

business operations of trust management. Instead, the DOI has a well-documented record of making short-term cosmetic changes in response to court-imposed deadlines or congressional inquiries.

Mr. Speaker, it is notable that this criticism, a lack of structural foundation, is exactly the same as has been leveled against the Department's development of the Trust Asset and Accounting Management System. All tribal leaders strongly support trust reform and want to work constructively with the Department and with Congress to ensure sound management of tribal assets. In fact, it is the tribes that have the greatest interest in ensuring that tribal assets and resources are properly managed.

In this spirit, I will submit for the RECORD the following principles of the National Congress of American Indians, which should guide the Department of the Interior in its trust reform efforts. Secretary Norton clearly needs help in attending to the concerns of Native Americans, and I would hope these principles would be taken into consideration by her.

I. Put first things first. Creating a new agency does not create trust reform, and we unequivocally oppose this proposal as currently framed. Tribal leadership urges the Secretary to stop the BITAM reorganization effort until there has been an opportunity to actively engage and consult with tribes in developing an alternative plan for the business processes of trust management in an open and consensus-based process. Once the Department, working with tribes, has a clear definition of the tasks that must be accomplished, then any staff reorganization should be based on this business processes plan.

II. Tribes can help solve this problem, but the Secretary must consult and collaborate with the tribal leadership on a government-to-government, sovereign-to-sovereign basis. Announce and defend is not consultation. The Secretary and the tribes should agree that the upcoming regional meetings should be to consult on the scope of the issues to be addressed. The scoping meetings planned at present are too fast and too few, and should be extended to cover all regions, with an extended timeline. A Tribal Leaders Task Force on Trust Reform should be created and funded, and consultation should include the IIM account holders. Consultation must continue throughout the trust reform effort, and the discussions must be marked by some fundamental ground rules. The tribes insist that the Department agree to deal in good faith, avoid self-dealing, and commit to full disclosure of relevant and material information (including that relating to known failures and losses).

III. In the past twelve years, Interior has paid more than a billion dollars in judgments and settlements for its failures to protect the trust assets. The costs of continued failure will far out-

strip the costs of doing it right. Congress must fund trust reform, and the IIM beneficiaries and tribes should not bear the burden of paying to fix the trust system. We therefore oppose the Department's proposed reprogramming of \$300 million within the Fiscal 2002 budget from the BIA budget to fund the proposed BITAM, and any other proposal to remove funds from the BIA for this purpose.

IV. The Secretary of Interior should come forward in an honest and forthright way to discuss ways of settling on historic account balances. If she cannot do this, then Congress must address this issue substantively.

V. Do no harm. Many tribes and BIA field offices have been successful in establishing sound trust management for their lands pursuant to the tribal self-determination policy. These successful systems should not be harmed or modified by the trust reform efforts without tribal consent.

VI. Successful development and resource management in Indian Country are linked to Indian control. The future of trust management includes increased protection and tribal control over lands and resources, and a federal system that provides technical assistance and trust oversight on resource management in a flexible arrangement that is driven by self determination through the special circumstances, legal and treaty rights of each tribe and reservation. Different regions in Indian Country and their specialization in grazing, timber, oil & gas, commercial real estate, agriculture, fisheries, water, etc., will all require different systems that must reflect the unique needs of each.

VII. The survival of tribal cultures and traditions is dependent upon the continuance of tribal lands and resources as durable means to live and be Indian. One role of the trustee is to protect the long-term viability of tribal lands and resources and ensure that the actions of the trustee are consistent with tribal control of the use and development of Indian lands.

ANNIVERSARY OF CEDAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday, December 18, marked the 22nd anniversary of the United Nations' adoption of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, otherwise known as CEDAW. Adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1979, CEDAW established a universal definition of discrimination against women and provides international standards to discourage sex-based discrimination. These standards encourage equality in education, health care, employment, and all other areas of public life.

