

Scarborough	Stark	Upton
Schaffer	Stearns	Velazquez
Schakowsky	Stenholm	Visclosky
Scott	Strickland	Walden
Sensenbrenner	Stump	Walsh
Sessions	Stupak	Wamp
Shadegg	Sununu	Waters
Shaw	Tancredo	Watkins
Shays	Tanner	Watt (NC)
Sherman	Tauscher	Watts (OK)
Sherwood	Tauzin	Weiner
Shimkus	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Shuster	Terry	Weldon (PA)
Simpson	Thomas	Weller
Siskis	Thompson (CA)	Wexler
Skeen	Thompson (MS)	Weygand
Skelton	Thornberry	Whitfield
Slaughter	Thune	Wilson
Smith (NJ)	Thurman	Wolf
Smith (TX)	Tiahrt	Wu
Smith (WA)	Toomey	Wynn
Snyder	Towns	Young (AK)
Spence	Trafigant	Young (FL)
Spratt	Turner	
Stabenow	Udall (CO)	

NAYS—2

Paul Sanford

NOT VOTING—72

Baker	Gutierrez	Neal
Ballenger	Hill (IN)	Nethercutt
Barr	Hilliard	Northup
Bliley	Hinche	Oxley
Blunt	Isakson	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Jones (OH)	Pombo
Burton	Klink	Pryce (OH)
Campbell	Lantos	Quinn
Capps	Lazio	Sanders
Clement	Lee	Serrano
Coburn	Maloney (CT)	Shows
Cook	Matsui	Smith (MI)
Cubin	McCollum	Souder
Danner	McCrery	Sweeney
DeFazio	McIntosh	Talent
Delahunt	McKinney	Taylor (NC)
DeLauro	McNulty	Tierney
Dickey	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Engel	Mica	Vento
English	Miller, Gary	Vitter
Fossella	Miller, George	Waxman
Franks (NJ)	Mink	Wicker
Gillmor	Murtha	Wise
Graham	Myrick	Woolsey

□ 1825

Ms. GRANGER changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and 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.

Stated for:

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was on a plane returning from my district tonight and was unable to attend votes. Had I been here I would have made the following vote on rollcall No. 487—"yea."

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, regretfully I was unavoidably detained and could not vote on rollcall No. 487. Had I been here, I would have voted "yea" for H. Con. Res. 399.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote No. 487. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

□

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5194

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 5194.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on the remaining motion to suspended the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

□

CALLING UPON THE PRESIDENT TO ISSUE A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF HELSINKI FINAL ACT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 100) calling upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 100

Whereas August 1, 2000, is the 25th anniversary of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), renamed the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in January 1995 (in this joint resolution referred to as the "Helsinki Final Act");

Whereas the Helsinki Final Act, for the first time in the history of international agreements, accorded human rights the status of a fundamental principle in regulating international relations;

Whereas during the Communist era, members of nongovernmental organizations, such as the Helsinki Monitoring Groups in Russia, Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia, and Armenia and similar groups in Czechoslovakia and Poland, sacrificed their personal freedom and even their lives in their courageous and vocal support for the principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act;

Whereas the United States Congress contributed to advancing the aims of the Helsinki Final Act by creating the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe to monitor and encourage compliance with provisions of the Helsinki Final Act;

Whereas in the 1990 Charter of Paris for a New Europe, the participating states declared, "Human rights and fundamental freedoms are the birthright of all human beings, are inalienable and are guaranteed by law. Their protection and promotion is the first responsibility of government";

Whereas in the 1991 Document of the Moscow Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, the participating states "categorically and irrevocably declare[d] that the commitments undertaken in the field of the human dimension of the CSCE are matters of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned";

Whereas in the 1990 Charter of Paris for a New Europe, the participating states committed themselves "to build, consolidate and strengthen democracy as the only system of government of our nations";

