

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for Rollcall 255, which was final passage of H.R. 1658, the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act. I am a cosponsor of this legislation. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on final passage of H.R. 1658, the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 222 AND H.R. 1145

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor from H.R. 222 and H.R. 1145.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT AIDE OF HON. TERRY EVERETT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Joe Williams, District Aide of the Honorable TERRY EVERETT, Member of Congress:

*Washington, DC, June 18, 1999.*

Hon. DENNIS J. HASTERT,  
*Speaker, 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 trial subpoena (for testimony) issued by the Circuit Court for Houston County, Alabama in the case of *Floyd v. Floyd*, No. DR-1998-000040.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JOE WILLIAMS,  
*District Aide.*

SALUTE TO PAYNE STEWART

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, on an evening when our rivalries on the floor are transferred to the baseball diamond, I want to talk for a minute about sports.

Seldom are we allowed to see deep into a person's mind, but last week in Springfield, Missouri, native Payne Stewart let us see deep into his. Standing on the green of the 72nd hole of the U.S. Open, Stewart needed to make a 15 foot putt to win the championship.

Despite the enormous pressure involved and knowing that the world was watching, Stewart stepped to the ball and sank the seemingly impossible putt for the tenth PGA Tour victory of his career. As the rain fell, Stewart and

his caddy celebrated with a jumping embrace on the 18th green in Pinehurst, North Carolina. With this win, Stewart also earned himself a spot on the U.S. Ryder Cup team. However Payne Stewart says that no other tournament he ever wins will be bigger than the 1982 Quad Cities Open championship. That was the only tournament victory his father, a golf pro in Springfield who taught him to play golf, ever saw him win. So on Father's Day 1999, with his wife at his side and his children watching from home, Payne Stewart proved not only to be a great golfer, but also someone with strong family values. These are the attributes we should all strive to maintain no matter what profession we choose to pursue.

A hearty congratulations is in order to Payne Stewart for the winning of his second U.S. open and third PGA major of his career. I thank Payne for setting a good example for families across America. Fellow southwest Missourians are proud of him.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1802, FOSTER CARE INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 1999

Mrs. MYRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-199) on the resolution (H. Res. 221) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1802) to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide States with more funding and greater flexibility in carrying out programs designed to help children make the transition from foster care to self-sufficiency, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROTOCOL AMENDING THE AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153 (b) and (d)), the text of a proposed Protocol Amending the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada signed at Washington on June 15, 1955, as amended. I

am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Protocol, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the Protocol. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by Title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277), I have submitted to the Congress under separate cover a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed.

The proposed Protocol has been negotiated in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The Protocol amends the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada in two respects:

1. It extends the Agreement, which would otherwise expire by its terms on January 1, 2000, for an additional period of 30 years, with the provision for automatic extensions thereafter in increments of 5 years each unless either Party gives timely notice to terminate the Agreement; and

2. It updates certain provisions of the Agreement relating to the physical protection of materials subject to the Agreement.

The Agreement itself was last amended on April 23, 1980, to bring it into conformity with all requirements of the Atomic Energy Act and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978. As amended by the proposed Protocol, it will continue to meet all requirements of U.S. law.

Canada ranks among the closest and most important U.S. partners in civil nuclear cooperation, with ties dating back to the early days of the Atoms for Peace program. Canada is also in the forefront of countries supporting international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries. It is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and has an agreement with the IAEA for the application of full-scope safeguards to its nuclear program. It also subscribes to the Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) Guidelines, which set forth standards for the responsible export of nuclear commodities for peaceful use, and to the Zangger (NPT Exporters) Committee Guidelines, which oblige members to require the application of IAEA safeguards on nuclear exports to nonnuclear weapon states. It is a party to the Convention on the

Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, whereby it has agreed to apply international standards of physical protection to the storage and transport of nuclear material under its jurisdiction or control.

Continued close cooperation with Canada in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, under the long-term extension of the U.S.-Canada Agreement for Cooperation provided for in the proposed Protocol, will serve important U.S. national security, foreign policy, and commercial interests.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed Protocol and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the Protocol and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediate consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House International Relations Committees as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 24, 1999.

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY CAUSED BY LAPSE OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1979—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12924 of August 19, 1994, to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 24, 1999.

IN OPPOSITION TO WORLD BANK LOAN TO CHINA

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the World Bank is about to decide whether to give China a loan to help in its efforts to colonize occupied Tibet with Chinese. Beijing's scheme with the Bank's approval would use \$160 million to pay for the relocation of poor Chinese farmers onto the Tibetan Plateau.

