some form of detention in China than in any other country. Both Evangelical Protestant house church groups and Roman Catholics have been targeted and named ''a principal threat to political stability'' by the Central Committee of China's Communist party. In recent months, in separate incidents 3 Chinese Christian leaders were beaten to death by Chinese authorities simply for their religious activities;

Whereas an Islamic court in Kuwait has denied religious liberty to a convert from Islam to Christianity, and the judge recommended that he be put to death;

Whereas 3 Christian leaders in Iran were kidnapped and murdered during 1994 as part of a crackdown on the Iranian Christian community;

Whereas severe persecution of Christians is also occurring in North Korea, Cuba, Vietnam, and certain countries in the Middle East, to name merely a few;

Whereas religious liberty is a universal right explicitly recognized in numerous international agreements, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

Whereas Pope John Paul II recently sounded a call against regimes that ''practice discrimination against Jews, Christians, and other religious groups, going even so far as to refuse them the right to meet in private for prayer,'' declaring that ''this is an intolerable and unjustifiable violation not only of all the norms of current international law, but of the most fundamental human freedom, that of practicing one's faith openly,'' stating that this is for human beings ''their reason for living'';

Whereas the National Association of Evangelicals in January 1996 issued a ''Statement of Conscience and Call to Action,'' subsequently commended or endorsed by the Southern Baptist Convention, the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church, and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, United States of America. They pledged to end their ''silence in the face of the suffering of all those persecuted for their religious faith'' and ''to do what is in our power to the end that the Government of the United States will take appropriate action to combat the intolerable religious persecution now victimizing fellow believers and those of other faiths'';

Whereas the World Evangelical Fellowship has declared September 29, 1996, and each annual last Sunday in September, as an international day of prayer on behalf of persecuted Christians. That day will be observed by numerous churches and human rights groups around the world;

Whereas the United States of America since its founding has been a harbor of refuge and freedom to worship for believers from John Winthrop to Roger Williams to William Penn, and a haven for the oppressed, and has guaranteed freedom of worship in this country for people of all faiths;

Whereas, unfortunately, the United States has in many instances failed to raise forcefully the issue of anti-Christian and other religious persecution and international conventions and in bilateral relations with offending countries; and

Whereas, however, in the past the United States has forcefully taken up the cause of other persecuted religious minorities, and the United States has the ability to intervene in a similar manner for persecuted Christians throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) unequivocally condemns the egregious human rights abuses and denials of religious liberty to Christians around the world, and calls upon the responsible regimes to cease such abuses;

(2) strongly recommends that the President expand and invigorate United States international advocacy on behalf of persecuted Christians, and initiate a thorough examination of all United States policies that affect persecuted Christians;

(3) encourages the President to proceed as expeditiously as possible in appointing a White House special advisor on religious persecution; and

(4) applauds the actions of the World Evangelical Fellowship in declaring an annual international day of prayer on behalf of persecuted Christians.

GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1996

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, when the House debated budget reconciliation last October, I submitted a statement for the RECORD in support of the provisions in the bill to reauthorize the generalized system of preferences [GSP] duty-free import program. Today, the House will again debate this issue as part of a larger bill to raise the minimum wage. I would like to again reaffirm my support for the reauthorization of the GSP Program. This program was designed as a way to help less developed nations export into the U.S. market. The GSP Program allows duty-free imports of certain products into the United States from over 100 GSP-eligible countries. The bill wisely provides that import-sensitive products are not to be subject to GSP treatment. Ceramic tile is a clear example of an import-sensitive product and is exactly the type of product which should not be subject to lower tariffs under the GSP Program.

Imports have dominated the U.S. ceramic tile market for the last decade and they currently capture nearly 60 percent of the market. This extraordinary level of import penetration is a result, in part, of over 30 years of documented unfair predatory foreign trade practices including dumping, subsidies, Customs fraud, import diversion, and abuse of a loophole in the GSP. The American ceramic tile industry, though relatively small, is efficient and competitive at normal tariff levels.

From its inception in the Trade Act of 1974, the GSP Program has provided for the exemption of ''articles which the President determines to be import-sensitive.'' In light of the history of unfair trade in ceramic tile and the significant and growing import participation in the U.S. ceramic tile market, the U.S. industry has been recognized by successive Congresses and administrations as import sensitive, dating back to the Dillion and Kennedy rounds of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. During this period the American ceramic tile also has been forced to defend itself from over a dozen petitions filed by various designed GSP-eligible counties seeking duty-free treatment for ceramic tile into this market. If just one petitioning nation succeeds in gaining GSP benefits for ceramic tile, then by law, every GSP beneficiary country is also entitled to GSP duty-free benefits for ceramic tile. If any of these petitions were granted, it would eliminate American tile jobs and could destroy the industry.

