

the top of our mutual agenda. India's vast pool of highly trained English speaking professionals offers our nation critical resources in our efforts to stay competitive and to remain the world's leader in high tech industry. We need to offer India a security and economic partnership.

India's testing must be understood in terms of its verifiable, objective security concerns and how the world's nuclear powers have responded to those concerns. Any changes to the Pressler amendment should be considered in terms of U.S. national interests in relation to Pakistan's behavior.

Mr. Speaker, I will soon be introducing legislation regarding sanctions against India and Pakistan. However, before we consider any changes in the law affecting Pakistan there must be fundamental changes in the Government in Pakistan. We cannot support a government that permits and encourages actions that lead to the murder of Americans or any other innocent civilians.

According, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 227.

H. RES. 227

Whereas the United States has a vital interest in ensuring stability in South Asia, reducing tensions between India and Pakistan, and preventing the spread of terrorism;

Whereas Pakistani-backed armed forces and, reportedly Pakistani regulars, have crossed from Pakistan into Jammu and Kashmir, India, and occupied Indian military positions that were temporarily abandoned for the winter season;

Whereas this incursion has the financial and military support of Pakistan;

Whereas Pakistan's strategy is to support the armed incursion into Kashmir and renegotiate the Line of Control;

Whereas the Indian armed forces have been forced into action to defend the territory on the Indian side of the Line of Control and push the terrorists and Pakistani military forces out;

Whereas Pakistani armed forces, reportedly, are involved in these incursions;

Whereas the actions by Pakistan are contrary to the Lahore Declaration, an agreement between India and Pakistan to promote regional stability, peace, and security in South Asia;

Whereas the forces include well-trained and heavily armed Afghans and Pakistanis associated with Osama bin Laden, the Harkat-ul-Mujahideen, and the Government of Pakistan; and

Whereas the Group of Eight (comprised of the United States, France, Germany, Italy, United Kingdom, Japan, Canada, and Russia) on June 20, 1999, called for an immediate end to the hostilities, restoration of the Line of Control, full respect in the future for the Line of Control, and resumption of the dialogue between India and Pakistan in the spirit of the Lahore Declaration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives—

(1) that it should be the policy of the United States to oppose the Government of Pakistan's support for armed incursion into Jammu and Kashmir, India;

(2) that it should be the policy of the United States to support the immediate withdrawal of intruding forces supported by Pakistan from the Indian side of the Line of Control, to urge the reestablishment and future respect for the Line of Control, and to encourage all sides to end the fighting and exercise restraint;

(3) that it should be the policy of the United States to encourage both India and

Pakistan to adhere to the principles of the Lahore Declaration.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 25, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote No. 256. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" or "aye" on rollcall vote No. 256.

ARE YOU AN AMERICAN?
THOUGHTS FOR INDEPENDENCE
DAY

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, while participating in the recent Memorial Day observance at Veterans Memorial Cemetery in my District, I was privileged to hear an inspired essay about what it means to be an American. This essay was composed and presented by Elizabeth [Liz] Bokan, a student at Washington Middle School in Seattle. Many of us in the audience were deeply moved by Ms. Bokan's eloquence. Her words lend us confidence that our future as a nation is in the good hands of enthusiastic and creative younger generations.

Mr. Speaker, many of us will celebrate Independence Day by participating in naturalization ceremonies, helping to welcome new citizens to our ranks. I proudly offer Ms. Bokan's essay to all my colleagues as we return to our districts to renew the bonds that hold us together as a nation this July 4th.

ARE YOU AN AMERICAN?

Are you an American? Ask yourself this, and you come upon the easy answer, well yes, I am an American, as I am a citizen of America. But I ask you, is there not more to being an American? And how does a true patriot respond to pressure on one's beliefs, while maintaining the presence of mind that is characteristic of being an American?

In my school, I have been taking a class on American History. The truth will always hurt, no less in the sense of what this country great. I have learned of battles fought, and unnecessary blood spilled, and to what cause? Yet reading these texts, and seeing these illustrations of great American heroes, one thing seems to shine through. The pride individuals appear to hold in their home, in their title, and in their love for themselves and their people. Does that not signify that these people were very much Americans? But does each and every person have to measure up to the incredible genius of Abraham Lincoln and Benjamin Franklin simply to be called an American?

We are by name the country that accepts the unwanted of other societies; the Statue of Liberty asks for the sick and poor of the rest of the dismal world to travel to America, the land of the free. It is said that we have lost our charity, and our openness to the rest of the world's outcasts, and yet do we not open our lives and hearts to the immigrants that come to us searching for a better life, for the "American Dream"? One

of the magics that is America is the diversity of culture, accepting any and all customs, and yet still adopting them as valid Americans.

