more extensive drug-like FDA regulation. The result is consumers cannot learn about simple and inexpensive ways to improve their health. For example, in 1998, the FDA dragged manufacturers of Cholestin, a dietary supplement containing lovastatin, which is helpful in lowering cholesterol, into court. The FDA did not dispute the benefits of Cholestin, rather the FDA attempted to deny consumers access to this helpul product simply because the manufacturers did not submit Cholestin to the FDA's drug approval process!

The FDA's treatment of the manufacturers of Cholestin is not an isolated example of how current FDA policy harms consumers. Even though coronary heart disease is the nation's number-one killer, the FDA waited nine years until it allowed consumers to learn about how consumption of foods and dietary supplements containing soluble fiber from the husk of psyllium seeds can reduce the risk of coronary heart disease! The Foods are not Drugs Act ends this breakfast table censorship.

The FDA is so fanatical about censoring truthful information regarding dietary supplements it even defies federal courts! For example, in the case of *Pearson* v. *Shalala,* 154 F.3d 650 (DC Cir. 1999), rehg denied en banc, 172 F.3d 72 (DC Cir. 1999), the United States Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit Court ruled that the FDA violated consumers' first amendment rights by denying certain health claims. However, the FDA has dragged its feet for over two years in complying with the *Pearson* decision while wasting taxpayer money on frivolous appeals. It is clear that even after Pearson the FDA will continue to deny legitimate health claims and force dietary supplement manufacturers to waste money on litigation unless Congress acts to rein in this rogue agency.

Allowing American consumers access to information about the benefits of foods and dietary supplements will help America's consumers improve their health. However, this bill is about more than physical health, it is about freedom. The first amendment forbids Congress from abridging freedom of all speech, including commercial speech.

In a free society, the federal government must not be allowed to prevent people from receiving information enabling them to make informed decisions about whether or not to use dietary supplements or eat certain foods. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to take a step toward restoring freedom by cosponsoring the Foods are not Drugs Act.

RECOGNIZING THE SPEAKER OF THE PUNJAB STATE ASSEMBLY HONORABLE SARDAR CHARANJIT SINGH ATWAL

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2001

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Sardar Charanjit Singh Atwal, Speaker of the Punjab State Assembly. Mr. Atwal has been a respected member in the Parliament of India for over 20 years.

Mr. Atwal visited the California Central Valley last year to attend the Commonwealth Speakers Convention, which includes Speakers from all over the world. In the fall of last year, Mr. Atwal also visited the Central Valley to meet with the local Sikh community. Mr. Atwal has been in the field of politics since 1957 and was first elected to the Punjab State Assembly in 1977. Sardar Atwal is a Dalit (Mazhabi Sikh) and a refugee from Pakistan who has risen from the grassroot worker's level to the top hierarchy of the Shiromani Akali Dal (Badal).

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Honorable Sardar Charanjit Singh Atwal and his achievements for the Sikh community. I urge my colleagues to join me in praising Mr. Atwal's more than 40 years of service to the people of India.

DISTURBING TRENDS REGARDING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN KAZAKHSTAN

HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2001

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the recent pattern of human rights violations in Kazakhstan. Since last autumn, but particularly since January 2001, the Kazakh government has shown a troubling trend in its treatment of American citizens living in Kazakhstan and Kazakh citizens who hold religious beliefs. I have received numerous reports in my office detailing the intense harassment of a number of different American families and their friends in Kazakhstan.

In one instance, officials called three families into the police station and told them they had to leave the country. The families made the arrangements to leave, then, after all of the adults, children and their luggage had been processed through the airport and the family was ready to board the airplane, security officials pulled everyone out of the airport and would not allow them to depart. In another situation, a member of the local secret police came to the family's home and threateningly said that he was staying in their apartment that night and escorting them to the airport to leave the next morning—basically putting the family, including a one-year-old little girl, under house arrest.

Security and court officials also harassed the families of those working at an education center, punished them because of their refusal to pay bribes to local officials, and forced them to pay a $240 per person fine for trumped-up charges—all apparently because of the peaceful practice of their religious beliefs.

