Slovakia in the center. And I would hope there will be one or more countries in southeastern Europe, in the Balkan region, that will qualify in our judgment and the judgment of the other 18 members of NATO for membership.

It seems to me if one or more of those countries in the Balkans meets the criteria and can be brought in, it is an outstanding example to the other countries and ethnic groups in that troubled part of Europe that there is an opportunity for them to have a higher degree of security through NATO membership and perhaps to successfully aspire to membership in the European Union as well.

I do want to say to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) that I recognize the contribution he has made by resolution that he has introduced before the Congress. It calls for the admission of new members to NATO, including the Baltic states, when the criteria for membership is fulfilled. And that is what it should come down to. So I heartily endorse and am pleased to be a cosponsor of the gentleman's legislation. It is the kind of initiative we had some time ago when we moved the country, moved the NATO alliance, to-

wards expansion to the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland.

I look to my colleagues for any concluding comments they might make in the last 5 minutes or so. I will yield to the gentleman from Florida, and then I will go to the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I thank very much the chairman for leading this and for all he does on this subject. I honestly believe that the world has changed in a great many ways. It is not just the technology, it is not just the evolution, it is not just the alignment of countries and the sovereignty questions and borders. It is all those things and more we are confronted with. And we are confronted with them in an extraordinary way of great privilege and honor but great responsibility and duty as members of the United States Congress when we talk to parliamentarians elsewhere, because people do look to the United States of America for help and guidance in so many ways.

The point I would make is that I honestly believe that this window is open on enlargement. We have enthusiastic, spirit-filled activity going on in these countries. This is real commitment that we are seeing. And the good-news part of it, beyond all the good news that is inherent in that message, is that if these countries are able to qualify and come in in a steady way under the NATO defense umbrella, it seems to me that that removes uncertainty; and removing uncertainty removes playing fields for mischief makers. I think that is the nature of the security threat we have today, is too many mischief makers taking advantage of areas of uncertainty.

So I think that stability factor we talk about is very important, and I think this is a critical time for leadership. I congratulate the gentleman for his leadership, and I hope we can get other leadership to list as well. I know the Speaker of the House is very interested in this and has been a great ally, and I am sure he will continue to be.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. And on a practical side, of course foreign investors, which are so important in that region, look to NATO membership as something that will bring security to their investments. We heard that in Bulgaria.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I just want to highlight the bipartisan aspect of the resolution: 25 Republicans, 15 Democrats. I want to also mention the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), who is the co-chair of the House Baltic Caucus highlighting that point.

And just a statement to our European allies. We have been there for them year after year after year. They need to be there for these emerging democracies.

Mr. BEREUTER. If the gentleman from New York has any concluding remarks, I yield to him.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the chairman, and I just want to say that I support the Shimkus resolution as a co-sponsor. As he advances that debate in the House, I look forward to participating with him and assisting him in the endeavor of that resolution.

I also want to say this is an important time, while our President is overseas in that part of the world that NATO's whole universe is about, the aspect of defense of our allies. So this is a tremendous time to launch the further debate on NATO enlargement and reminding not only ourselves but the world of the criteria that NATO has established and that these countries are working diligently to meet that strong criteria so that they can be partnering in a NATO alliance in the future.

I believe enlargement is a subject that, while we only discussed it today, should hopefully bring a result in Prague in 2002.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks. I thank all my colleagues. And I want to say that I appreciate the written remarks submitted by our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), our Democratic senior member of the Committee on International Relations, who is very supportive for NATO expansion. His views are very consistent with those I think we expressed here tonight.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for calling this special order on the recent meeting in Vilnius of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. We in the House are indeed well served to by DOUG BEREUTER's outstanding leadership of the House delegation to the NATO parliamentary exchanges. He is serious and thoughtful in his leadership, and he has served our nation well through his commitment to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.

Madam Speaker, in NATO and in the growing European Union we have a powerful group of friends and allies who basically share our values and objectives. We have said during the Cold War—and I personally passionately believe it—that NATO was a defensive military alliance. I believe that today NATO is a defensive alliance.

I am completely supportive of NATO enlargement, once the countries which are candidates for membership meet the economic and political criteria that qualify them for membership. The three Baltic countries—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—are moving rapidly in this direction, and I strongly favor their admission into NATO. Whether it takes place in 2002, 2004, 2005 or 2006 is very secondary.

Madam Speaker, I want to make clear my strong belief that Baltic membership in NATO—or the membership of any other country in NATO—is not contrary to Russian interests. In fact, it is in Russia's interest to have the arena of stability and prosperity in Europe expanded to Russia's borders. It is clear that as democratic forces gain strength within Russia, these democratic forces will welcome the enlargement of NATO and the growth of stable democracies in adjacent countries. It is not in Russia's interest to have countries such as Belarus run by a dictator on their border. It is

in Russia's interest to have a country such as democratic Estonia—prosperous, free, and a member of NATO—to be near Russia.

I never accepted during the Cold War—and I do not accept now—the notion that NATO threatens Russia. There is no NATO leader that has the slightest ambition to invade or act in a way that is contrary to Russia's long-term interests. The NATO leadership hopes for the evolution of a democratic and prosperous and stable Russia. The leadership and the members of NATO want nothing more for the Russian people but an improvement in their economic conditions and the improvement of their political and civil liberties.

Madam Speaker, I disagree most strongly with the notion that we have to pay off the Russians in order to win their agreement to modify the ABM treaty in order to move ahead with our own system of missile defense. We should not truncate the natural growth of NATO in order to win concessions on missile defense, and we should definitely not allow Russian efforts at intimidation or blackmail to dissuade us from accepting the Baltic countries as members of NATO.

Madam Speaker, these were our goals with respect to Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland when they were accepted for NATO membership four years ago. These will be our objectives with Slovenia, Slovakia and all other countries that seek membership and are granted membership in NATO in the future.

COMMUNICATION FROM FORMER STAFF ASSISTANT OF HON. JIM MCCRERY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Jennifer Lawrence, former staff assistant of the Honorable JIM MCCRERY, Member of Congress.

JUNE 7, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a criminal subpoena for trial testimony issued by the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana in a criminal case pending there.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that it is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

JENNIFER LAWRENCE,
*Former Staff Assistant to Congressman
Jim McCrery of Louisiana.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOHN CONYERS, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN CONYERS, Jr., Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 11, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for production

of documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, JR.,
Member of Congress.

□ 1830

AMERICA HAS URGENT NEEDS FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HART). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to direct the attention of my colleagues to a task that I think is paramount in our Nation and our ability to be able to compete in the 21st century, and that is the task of improving the public schools in this country.

As the hour goes on, a number of my colleagues on the Democratic side have indicated they will join me as we offer a perspective on this critical issue facing our Nation, our States, our communities, and certainly the parents, teachers, and students of this country.

As communities throughout my district and really across this country celebrated the graduation season in the past few weeks, I believe it is an opportune time to look at what Congress needs to do to provide our schools the support they need to succeed in the 21st century.

It does not seem like it, but in just a matter of less than 2 months, school will be convening again all across America. Over 53-54 million students will head back to school, the largest number of public school students in the history of this country. At a time when the classrooms are going to be overcrowded, space will be at a premium and staffs will be challenged. Today my colleagues, Democratic colleagues who will join me, together we joined all of the members of the Democratic Caucus in signing a discharge petition on the bipartisan Johnson-Rangel-Etheridge school construction bill. American people understandably do not follow legislative process close enough to know what a discharge petition is or why it is important.

I regret that we even have to use it, but when there comes a time when the majority estoppels an issue as important as school construction for the children of this country, it is time for drastic action. A discharge petition is the only vehicle we have as ranking minority members to force the leadership to act, such as when they have blocked us from bringing up needed legislation. That is the only way that the Members have an opportunity to get it done. I would remind my colleagues and others that every Member of this body is elected by the same

number of people, except at the end before a census when you may have more or less people in a district than usual.

This is so important because we know that we have a bipartisan majority in this body of the membership who will vote for this school construction bill that will provide \$25 billion to help build and fix schools in communities all across America. But the only way we can get a vote on this bill is if we get 218 signatures on the discharge petition. That means that we have to get a majority of the Members of the House to sign the discharge petition to get it to the floor, and we have more signatures than that as cosponsor of the bill when it came up before. If we get a chance to vote on it, it will pass by a large majority, in my opinion.

As my colleagues know, I am the only former State school chief serving in Congress. I had the privilege of being elected to lead my State of North Carolina's public schools for 8 years, through a time of tremendous growth and change and opportunity. I am pleased to be serving in Congress. I have been working since I got here now 4½ years ago to pass this innovative legislation to provide national leadership for better schools.

But the Republican leadership refuses to allow us a vote on this critical bill, for whatever reason. Some say partisanship; some say unyielding ideology. It makes no sense not to have a vote on it. It does not do anything to dictate to anyone. The only thing it does is provide tax free bonds to the local units of government, to sell those bonds and build school buildings to get children out of trailers, off stages, and out of hallways to where they have decent lighting and new technology, all of those things that we think about that is important for education.

It is difficult for me to understand why we cannot get a vote on it. When Members stand on the floor of the House and say education is important, the President of the United States says it is one of his top priorities, if he makes one telephone call, we might get a breakthrough, if he would just call the Speaker.

We have urgent needs for school construction, and they are going worse every day. We must work to help meet these needs.