A major guiding principle of the GSP Program has been reciprocal market access. Current GSP eligible beneficiary countries supply almost one-third of the U.S. ceramic tile imports and they are increasing their sales and market shares. U.S. ceramic tile manufacturers, however, are still denied access to many of these foreign markets. Many developing counties maintain exclusionary tariff and nontariff mechanisms which serve to block the entry of U.S. ceramic tile exports into these markets. Industrial countries, including the European Union [EU], may use less transparent methods such as discriminatory product standards and testing methods to control their ceramic tile imports and, in some cases, to divert ceramic tile manufactured in third countries over to the U.S. market by imposing restrictions on those third-country exports to the EU.

I am in support of the reauthorization of the GSP Program and trust that import-sensitive products such as tile will not be subject to GSP.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HELEN CHENOWETH

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1996

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, August 1, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes 379 and 380.

Had I been here, I would have voted: ''yea'' on rollcall 379 and ''yea'' on rollcall 380.

PITTSBURGH'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE 1996 OLYMPICS

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1996

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the contribution that one of my constituents, Mr. Peter Calaboyias, has made to the 1996 Centennial Olympic games in Atlanta.

Mr. Calaboyias, a resident of the Shadyside neighborhood in Pittsburgh, created the sculpture ''Tribute'' that adorns Centennial Park in Atlanta. Mr. Calaboyias, who is also an art instructor at Grove City College, is a very talented sculptor. He has spent years designing and creating this beautiful bronze sculpture, which features three Olympic athletes.

In this work, Calaboyias has highlighted the unchanging spirit of the Olympic games over the last 2,700 years by incorporating three separate athletes—one from ancient Greece, one from the first modern Olympic games in 1896, and one representing the present and future games—into his composition. The modern figure, incidentally, is a woman—to reflect the changing nature of the games as well as the values they share in common.

This outstanding sculpture is located in Centennial Plaza, the emotional focal point of the Olympic games. Consequently, it will be seen by millions of visitors—and by millions of television viewers—in the course of the games. After the games are over, ''Tribute'' will remain as a lasting reminder of the glory and human drama of the Centennial Olympics.

Mr. Speaker, this statue is a fitting tribute to the spirit of the Olympic games, and to the determination, skill, and camaraderie of the athletes who have competed in the Olympics over the millennia. I am honored that one of my constituents has made such an outstanding contribution to the Centennial Olympic games in Atlanta. I want to recognize Peter Calaboyias today on the House floor and commend him for creating this remarkable work of art.

BILL TO AMEND THE RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1996

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues of a bill I'm introducing to toughen Federal laws regulating hazardous waste facilities. Hazardous waste treatment and disposal is regulated by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act [RCRA]. Since RCRA was enacted in 1976, we have made dramatic progress in improving oversight of hazardous waste though a flexible regulatory structure in which States have the primary role in enforcing the statute. The bill I introduce today takes three simple, but powerful, further steps to assist State environmental agencies in protecting the environment from hazardous wastes.

First, the bill requires the Administrator of the EPA to certify that authorized State RCRA programs include standards for the siting of hazardous waste facilities. Currently, a number of States have no regular standards which guard against the placement of hazardous waste facilities in environmentally sensitive or unstable areas. These States operate on an ad hoc basis when making permitting decisions. But the ad hoc approach has two weaknesses. The public is left with little to no information to judge whether a particular site represents a true danger to public health, and business is left with little certainty as to which sites are likely to garner approval. Standards which preclude siting in places like flood plains, karst terrain, or over important aquifers will clear up this confusion for both parties. And the bill allows each State the flexibility to tailor standards to its own needs and conditions.

Second, it authorizes the States to fund their RCRA programs through permit fees, and requires the EPA to determine for each State the cost of fully maintaining its program. In many States, taxpayers are funding RCRA programs from general revenues. Not only is this unfair, since the burden of supporting oversight functions properly belongs to those who treat and dispose of the waste, but it often leads to underfunding of State programs. This bill provides every State the opportunity and the ability to recover these costs through permits fees in accordance with the polluter pays principle.

Third, the bill corrects the problem that owners of hazardous waste facilities who are currently violating State or Federal environmental laws are still legally eligible to receive and do receive new operating permits. The third part of my bill, called a good-guy provision, prevents any company which is violating State or Federal environmental laws from obtaining a permit for a hazardous waste facility. This provision provides a strong incentive for operators to obey laws designed to protect public safety and minimize environmental risks.