Whereas the 1999 Istanbul Charter for European Security and Istanbul Summit Declaration note the particular challenges of ending violence against women and children

as well as sexual exploitation and all forms of trafficking in human beings, strengthening efforts to combat corruption, eradicating torture, reinforcing efforts to end discrimination against Roma and Sinti, and promoting democracy and respect for human rights in Serbia;

Whereas the main challenge facing the participating states remains the implementation of the principles and commitments contained in the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents adopted on the basis of consensus;

Whereas the participating states have recognized that economic liberty, social justice, and environmental responsibility are indispensable for prosperity;

Whereas the participating states have committed themselves to promote economic reforms through enhanced transparency for economic activity with the aim of advancing the principles of market economies;

Whereas the participating states have stressed the importance of respect for the rule of law and of vigorous efforts to fight organized crime and corruption, which constitute a great threat to economic reform and prosperity;

Whereas OSCE has expanded the scope and substance of its efforts, undertaking a variety of preventive diplomacy initiatives designed to prevent, manage, and resolve conflict within and among the participating states;

Whereas the politico-military aspects of security remain vital to the interests of the participating states and constitute a core element of OSCE's concept of comprehensive security;

Whereas the OSCE has played an increasingly active role in civilian police-related activities, including training, as an integral part of OSCE's efforts in conflict prevention, crisis management, and post-conflict rehabilitation; and

Whereas the participating states bear primary responsibility for raising violations of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress calls upon the President to—

(1) issue a proclamation—

(A) recognizing the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe;

(B) reasserting the commitment of the United States to full implementation of the Helsinki Final Act;

(C) urging all signatory states to abide by their obligations under the Helsinki Final Act; and

(D) encouraging the people of the United States to join the President and the Congress in observance of this anniversary with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities; and

(2) convey to all signatory states of the Helsinki Final Act that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, democratic principles, economic liberty, and the implementation of related commitments continue to be vital elements in promoting a new era of democracy, peace, and unity in the region covered by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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 on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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 rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, honoring the Helsinki Final Act in light of the recent 25th anniversary of its signing and calls on the President to reassert the U.S. commitment to its implementation.

The Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, or OSCE, created by the Helsinki Act of 1975, is actually not a security alliance. The OSCE is also not based on a ratified treaty with provisions that are binding on its signatories. And yet the OSCE, in the agreement that established the Helsinki Final Act, has proven extremely influential in modern European affairs both during the Cold War and in today's post-Cold War era.

□ 1830

As the resolution notes, the Helsinki Act inspired many of those seeking freedom from Communism to create nongovernmental organizations to monitor their government's compliance with the human rights commitments made by Communist regimes in Helsinki in 1975.

Today's OSCE, in continuing to uphold the Helsinki Act's signatory, states the standards they should aspire to meet particularly with regard to human rights; and political rights continues to play a very beneficial role. Moreover, since the OSCE includes in its ranks of participatory states almost all of the states of Europe, those states have agreed to grant OSCE a greater role in conflict prevention and conflict resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that as we continue to work towards the Europe and the North Atlantic community of states that is truly democratic from Vancouver to Vladivostok, the OSCE will continue to play a vital role.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this resolution, I urge our colleagues to join in ensuring its passage.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, for introducing this important resolution; the gentleman from New

York (Chairman GILMAN) for moving it through the legislative process; also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER); and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) as well for their help in moving this measure to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, August 1 of this year marked the 25th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act, which created the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which has since been renamed the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The 1957 Helsinki Final Act has played a critical role in ensuring that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms was recognized by all countries in Europe and was at the top of the agenda of discussions between European countries.

The Helsinki process that resulted from the act ensured that there was a wide-ranging dialogue on issues ranging from migration and military security to the environment and independent media. Although CSCE had no permanent headquarters and no enforcement capability, it made important progress in setting standards for the protection of human rights during the Communist era.