Throughout my district in North Carolina, schools are bursting at the seams. As I said, school will open in just a few short months, less than 2 now. And somewhere between 53 and 54 million children are going to show up. We know that school enrollment is going to increase the following year, and the year after that, and projections are for the next 10 years. Too many students are being condemned to less-than-the-best facilities and stuffed in overcrowded classrooms and rundown facilities. We need a modernization act to help fix this problem.

It bothers me that we talk about how important education is and we turn a blind eye to doing the needed things we

need on facilities. Is it the most important thing? Probably not. But it is among the list of important things. Why? Because a well-trained teacher in front of that classroom, in my opinion, is the most critical piece. But then again you ask the question: Why not have a good place for the teacher to teach and the child to learn? If we say education is important and children ride in buses passing nice new prisons to go to a rundown school, what kind of message are we sending to our children. Do they really believe that we believe that education is that important? And yet the Republican leadership refuses to act on our modest bipartisan legislation that begins to supply some measure of help in this critical crisis.

Yes, we need more teachers. We need to reduce class sizes, but we need the space to put students in. Every year, the Federal Government spends billions of dollars to build State prisons. We spend money for local roads, bridges, waterways, and countless other projects that are needed and are important. But why do they get priority over school construction? Do you reckon it is because of powerful constituents and influential patrons here in Washington. I would dare not think it was because school children do not vote.

My friends, I am here to fight for the citizens who cannot vote, the children. They may only be 20 percent of our population, but I can assure you tonight that they are 100 percent of the future.

I am here to represent the children who do not have lobbyists to get the leadership to cut them a deal. I am here to speak for the children whose voices will not be heard by themselves to say we need school construction. We need books. We need air conditioned classrooms. We need technology in those classrooms. We need bathrooms that work and water fountains that put out cool water on a hot day.

I urge my colleagues to join me in signing the discharge petition on the Johnson-Rangel-Etheridge School Construction Act and to pass this critical bill without delay, and we can do it. It seems to me a tax cut was important to this body and to the President, and we got it through here in record time, before Memorial Day. School starts in less than 2 months. We cannot build buildings that quick, but we can start; and it is important.

I have spoken many times on this floor about the need for school construction, and I will continue to speak out because the need is growing every day, every month, and every year. The last number I saw about the need for modernization in this country is approaching \$300 billion. That is a lot of money. Historically we have said that is a local and State responsibility, and we do not say that with a lot of other things.

We have people come to the floor and say education is the most important thing we have to do in this country be-

yond our national defense, and when it comes time to make the hard decisions to help make a difference, it becomes a big slip between the lip and the hip. It takes resources to get the job done. As more children come, the need will continue to grow.

You know, the other side of that coin, as I mentioned earlier, is the need for good teachers, to reduce class size, decent facilities, adequate class sizes, and well-trained teachers are a critical piece in the challenge to improve education. We cannot do it in a stop-start, a piece here and a piece there. We would not dare, no businessman would dare try to do that on a production line building an automobile or tractor or any other product; and yet we ask our teachers to operate in conditions that we would not operate a factory for business people. It says something about our priorities. It bothers me greatly at a time when we have more resources available to us in this Congress than we have had in over 20 years. I trust we will not squander that opportunity.

Last year, the Democratic staff of the Committee on Government Reform Special Investigation Division prepared for me a study entitled K-3 Class Sizes in North Carolina's Research Triangle Region, and the numbers in this report are startling. I am talking about an area of the country that I think is fairly progressive. It does a good job with education. We have outstanding teachers. Children do well. It is one of those regions when you talk about high tech, you have to talk about Research Triangle Park as one of the top five or six places in the country. No matter how much talk or rhetoric there is in this town about education, I believe we should stick to the facts. Let me share with you some of the facts from my district. I think they would be the same from other districts and could very well be more telling.

Fact number one, last year in Wake County, the largest county in my congressional district and the second fastest growing county in the State of North Carolina, over 95 percent of young children were taught in classrooms that exceeded the national goal of 18 students per classroom. That is kindergarten through third grade.

Anyone who has done any kind of longitudinal study, which is a study that is done over years that has a statistical base, says if one wants to really improve education, improve the quality of opportunity for every child, then reduce class sizes, put a good teacher in front of that classroom, and exciting things will happen.

Why? Because teachers do not have time when they have 26 or 30 students in a class. It is very difficult. I like to remind people when they raise the issue, Faye and I have three wonderful children. We love all three of them. They have done well, and we are proud of them. One is a teacher, one started as a teacher and is now in law school, and the other finished school and is farming.

But when they were growing up, I would hate to think that we had 28 or 30 in a room. They were great youngsters, but I think that would have been tough. That is what we ask our teachers to do every day. We ask them to be surrogate parents, counselors, moral leaders. We ask them to be teachers. We ask them to do everything for our children. And to give students the kind of care and direction they need, and yet we put them in overcrowded classrooms.

□ 1845

We stuff more in than the teacher has time to work with and it makes it very difficult. In the Research Triangle region as we talked about those class sizes, 95 percent of the young children are taught in classrooms that exceed the national average. Across the 13-county Triangle region, 91 percent of our children in kindergarten through the third grade are taught in classrooms that exceed 18 students. That is a significant number when you look at all the challenges you have as a kindergarten. For those of us who are adults, it is kind of hard to remember when we were kindergartners. Sometimes it is difficult to remember that when you only have one at home. Just think what it would be if you had 18 and you were trying to teach them their numbers, their colors and their ranges are so great, from some who come to school knowing their colors, others who come to school knowing how to use the bathroom and go do other things and others who do not. Teachers have to do all that. When you are in classrooms over 18, the job is exceedingly difficult.

More troubling is the fact that a whopping 42.5 percent of kindergarten students in Wake County are in huge classrooms of 25 or more.

When we talk about improving the quality of education across this country as we compete in a global economy, then we understand the tremendous challenge and responsibility we are placing on teachers. No wonder it is difficult to recruit teachers and more difficult to keep them in the classroom. They are looking for other jobs. Besides that, we do not pay them like we ought to pay them. The last time I checked, if a teacher bought a car it cost just as much as it does for the president of a bank or a large corporation. They do not give them a discount. We have got teachers leaving education at an alarming rate now. Why? In the first 5 years, roughly 25 percent are leaving the profession, because they cannot make a living, buy a home and look after their children. There is something wrong when we are not doing that. Besides that, we are not even building the kind of facilities they need. We have to change that.

The report I am talking from also documented that reducing class size improves order. Surprise. Improves discipline. It cuts down as much as 30 percent on the time a teacher must divert

from instruction to dealing with disruption. It seems to me that means students are learning more if you have time to instruct and they have time to learn. Not surprisingly, small class sizes lead to greater academic achievement, as I have just said. That is what we all want.

The report demonstrates that class size reduction in the early grades is one of the most direct and effective ways to improve education performance. Why is it, then, if we know that, that this body wants to turn a blind eye to putting more teachers out there to help reduce class sizes? It is beyond me. I do not understand it. Maybe someone will explain it to me. No teacher can be expected to reach young minds effectively in a classroom that is overcrowded with so many youngsters. It is very difficult. The task is challenging enough to begin with without handicapping our teachers who care so much for their children.

Madam Speaker, I have been in a lot of classrooms, probably more than any other Member in this body. I have seen how teachers can take milk cartons and turn them into turkeys for young children. I have seen how they can take throwaway things and turn them into usable items in the classroom. They take all the used equipment we give them, and I often marvel at how grateful they are that we will give them anything they can use. I remember when I was superintendent, we got the business community to give us their used computers because some schools had no computers. Then I go to meetings and I hear people say, "What we need to do is turn out young people who can compute, who can communicate and when they come out of school, they ought to be able to go in business and run all this equipment." I say, "That's right." But they do not have the equipment to learn on. Yet we criticize the public schools and we are not willing to give them the tools to do the job. It is wrong. It is unfair to hardworking teachers and bright young people who want to achieve to not give them a chance.

Let me talk about now some of the good things that Congress is doing to help improve our Nation's schools, because I do not think you always ought to talk about the things we are not doing. I think it is important to remind ourselves that we are doing some things. As a member of the Committee on Science, I have been working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help strengthen math and science and engineering education in this country, because I firmly believe as most of my colleagues do and I think a majority of the people in this country, if we are going to be a major competitor in the 21st century, we are going to have to do better and better educationally and academically because we truly are competing with the world. The days are gone when we just compete with the neighbors next door. We still are the world's largest market, but the

truth is that 95 percent of the people of this world live outside the borders of the United States, so that is our developing market and our future market and we have got to be able to compete with it. There are absolutely critical fields in math, science and engineering for our Nation's economy to prosper. Military dominance and supremacy. Domestic quality of life in the 21st century. It is absolutely imperative that we improve our technological skills if we want to remain and continue to grow. Otherwise, we will be passed.

The Rand Institute recently issued a report on the changes technology will bring in the coming years, over the next 25 years. Let me share some of this with Members. Hopefully it will help folks understand where we need to get to and be a little bit more focused on why we need to be spending dollars today on education to help our young people who will come out in 2015, will really be the next graduating class that starts this coming year.

It dramatically lays out how high the stakes really are, and they are very high. Let me read from the report summary. If that is not a wakeup call, then maybe we have got people ready for a slap.

"Life in 2015 will be revolutionized by the growing effects of multidisciplinary technology across all dimensions of life: social, economic, political and personal. The results could be astonishing. Effects may include significant improvements in human quality of life and lifespan; high rates of industrial turnover; lifetime worker training; continuing globalization; reshuffling of wealth; cultural amalgamation or invasion with potential for increased tension and conflict; shifts in power from nation states to nongovernmental organizations and individuals; mixed environmental effect; improvements in quality of life with accompanying prosperity and reduced tension; and the possibility of human eugenics and cloning."

