

Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Personnel Management to improve financial management practices and policies in the public sector.

The Scantlebury awards were named for the former Chief Accountant of the GAO, and were established to give the highest recognition to government executives who have demonstrated outstanding leadership and improvement in financial management in the public sector. The award was presented to Mr. Renfrow by David M. Walker, Comptroller General of the United States.

Governor James B. Hunt of North Carolina nominated Mr. Renfrow for the award stating, "Throughout his distinguished career, Ed Renfrow has served the citizens of North Carolina by providing sustained, high quality leadership in financial management at both the state and national levels. Ed has been a strong voice for fiscal accountability and responsibility within government and has been instrumental in reducing costs and promoting the efficiency, effectiveness and economy of government operations. The awards committee could not have recognized a more accomplished leader in the area of financial management and I congratulate him on this prestigious award."

Mr. Renfrow has distinguished himself through a lengthy career of public service to the people of North Carolina. I am proud to say that I share personal and professional paths with Mr. Renfrow, both of us having grown up in Johnston County and serving together on the North Carolina Council of State from 1989 to 1993. Mr. Renfrow began his career of elective public service in 1974 when he was elected to the North Carolina General Assembly, serving three 2-year Senate terms. In 1980, Mr. Renfrow began his first of three 4-year terms as North Carolina's State Auditor. Mr. Renfrow's current position as North Carolina's State Controller began in 1993 with his appointment by Governor Hunt and subsequent confirmation by the General Assembly. His current term as State Controller ends on June 30, 2001.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in congratulating Edward "Ed" Renfrow on this most recent award, continuing recognition of his long career of public service.

"THAT'S WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME"

HON. DAVID D. PHELPS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I have been fortunate enough to hear from American citizens from all walks of life. I have heard the many voices throughout this nation about what this country means to them. They have expressed their appreciation, love, gratitude and pride for America. I have heard from the veteran who has voiced strong convictions about the value of military service and the sacrifice of men and women who made this country free. I have listened to the educators and students share their dreams and aspirations for the future. And I have learned from citizens who speak from their hearts about our moral obligation to help the poor, the homeless, and destitute. But, possibly, louder than anyone, I have

heard from the silent majority; those who never wave banners, or hold protest rallies, but faithfully take their privilege to vote seriously and always find their ways to the polls. These expressions of pride, deep commitment to principles, and faith in God and Country tell about the greatness of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I have incorporated all of these important ideals in this song I wrote several years ago about my love for this Country. Tomorrow is the Fourth of July, a day that has a very special meaning to me, the Nation, and all the Members of this body. I hope we can all enjoy this song and I am honored to have this opportunity to put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"That's What America Means to Me"

Verse

A place where you can speak your mind and firmly disagree.

If you believe in what you say just say what you believe.

Where you can choose to work and live or where you want to pray.

The Land of opportunity; you can do it your own way.

Chorus

That's what America means to me

Where dreams come true;

It's up to you to be what you want to be.

Though silent your voice will be heard

That's what America means to me.

Verse

Your rights are guaranteed; they're written down in history.

We help the poor and weary;

we feed the hungry.

Protecting our honor, defend it we must.

We still do pledge allegiance

and still in God We Trust.

RESEARCH DEBATE DESERVES OUR ATTENTION

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, John Kass, a columnist with the Chicago Tribune has written another important article on a sensitive subject, fetal research. I urge my colleagues to read it carefully.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 1, 1999]

RESEARCH DEBATE TACKLES NEW WORLD SOME DARE NOT BRAVE

(By John Kass)

A discussion begins in Washington on Thursday. It's not about sex or money. It's not about scandals or interest rates or war.

So it might not get the media coverage it deserves.

But it could be the most important debate of our generation. It will determine whether we're going to make it easy on ourselves to make a bargain with science and the future.

Depending on how it comes out and what we settle for, it will determine what kind of human beings we will become, as science moves quicker than our ability to understand its consequences, in areas from human cloning to fetal stem cell research.

And it will answer a question:

Is it right to take human beings and process them as resources to benefit other human beings?

About 100 doctors and scientists have signed a statement from the Center for Bio-

ethics and Human Dignity to oppose something horrible—embryonic and fetal stem cell research, which uses aborted children and viable fertilized embryos to develop cures for some diseases such as Parkinson's and Alzheimer's.

At the news conference, the doctors are being joined by U.S. Sen. Sam Brownback, the joined by U.S. Sen. Sam Brownback, the Republican from Kansas, who is expected to lead a fight against changes in federal policy that now allows the research.

The National Institutes of Health already supports and finances the research using fetuses. Now, the NIH wants to use embryos too.

Among those opposing the research is former U.S. Surgeon General C. Everett Koop.

Some scientists argue that they need the human "material," as they call it, to study how the mind works, in order to attack the horrible diseases.

But doctors who have signed the document say that's wrong. Stem cell research on brain diseases is in its early stages, and there are other means to grow the cells to attack brain diseases.