The CSCE also increased confidence between East and West through the advanced notification of military activities and the exchange of military information. With the end of the Cold War, all CSCE countries, for the first time, accepted the principles of democracy and free markets as the basis for their cooperation. This made it possible for CSCE and later OSCE, to explore ways to act on its rigorous principles and to ensure that they were upheld.

Mr. Speaker, OSCE and CSCE have been on the forefront of the new post Cold War Europe as a peacemaker, election observer, and a conscience of democracy.

I am proud that the Helsinki Commission, established by Congress to follow the implementation of the final act, has made a significant contribution to this process. The resolution before the House today recognizes the important contributions the CSCE and the OSCE have made since the adoption of the Helsinki Final Act 25 years ago.

The resolution also calls on the President to issue a proclamation which recognizes this anniversary, reasserts the commitment of the U.S. to implementation of the Final Act, urges all states to abide by their obligations, and encourages Americans everywhere to mark the observance of this important anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 100.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, let me give a special thanks to Bob Hand, who is a specialist on the Balkans, especially the former Yugoslavia and Albania, at the Helsinki Commission. As my colleagues know just a few moments ago, we passed H.R. 1064 by voice vote, legislation that I had introduced early last year. We went through many drafts and redrafts, and I would like to just thank Bob for the excellent work he and Dorothy Taft, the Commission's Chief of Staff, did on that legislation.

H.R. 1064 would not have been brought to the floor in a form we know the Senate will pass quickly and then forward for signature, without their tremendous work on this piece of legislation, and their organization of a whole series of hearings that the Helsinki Commission has held on the Balkans. We have had former Bosnian Prime Minister Silajdzic, for example, testify at several hearings.

The Congress itself has had so much input into this diplomatic process which we know as the "Helsinki process," and they have done yeoman's work on that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise and ask my colleagues to support passage of H.J. Res. 100, recognizing the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act. I am pleased that we have more than 40 cosponsors on this resolution, and that includes all of our colleagues on the Helsinki Commission. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), is the ranking Democratic Member, and my good friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, the Helsinki Final Act was a watershed event in European history, which set in motion what has become known as the Helsinki process. With its language on human rights, this agreement granted human rights the status of a fundamental principle regulating relations between the signatory countries. Yes, there were other provisions that dealt with economic issues as well as security concerns, but this country rightfully chose to focus attention on the human rights issues especially during the Cold War years and the dark days of the Soviet Union.

The Helsinki process, I would respectfully submit to my colleagues, was very helpful, in fact instrumental, in relegating the Communist Soviet empire to the dust bin of history. The standards of Helsinki constitute a valuable lever in pressing human rights issues.

The West, and especially the United States, used Helsinki to help people in Czechoslovakia, in East Germany and in all the countries that made up the OSCE, which today comprises 54 nations with the breakup of the Soviet Union and other States along with the addition of some new States.

Let me just read to my colleagues a statement that was made by President Gerald Ford, who actually signed the Helsinki Accords in 1975. He stated, and I quote, "the Helsinki Final Act was the final nail in the coffin of Marxism and Communism in many, many countries and helped bring about the change to a more democratic political system and a change to a more market oriented economic system."

The current Secretary General of the OSCE, Jan Kubis, a Slovak, has stated, and I quote him, "As we remember together the signature of the Helsinki Final Act, we commemorate the beginning of our liberation, not by armies, not by methods of force or intervention, but as a result of the impact and inspiration of the norms and values of an open civilized society, enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act and of the encouragement it provided to strive for democratic change and of openings it created to that end."