We need to read that a couple of times, because that is really heavy stuff. That is available within most all of our lifetimes unless something happens to suddenly end it. Those are major changes. They will all come about as a result of the opportunities in technology and others.

Madam Speaker, the impact of this coming revolution is mind-boggling, but one point is abundantly clear. There is no question about it in my mind: America must have the leaders and workers to harness the potential of this coming revolution and continue to exert our global leadership role to secure our economic leadership position. Congress must provide support today through innovative efforts to improve science education to promote the success of America tomorrow. We cannot wait 5 to 10 years to start. Other countries are already investing today.

I am pleased to report that we have begun to make some progress in this effort. Today, the House Committee on

Science unanimously adopted H.R. 1858, the National Mathematics and Science Partnership Act, to improve our Nation's standing in math, science, engineering and technological education and the instruction of it. This bill includes a major initiative that I started out with last year to enhance math and science education and teacher preparation through the National Science Foundation. This measure authorizes \$200 million for NSF to establish partnerships between institutions of higher education and local and State school systems to improve the instruction of elementary and secondary science education. That is an important component. Having been a State superintendent and working at the State level with local school systems, I can tell Members that is a critically needed piece and those dollars can be used wisely. It will provide a variety of other activities to include: recruiting and preparing pre-service students for careers in mathematics education, a shortage in this country right now; offering in-service professional development initiatives, including summer or academic year institutes or workshops to strengthen the capabilities of existing mathematics and science teachers.

For too many years, we employed teachers, depending on the school systems, 9 months; in North Carolina it is 10 months and we wonder what they ought to do the next 2 months. Go out and find a part-time job? That is fine when you are young, but as you get older, you really need to have full-time work because you have full-time bills. We are beyond where that can continue to happen. Especially in the area of science and mathematics, if we can provide them with resources, they can get training, they will come back and even be far better teachers the following year.

Innovative initiatives that instruct teachers on using technology more effectively. This is a critical piece, because technology is moving so fast. When you are in that classroom every day and you are instructing every day, you do not have time in a lot of cases to do all those things you would like to do to keep up to speed with all the new pieces coming down. I guess education is the only place I know where we ask a teacher to teach all day, go home at night and do a lesson plan, grade papers until sometimes 8, 9, 10 o'clock at night, especially if you are a teacher of literature and grading compositions, and come back and start all over the next day. That is why it is getting more and more difficult.

It also will help in the development of distant learning programs for teachers and students, an opportunity to cut down on travel, especially now when gas prices are getting to be prohibitive for people to travel.

Teacher transition efforts for professional mathematicians, scientists and engineers who wish to begin a career in teaching. There are those who have put in a full career in a professional field

and really have got their years in to retire and feel a calling. They would like to go back to the public schools and get reinvigorated with a group of young people, and start teaching all over again, something they have wanted to do but could not do because of finances. There will be resources here to help make that transition, especially at a time when teachers are so critical and the shortage is so great.

Madam Speaker, my district is, as I said, in the Research Triangle region of North Carolina, where we know that technology fueled the remarkable economic growth we have experienced in the 1990s, land that was turned from pine trees and cotton fields to high tech, computer chips, and a revolution that employs over 100,000 people. It has changed the landscape forever and added wealth to a lot of people. This partnership bill, this initiative that we are talking about, will help foster and provide a solid foundation on which to build better math and science education, not only in places like Research Triangle Park, but all over America and help those people who are looking for a better opportunity in life to realize it.

□ 1900

We cannot turn back. I grew up on a farm in eastern North Carolina. The county where I grew up, we grew normal crops you would have in eastern North Carolina, tobacco, corn, cotton, soybeans. Then we had hogs and all the other stuff. I think now how busy we thought we were then, but reflecting back we really did not have anywhere near as much to do as I thought we did, because today the pace seems to be much faster. I only say that to say that the things we are talking about tonight of education and opportunities have helped a young farm boy have the opportunity to get a college degree and the educational opportunities I have had, and served as a State legislator, State superintendent, now a Member of the most distinguished body, in my opinion, in the world, in the United States Congress. Yet, with all that we still have much to do.

Let me take just a moment now in this special order to talk about and celebrate a bipartisan accomplishment that passed this House just a few weeks ago. I think it is so important. It really is a bipartisan accomplishment that I think will help improve the schools in this country and certainly has had a significant impact on schools in my State and in those areas across the country that we have put it in, and that is called character education.

Last month, during the consideration of H.R. 1, this House unanimously voted to add a character education amendment that was offered by myself and my Republican colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP). This important measure will provide \$50 million per year for the U.S. Department of Education to provide grants to State and local school sys-

tems to launch education initiatives for our children.

When I served as State superintendent, we pioneered character education. After a comprehensive survey I did in 1989, surveying about 25,000 across the State, some alarming data came back that things we really needed to do and pay attention to and after a year and a half study and work with a whole host of principals, teachers, academicians, judges and others, we recommended to the State board and they adopted a character education program that we really initiated and integrated into the curriculum across the State.

The survey showed that discipline, safety, good order and respect were really major problems or were perceived to be major problems, I should say, in the public schools of North Carolina. We planted a seed of character education, and I happen to believe they have produced a bumper crop of good things for the children of our State. This bill, I trust, will begin the process of doing that across America.

Character education works, I believe, because it teaches students to view the world through a moral lens and to learn that actions really do have consequences. I think character education works best because it is integrated in the curriculum but probably equally or more important it integrates those basic values that all of us can agree on: Honesty, integrity, respect, responsibility, kindness, compassion, perseverance throughout the academic curriculum.

I do not know of anyone who can disagree with those. It works, character education works, because it teaches children how to grow up to become not only good students but good citizens and decent human beings as well.

I am pleased and proud that the House has passed the \$50 million Etheridge-Wamp character education amendment and I call on my colleagues in this body and the White House to support it.

Mr. Speaker, let me return back to where I started and then I will prepare to wind down shortly. This issue of school construction, I have talked about several issues after having started with that but I think it is important to remember Congress is called upon from time to time to do many things. If we have a disaster, we try to respond. If we have a problem in the world, America is the last safe haven as a democracy for people around the world, and we normally go and try to help, as we should.

The time has come to do our own homework, to take care of our own children, to meet their needs, and we can do it. We have the resources, but the question is do we have the will. Do we have the commitment? I have often believed that it is one thing to talk. It is another thing to do. It is easy to say I care; I have compassion. It is another thing to show it in acts. It is one thing to tell a person, I am concerned you do

not have food and then walk off and leave them with their stomach grumbling. It is another thing to help.

I do not know that building schools is exactly like that, but I truly believe that if we do the things for children, we have quality facilities, good teachers, a good environment for them to learn, reach out to their parents and invite them to be part of the educational establishment, schools will be better, educational attainment will increase and America will be a better place in the future, and our democracy will stand for a long, long time.

If we do not, as our Founding Fathers challenged us long ago, we have a democracy but we are the only ones who can determine whether it will last. I really believe that we have it within our destiny.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my views on reform of Federal support for kindergarten through 12th grade education. As I said at the outset, I spent a number of years, and as I told my colleagues when I came here, as the only chief in this body, former chief. I do not know that I have all the answers but I know some of the things we ought not be doing and sometimes we do some things on this floor that I know we should not be doing. I believe I have a little different perspective as we look at it than others in this town about what it takes to improve schools for our children, and my State has repeatedly been cited as a model for reform by everyone from the Bush White House to Democratic leaders in the Congress, to the nonpartisan Rand Corporation that has done a number of studies in education across America.

H.R. 1 as passed by this House may prove to be a decent education reform. I sure hope it does. There are some things in it that I would not have put in it, I would have written differently, but I voted for this bipartisan bill because I support the concept of greater accountability with greater resources to get the job done.

Let me say again so no one misunderstands, one cannot, one will not, improve schools and education on the cheap. In the 1980s, we decided we were going to rearm the military and the last time I checked we spent hundred of billions of dollars and we won the Cold War. We did not win it on the cheap. It will not even take that kind of money to turn education around.

I get amused when people talk about how much we are spending, and we do spend quite a bit, but the truth is at the Federal level in most cases it is less than 7 percent of all the money going to education. If one goes back to the 1960s, when we really increased in science and math education, when Sputnik went up we were spending closer to 12, 15 percent, depending on which system you were in.

So we have gone backwards. Our schools today face daunting challenges, among them record enrollments, run-down facilities, incredible diverse bodies with special needs. And, yes, we

have higher expectations, to name a few. We have more children showing up at the schoolhouse door today who do not speak the language of the school system than ever in history, but if we will do a few things we can help those children. They will be capable. They will be prosperous. They will be our next generation of doctors, lawyers and teachers. We have to give them an opportunity. Education is the key to opportunity. Education is the door through which all of us walk into the middle class. We do not get there without it.

The days are gone when you can be a dropout and become a millionaire, but you can do it with education. That is still the American dream.

Before we put new requirements on our schools and on our children, the schools are not going to be able to meet those strident new standards if we fail to provide the resources that they are going to need to achieve those goals. It is one thing to say jump and then you put a millstone around their feet. It is another thing to give them wings. I am very concerned that we may not put the resources behind it.