Sen. Brownback said it is important to realize that the ethical line of using human life for stem cell research need not be crossed.

"For those who say there are moral and ethical issues on the other side, who say we have the moral responsibility to solve diseases like Parkinson's, I say, look at the other possibilities that we have," Brownback said Wednesday in an interview.

"We don't have to give up on solving Parkinson's. We have other ways of doing it. And that seems to be a prudent way to proceed," he said. "It's almost every week that another study comes out about advances in adult stem cell research. Let's not get into the situation where you go into all these legal and ethical issues—you'd have enormous ethical and moral issues here, and you shouldn't jump into it."

The debate over the use of fetal brain tissue in experiments was touched on in this space Monday. And I could hear the angry howling.

I'm not opposing science, or research, or organ donation, or any other reasonable practice. Organ donors offer their consent to have their bodies used by science.

But aborted children don't have that opportunity. They're not asked to give their consent. And they are used in stem cell research to help adults fight brain diseases.

Fifty years ago, the Nuremberg war crimes trials led the world to promise never to use human life in scientific experiments without consent. But now we're changing our minds, in order to win a scientific benefit.

And we cannot make a political deal on this issue without publicly and fully discussing the consequences of such selfish thinking.

Some people argue that to oppose this research is to condemn people with Parkinson's to death.

U.S. Sen. Richard Durbin (D-Ill.) thinks so. Though we disagree on this issue, he should be heard too.

"I think this is valuable research," Durbin said. "We have to set up safeguards that will keep it from becoming commercialized. The important thing about these (fetal) neural cells is that they may be able to help in cases that we can do nothing about now, conditions like that which keep Christopher Reeve in a wheelchair."

But there are other ways to obtain stem cells, according to the Center for Bioethics and Human Dignity. And even if there weren't other ways, using human babies and embryos should not be allowed.

Stem cells can be obtained from the living human nerve tissues of consenting adults and from adult cadavers, according to researchers. Like the fetal stem cell research, all of this is experimental.

Here's one reason why the fetuses and embryos are used. It's easier. They're available. And that's the problem.

Because it is easy, and because there is promise in the research, we might be willing—through small steps we don't even notice at the time—to barter something away. Our humanity.

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE MEDDLING IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF SOVEREIGN NATIONS—YET AGAIN

HON. HELEN CHENOWETH

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, can you believe that the Clinton-Gore Administration may be working with the United Nations to override a decision by the sovereign, duly-elected government of Australia regarding an internal land-use issue in that country?

On July 12th the World Heritage Committee of the United Nations Educational Cultural and Scientific Organization (UNESCO) will meet in Paris, France for the purpose of stopping the proposed Jabiluka uranium mine near the Kakadu National Park in the Northern Territory of Australia. Mine opponents were unable to persuade the Australian people and their government to stop the mine, so they have appealed to the World Heritage Committee (WHC) of the United Nations. Since Kakadu National Park is a U.N. World Heritage Site, environmental and anti-nuclear activists want the WHC to have Kakadu declared "In Danger," thus making mine construction very difficult.

The United States is a Member of the 21 nation World Heritage Committee, and the Clinton Administration is being lobbied by U.S. environmental and anti-nuclear activists to oppose Australia and vote in favor of the "In Danger" designation. The important issue here is protection of the rights of people in the democratic process of a sovereign nation from interference by international bureaucrats with no accountability whatsoever. The Jabiluka mine decision fundamentally affects citizens of Australia and a global organization should not be ceded that role and its associated powers to in which affected Australians have no representation. If the United States does not oppose this interference of the WHC in Australia's internal affairs, then we will hardly be able to complain when the WHC shows up on our doorstep to review some land-use decision in this country.

I would like to put this letter signed by 40 of my colleagues in the RECORD. The letter urges President Clinton to direct the U.S. Delegation to the World Heritage Committee in Paris not to meddle in the Jabiluka issue in which the United States has no clear national interest—nor any business in becoming involved. I also want to put a newspaper article in the RECORD from the Sydney, Australia Daily Telegraph. This article provides crucial background information on this important issue. I urge every Member to become familiar with this very serious issue.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, July 1, 1999.

Hon. WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON,
President of the United States of America, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, the House of Representatives approved for the third consecutive Congress the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act (H.R. 883) which increases congressional oversight of UNESCO's World Heritage and Biosphere Reserve programs.

This legislation, which has 183 bipartisan cosponsors, is partially a response to the international World Heritage Committee's meddling in a dispute regarding a proposed gold mine located on private property outside the boundary of Yellowstone National Park. Yellowstone has been designated as a World Heritage Site. The World Heritage Committee, a collection of unelected United Nations bureaucrats, voted in Berlin, Germany to declare Yellowstone a World Heritage Site In Danger in an effort to stop the mine. The Committee did not seek local or U.S. congressional input, but acted after only a brief visit to the park in 1995.