Mr. Speaker, the Helsinki Final Act is a living document. We regularly hold follow-up conferences and meetings emphasizing various aspects of the accords, pressing for compliance by all signatory states. I urge Members to support this resolution, and I am very proud, as I stated earlier, to be Chairman of the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the Statement made by the U.S. Ambassador to the OSCE, David T. Johnson, at the Commemorative meeting on the 25th Anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act

STATEMENT AT THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
HELSINKI FINAL ACT

(By Ambassador David T. Johnson to the
Commemorative Meeting of the Permanent
Council of the OSCE)

MADAME CHAIRPERSON, as we look with fresh eyes today at the document our predecessors signed on August 1, 1975, we are struck by the breadth of their vision. They agreed to work together on an amazing range of issues, some of which we are only now beginning to address. The States participating in the meeting affirmed the objective of "ensuring conditions in which their people can live in true and lasting peace free from any threat to or attempt against their security;" they recognized the "indivisibility of security in Europe" and a "common interest in the development of cooperation throughout Europe."

One of the primary strengths of the Helsinki process is its comprehensive nature and membership. Human rights, military security, and trade and economic issues can be pursued in the one political organization that unites all the countries of Europe including the former Soviet republics, the United States and Canada, to face today's challenges. Over the past twenty-five years we have added pieces to fit the new realities—just last November in Istanbul we agreed on a new Charter for European Security and an adapted Conventional Forces in Europe treaty.

But the most significant provision of the Helsinki Agreement may have been the so-called Basket III on Human Rights. As Henry Kissinger pointed out in a speech three weeks after the Final Act was signed, "At Helsinki, for the first time in the postwar period, human rights and fundamental freedoms became recognized subjects of East-

West discourse and negotiations. The conference put forward . . . standards of humane conduct, which have been—and still are—a beacon of hope to millions."

In resolutions introduced to our Congress this summer, members noted that the standards of Helsinki provided encouragement and sustenance to courageous individuals who dared to challenge repressive regimes. Many paid a high price with the loss of their freedom or even their lives. Today we have heard from you, the representatives of the many who have struggled in the cause of human rights throughout the years since Helsinki. We are in awe of you, of the difficult and dangerous circumstances of your lives, and of what you have and are accomplishing.

Many of us here cannot comprehend the conditions of life in a divided Europe. And those who lived under repressive regimes could not have imagined how quickly life changed after 1989. Political analysts both East and West were astounded at the rapidity with which the citizens of the former Iron Curtain countries demanded their basic rights as citizens of democratic societies. What we have heard time and again is that the Helsinki Final Act did matter. Leaders and ordinary citizens took heart from its assertions. The implementation review meetings kept a focus fixed on its provisions.

Even before the Wall came down, a new generation of leaders like Nemeth in Hungary and Gorbachev in the Soviet Union made decisions to move in new directions, away from bloodshed and repression. In the summer of 1989, the Hungarians and Austrians cooperated with the West Germans to allow Romanians and East Germans to migrate to the West. Looking at what was happening in Europe, the young State Department analyst Francis Fukuyama, wrote an article which captured the world's attention. In "The End of History," he claimed that what was happening was not just the end of the Cold War but the end of the debate over political systems. A consensus had formed that democracy, coupled with a market economy, was the best system for fostering the most freedom possible.

And then in the night of November 9, 1989, the Berlin Wall opened unexpectedly. Citizens emerging from repressive regimes knew about democracy and told the world that what they wanted more than anything else was to vote in free and fair elections. Only a year after the fall of the Wall, a reunited Germany held elections at the state and national level. Poland, Hungary, and the Baltic states carried out amazing transformations beginning with elections which brought in democratic systems. When Albania descended into chaos in 1997, groups across the country shared a common desire for fair elections. We have seen Croatia and the Slovak Republic re-direct their courses in the past several years, not by violence but through the ballot box. Just a few weeks ago, citizens of Montenegro voted in two cities with two different results—in both instances there was no violence and the new governments are moving forward with reforms to benefit their citizens. OSCE has time and again stepped up to assist with elections and give citizens an extra measure of reassurance that the rest of the world supports them in the exercise of their democratic rights.