This comprehensive United Nations treaty serves as a powerful tool for all

women as they fight against discrimination, and this treaty has led to substantial improvements for women's lives in countries including Japan, Brazil, Sri Lanka, and Zambia. In fact, when Brazil redrafted its constitution, they used CEDAW as a framework for their human rights for women. The Brazilian constitution now contains provisions on gender equality, gender-based violence, equality of rights within marriage, family planning, and employment, paralleling those contained in CEDAW.

To date, 168 countries have ratified CEDAW. However, the United States is not one of those countries. In fact, the United States is the only industrialized nation that has not ratified CEDAW, a distinction that places us in the company of North Korea, Iran, and Afghanistan. The decision to abandon this embarrassing distinction is long overdue.

The last 3 months have focused on recovering from the tragic events of September 11 and fighting against terrorism. And as a part of our response to the terrorist attacks, the U.S. has overthrown the Taliban, a government that stripped Afghan women of all freedoms, dignity, and respect. Now the United States will play an important role in rebuilding the Afghan Government. Critical to building this new democracy will be the inclusion and acceptance of Afghan women.

But in our quest to help Afghanistan rebuild, we are presented with a shameful irony. While we are trying to teach the Afghani people that women must be an equal part of a post-Taliban democracy, we contradict ourselves by refusing to ratify the one international treaty that ensures the rights of all women. If we truly want to be regarded as a world leader and champion of human rights, our country must ratify this treaty. Women around the world are depending on the United States to show support for CEDAW, because United States' support will strengthen CEDAW's purpose and enhance its credibility.

During my 9 years in Congress, the ratification of this treaty has been a top priority of mine. Although it is the purview of the other body to ratify a U.N. treaty, 90 bipartisan Members of the House of Representatives have signed a House Resolution asking the Senate to take up this issue and ratify CEDAW. Please join this effort to convince the administration and the other body that the time has come for the United States to join 168 other nations who have committed themselves to safeguarding basic human rights and ending gender discrimination and ratifying CEDAW.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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 addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NO EXPRESSION OF SUPPORT IN CONGRESS FOR WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, along with a large majority of the House, I voted for a resolution that reiterated our opposition to the acquisition by Saddam Hussein of Iraq of weapons of mass destruction. But I am concerned that some might try, quite inaccurately, to take that large vote repeating our condemnation of Saddam Hussein and our insistence he comply with U.N. resolutions regarding these weapons, that some might mistake this as an expression of support for a war in Iraq.

First of all, we should be very clear: there is no legislation, no resolution that has passed this House, that expresses support for war in Iraq. The post-September 11 resolution was explicitly limited to involvement in the attack on the World Trade Center. And to date, no one has produced evidence, as reprehensible as Saddam Hussein is, as despicable as his regime, that he was in any significant way involved in that.

Many of us, in fact many of us who voted for the resolution, signed a letter to the President reiterating we do not believe it would be appropriate to commit America to a major military action in Iraq or anywhere else in the world without a congressional vote. And I would be, at this point, voting against that.

We did a very good job in Afghanistan. The American military made us proud. And, by the way, that is the American military that President Bush inherited from President Clinton. All during the campaign of 2000 candidates Bush and CHENEY denigrated the American military, claimed inaccurately that Clinton had somehow left it impotent. All of a sudden it got very good in a hurry, because that very military that President Bush inherited from President Clinton showed a great capacity in Afghanistan.

But as good as they were and as careful as they were, innocent lives were lost, property was destroyed, the economy, already in tough shape, was disrupted, food distribution was inhibited. We had a moral right and a moral obligation to go into Afghanistan. But having done that, having unleashed significant military power in that poor country, for good moral reasons, I think it is now an equal moral obligation to show that we can work just as hard to help rebuild the country, to help feed people, and to help reconstruct it.

In the first place, I would say this: until we have shown an equal ability

and commitment and dedication to giving the people of Afghanistan a better life, as we should, to helping them get rid of that terrible regime, then I do not think we have earned the right to go do that somewhere else.