All permitting decisions regarding the mine were being considered pursuant to relevant state and federal laws including the National Environmental Policy Act. Actions taken by the World Heritage Committee were intended to short-circuit these laws and influence land use policies in the United States. In short, it amounted to a significant threat to the sovereignty of the United States. Any decision regarding this proposed mine should have been made by U.S. citizens and their elected officials; not by a committee of unelected United Nations bureaucrats meeting in Germany.

We understand the World Heritage Committee, of which the United States is a member, will meet on July 12 in Paris to consider designating the Kakadu National Park in Australia as a World Heritage Site in Danger in an effort to stop the proposed Jabiluka uranium mine which is located near that park—a situation remarkably similar to that in Yellowstone.

The duly elected Government of Australia has performed exhaustive studies regarding the environmental impact of the Jabiluka Mine. Based on these studies, it has concluded that a properly regulated mine will not impair the park. Consequently, Australian government authorities have issued the necessary permits for the mine to proceed, and the Australian government strongly opposes any intervention by the World Heritage Committee.

Australia's environmental record is exemplary. There is another nearby mine, the Ranger mine, which has successfully operated for many years without impairing the park. In fact, one color picture used by the Australian Wilderness Society in its 1999 annual calendar showed an idyllic wilderness scene of Kakadu with the oft-photographed Mt. Brockman in the background and a lovely picturesque lake in the foreground. The lake—home to frogs and crocodiles—also happens to be the Ranger mine's man-made retention pond.

As in the case of Yellowstone, any dispute regarding an Australian mine should be settled by the citizens of Australia working with their elected leaders—not at some obscure World Heritage Committee meeting thousands of miles away in Paris. Our government has no business engaging in exercises of eco-imperialism that undermine the sovereignty of Australia's elected government.

Any action by the U.S. delegation to support a World Heritage Site in Danger status for Kakadu could threaten our foreign relations with Australia which historically has

been among our strongest allies. We strongly urge you to direct the U.S. Delegation to the World Heritage Committee in Paris not to meddle in the Jabiluka issue in which the United States has no clear national interest—nor any business in becoming involved.

Sincerely,

Helen Chenoweth, Don Young, Greg Walden, John Doolittle, David McIntosh, Jack Metcalf, Tom Tancredo, Jim Gibbons, Bob Ney, Ron Paul, Van Hilleary, John Shadegg, Joe Knollenberg, Barbara Cubin, John Peterson, Rick Hill, Richard Pombo, Bob Schaffer, George Radanovich, John Hostettler, Frank Lucas, Mike Simpson, Tom Coburn, J.D. Hayworth, Sam Johnson, Asa Hutchinson, Dana Rohrabacher, Roscoe Bartlett, John Duncan, Donald Manzullo, Dave Weldon, Tom DeLay, Jo Ann Emerson, Kevin Brady, Doc Hastings, Bob Stump, Bob Barr, Scott McInnis, Wally Herger, Duncan Hunter,

PITTING EMOTION AGAINST REALITY

Maybe, just maybe, the UN is at last showing some spine on environmental and indigenous matters.

It's a big maybe but at least the UN's World Heritage Commission has given the Australian Government six months breathing space to counter the scurrilous propaganda put out by environmentalists and some Aborigines about the development of the Jabiluka uranium mine adjacent to Kakadu national park.

The report, prepared by a committee chaired by Italian Francesco Francioni, is undoubtedly one of the most egregious documents ever to come out of UNESCO.

Environment Minister Senator Robert Hill was not exaggerating when he damned it as "biased, unbalanced, and totally lacking in objectivity".

At a time when the United Nations' misguided committees are coming under more fire than ever before, this sort of criticism from a senior figure in a democratic government, unlike most UN members, will attract the concern of senior people up the UN ladder. And it should.

Dr. Francioni's group not only failed to take into account material on Jabiluka which would have added some balance to its report, it actively avoided witnesses who could have shed informed light on the issue and attempted to impugn the integrity of others.

Instead it was spoon-fed the usual pap from green and Aboriginal activists and a mish-mash of scientific data from so-called experts who hadn't even visited the site.

In most circles, the omission of evidence from key scientific and Aboriginal groups in such a report would be considered to constitute fraud.

Not unexpectedly, the usual suspects are saying they're outraged that the UN hasn't bought the report.

Well, let them huff and puff and let them explain why the report they cherish contains fundamental and humiliating errors of law.

For example, the report refers to the 1993 Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples but last we heard, this most contentious document was still being negotiated with just two of its 45 draft articles being settled.

The report seeks to rely on Australia's obligations under two Conventions to which Australia is not a party and it seeks to rely on another Convention relating to stolen or illegally exported cultural exports, to which Australia is not only not a party to, but which is also irrelevant.

The UN mission relied almost exclusively on a submission from four scientists from the ANU, three of whom have never been on