We are all aware that in the decades since Helsinki, we have seen conflict, torture, and ethnic violence within the OSCE area. Unfortunately, not all areas in the OSCE region made a peaceful transition to the Euro-Atlantic community of democratic prosperity. Some OSCE countries remain one-party states or suffer under regimes which suppress political opposition. Perhaps the most troubled region is the former Yugoslavia. As Laura Silber has written in the text to the

BBC series "The Death of Yugoslavia," "Yugoslavia did not die a natural death. Rather, it was deliberately and systematically killed off by men who had nothing to gain and everything to lose from a peaceful transition from state socialism and one-party rule to free-market democracy."

We need only look at the devastation of Chechnya and the continuing ethnic strife in parts of the former Yugoslavia to realize there is much still to be done in the OSCE region. We must continue our work together to minimize conflict and bring contending sides together, foster economic reforms through enhanced transparency, promote environmental responsibility, and or fight against organized crime and corruption. Human rights remain very much on our agenda as we seek to eradicate torture, and find new solutions for the integration of immigrants, minorities and vulnerable peoples into our political life.

"Without a vision," wrote the prophet Isaiah so long ago, "the people will perish." We here today have a vision of collective security for all the citizens of the OSCE region. After twenty-five years, the goals embodied in the Helsinki final act remain a benchmark toward which we must continue to work. The Panelists have reminded us today that the Helsinki Final Act has incalculable symbolic meaning to the citizens of our region; we must continue to take on new challenges as we strive to keep this meaning alive.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member of the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for yielding me the time. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for bringing this resolution to the floor. I am pleased to join my very good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), with whom I have served on the Helsinki Commission since 1985 and who is now the chairman of our commission and does an extraordinarily good job at raising high the banner of human rights, of freedom, and democracy and so many other vital values to a free people. I am honored to be his colleague on the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 100 which commemorates the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act which, was signed on August 1, 1975.

It is my firm belief that the political process set in motion by the signing of the Final Act was the groundwork for the forces which consumed the former Soviet empire. In 1975, many of the Final Act signatory states viewed the language of the act dealing with human rights and the obligation that each state had toward its own citizens, as well as those of other states, as essentially meaningless window dressing.

Their objective, it was felt that of the Soviets, was to secure a framework in which their international political position and the then existing map of Europe would be adjudged a fait accompli.

Let me say as an aside that as we honor the 25th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act, we ought to honor the courage and the vision of President Gerald Ford. I am not particularly objective. President Ford is a friend of mine for whom I have great affection and great respect, but those who will recall the signing of the Final Act in August of 1975 will recall that it was very controversial, and that many particularly in President's Ford's party thought that it was a sellout to the Soviets, thought that it was, in fact, a recognition of the de facto borders that then existed with the 6 Warsaw Pact nations, captive nations, if you will.

President Ford, however, had the vision and, as I said, the courage, to sign the Final Act on behalf of the United States along with 34 other heads of state; that act became a living and breathing process, not a treaty, not a part of international law, but whose moral suasion ultimately made a very significant difference.

I want to join my colleagues who I know would want to thank President Ford for his vision and courage in that instance, because those who thought it was a sellout were proven wrong.

The Helsinki process, which provided a forum and international backing for Refuseniks and others fighting behind the Iron Curtain for fundamental freedom and human rights, led inevitably to the collapse of Soviet communism.

Today we celebrate the freedom yielded by our steadfast commitment to the process and by our demand that the former Soviet bloc countries adhere to and implement the human rights standards enshrined by the accords. The fall of the Berlin Wall, Mr. Speaker, transformed the world and demonstrated unreservedly that respect for the dignity of all individuals is fundamental to democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe took a stand that human dignity, tolerance, and mutual respect would be the standards for all nations of Europe as we entered the 1990s. The Helsinki process served as a source of values and acted as an agent of conflict resolution.

It provided, Mr. Speaker, participating states with a blueprint by which to guide them away from the past, but most importantly, it reminded members, old and new, of their responsibilities to their own citizens and to each other.