Congress may fail to do that. If we do, we will pay a heavy price. The resources that we are going to need to invest in better schools can only come from the budget we have. The Bush budget request provides the smallest educational increase in percentage terms in 6 years, in 6 years. In fact, the final budget that we passed eliminates all the education funding that the Senate Democrats added and cuts education funding even below what the President's budget had requested, \$1 billion less than the President's budget this year, and \$20 billion less over the next 10 years.

Now, that does not sound like folks who are really committed to improving education in this country. I cannot imagine this body saying we are going to improve our military and scale up to meet the needs of the 21st century and the challenges around the world but we are going to give you \$20 billion less money. That is not going to happen.

To do it to our teachers and to our children is akin to being sinful. If we are to realize our potential as a country, we absolutely must reverse this course and rededicate ourselves to real education reform. We must provide the tools to get the job done. If you are going to dig a hole, you give somebody either a shovel or you give them a tool to dig a hole with. If you are going to dig a big enough one, you may want a piece of power equipment. But if we are going to raise the bar on every child in America, and I happen to believe we can and should, we need to make sure that they are strong enough to jump over that bar.

It reminds me of something one of my farmer friends told me one time. He said, if all you do to a pig is weigh him every day and you do not feed him he is not likely to get much bigger. Well, if all we do to young people is we test

them every day and we do not give them the resources to help those that have the greatest need, they are not likely to improve a whole lot. We need to be able to put the resources there to get the job done. Tough reform without real resources will be nothing but a cruel hoax on our children. Reform without resources will condemn an entire generation of American children to failure at a critical time in our Nation's history by frittering away an unprecedented budget surplus.

□ 1915

In North Carolina, when we started doing our assessment program, we put resources in to help those children who were not up to scale. We put in summer school so they can go back and catch up so they do not get failed, because once a child fails and he fails to pass a grade, the likelihood of that youngster dropping out increases dramatically. It is important that we do the things that need to be done.

We know what needs to be done. We may not know everything that works, but we can find the best ideas and put them in there.

Madam Speaker, we have a chance before this Congress adjourns this year to get this discharge petition before this body, to vote on it, send it to the Senate, let them vote on it, and I have every belief that they will pass it, and send it to the President for his signature. It will make a difference in the quality of schools in America and the modernization and the technology that is needed; but more importantly, it will make a difference in the lives of children in America.

REASONABLE SOLUTIONS BY REASONABLE PEOPLE REGARDING THE UNITED STATES ENERGY SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HART). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. McINNIS. Madam Speaker, this evening I want to talk about the energy situation that we have in the United States. Really, the theory of my discussion this evening is about reasonable solutions by reasonable people.

We have heard on this floor for any number of weeks now constant attacks against the administration, constant attacks against the U.S. Congress, constant attacks on why this energy crisis has come about, but we are real short on hearing much about solutions.

This evening I want to talk a little about, number one, just how widespread especially the electrical shortage is in this country. I want to give my own predictions on where I think we are going to be in a year or two in regard to the electrical generation shortage we have in this country; and I will visit a little about California, which seems to be the State, frankly,

that did the least amount of planning and is in the most amount of trouble. There is a correlation between not much planning and lots of trouble. We will discuss a little of that this evening.

We will talk shortly about New York State and the other 48 States and what the other 48 States have done and what kind of a situation we are in.

I want to start at the very beginning of my remarks by saying that I do not have an anti-California bias. I know some of my colleagues are upset, and I think that there is some justification to these people being upset, with the situation in the State of California. But there are a lot of us on the Republican side, and I am sure on the Democratic side, outside of the State of California, who live outside the State of California, who happen to believe that we need to help California; that California, while it primarily got itself into this mess on its own, it cannot get itself out of this mess entirely on its own, although, frankly, California is going to have to put its boots on by pulling itself up by its own bootstraps. So there is a lot of responsibility that falls on California.

But we have got to remember that California is the sixth most powerful economic factor in the world. Not in the United States; it is not the sixth most powerful economic State in the United States. If it were a country of its own, it would be the sixth most powerful country in the world from an economic point of view.

Frankly, what is bad for California is bad for the United States when it comes to economies. California produces a tremendous amount of our agricultural products, the foods that you buy at the grocery store. So we are dependent on California, and California is dependent on us. This is a union, you know, the United States of America, so when one State generally gets in trouble, the other States feel the impact; and in my opinion, the other States have an obligation to step up to the plate to help their colleague.

But that does not mean that as you step up to the plate to help a fellow State you ignore how you got there in the first place, or that you take some of the more radical positions, or that you accept some of the radical ideals of how to approach this. It all comes back, in my opinion, to a reasonable approach by reasonable people.

Let me talk just very briefly here about the California energy crisis. I have a number of charts this evening. I think, colleagues, they will help me walk through my points with you.

Let us take a look at the State of California. First of all, remember that in California, this is a State where predominantly you saw, and I know this may ruffle some feathers, but the fact is you predominantly saw in that State an attitude of "do not build it in my backyard." We predominantly saw an attitude in the State of California where the political leaders seemed to

believe that anything that California needed in the way of a new power source, that they could either get it from renewables, alternatives, or conservation.

Now, most of my discussion this evening is going to be about conservation. Conservation is a very, very, very important factor in helping California and helping the entire Nation. One, use our energy more efficiently; and, two, make sure that the other 40 States avert an energy crisis.

But we have to be realistic, and I am afraid that some of this realism never really existed or it was ignored in California, the realism that you cannot get yourself out of this energy shortage by conservation alone.

I note that the Vice President has been criticized on numerous occasions because the Vice President stood up and said exactly that; that, look, no matter how hard we believe in conservation, no matter how much we exercise, we still need to come up with additional power generation. We still need to take into consideration that this Nation is becoming more and more and more dependent on foreign nations for our oil resources.

So as the Vice President agrees and as I strongly advocate, as do most reasonable people, it is some kind of combination of answers that will help the State of California out of its energy crisis; that that combination would contain conservation; that that combination would contain other types of alternative energy; that that combination would contain exploration of further oil resources; that that combination would contain additional electrical generation. That is how we are going to get an answer for our colleagues, for our fellow State, the State of California.

Now, remember, in the last 8 years there has not been the approval for a natural gas transmission line. I am not talking about the natural gas line that goes from Main Street into your House. I am talking about a major transmission line, to move the natural gas from one location to another location.

I can tell you that it seems to me that every time there was an effort at putting in some type of project, whether it was natural gas transmission lines, whether it was electrical generation, all you continued to see was that nothing would work; no generation plant in California would satisfy the people near it; no gas transmission line through California would work. In fact, every single project, to the best of my knowledge, in the last 8 or 10 years in California involving nuclear energy, involving electrical generation, involving natural gas transmission, every one of them was aggressively opposed, as if it would bring an end to society as we know it if we dared build that type of project. That is one of the reasons that our fellow colleagues in California are in this kind of shape.

Let us look at the second point, place price caps on the rate that electrical

providers could charge to consumers while doing nothing to discourage demand.

You know, this is a misconception that deregulation, true deregulation, actually took place in California. True, they called it deregulation, they gave it the label of deregulation, but what California did was not true deregulation. What California did in their State was they allowed the electrical utility companies to sell their generation facilities to an outside party, and then, retaining oversight on the utility companies, the State of California prohibited the utility companies from raising their prices on the consumer in the State of California.

By not raising your prices to the consumer, it is very similar to renting. If you are a landlord renting an apartment to a tenant and you pay for the utilities, what happens in that kind of case? What will happen is you will go see the people that are renting from you, if you are paying their utilities, in the summer their air conditioner will be at 50, and in the winter they will have the windows of the apartment open trying to get rid of all the heat they are generating in the house because they have the thermostat turned up to 80 or 90 degrees.

It does not work. Economically it does not work. Allowing a price freeze for consumers instead of a price that reflects what the markets demand, you create an artificial floor. You do not have to walk very far on that artificial floor if you do not have supports for it before somewhere you are going to fall through. That is what happened, because California did not have true deregulation.

Let us go on. No new coal-fired power permits in the last 10 years. I am a little discouraged to see that just in the last few days, number one, the State of California has panicked and is now proceeding through their Governor Davis, who has attacked almost everyone else, the blame game, blame it on them, blame it on them, blame it on them, but never point a finger at the political leaders in California, the State political leaders, never point a finger at the Governor of California. Point them at everybody else.

The difficulty is that now in the last few days we have seen some pretty rash reactions by the political leaders within the State of California. The first thing, the Governor apparently, and this is what I read from the media, I obviously have not had a conversation with the Governor, but the Governor apparently has now agreed to sign long-term contracts for electrical generation. Long-term contracts.

You know where that electrical price is today, folks? Do you know where that price is? You are at the top of the market. You are at the top of the market in what you are paying for electricity. Now is not the time to sign long-term contracts to buy that power, but the Governor of California has decided that it is.

I will point out here just exactly how many power generation facilities we have coming online in this next year. In this next year we will have three generation plants a week coming online throughout the rest of the Nation. Believe it or not, it is my prediction that in the next year to year and a half, maybe 2 years at the outmost, we are going to have an electrical glut. We are going to have more electricity in this country than we know what to do with.

We may have trouble with transmission, and, again, looking at the State of California, ask California when is the last time they allowed a major transmission line to go through their state. You can generate all the electricity you want, but if you cannot move it from point A to point B, and sometimes that point from A to B is a long distance, the electricity does not do you much good, because, you see, once you generate electricity, as we all know, you cannot put it in a little bottle; or, like a bag of potato chips, eat half the bag and wrap it up and eat the rest of the bag the next day. You cannot do that with electricity, and time you do not generate is time lost. So I actually think that we are going to have an electrical surplus.