Editorials in the Washington Post, the Washington Times and the New York Times have urged the Bank not to go through with this project. I request that copies of these editorials be included in the RECORD.

The U.S. Treasury announced on Tuesday that it is going to oppose the loan. Chinese officials have demarched embassies in Beijing with threats of economic repercussions if member states vote to oppose the loan. Twelve bank board members have cosigned a letter to President Wolfensohn expressing opposition to this project. Activists and parliamentarians from around the globe have deluged the World Bank with letters and e-mail messages opposing the loan. Over 60 Members of this Chamber signed a letter to the President of the Bank urging him to reject the loan.

For Tibetans this is not development or poverty alleviation, it is cultural genocide. This project will lead to increased ethnic tension and conflict over access to scarce natural resources. I ask my colleagues to join in opposition to this loan.

Mr. Speaker, today the World Bank will decide whether or not to give China a loan to help it in its efforts to colonize occupied Tibet with Chinese. Beijing's scheme with the Bank's approval would use 160 million dollars to pay for the relocation of poor Chinese farmers onto the Tibetan Plateau.

This week, editorials in the Washington Post, the Washington Times and the New York Times urged that the Bank not go through with the loan. I ask that copies of the editorials be placed in the RECORD.

The U.S. announced on Tuesday that it will oppose the loan.

Chinese officials have demarched embassies in Beijing with threats of economic repercussions if member states vote to oppose the loan.

Twelve Bank Board members have cosigned a letter to President Wolfensohn expressing opposition to the loan project.

Activists and parliamentarians from around the globe have deluged the World Bank with letters and e-mail messages opposing the loan.

Over sixty Members of this chamber signed a letter to the President of the Bank urging him to reject the loan.

China's population transfer program is a long-standing effort to resettle Chinese in Tibet to increase its assimilation.

The World Bank loan would be the first time international financing, including U.S. dollars would be funding population transfer.

For Tibetans, it is not development or poverty alleviation, it is cultural genocide.

The World Bank, in violation of World Bank policy, failed to make an environmental anal-

ysis available to the public before the project went to appraisal.

The Bank also failed to undertake a full environmental assessment, provided no accounting of the impact on indigenous Tibetan and Mongolian peoples in the resettlement area, and neglected to evaluate the impact on fragile natural habitats.

The project will likely lead to increased ethnic tension and conflict over access to scarce natural resources.

And opposition to the project could land Tibetans in a Chinese prison. The official Chinese news agency has labeled opposition to the resettlement as a part of an "anti-China" plot.

Mr. Speaker, the World Bank has been placed on notice that it has to stay out of politics. It should stick to its mandate of poverty alleviation and not disenfranchise people who are struggling for their very existence.

China is one of the major recipients of World Bank money. It should not be dictating to terms of the loans to anyone.

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1999]

THE U.N.'S NEW CHINA PROJECT

The World Bank's technical people, having launched 31 "poverty reduction projects" in China, saw no problem with No. 32. That is why, incredibly, only when British Tibet advocates started spreading the word seven or eight weeks ago did the bank learn of the project's political aspect: It would resettle some 60,000 poor Chinese farmers on land Tibetans say is traditionally theirs.

The word offended the bank's biggest shareholder, the United States. Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin, expressing doubt about the staff-proposed \$160 million loan, has said he is "inclined" to oppose it. Needless to say, the bank's largest borrower, China, is also among the offended. It has threatened to "reevaluate its relationship with the bank" if the project does not unfold as planned.

The World Bank's board is due to vote on the question today. From an American standpoint, any vote on the merits has to be a simple one. As the Tibet lobbyists say, the project puts the bank in the position of underwriting the resettlement of Han Chinese and Chinese Muslims into a traditionally Tibetan and Mongolian area on the Tibetan plateau. Had this factor been fed into deliberations in a more timely fashion, no doubt the project would have been handled differently. It becomes a political embarrassment to deal with the project now. But it is an unavoidable and manageable embarrassment. The World Bank cannot accidentally become the instrument of a Chinese policy that affects the survival of Tibetans as a distinct people and culture.

The bank itself has a structural problem. The line between technical and political is obviously too sharp. Or the bank has been slow to grasp that decentralization works poorly when a heavy burden of accountability is devolved upon countries such as China that do not provide adequately for a free flow of information or for a space for dissent.

[From the Washington Times, June 22, 1999]

ETHNIC CLEANSING AND THE WORLD BANK

In a stunning display of insensitivity towards the plight of the Tibetan people, today the World Bank board is scheduled to vote on a project that would grant the Chinese government a \$160 million loan to resettle 57,775 Han Chinese and Chinese Muslims farmers into a historically Tibetan territory. The move is being defended by China and the