Mr. Speaker, this lesson was sorely tested in the years following the Wall's fall with the dismemberment of Yugoslavia, the genocide in Bosnia and Kosovo, the economic collapse of Albania, and the emergence of new threats to the citizens of Russia.

One year after the fall of the Wall, at the OSCE Paris Summit, former political prisoners like Vaclav Havel and Lach Walesa, who had fought for the rights espoused in Helsinki in 1975, led their countries to the table and recommitted themselves and their governments to the principle of human rights,

security and economic cooperation that are the foundation of the Helsinki Final Act.

Today, Mr. Speaker, 54 nations of Europe and the Americas, the Caucasus and Central Asia are committed to the Helsinki process as participating states in the OSCE. Now, we must recognize that all 54 of those states do not carry out those principles any more than the Soviet states carried out those principles in the months and long years after the signing of the Final Act, but we found then that inevitably the power of those ideas was like a tide that swept down oppression and resistance.

□ 1845

Hopefully, all 54 states will find that tide irresistible and will incorporate in their own lands all of the principles of the Helsinki Final Act.

Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on this anniversary, we understand that the countries and peoples of the region are still in transition and will be for decades to come. Great strides have been made by many former Communist countries in building democratic societies and market economies. Yet, progress has been uneven, and much remains to be done, as I said.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, it is critical that the United States remain engaged with the peoples and governments of Europe and the countries which emerge from the former Soviet Union, especially from Russia, during this difficult period.

I agree with President Clinton when he said that we must, and I quote, "reaffirm our determination to finish the job, to complete a Europe whole, free, democratic, and at peace for the first time in all of history." It is in our strategic and national interest, Mr. Speaker, to do so. By doing so, we honor the memory of all those who sacrificed so much to hold high the banner of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass H.J. Res. 100 unanimously.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman from Maryland yielded me some time. The reason I wanted to take this time is he will not say himself, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) is a member of the Helsinki Commission and has served with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and I for many years. There is a no more conscientious, a no more engaged and focused member of the Helsinki Commission than the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN). I am pleased that he rises to speak on behalf of this resolution.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for those very kind remarks, and I am going to include some comment about the gentleman from Maryland in my statement.

First, let me first just point out the obvious. It has been 25 years that our country has been an active participant in the Helsinki process. We are right to acknowledge that and celebrate that today. This resolution recalls the importance of the Helsinki process in promoting human rights, democracy, and the role of law within 54 countries that participate in the OSCE.

I am proud to represent this body in the Helsinki Commission and this Nation. This is unusual participation because we have both the legislative and executive branches that work side by side on the Helsinki Commission, and we work together. It is unusual. We do not have too many opportunities where both the executive and legislative branches participate as equal partners in a process. So it is truly unique. It has been very effective.

I want to congratulate the leadership on the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), for the roles that they have played, very supportive of this commission, and giving us the opportunity to be active participants. We thank them very much for that.

To the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), our chairman, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our ranking member, I had participated with both of these individuals. Let me tell my colleagues I think either of them would make an excellent Secretary of State. They do a great job representing this Nation in some very, very difficult negotiations. I think we are very well served by the leadership of both the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) in guiding our participation in the Helsinki process.

It is unique. This is very bipartisan. I do not think I ever recall a moment in my entire service on this body where there has been a partisan difference. We worked together for our Nation, and we worked together for human rights, and today we really can celebrate the successes. Sure we can say there are still many challenges in Europe, and former Yugoslavia obviously presents a tremendous challenge for us. But we celebrate our successes.

We have been successful in establishing democratic principles in most of the countries that were dominated by the former Soviet Union, and the Helsinki process has been key to those achievements; and we rightly celebrate that.

We also can celebrate the fact of what we did with Soviet Jews. The Helsinki process allowed many people to be able to leave the former Soviet Union.