But California's responsibility is to help itself, and we have a responsibility to help California. I do not think we should continue to heap on California, continue to bash California, but I think we should be willing enough, all of us, to say where are the shortfalls? What do we need to do to help our colleagues?

Let us go on.

□ 1930

Now let me say that on the coal-fired, as I started to say, the coal-fired plant permits, another thing that has discouraged me in the last few days, which is caused by panic and by poor planning, I understand now in California the Governor has lifted restrictions on some of the dirtiest or most polluting electrical generation plants in the State for special hours when they run short of electricity.

What brought that about? A shortage. But what brought about the shortage? The fact that it now has California reducing or diluting their tight standards for pollution, it is because they have refused to approve anything. Nothing satisfied the regulators out there in California. Nothing satisfied the people that opposed electrical generation plants or electrical transmission lines or natural gas transmission lines.

Now, as a result, when they get in a crisis in the State, they see the environment in my opinion kind of taking second seat because they have to have that energy. What is going to come first, the environment, or having electricity to the local hospital? The environment, or being able to power the refineries so they can continue to produce gas?

There is give and take in everything we do. We cannot possibly live on this Earth without taking something from the environment. We have to eat, sleep, et cetera.

The same thing in California, but now the give and take is kind of out of proportion because, in California, they did not plan. They did not say, all right, we may not like electrical generation plants, we may not like coal-burning plants, we may not like transmission lines, those big towers with those big wires that are kind of ugly. We may not like to even begin a discussion on nuclear energy, but the fact is, we have to do some planning.

That is what is missing from the California solution, from the California deregulation effort. Now we see not a discussion, a good, thorough discussion by reasonable people about, what do we do on deregulation so it does not repeat itself. Instead, what we are seeing primarily from the elected State officials there in California, primarily the Governor of California, we are seeing the blame game: "It is your fault. It is your fault. It is your fault."

Come on. We have to come up with a solution here. Let us look at a couple of other things.

One is, no inland refineries have been built in 26 years. California's power capacity is down 2 percent since 1990, while demand is up 11 percent in that same time period. That is a collision. That is a collision waiting to happen. They drop capacity down at the same time they bring demand up and they are going to have a collision. That is what has occurred in California.

Let me say that the Governor of California speaks as if all of the States in the Union are in this kind of problem. I have to tell the Members, there is a reason that California stands alone in this energy crisis. There is a reason that California is in worse shape than everybody else. It is not because they got the bad draw out of the hat. It is not because they happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time. It is because they put themselves there.

There are a lot of States in this Union who have said, we may not like it in our backyard, we may not like electrical transmission lines, we may not want to see a generation facility, but the fact is for our citizens in this particular State we need to plan for our future energy needs. Now, that includes, by the way, conservation.

I must say here, Madam Speaker, California has demonstrated a solid move and solid progress towards conservation. In the last month alone, the State of California has dropped their energy demands in the electrical market as I understand it by 10 percent, not because they brought additional production on, although, as I said, they are going to have to, but because they have begun to conserve.

We are going to go over some conservation ideas tonight that I think will be an easy sell to my colleagues, because my ideas and ideas that I have

gathered of other people's for conservation are conservation without pain.

Does it sound too good to be true? It is not. It is just some simple, common-sense ideas about conservation that will reduce the demand, which, by the way, in the long run will also reduce the price, and also, it is good policy not to waste energy.

Let us go on. I just mentioned how ironic it is that the State of California really has its biggest problem. The dark days are ahead in California. Now, remember that California is an importer. They are bringing in electricity because they cannot, under the regular course of events, under a regular course of events, generate enough electricity to supply their State.

The same thing, by the way, in the United States. Under a regular course of events, this Nation has become more and more dependent on foreign countries across the oceans to answer our needs because, in large part, we have not had exploration.

Let us take a look at the United States. We are going to find out that the Governor of California, by the way, has taken great delight in criticizing Texas simply because, in my opinion, he wants to run for President in 2 years, and the President happens to be from Texas.

But if we put the political biases aside, the problem that Texas has is Texas frankly has done good planning. It has plenty of power for its State. The difficulty is Texas, which really has surplus power, they, in other words, are on the another end of California, and they have power they can export out of their State, but they do not have the transmission lines, for example, to take much power into the eastern grid or into the western grid. I think that is going to be resolved pretty soon, because then Texas can help other States.

New York City has been unable to generate enough energy for its demand. They had blackouts, as we remember, in 1965 and in 1977. But they are in the process of allowing facilities to be built in New York. They are not a State that has refused to allow electrical generation to be built in their State for 10 years. They are trying to keep up with demand, and they are being more aggressive about it as we speak.

New York, my guess is this summer New York blackouts will be at a minimum because New York is racing to come up with a solution, understanding that conservation alone will not give them the answer, although conservation is going to be a critical part of the solution.

Now, in the Pacific Northwest we have heard about possible power shortages up in Washington and Oregon. These are not because Washington and Oregon have refused to allow generation facilities. These shortages are not because they are naysayers, because they have that NIMBY attitude, not-in-my-back-yard attitude. Their problem up there in the Northwest is they have a drought.

In fact, that contributes to the problem in California, because California is dependent upon the hydro power, which of course means water, which of course, when we have a drought, we do not have, out of the Pacific Northwest.

The Pacific Northwest, primarily the Columbia River, which has dried up fairly dramatically, that is nature, that is an act of nature. We have to do what we can do to help these States, but I think that will resolve itself. Our droughts usually come to an end. I think we will see some resolution.

Now let us look at California. There could be as many as 34 or more blackouts in the State of California, although, again to the credit of California, because of the conservation methods they are now exercising, California may drop that fairly dramatically. California may have less of an energy crisis. They will not eliminate it until they accept the fact they have to have additional generation, but I think they are going to have less of an energy crisis than we thought even just 2 weeks ago because of the fact that the people in California are seriously accepting conservation methods.

So in California, the primarily problem with California is lack of planning and lots of pretending, lack of planning and lots of pretending. That is what has happened in California. They pretended that they really had deregulation. They pretended that they could say to their citizens, you will never have a price increase. We are going to cap it. They pretended that while demand for power went up, there was no need to provide additional generation to answer that. They pretended that conservation and alternative energy standing alone could meet the additional demands of the citizens of California.

That is what has happened. That pretending has created the problem in California. But I think we can get it resolved. I am going to show the Members some other ideas I have.

This cartoon I just saw today in the paper. I wanted it made up. The fact is, as I have said repeatedly throughout my comments this evening, reasonable people can reach reasonable solutions, but we have to have people who are not hypocritical. We have to have people who do not say one thing on one end and do something else on the other.

I think this editorial cartoon out of the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel pretty well depicts exactly some of what has gone on.

Here we are in a Volkswagen van. It has solar power on the roof. It says, "Make love, not power plants. Save the Earth. No nukes." On the back, it has a California license plate, racing right by the "last chance" energy gas station. Then the cartoon down there shows the Volkswagen bug running out of gas. Now it shows the driver of the bug with a gasoline can in his hand walking back saying, "It is all Bush's fault."

That is exactly what we are seeing a lot of out there, people who oppose gen-

eration: "Not in my backyard. No more exploration. No electrical generation plants, no transmission lines." But then the minute they run out of power, they go and blame everyone else.

We need to avoid that, because we can come up with solutions, all of us working together. We have to face the fact that no matter how good a solution we come up with, we are always going to have 10 percent over here on this extreme that might, for example, say, "Drill at any expense." That is crazy. We all cherish our environment too much to have that, to buy into that. We have 10 percent or 15 percent over here who say, "Do not drill at all. We do not need additional power," et cetera, et cetera.

But in the middle there is a large segment of people who believe, one, in conservation, and believe in exercising responsibility in their own lifestyles for conservation, while at the same time acknowledging that we have to become less dependent, not more dependent, on foreign countries, and that we have to have generation facilities sometimes within view of our homes, sometimes within view of our communities. Sometimes we have to sacrifice a little of that so we can have the supply, the energy supply, that we need.

Let us talk about our homes. As we all know, the electricity in a home travels through the house in wires. These wires lead to light switches and outlets which power the televisions, computers, lights, and most everything else in our homes.

Think about how dependent we are on energy. Our heat is dependent on energy. No matter whether we use natural gas or propane, we have to use electricity. The air cooling, whether it is refrigerated air or a humidifier type of air or just simply fans, is dependent on electricity. Obviously, the lights, the security system, is dependent. When we take a look at our houses, just how dependent are, it is incredible just how much we depend on electricity. Electricity makes our homes comfortable to live in.

It is not free. Electricity is not free. We cannot have electricity brought to our homes without some type of sacrifice. We cannot have electricity in our homes without some type of impact to the environment.

The key on the impact is that as we look at the impact, is it a reasonable impact? Is it a balanced impact? Is it an impact that is sustainable as far as mitigation to the environment?

Let us go on. Before electricity gets to our homes, some type of fuel must be used. It can be coal, it can be nuclear, or even a dam on a river. We give up certain parts of nature to enjoy electricity, so we must do our part to conserve electricity.

For example, if we leave the light on in the room after we leave it, we are using electricity we do not need. To conserve electricity, shut off lights in rooms we are not using.

Now, that sounds pretty simple. Gee, here is the gentleman from Colorado

(Mr. McINNIS) telling us to turn off our lights. We know that, it is common sense, turn off the lights on the way out of the room.