□ 1345

I do not think that we can simply go from country and oppose destruction, even when it is morally justified to go after some bad people, without living up to the second part that of commitment.

Secondly, an attack on Iraq, unlike the war in Afghanistan, would be almost universally opposed by a variety of others. The Bush administration has learned that going it alone is not the best strategy. I am glad the Bush administration has abandoned the kind of unilateralism that unfortunately marked its early months. But if we now attack Iraq, we would be back in that situation. In fact, any hope of further cooperation with Arab regimes in getting intelligence, in prosecuting terrorists and continuing to go after al Qaeda would be discouraged.

Mr. Speaker, I am no fan of the regime in Saudi Arabia which is lacking in so many respects; I have become increasingly disenchanted with Mubarak in Egypt, but they, at this point, seem to me better than what we would get as an alternative if we were to launch an attack on Iraq that could destabilize those countries. And as King Abdullah, the King of Jordan, in the tradition of his father, seems to be a responsible individual trying to do well, I do not want to see those efforts undercut.

So it would be counterproductive in the war against terrorism to go after Iraq. I would love to see Saddam Hussein out of power. He is a vicious and brutal man, but to attack him militarily at this point, engendering the opposition this would engender in the Muslim world, would be counterproductive to our fight against terrorism.

Indeed, as a strong supporter of the legitimate right of Israel for self defense, which is now under attack from the most irresponsible elements in the Arab world, people should understand, President Bush never said that he was for a Palestinian state until after September 11. The political need to show some connection to the Muslim world moved him in that direction. I fear greatly that an attack on Iraq, with all of the negative consequences that would have in the Muslim world would, in fact, lessen rather than strengthen America's support for Israel's legitimate needs. I fear there would be a tendency to trade-off a little bit of that support for Israel at a time of great crisis because of this.

Finally, they are not analogous. Not only do we not have Saddam Hussein not having attacked us the way the Afghan-supported Taliban allowed al Qaeda to do it, we do not have the same situation. There is no Northern Alliance. One of the things that helps

morally vindicate our effort in Afghanistan was the obvious joy of so many people in Afghanistan that we helped rid them of this barbarous repressive regime.

Saddam Hussein is not a lot better than the Taliban, but I do not see in Iraq the kind of opposition that would allow us to do the same thing. So while to continue to support the sanctions and I continue to say we should work with opposition within Iran, if possible, to launch a military assault on Iraq comparable to what we do in Afghanistan would be counterproductive. I hope it will not be done. Clearly, the resolution we voted offers no support for that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALOMAVEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FALOMAVEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MORATORIUM CALLED FOR ON VETERAN PRESCRIPTION DRUG CO-PAYS

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I may be the last speaker in this Chamber of this particular session of the House of Representatives. I rise today to say when it comes to the way we treat our veterans in this country, talk is cheap, but actions speak louder than words. Why do I say that?

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hands this afternoon a document from the Department of Veterans Affairs entitled, "Implementation of Medication Co-payment Changes." It is a document that details the changes that will take place in the level of co-payment made available to veterans who get their prescription medications at the VA hospitals. What we are proposing is outrageous in my judgment.

Currently, most veterans who go to VA hospitals and receive their medications as an outpatient pay a \$2 co-pay per prescription. On February 4, according to this document, that co-pay will be increased from \$2 a prescription to \$7 a prescription, a whopping 250 percent increase. An unacceptable increase. Why is this so outrageous? It is outrageous because this House has recently passed a \$15 billion bailout for the huge airline companies, \$15 billion. This House has recently passed a bill that would have provided \$24 billion in tax rebates going all of the way back to 1986, giving profitable companies a give-back of all of the taxes they had paid under the alternative minimum tax since 1986, estimated to be a \$24 billion give-back. And yet at the same time, we are in the process of increasing the co-pay for veterans' medicines from \$2 to \$7.