Unfortunately, I have numerous other examples of the negative treatment of religious believing Americans by Kazakh officials. However, not all Americans are treated this way, only the ones who hold religious beliefs. The Americans who were harassed all attended church services, just as they would do anywhere they lived and worked, and made friends with people in that religious community. Sadly, government officials somehow saw something sinister in their peaceful religious practices. Even further, of great concern is the fact that each person or family with whom these Americans were friends has since been harassed by police and state security officials.

Disturbingly, these situations are not mere misunderstandings or random actions by local officials. The pattern of harassment is occurring throughout the country, not just in isolated incidents. Furthermore, Kazakh Evangelical Baptists have reported that security officials have interrupted church services, confiscated literature in the church, recorded all attendees at the service, even arresting participants, and severely beat the pastor in the head, neck and stomach. Then, at the police station, officials threatened the Christians saying things like, ''During the Soviet times, believers like you were shot. Now you are feeling at peace, but we will show you.''

Correcting the injustices against Americans and Kazakhs is an important step in reflecting the Kazakh government's desire to establish rule of law in Kazakhstan.

Kazakhstan has been the nation that people point to in Central Asia where there has been freedom to peacefully practice one's religious beliefs and freely meet with one's faith community. The Constitution protects religious freedom and the government previously has upheld its commitments as a party to the Helsinki Accords and a member of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The recent trend, however, seems to belie previous optimism about religious freedom. Further cause for concern lies with new legislation that restricts religious freedom. The concerns cited by the government regarding wanting to ensure that no criminal activity occurs among people who adhere to certain religious beliefs can be accommodated under criminal law. There is no need for a law to restrict freedom of conscience, freedom of association, and freedom of speech.

Kazakhstan can be a leader in Central Asia and can forge a new path for democracy in that region. There are many people in the United States who desire to increase our friendship with Kazakhstan. However, recent trends of increased human rights violations in Kazakhstan can slow that relationship people desire to build.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the government of Kazakhstan to correct the injustices perpetrated by security, police, and court officials, and forge a new path as a key leader in Central Asia and the international community.

RECOGNIZING HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. ERIC CANTOR

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 2001

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer my support for H. Con. Res. 163, entitled ''Recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day and expressing the sense of Congress that history be regarded as a means of understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future'' introduced by Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

For two and a half years, Texas slaves were held in bondage after the Emancipation Proclamation became official. Only after Major General Gordon Granger and his soldiers arrived in Galveston, Texas on June 19, 1865, were African-American slaves set free. Juneteenth celebrates this triumphant occasion, when Major General Granger read the

Emancipation Proclamation and began to enforce President Abraham Lincoln's executive order.

We must never forget how precious our freedom is to all Americans; the thousands of men and women who died fighting for our freedom; or the struggles of past generations as they demanded a true equality, regardless of their race, sex, or religion.

I can think of no better way to move forward than to celebrate the defeat of slavery. Juneteenth Independence Day is a celebration where all Americans, of all races, can join together to celebrate our independence and our freedom.

Just this past weekend, Richmond, Virginia, celebrated ''Juneteenth, an Emancipation Celebration.'' Festivities took place at the Manchester Dock, which served as a port of entry for Africans being brought into America to be sold as slaves. Later in the evening, individuals walked along the same trail marched by slaves from Manchester Dock. I would like to thank the City of Richmond Slave Trail Commission, Senator Henry Marsh's Unity Day Committee, and the Elegba Folklore Society for hosting ''Juneteenth, an Emancipation Celebration.''

Madam Speaker, I hope you join me in reflecting upon the struggles of our African-American brothers and sisters and celebrate with me and Americans all across the United States the Emancipation Proclamation. Madam Speaker, please support H. Con. Res. 163. Thank you.

STAND UP FOR OUR VETS

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2001

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, later this month, the Prime Minister of Japan will meet President Bush. I urge the President to address the issue of compensation of American veterans who were sent to forced labor camps during the war.

Obtaining justice for Americans who suffered at the hands of Japanese companies is an issue that must be addressed during the upcoming summit.

It is unfortunate that the State Department has taken the mistaken and regrettable position that the Peace Treaty with Japan somehow bars private legal actions by our veterans against private Japanese corporations to whom they were forced to work with no pay and horrendous conditions.