I will make a little confession here: Up to about 3 months ago when I went to my office the first thing in the morning, I turned on every light in the office. I put on the coffee, turned on the lights. I went to the sink, ran the hot water until the water got hot, started to put it in the coffee pot.

We do it differently now in my office. Now I do not turn on lights in the office, all the lights. I turn on the light that I need to read by, but I do not turn all the lights on until the office personnel shows up, until we actually need the lights.

If we as a Nation would only turn on that light switch when we actually needed the lights, that would help. Light we use for security purposes, for example, we may have a timer that turns on a bedroom light, especially while we are away on vacation, or a garage light that a timer turns on at 2 or 3 in the morning. Just go up to that light and replace it with a lower wattage light and we are helping save energy. These are simple ideas that cause no pain.

The fact that I go into my office and do not turn on all the lights does not cause any pain. It helps the situation. The fact that we use a lower wattage bulb does not impact the security at all.

Shut off the TV when nobody is watching it. Keep the computer in sleep mode if we are not using it. Shut off the monitor. Unplug appliances like curling irons and clothing irons right away. Letting them sit while turning off wastes electricity, and on top of that, it is unsafe.

I know the Members are saying, well, this is all pretty basic stuff. We have heard this before. The whole reason, the whole reason that I am visiting with the Members this evening is we have all heard it before, but we have not all used it before. We have not exercised our responsibilities to help with conservation. If we are going to get to the bottom of this problem, we have all got to pitch in on conservation.

□ 1945

Let us continue. Here are a few steps you can take to immediately, this is immediately, help this Nation conserve on fuel, on energy. Do not let the hot water run while you are washing your hands, brushing your teeth, or shaving.

I have done that before. I get ready to shave. I turn on the hot water, I walk over, I get the shaving cream or something, water is running, and I casually look in the mirror. You can save a lot of hot water, plus you can save the water.

Water is a little more complicated, because it is a renewable resource. But the electricity to heat is not renewable, and we can conserve on that. Use smaller appliances such as microwaves, toaster ovens, and crock pots. Use cold

water to operate your garbage disposal, this saves energy. And, frankly, it helps the unit to dispose of grease more efficiently.

Wash your clothes in cold water. If you use ceiling fans, blades should rotate clockwise, keep that in mind, that in the summer, your ceiling fans have to turn clockwise. Make sure it is turning clockwise, otherwise it is defeating the purpose.

If it is turning counterclockwise, it works to help heat the home. If it turns clockwise, it lifts the cool air up, and it helps cool the home, very simple, no pain. It does not cost you any more money. It does not require you to sacrifice the lifestyle that you have.

All it requires you to do is reach up and pull the chain, that is all it requires, and you can help our Nation conserve.

Keep doors closed as much as possible, especially on refrigerators. Do not circle a parking lot over and over instead, take the first spot available. How many of us do go to Wal-Mart, we go down to the grocery store and go through the parking lot three times or four times and see if we can find a parking spot that is 15 feet closer to the front door?

Take the first available parking spot you saw, number one, walk into the store. It actually helps you get a little more exercise, takes off a few calories and you are wasting less energy. For somebody that goes down where there is parking, having a tough time finding parking in shopping centers, over a year period of time, you actually would be surprised how much consumption of gasoline you would save by simply taking the first parking spot available.

Again, back to conservation. Here are some others. Now, this is one that is really a pet peeve for me. If you take a look, and I am asking all of my colleagues to pay special attention to this, because this is a significant conservation move that we can take that is totally and completely painless.

What am I talking about? Tonight when you go home, colleagues take a look at your owner's manual in your car. Go into the glove compartment and pull out the owner's manual.

Before you look at the owner's manual, remember a couple of basic things. Number one, that people who drafted it, who put that owner's manual together are the people who designed the car, the people who tested the car, the people who sell the car. If you look in there, go in there and see how often the people who know the most about your car how often they tell you to change the oil.

My guess is that most of you will see in your owner's manual that your personal car oil only needs to be changed every 5,000 miles to 7,000 miles.

Now, take a look at the campaign that has gone on over the last several years. There are a lot of people out there that want you to believe that if you do not change your oil every 3,000 miles, your car motor is going to be ruined.

It is a very clever marketing ploy, and it has worked very successfully. There are hundreds of thousands of people in this country who religiously change their oil every 3,000 miles even though the owner's manual says change it every 5,000 or every 6,000.

Let us say that if half of those people that change their oil every 3,000 miles now do what the owner's manual tells them to do and change it every 6,000, look what kind of savings you have. Look what you do to demand. Over a year period of time, you are talking about, you are talking about millions of barrels of oil, millions of barrels of oil.

Yet, if we do this, there is no pain. Your car is not going to run any less efficient. You are not going to be restricted from driving anywhere. Life goes on just as it went on before, except now you are helping us reach some kind of solution. You are a reasonable person coming to a reasonable solution. You are a contributor to the solution.

Let us go on. Make a grocery list and take fewer trips to the store; use public transportation or ride your bike or walk when you can; turn down cooling levels for your refrigerator or freezer; keep all exterior doors tightly shut and avoid frequent in and out traffic; lower the temperature of your hot water heater to 120 degrees.

This is a pretty interesting one, because a lot of people do not know about this. Colleagues, tonight when you go home, take a look at your hot water heater, take a look at the hot water tank.

On the bottom of the tank you are actually going to see a thermometer and you might find, to your surprise, that your thermometer is on high. I can tell you if you think, put your thermometer on low at about 120 degrees, that water is still too hot for you to stand in; 120 degrees is still too hot.

You actually save energy, there is no reason to heat the water to 190 or higher. Heat it to 120. Move that little gauge to lower. And guess what? You are one of those reasonable people who help with a reasonable solution that has not impacted your life-style one iota. It has not impacted your life-style one bit. Very important you are part of the team.

Take shorter showers. Now I know I have that on there. I can tell you it was snowing in my district. By the way, colleagues, as you know, my district is the Rocky Mountains of Colorado. We are at the highest elevation in the country. And after it snows in the middle of June, you like to go home and have a long hot shower.

So I do not know, maybe that impacts life-style a little too much, but if it does not impact your life-style, go ahead and cut down your hot water showers.

Let me tell you just the conservation elements that we have gone through to this point. We have not had to use mil-

lions of dollars of taxpayers' dollars to research whether these work or not. We have not had to put taxpayer credits out there, so that you have the money and you get credits to use against your taxes to see whether these work or to make them work.

I can tell you, in my opinion, if the American people would follow the recommendations I have made this evening, we will have made more progress towards conservation, in my opinion, than any of these solar tax credits or other tax credits, we have spent hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars at the Federal level trying to find a Federal solution which generally does not work.

Let us go on. Conservation. This is pretty interesting. I did not know this until about 3 weeks ago when I was researching it. Preheat your oven only when it is necessary to preheat it. Do my colleagues know that foods that take over an hour to cook do not require a preheated oven?

In other words, if you have a roast and it is going to take more than an hour to cook it, do not preheat your oven, it does not do you any good. And not only does it not do you any good, if you do not preheat your oven, guess what happens? You save money. Because preheating an oven takes a lot of energy.

You actually cut your own electrical bill. You improve your life-style, because you bring home more money at the end of the month.

If your water heater, and this is important, was purchased about 1992, use a blanket around it. You can buy that blanket at a local convenience store. It probably pays for itself over a 6-month period of time. After 1992, there is some question as to whether or not the blanket is really going to help you with your hot water heater.

A full refrigerator uses less energy to cool. If you have a refrigerator, and you just have a couple of cartons of milk and cheese and maybe 120th of your refrigerator has food in it, put some water bottles in there, occupy the space. It actually saves energy, and you have cold water to drink.

Some of this stuff may sound mundane. Some of it he just keeps talking about conservation. He just keeps talking about conservation. Every item I have told you tonight is something that each and every one of us can utilize. This chart does not belong to one class. This chart does not belong that only one in one State can use it. This chart is for another.

Every chart I have showed you on conservation hints or conservation suggestions work no matter where you use it. It works in California. It works in New York. It works in Florida. It works in Montana.

Conservation, paint and decorate in light colors. Dark colors absorb light. Light colors reflect light. The lighter colors you use the less artificial lighting is required. You think we would all know that. But if you have a room with

white walls, you are going to use a whole lot less electricity to light that room up than if you paint it with dark walls.

Defrost food in the refrigerator instead of defrosting it in a microwave where you use a lot of extra energy. Place it in the refrigerator 24 hours before you need it. So tomorrow if you know that you are going to have, you have some frozen burritos in the freezer, instead of 5 minutes after you come home from work and 10 minutes before you have dinner stick it in the microwave to thaw it out, simply the night before, place it in the refrigerator. By the time you come back the next day, they would have thawed out on their own and ready to go right in the oven.

It is a very simple step. Imagine if we had 200 million people going home from work and they were not defrosting in the microwave, you want to know something? That would help conserve electricity? Good idea.

Every time your iron heats up, you burn more electricity than leaving your lights on for 4 consecutive hours. Try ironing all of your clothes at one time. This simple practice can make a surprising difference in your water and power bill. Clean the lint filter after every load. It says that on your dryer, clean that lint filter.

Every time you turn that iron up, it is like lighting for 4 hours. That iron uses a lot of electricity. I am not saying do not use the iron. I am not saying that at all. What I am saying is, hey, let us do all of your clothes at once so you do not have to continually heat it up.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about a couple other simple things. Replace 60-watt bulbs that are left out overnight with two 15-watt bulbs. We talked about that. We talked about the use of the lights that use compact fluorescent bulbs. You have probably heard that.