We have known what it is like to be the underdog, we have felt the ridicule of the rest of the world, and the pressures of an often losing struggle to overcome all odds, against us, and we continue to offer our support to those who feel the stress we felt, and more. And each and every one of those people we bring in as our own call themselves Americans, yet are they believed by the majority? In our society today, there is great conflict on every issue that could possibly be argued over, and people speak of the destruction of the American spirit. Yet the fact being overlooked is that the basis of the American way of life is within discord; we have the American right to disagree. But that discord brings about a people of accord, does it not? Through the wars fought and the policies enacted, we have always agreed to disagree in one way or another, and that leads to a harmony of the people.

But does an American necessarily have to be a hero, or a recently discovered patriot? Think of the thousands of soldiers whose names you've never heard, of the ones who have died for this country in the last 200 or so years, and of those who survived, who make sure these heroes can live on in American hearts. Think of the average working citizens, those who hold strict morals for themselves and those around them, who live their lives maybe raising a farm and a family. These people proudly call themselves Americans, and we believe them. Why? The truth is, Americans are people who will die for their country, who will stand up for their rights and those of the oppressed. Sure, it may be done with fear in their hearts, but is fear not also an American standard? We thrive on it, and have never felt the need to deny ourselves of it. The people we embrace and those who do the embracing are Americans. It is a state of mind to be an American, it is a love and joy in our freedom. I am an American, and if I could, I would tell the world, but it is enough to know that I can, I have the right to, and that absolutely no one can stop my love of the American spirit which I call my own.

IN HONOR OF DON FOWLER

HON. JAY INSLEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an exceptional college president in my district, Mr. Don Fowler. Mr. Fowler will retire as President of Lake Washington Technical College on June 30, after 19 years on its campus.

Lake Washington Technical College has blossomed under Mr. Fowler's leadership. The college, which enrolls 20,000 students, is the largest hi-tech college on the East Side. Moreover, 92 percent of its graduates secure employment upon graduation.

Lake Washington Technical College's strong commitment to life-long learning is exemplified by its extensive curriculum. Vocational education is just one of the many paths students may choose. This college also offers advanced skill training for the employees of local industries, hi-tech training, ESL classes for recent immigrants, and courses geared toward high-school students.

While I am confident that Lake Washington Technical College will continue to be a first-

rate educational institution without Mr. Fowler, the college will indeed lose a remarkable educator.

Mr. Speaker, even though Mr. Fowler is set to retire, I know that he will be an active participant in the community for years to come. Again, thank you, Mr. Fowler, for your many years of service.

BABIES AS MEDICAL PRODUCTS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, John Kass, a thoughtful columnist for the Chicago Tribune, on June 28, 1999, wrote an important column about a development in modern medicine that has the most serious consequences for the value of human life. I commend Mr. Kass' article to my colleagues:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 28, 1999]
DRAW THE LINE NOW AGAINST USING BABIES
AS MEDICAL PRODUCTS
(By John Kass)

It's an ugly twist on an old science fiction theme:

Would you use the body parts of an innocent baby so that you could live a happier life?

Would you support a system of incentives to kill other babies, and process them like meat at a packing plant, for the benefit of a frightened Baby Boom generation terrified of Alzheimer's disease and death?

Of course not. The suggestion is monstrous and dehumanizing. By comparison, it makes what the Serbs and Albanians are doing to each other look like a gentle game.

But the science fiction scenario doesn't generate the terrifying passions of old Balkan blood feuds.

Instead, it's calculated, without anger, and practiced by reasonable men and women in white lab coats.

It's about pure reason, efficiency and scientific rationalism. It's what a culture can do when it loses its soul. If you don't believe me, ask a Jew about the Nazi concentration camps.

So get horrified. Because it's not science fiction. It's happening now, in our country.

I read about it in Sunday's Tribune, in a fascinating story by science writer Ronald Kotulak under the headline "Stem cells opening path to brain repair."

It began with an anecdote about a woman with Parkinson's disease. Her name is Dr. Jacqueline Winterkorn. The drugs she was taking to fight the disease weren't working anymore.

"It's a very sad disease," Dr. Winterkorn was quoted as saying. "People are locked into bodies that don't move. Their brains are working, their minds are working, but they can't talk and they can't move."

In other words, they're human beings immobilized through no fault of their own, trapped without speech. They have emotions, but they can't do anything about it. They're helpless.

Like a fetus.

But Dr. Winterkorn's condition began improving, the story said, after she was given millions of new brain stem cells because her own brain cells weren't doing their jobs. Her brain cells weren't producing enough dopamine to control her movements.

The new brain stem cells worked just fine. They produced dopamine in her brain. She improved. The scientists are thrilled.

"The prospect of repairing a damaged brain is pretty remarkable," said Dr. Curt Freed, who did the study. "It has been possible to show significant improvements in some patients who suffered from a chronic neurologic disease for an average of 14 years."