The legal experts who have aligned themselves with these American heroes in their actions against immensely profitable private Japanese companies make a number of solid arguments to the effect that the waiver provisions of the 1951 Treaty do not cover these national-against-national claims. It is far from obvious that under our constitutional system, the federal government even has the authority to compromise or to waive claims of private citizens, which, after all, do not belong to the government. Nor is it obvious that the negotiators of the Treaty—including John Foster Dulles—contemplated, much less preemptively resolved, private claims of this kind.

Article 14 of the Treaty does not even purport to waive all claims howsoever arising, having to do with misconduct by Japanese companies during the War years. It is limited, even by its own terms, to claims based on ''actions taken . . . in the course of the prosecution of the War.'' Acts that were illegal under international law as it existed in the 1940s are not, and should not be, protected under the waiver according to the principle of law, morality, and common sense that one should not be permitted to profit from his own wrong.

Using slave labor to assist in the War effort was illegal in the years 1939–45, as it is today. Thus mistreatment of prisoners of war cannot have been undertaken ''in the course of the prosecution of the War,'' unless the companies that accepted the benefit of these captives' work are now to confess that they are guilty of war crimes: allegations they have vehemently resisted for nearly five decades.

These men do not seek, nor does the outcome they are attempting to achieve require, abrogation of the Treaty. They believe that as a matter both of law and of fairness, the Treaty and the peaceful Pacific that it heralds are consistent with a measure of compensation for their suffering. A legal victory for our vets would be another indication that the United States legal system is founded not on empty ideals but on the real rights of real people. That would be an outcome in which all Americans should rejoice.

But make no mistake about it, while I hope that the Bush Administration and the government of Japan will assist our veterans through diplomacy, failure to do so would not put an end to this issue. Rep. MICHAEL HONDA and DANA ROHRABACHER have introduced legislation to overcome the State Department's twisted interpretation. I support this bill and will push for its passage into law if the U.S./Japanese Summit does not produce justice for our veterans.

A TRIBUTE TO G. LOUIS FLETCHER, SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2001

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to pay tribute to the 35-year public service career of G. Louis Fletcher, the General Manager of the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, located in my Congressional District in Southern California. From his start as an engineer, General Manager Fletcher has provided leadership at every level of the agency. He will retire at the end of this month.

Louis Fletcher is one of the unsung men of vision who have ensured that the booming communities of the San Bernardino and Yucaipa Valleys have never faced a water supply problem. Starting with the agency in 1966, Mr. Fletcher was responsible for the design and construction of a major aqueduct system that presently delivers imported water from the California State Water Project to the San Bernardino and Yucaipa Valleys.

Mr. Fletcher has championed the needs of constituents in the 40th Congressional District for decades, including leading the fight to convince the Army Corps of Engineers to agree to a flood-control dam that would be much more aesthetic—and more effective—than what was planned for the town of Mentone. The completed Seven Oaks Dam on the upper Santa Ana River provides flood control relief for millions and blends wonderfully with the surrounding hills.

The principal accomplishment of Mr. Fletcher's career has been the design and construction of a water supply system for hundreds of thousands of people. He is known throughout California for his innovative work in groundwater management, water quality and quantity computer models, mortar lining of steel water pipelines, and improved methods of wastewater management.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in honoring G. Louis Fletcher for his lifelong work in providing clean and reliable water to so many people. It is fitting that all of us join with his family and friends in recognizing his service and dedication to the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District. We wish him well in his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2001

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to vote during consideration of rollcall No. 169 and 170. I would have voted: ''nay'' on both these rollcall votes.

2001 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2216) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DeLauro Amendment, which would increase funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP).

My colleagues, LIHEAP is the safety net that protects our most vulnerable from making a choice between food and heat or air conditioning. Many LIHEAP families receive a small amount of support, but it's a difference that helps them maintain their dignity.

Nearly 80 percent of LIHEAP participants receiving heating assistance earn less than the federal poverty level. Unfortunately, nearly half of the states have exhausted or nearly exhausted available funding.

In New York—where energy prices increased by more than 20 percent over the last year, and this summer they are expected to be higher than ever—our LIHEAP funding balance is only $23 million. Last year at this time the balance was $35 million.

Unless we provide added funds to the LIHEAP program, an increase in energy prices will force millions of families to chose between