Here is another conservation, replace 150-watt bulb operating 5 hours a night with a 35-watt compact fluorescent bulb. Same lighting impact, no impact on life-style, but yet you are helping conserve in this country.

Let us look at this one, here are some other easy steps, unplug or get rid of that refrigerator in the garage. Do you know how many people have an extra refrigerator in the garage? Millions. Do you know how many people have a freezer in the garage that does not have much in it? A lot of people.

You probably do not really need it and if you figure it out, the average refrigerator, the extra refrigerator you have plugged in your garage uses about \$16 a month in electricity.

You figure out what kind of foods you have in that refrigerator you may have a couple six packs of beer and figure out at \$16 dollars a, you figure how much, what that, about \$192 dollars a year, just to be able to refrigerate it in the garage. Make a little more room in the refrigerator, put your beer in there. You are going to save a lot of electricity, and you are going to save yourself a lot of money.

Use your dishwasher only when you have it full, the same thing with your clothes washer. If you have to cook a hot meal, wait until later in the evening until it is cool. That one is maybe kind of a little impractical, but it is not impractical for you to take a look and see if you really need that refrigerator in the garage.

Let us look here. While on vacation, there are a lots of us colleagues that are going to be taking vacations this year. Here is some ideas, completely painless. It will not affect vacation. Set your air conditioner at 35 degrees at 85 degrees, excuse me, not 35 degrees, you get the opposite result, 85 degrees when you leave the home.

My wife and I left this last weekend, and we have refrigerated air. Every air conditioner in our house we have three separate thermometers, three separate air conditioning units, one system, but three units and each of those units, that thermometer was at 90 degrees on all three of them.

When we came home, it only inconvenienced us for about 15 minutes. The house was hot for about 15 minutes before that refrigerated air began to cool that home, and within half an hour, we were at the exact temperature we wanted to be.

But in the meantime for 48 hours instead of those air conditioners running about every 20 minutes, they didn't run at all. That probably saved my wife and I \$20 or \$30 for the weekend. So you save money, you help conserve.

We have talked about several basic things that we can do for conservation. Let me reiterate a few of my points and with my last 17 minutes, let me just kind of recap what I have said this evening.

First of all, take a look. Cleaner air. We are making progress. Do not become distressed about the entire picture. There are certain areas that we really need to do something or we are going to have a lot of problems.

□ 2000

One of them is our dependency on foreign oil. Our second one is to ignore conservation. We cannot ignore conservation, and we cannot continue to build our dependency on foreign oil.

But some of the good things that are happening is, one, people in this country are willing to conserve. If we can help give ideas, tell your neighbor, talk about it at coffee.

In California, they are in a crisis. Now they did not conserve because the Governor of California told them to conserve. They did not conserve because, all of a sudden, they felt like good citizens overnight. They conserve because they had a crisis. They conserve because they got their monthly utility bill. But none the less, their conservation cut electricity demand by 10 percent in the State of California last month alone. That is pretty good. That is positive.

I want my colleagues to know that if one takes a look, cleaner air, energy

consumption has risen while emissions have declined. We can make better cars. We can make cars with cleaner emissions.

Now, the answer for our automobiles, for example, in my opinion, is not to eliminate the automobile, we would never do it on a practical aspect, and not to make such outrageous demands on the automobile manufacturers that the automobile they produce cannot go more than 30 miles an hour, cannot go up a hill.

I live in the highest mountains of the United States. We have got to have cars that have power. We have to have SUVs up there. We need those kind of automobiles. But we do not need automobiles that get four miles to the gallon.

Frankly, the automobile manufacturers had been responsive, not because they are all of a sudden good citizens, but because we the citizens are demanding more efficient automobiles. We are demanding better gasoline mileage; and after this energy crisis, we are going to demand more.

But take a look. As I said earlier, mark my word, I think in a year and a half, at the outmost 2 years, we are going to have an electrical generation glut in this country.

Let me give my colleagues some statistics. Right now, the power plant industry is in the midst of an unprecedented, unprecedented in our entire history, power building boom and adding more new power than the plant a week that was recently called for. Last year, 158 new generation plants were completed nationwide or three plants a week. The new units had an average capacity of 150 megawatts. That means about 150 homes.

Let me just go on here. The electricity industry expects to build 1,453 new power units in the next 3 years. Taking time off for weekends, that amounts to one plant a day for 5 years running. Now, maybe all of these will not get built, but right now the electrical generation capacity plants designs in this country call for a new plant every day coming on-line for the next, as I said, for the next 5 years.

So I think we are going to have an electrical generation glut. But that does not mean we have solved the problem. Number one, we have to have transmission lines. We have to move the electricity from point A to point B. Number two, we have got to continue a very aggressive educational campaign on conservation, points like I gave my colleagues, very harmless ways to help all of us, reasonable people bring about a solution for our energy crisis.

But probably what is most important this evening, I can tell my colleagues, is it cannot be conservation alone. I am a big believer in conservation. I just spent the last hour going through with my colleagues where I think we can all conserve. The numbers that result from these conservation ideas that I gave are not insignificant numbers. These are not small numbers. These numbers make a difference.

But while I say this, while I say that conservation will be of substantial benefit to our energy situation, I must also say that we have got to continue to look for, explore for natural resources, that we have got to continue to allow transmission lines, that we are going to have to have some refineries in this country.

We cannot typically say that everything that is being built is a disaster, that everything being built means the end of our life as we know it, that everything being built is going to be a complete and ultimate decimation to our environment. There are a lot of reasonable proposals out there that can be made to work.

Now, no project, no project should be approved without mitigation, in fact even higher than mitigation, and that is supplementation to the environment. On the other hand, when the environmental impacts have been mitigated, when the environment has been enhanced in some cases or may be enhanced to a degree in all cases, when we meet that standard, do not continue to say no. Do not continue to say it cannot happen in my backyard.

When those standards are met, we as a Nation have a responsibility to the next generation. We have to have enough foresight for future generations to say yes to reasonable projects, yes to reasonable conservation. We have also got to have enough guts, frankly, to stand up here. We have tax credits that are not working, not only in Washington, but Washington is unique. There have been hundreds of millions of dollars wasted in tax credits for so-called alternative energy.

Well, what are the results. Do not let people divert us from looking at the bottom line. Are we getting the results that we want simply because of what they call their project: "My project is the solar project, so do not dare ask me any questions about what is the bottom result." Are we really coming out with a product that is efficient for our environment? Are we really conserving energy for the hundreds of millions of dollars we are spending?

It was amazing to me how many people criticize the President in his budget when he says this program has not produced. This program sounds good. It has got a great name, especially in an energy crisis. It has got lots of special interest groups in Washington who benefit from those tax credits, pushing, how dare you say no to this alternative or that alternative.

But the reality of it is, one, we have to conserve; two, we have to explore and find new resources for our energy; and, three, the money that we are currently spending, the taxpayer dollars, my colleagues' dollars, their constituents' dollars, we have to justify, we have got to treat those dollars as if they were our own.

We have an incumbent responsibility, an inherent responsibility to manage those dollars. No matter how nice sounding or how progressively sound-

ing a program is, if it is not giving us results, we have got to have enough guts to stand up and cut it off.

In summary, Madam Speaker, I think this energy crisis is limited. Over the long-term, obviously we have issues. We cannot continue to grow in dependency on foreign oil. But California is unique. California is more the exception than the rule. California, a large part, brought this on itself. But California is a large part of the United States. We all want to help California despite the criticisms we have; and some of the whipping that California gets they have got coming. But a lot of it, they do not. Californians I think are exercising responsibility by practicing conservation.

But the reality is this, reasonable people can come together and have reasonable solutions that, one, protect our environment; two, conserve for future generations; three, lower dependency on foreign oil; and, four, do not have a negative impact on the life-style to which we have all become accustomed. If we can meet those four, five standards, we have done pretty well. I think reasonable people can do that.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 3:00 p.m. on account of attending a funeral in Connecticut.

Mr. FOSSELLA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending the graduation of his son.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. POMEROY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEINER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDREWS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. CARSON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REHBERG) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today and June 14.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGLISH, for 5 minutes, June 14.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FRIDAY, JUNE 8, 2001

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 487. An act to amend chapter 1 of title 17, United States Code, relating to the exemption of certain performances or displays for educational uses from copyright infringement provisions, to provide that the making of copies or phonorecords of such performances or displays is not an infringement under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1914. An act to extend for 4 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCINNIS, Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 14, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2458. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Noxious Weeds; Permits and Interstate Movement [Docket No. 98-091-2] received June 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2459. A letter from the Chief, Programs and Legislation Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Commander of Air