But there is a price for Dr. Freed's success. The new brain cells have to come from somewhere. And they don't come from pigs.

They come from fetuses, which is a polite way of saying they come from tiny human beings. The tiny human beings didn't willingly give up their brains. Nobody asked them to sign papers donating their bodies to science.

They didn't have much say in the matter. They were aborted.

The National Institutes of Health—which means the federal government—has lifted its ban on the use of human fetal cells and is bankrolling several other similar studies.

Meanwhile, the White House worries that video games cheapen human life and make possible massacres like the one in Littleton, Colo.

Courts and abortion rights advocates have said that what grows in a mother's womb is not a human being. You don't say baby. That's impolite. You say "it," because that makes a human being easier to kill.

The debate over abortion is an old one now. Most folks have settled into their positions and defend them vigorously. That's not going to change.

What's changing is that we're progressing to a civilized new stage—turning human beings into valuable commodities—in which the bodies of the helpless are used to improve the lives of the powerful.

And it's being done in the name of cold scientific reason. The rhetorical pathway was cleared years ago, when the Germans built Buchenwald and Auschwitz and other places.

Soon other folks with Parkinson's or other brain disorders such as Alzheimer's disease will seek such treatments. The Baby Boom generation that has never been denied will make its demands.

It's human nature to use available resources to satisfy the most powerful human need: staying alive.

So aborted human babies will become resources. They'll become products, subjected to the market. Because they'll have value, there will be an incentive to provide more. Their bodies will be served up for the benefit of adults.

If we don't stop it now, if we accept this crime in the name of scientific reason, we'll lose ourselves.

Ask a mother carrying a child inside her. Ask her if it's not human. Ask any father who puts his hand on his expectant wife's belly and feels a tiny foot.

In a few weeks, they're out and looking up to you. They grab your finger. You kiss their necks. Someday, when they're old enough, they might ask you what fetal brain stem cell research is all about.

What will you tell them?

THERE THEY GO AGAIN: MORE ON THE CLINTON-GORE SCHEME TO BLACKLIST U.S. JOBS

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1999

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the perspective of the Investor's Business Daily newspaper on the Clinton-Gore scheme to blacklist certain

U.S. employers, threaten the jobs of U.S. workers, and increase taxpayers' cost of the government buying goods and services.

DOES RULE "BLACKLIST" BUSINESS?

CONTRACTORS MAY BE PRESUMED GUILTY UNDER GORE PLAN

(By John Berlau)

Al Gore's official campaign for president has just begun. But he's already upholding a pledge to organized labor that has business groups fuming.

Gore made his promise when House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt, D-MO—a union favorite—was considering a White House run. In February 1997, Gore told the AFL-CIO Executive Council that "the Clinton administration will seek to bar companies with poor labor records from receiving government contracts."

If a company wants to do business with the Federal Government, Gore said, it has to "respect civil, human and union rights."

Fearing that this promise could become a regulation that favors organized labor, groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and the Associated General Contractors of America have been worrying ever since.

Their fears may be justified. The rule is now circulating around federal agencies and lawmakers' offices. It's expected to be published in July.

It would give bureaucrats power to deny government contracts to companies that are merely accused of violating labor, antitrust, health, consumer or environmental laws. The charges don't have to be proved in court; allegations alone may be enough.

The rule could affect the \$180 billion spent on federal contracts with private companies each year. It's estimated that companies doing at least some business with the Federal Government employ more than 25 million people and account for more than a fifth of the work force.

The rule is "much, much worse" than expected, said labor lawyer Hal Coxson, who's executive director of the National Alliance Against Blacklisting, a coalition of business groups opposed to the rule.

"This is huge," said Randy Johnson, vice president for labor and employee benefits at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

But Steven Kelman, head of the White House Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) from 1993 to 1997, said the rule represents "a common sense point of view: If you violate the law, you can't do business with the Federal Government." Kelman says it's not that different from existing rules contractors must obey.

Gore spokesman Christopher Lehane told National Journal that the vice president "has paid a great deal of attention to (the proposal) because it will help labor in its efforts to continue organizing."

Attempts to get comments from Gore's campaign, his office and OFPP were unsuccessful.

A copy of the regulation obtained by Investor's Business Daily shows how far it could reach.

It says bureaucrats should deny a government contract if there's "persuasive evidence of the prospective contractor's lack of compliance with tax laws, or substantial noncompliance with labor and employment laws, environmental laws, antitrust laws and other consumer protections."

In some cases, violations don't have to be proved. According to the rule, "final adjudication" isn't needed if the contracting officer finds "persuasive evidence of substantial noncompliance with a law or regulation."

A fact sheet White House officials provided to lawmakers gives specific examples of