I have a particular interest in ensuring that hazardous waste facilities are safe because my congressional district is adjacent to a hazardous waste landfill in Sumter County, SC—the second largest hazardous waste landfill in the Southeast, and my district formerly hosted a hazardous waste incinerator in Rock Hill, SC, which is now a reprocessing facility. Both have experienced problems, and I believe facilities of this kind would benefit from stricter Federal laws. I know the general public would benefit. Similar situations exist in almost every congressional district in the country. That's why this legislation is appropriate and deserves the support of the entire Congress.

I believe this bill represents modest but important change in environmental law. Hazardous waste facilities will continue to pose a danger to our health and the environment, but this legislation can help minimize that risk.

ABANDONED AND DERELICT VESSEL REMOVAL ACT OF 1996

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1996

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Abandoned and Derelict Vessel Removal Act of 1996. This act will provide the necessary tools to encourage the cleanup of a long-term public nuisance resulting from abandoned boats and barges found in the navigable waters of many communities in this country.

This issue centers on dozens of abandoned boats and other debris which has accumulated along the Guadalupe Channel, which surrounds the community of Alviso, CA. This concern was first brought to my attention by members of the San Jose City Council, the Alviso Master Plan Task Force and, most important, members of the Alviso community. These abandoned vessels have become a public health and safety hazard to both the community as well as to those that use the adjacent public waterways. Unfortunately, Alviso is far from the only community that suffers from this problem.

The Abandoned and Derelict Vessel Removal Act also make sense economically. Abandoned vessels do not just sit harmlessly by—these vessels are often used as an illegal dumping ground for hazardous materials. Cleaning up this mess is both expensive, time consuming, and places the health of the community in jeopardy. Between January 1988 and September 1991, the Federal Government spent $5.2 million to remove 282 abandoned vessels that blocked waterways. In that same time, Government spent nearly $5.7 million to clean up pollutants from just 96 abandoned vessels. This legislation would cut cleanup costs to the Government by more than 300 percent.

This legislation will establish clear authority to remove vessels left unattended in a public waterway that has not been designated as a harbor or marina for more than 45 days or those left unattended in an approved harbor or marina for more than 60 days. There are approximately 17 million recreational boaters using public waterways nationwide. It is estimated that this number will increase, on average, 4 percent per year. Given this substantial increase in waterway users, regulation becomes necessary.

This legislation empowers local authorities to keep public waterways clear while allowing boat or barge owners the opportunity to repair and remove vessels that are not actually abandoned. In addition, the removal of these derelict vessels will alleviate concerns regarding water quality and its impact on the public health of the local community.

This legislation will promote cooperation between interested local citizens, community groups, and government agencies in their joint efforts to preserve and protect the navigable waters of the United States, and it will return the power to take action to the communities and force boat owners to take responsibility for their vessels. A community could instigate action simply by petitioning a local elected official to notify the Secretary of the Army of the problem. Proceedings to notify the boat owner, and ultimately to remove the boat, would then be taken by the Secretary.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

H.R. —

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 ''Abandoned and Derelict Vessel Removal Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) ABANDON.—The term ''abandon'' means to moor, strand, wreck, sink, or leave a vessel unattended for longer than 45 days.

(2) NAVIGABLE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term ''navigable waters of the United States'' means waters of the United States, including the territorial sea.

(3) REMOVAL; REMOVE.—The term ''removal'' or ''remove'' means relocation, sale, scrapping, or other method of disposal.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Army.

(5) VESSEL.—The term ''vessel'' includes recreational, commercial, and government-owned vessels but does not include vessels operated by the Coast Guard or the Navy.

(6) VESSEL REMOVAL CONTRACTOR.—The term ''vessel removal contractor'' means a person that enters into a contract with the United States to remove an abandoned vessel under this Act.

SEC. 3. ABANDONMENT OF VESSEL PROHIBITED.

An owner or operator of a vessel may not abandon it on the navigable waters of the United States. A vessel is deemed not to be abandoned if—

(1) it is located at a federally or State-approved mooring area;

(2) it is on private property with the permission of the owner of the property; or

(3) the owner or operator notifies the Secretary that the vessel is not abandoned and the location of the vessel.

SEC. 4. PENALTY FOR UNLAWFUL ABANDONMENT OF VESSEL.

Thirty days after the notification procedures under section 5(a)(1) are completed, the Secretary may assess a civil penalty of not more than $500 for each day of the violation against an owner or operator that violates section 3. A vessel with respect to which a penalty is assessed under this Act is liable in rem for the penalty.