We have an acknowledgment from Europe of the rights of ethnic minorities. There is no longer question that ethnic minorities are entitled to protection in their individual states. It is the right of every other participating state to raise those issues, and we do.

So, sure, there are challenges that are still remaining. We all understand that in Europe. But the Helsinki process is an unquestioned success. Today, by passing this resolution, we acknowledge that.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we have any additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 100.

The question was taken.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□

PERIODIC REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO NATIONAL UNION FOR THE TOTAL INDEPENDENCE OF ANGOLA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-297)

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 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) that was declared in Executive Order 12865 of September 26, 1993.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 25, 2000.

□

PERIODIC REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-)

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 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on developments concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, and matters relating to the measures in that order and in Executive Order 12959 of May 6, 1995, and in Executive Order 13059 of August 19, 1997.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 25, 2000.

□

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□

GOP'S FALSE "CHOICE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, a confidential document prepared for House Republicans somehow found its way into the public realm. It was not big news at the time, just some talking points. They were prepared by a Republican polling firm in response to the Democrats' Medicare prescription drug proposal.

According to their analysis, an effective way to create opposition to the type of proposal offered by the President and House Democrats is to call it a "one-size-fits-all" plan, a "big government" plan, or worst of all, a "one-size-fits-all big government" plan.

One cannot blame the public for reacting to these phrases. I do not know anyone who likes big government simply for big government's sake. However, one can blame politicians for exploiting these terms instead of confronting the fundamental differences between the Democrat and Republican prescription drug proposals.

The Democrats' plan would add an optional drug benefit to Medicare. The Republican plan would bypass Medicare and subsidize private stand-alone insurance plans instead.

It is difficult to conceive of a program offering more choice than Medicare. The Medicare program covers medically necessary care and services. Beneficiaries can see their own health care professional and go to the facility that they choose.

Under the prescription drug plan, similarly, enrollees could go to the pharmacy of their choice. FDA-approved medications prescribed by a physician would be covered without regard to formulary restrictions.

Given this level of flexibility, how would a legion of new private plans enhance a beneficiary's choice in any way that matters? It is more likely these plans, like any other managed care product, would find ways of restricting choice which would, indeed, enhance something, their bottom line.

Medicare is a single plan that treats all beneficiaries equally and provides maximum choice and access for patients and doctors. The Democrats' prescription drug proposal embraces the same choice principles.

Under the Republican prescription drug proposal, Medicare beneficiaries would choose between private stand-alone insurance company prescription drug plans. Ostensibly, this would enable seniors to tailor their prescription drug coverage to their particular needs.

But what exactly would distinguish one private insurance plan from another private insurance plan? Realistically, the key differences would have to relate to the generosity and restrictiveness of the benefits, how many pharmacies would be covered, how stringent is the formulary, how much cost sharing would be required by the patient.

None of these plans could responsibly in any way, theoretically or practically, provide more choice than the Democrats' proposal in terms of which medications are covered, since the Democrats plan covers all doctor-prescribed medications.

None of these plans could provide a broader choice of pharmacy, since the Democrats' plan does not restrict access to pharmacies.

It appears that "choice" is actually code for "wealth." Higher-income seniors could afford a decent prescription drug plan under the Republican plan, one with the same level of coverage that would be available to all beneficiaries under the Democrats' plan. In other words, if one is wealthy, one can get as good a plan as the Democrats' plan. But under the Republican plan, lower-income enrollees would be relegated to restrictive alternatives. Some choice that is.

When opponents of the Democrats' prescription drug coverage plan berate it for being "one-size-fits-all" and "big government," they are actually berating Medicare itself. In fact, the Republicans' prescription drug proposal, which ignores Medicare to establish new private insurance HMO policies, is an insult to the program.

Their plan pays homage to those Members of Congress who favor privatizing Medicare, turning Medicare over to this Nation's insurance companies. I might add, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to meet anyone outside the Beltway who favors such a plan to privatize Medicare.