Force Space Command is initiating a single-function cost comparison of the Communications activity at Peterson Air Force Base (AFB), Colorado, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2460. A letter from the Army Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Report On Use of Employees of Non-Federal Entities to Provide Services to the Department of the Army—received June 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2461. A letter from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Community Bank-Focused Regulation Review: Lending Limits Pilot Program [Docket No. 01-12] (RIN: 1557-AB82) received June 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2462. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Community Development Revolving Loan Program for Credit Unions—received June 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2463. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Central Liquidity Facility—received June 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2464. A letter from the Trial Attorney, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—List of Nonconforming Vehicles Decided To Be Eligible for Importation [Docket No. NHTSA 2000-7882] (RIN: 2127-A117) received June 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2465. A letter from the Trial Attorney, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Schedule of Fees Authorized by 49 U.S.C. 30141 [Docket No. NHTSA 2000-7629; Notice 2] (RIN: 2127-A111) received June 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2466. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Conversion of the Conditional Approval of the NOx RACT Regulation to a Full Approval and Approval of NOx RACT Determinations for Three Sources [DE053-1029a; FRL-6996-5] received June 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2467. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Underground Storage Tank Program: Approved State Program for North Carolina [FRL-6976-5] received June 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2468. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—North Carolina; Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program [FRL-6976-4] received June 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2469. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule—Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for FY 2001 (RIN: 3150-AC73) received June 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2470. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the semi-annual report of the activities of the Inspector General during the six-month period ending March 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2471. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2472. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2473. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2474. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2475. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2476. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2477. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2478. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2479. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2480. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2481. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2482. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2483. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2484. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2485. A letter from the Senior Management Analyst, Division of Policy and Directives Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subparts A, B, and C (RIN: 1018-AH85) received June 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2486. A letter from the Acting Administrator for Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's "Major" final rule—Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve Regulations [Docket No. 970404078-0176-02] (RIN: 0648-AE41) received June 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2487. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Documentation Of Nonimmigrants Under The Immigration And Nationality Act, As Amended: Aliens Ineligible To Transit Without VISAS (TWOV)—Russia—received June 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2488. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Paralyzed Veterans of America, transmitting a copy of the annual audit report of the Paralyzed Veterans of America for the fiscal year 2000, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1166; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2489. A letter from the Attorney, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pipeline Safety: Incorporation of Standard NFPA 59A in the Liquefied Natural Gas Regulations [Docket No. RSPA-97-3002; Amdt. 193-17] (RIN: 2137-AD11) received June 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2490. A letter from the Regulations Officer, FHA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Standards for Traffic Control Devices; the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways; Standards for Center Line and Edge Line Markings [FHWA Docket Nos. 97-2295(96-47), 97-2335(96-15), and 97-3032] (RIN: 2125-AD68) received June 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2491. A letter from the Acting Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Size Eligibility Requirements for SBA Financial Assistance and Size Standards for Agriculture—received June 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

2492. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—F frivolous filing position based on section 861 [Notice 2001-40] received June 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2493. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Interest Rate [Rev. Rul. 2001-32] received June 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2002 (Rept. 107-100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. JONES of Ohio (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2145. A bill to provide for fire sprinkler systems, or other fire suppression or prevention technologies, in public and private college and university housing and dormitories, including fraternity and sorority housing and dormitories; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. FROST, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. HART, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. NEY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. SWEENEY):

H.R. 2146. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide life imprisonment for repeat offenders who commit sex offenses against children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. KERNS):

H.R. 2147. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for making energy efficiency improvements to existing homes and for constructing new energy efficient homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. WU, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 2148. A bill to reestablish the Office of Technology Assessment; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. DUNN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BASS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COX, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LINDER, Mr. McINNIS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. OTTER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PENCE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mrs. WILSON):

H.R. 2149. A bill to extend trade authorities procedures with respect to reciprocal trade

agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BALDACCI:

H.R. 2150. A bill to modify the land conveyance authority with respect to the Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station, Cutler, Maine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BALDACCI (for himself and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 2151. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a commercial truck safety pilot program in the State of Maine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 2152. A bill to provide for the issuance of bonds to construct and modernize Indian schools and to provide a credit against Federal income tax for holders of such bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 2153. A bill to provide for an election to exchange research-related tax benefits for a refundable tax credit, for the recapture of refunds in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. DEGRETTE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 2154. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Department of Defense and all other defense-related agencies of the United States to fully comply with Federal and State environmental laws, including certain laws relating to public health and worker safety, that are designed to protect the environment and the health and safety of the public, particularly those persons most vulnerable to the hazards incident to military operations and installations, such as children, members of the Armed Forces, civilian employees, and persons living in the vicinity of military operations and installations; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Resources, Education and the Workforce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 2155. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it illegal to operate a motor vehicle with a drug or alcohol in the body of the driver at a land border port of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon (for herself and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2156. A bill amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a public response to the public health crisis of pain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. TANNER, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BASS, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. KIND, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GOODE, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 2157. A bill to address health care disparities in rural areas by amending title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2158. A bill to provide for monitoring of aircraft air quality, to require air carriers to produce certain mechanical and maintenance records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2159. A bill to provide for grants to States for enacting statewide laws regulating public playgrounds consistent with playground safety guidelines established by the Consumer Product Safety Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WATKINS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. HART, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DELAUNT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. HORN):

H.R. 2160. A bill to provide for the establishment of individual development accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. NEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 2161. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide a mandatory fuel surcharge for transportation provided by certain motor carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 2162. A bill to authorize a national museum, including a research center and related visitor facilities, in the city of El Paso, Texas, to commemorate migration at the United States southern border; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and

in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ (for himself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island):

H.R. 2163. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that disability of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by certain conditions is presumed to result from the performance of such employee's duty; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BASS, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KIRK, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 2164. A bill to amend the Agricultural Market Transition Act to gradually reduce the loan rate for peanuts, to repeal peanut quotas for the 2004 and subsequent crops, and to require the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase peanuts and peanut products for nutrition programs only at the world market price, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 2165. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of a Cold War service medal to members of the Armed Forces who served honorably during the Cold War era; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. COYNE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. LAFALCE):

H.R. 2166. A bill to expand the purposes of the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families to include poverty reduction, and to make grants available under the program for that purpose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KIND, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 2167. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect 1/3 of

the world's fresh water supply by directing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a study on the known and potential environmental effects of oil and gas drilling on land beneath the water in the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SUNUNU:

H.R. 2168. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on bitolylene diisocyanate (TODI); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 2169. A bill to extend the deadline under Part I of the Federal Power Act for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURTHA:

H.J. Res. 52. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to school prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. STARK):

H. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to rights each registered voter in the United States should have; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. HART, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. KLECZKA):

H. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to honor its commitment to the United States aviators who lost their lives flying for France during World War I by appropriating sufficient funds to restore the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CONDIT (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BACA, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. WATSON):

H. Res. 165. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1468) to stabilize the dysfunctional wholesale power market in the Western United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas introduced a bill (H.R. 2170) for the relief of Steven Joseph Sweeney; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 31: Mr. CANTOR.
H.R. 64: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 65: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 91: Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 94: Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 123: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. KERNS.
H.R. 162: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 239: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 260: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 303: Mr. GILMAN.
H.R. 326: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 425: Mr. SOLIS and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 510: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 519: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 572: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 600: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 606: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 612: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DEMINT, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 641: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.R. 687: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 699: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 702: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 703: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 721: Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. EVANS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 757: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 774: Mr. BURR of North Carolina.
H.R. 781: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 794: Mr. MASCARA.
H.R. 804: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. SIMMONS.
H.R. 808: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KING, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, and Mr. GRUCCI.
H.R. 817: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 823: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 898: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mrs. CLAYTON.
H.R. 912: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. GRUCCI.
H.R. 940: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 968: Ms. LEE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 978: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 981: Mr. CAMP, Mr. HORN, and Mr. SIMMONS.
H.R. 1017: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1035: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1109: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. HANSEN.
H.R. 1110: Mr. RILEY.
H.R. 1120: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. CANTOR.
H.R. 1129: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 1130: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 1134: Mr. STUMP and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1170: Mr. GEPHARDT.
H.R. 1171: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. OSBORNE, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 1187: Mr. RUSH and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1192: Mr. BALDACCIO and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

- H.R. 1194: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 1252: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1254: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1262: Mr. FROST and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1291: Mr. GIBBONS.
H.R. 1339: Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 1340: Mr. SIMMONS.
H.R. 1353: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.
H.R. 1364: Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 1382: Mr. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 1401: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1411: Mr. GIBBONS and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1452: Mr. BONIOR and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
H.R. 1459: Mr. TERRY, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MCINNIS.
H.R. 1483: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1507: Mr. HAYWORTH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1509: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. CALLAHAN.
H.R. 1510: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 1543: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1553: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1615: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
H.R. 1624: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1632: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 1645: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1648: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1650: Mr. WU.
H.R. 1668: Mr. WAMP, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. KINGSTON.
- H.R. 1672: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. CONDIT.
H.R. 1673: Mr. SIMMONS.
H.R. 1707: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1711: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1739: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1760: Mr. SOUDER and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1764: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. PHELPS.
H.R. 1782: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1805: Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1825: Ms. LEE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. BALDACCI.
H.R. 1839: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1842: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1873: Mr. BACA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FRANK, and Mrs. BONO.
H.R. 1882: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1911: Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 1923: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1935: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. RILEY.
H.R. 1941: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1948: Mr. RUSH and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1961: Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1975: Mr. STUMP.
H.R. 1984: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 2001: Mr. POMBO.
H.R. 2009: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. FORD, Mr. OSE, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2017: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2037: Mr. STUMP, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BRADY of Texas,
- Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 2063: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 2074: Mr. FRANK and Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 2076: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 2082: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2101: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 2117: Mr. RUSH and Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 2125: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2134: Mr. RUSH and Mr. BONIOR.
H.J. Res. 36: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. REHBERG.
H.J. Res. 45: Mr. FLAKE.
H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. OWENS.
H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. LAHOOD.
H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. HILLEARY.
H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. OSE.
H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. UPTON.
H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. SCHROCK, and Mr. SIMMONS.
H. Con. Res. 151: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HOYER.
H. Res. 160: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, and Mr. WOLF.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 877: Mr. CLEMENT.