

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHAW) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2052) to facilitate famine relief efforts and a comprehensive solution to the war in Sudan, pursuant to House Resolution 162, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 2, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie Bonilla Clyburn
Ackerman Bonior Coble
Aderholt Bono Collins
Akin Borski Combest
Andrews Boswell Condit
Army Boucher Conyers
Baca Boyd Cooksey
Bachus Brady (PA) Costello
Baird Brady (TX) Cox
Baker Brown (FL) Coyne
Baldacci Brown (OH) Cramer
Baldwin Brown (SC) Crane
Ballenger Bryant Crenshaw
Barcia Burr Crowley
Barr Burton Cubin
Barrett Buyer Culberson
Bartlett Callahan Cummings
Barton Calvert Cunningham
Bass Camp Davis (CA)
Becerra Cannon Davis (FL)
Bentsen Cantor Davis (IL)
Bereuter Capito Davis, Jo Ann
Berkley Capps Davis, Tom
Berman Capuano Deal
Berry Cardin DeFazio
Biggert Carson (IN) DeGette
Bilirakis Carson (OK) Delahunt
Bishop Castle DeLauro
Blagojevich Chabot DeLay
Blumenauer Chambliss DeMint
Blunt Clay Deutsch
Boehlert Clayton Diaz-Balart
Boehner Clement Dicks

Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)

Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps

Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancred
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)

Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield

NAYS—2

Flake

Paul

NOT VOTING—8

Allen
Dingell
Ferguson

Filner
Fossella
Johnson, E. B.

Morella
Rush

□ 1502

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 160, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

CONDEMNING TALIBAN REGIME OF AFGHANISTAN REQUIRING HINDUS TO WEAR SYMBOLS IDENTIFYING THEM AS HINDU

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 12, 2001, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 145) condemning the recent order by the Taliban regime of Afghanistan to require Hindus in Afghanistan to wear symbols identifying them as Hindu, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 145 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 145

Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights guarantee the freedom of religion;

Whereas on May 22, 2001, the Taliban regime of Afghanistan directed Hindus and other non-Muslims to wear a yellow identity symbol and for Hindu women to fully cover themselves in a veil;

Whereas this proposal is reminiscent of the yellow Star of David that Jews were forced to wear in Nazi Germany and Nazi-occupied areas;

Whereas Department of State spokesperson Richard Boucher condemned the Taliban action, stating that "forcing social groups to wear distinctive clothing or identifying marks stigmatizes and isolates those groups and can never, never be justified";

Whereas the Taliban regime recently ordered the world by ordering the destruction of all pre-Islamic statues in Afghanistan, among them a pair of 1,600-year-old, 100-foot-tall statues of Buddha that were carved out of a mountainside;

Whereas the reprehensible policies of the Taliban are exacerbating the suffering of the people of Afghanistan who are already besieged by a devastating drought and the continued fighting in the region; and

Whereas the American people feel a great deal of sympathy for the people of Afghanistan and continue to provide humanitarian assistance to alleviate the suffering of the Afghan people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the Taliban's use of Nazi tactics to force Hindus in Afghanistan to wear symbols identifying them as Hindu;

(2) joins with people of all faiths around the world in standing against the religious persecution by the Taliban regime;

(3) demands the Taliban regime immediately revoke its order stigmatizing Hindus and other non-Muslims in Afghanistan and conform its laws to all basic international civil and human rights standards; and

(4) calls on the Government of Pakistan to use its influence with the Taliban regime to demand that the Taliban revoke the reprehensible policy of forcing Afghan Hindus and other non-Muslims to wear a yellow identity symbol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 12, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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 am pleased to rise in support of H. Con. Res. 145, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL). First, I would like to say that I appreciate the support of the chairman of our Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and the House leadership for making timely consideration of this resolution possible.

It was considered and ordered reported to the House by the full Committee on International Relations earlier this month.

This resolution we are considering condemns a recent order by the Taliban regime of Afghanistan to require Hindus in Afghanistan to wear symbols identifying them as Hindus, yellow symbols similar to the one I have on my lapel at this time.

Many of us are appalled and deeply concerned by this order. Our Nation and the rest of the world need to register the strongest possible condemnation of this outrageous regulation. As our resolution points out, the world has not been witness to anything like this since the Nazis required the Jews to wear a yellow Star of David.

The Taliban's repression of women and its intolerance of other minorities goes hand in hand with other reprehensible behavior. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Taliban provides Osama bin Laden, the terrorist kingpin, a safe haven, allowing him to reside in Afghanistan as its special guest. Bin Laden is responsible for much of the terrorist-related murder and mayhem that has shattered peace throughout the subcontinent. It is his thugs that killed our State Department employees and hundreds of other innocent people.

The Taliban and bin Laden appear to be made for one another. Moreover, the Taliban's involvement in taxing, stocking and the trafficking in opium make it responsible for much of the global misery related to drug addiction.

Finally, it is an open secret that Pakistan in many ways supports the Taliban. It is appropriate, therefore, that this resolution calls upon Pakistan to use its influence to demand that the Taliban revoke its edict that identifies Hindus and other non-Muslims.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I fully support H. Con. Res. 145 and I ask our colleagues to join us in support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 145, which was introduced by my friend and colleague from New York (Mr. ENGEL). This resolution condemns the Taliban regime of Afghanistan for their offensive and inhumane policies towards Hindus and other non-Muslims in Afghanistan, and it demands that the Taliban regime immediately revoke its edict issued on May 23 requiring Afghan Hindus to wear yellow identification badges and for Hindu women to cover themselves in a yellow veil.

This latest despicable action of this despicable regime is only the most recent of a long list of horrific human rights and religious freedom abuses committed by the Taliban against their own people. They have shut down schools, restricted education and have systematically discriminated against all women in Afghanistan.

Earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, the Taliban sparked international outrage by destroying the ancient Buddhist statues of Bamian. It is no accident that the international terrorist kingpin Osama bin Laden has found welcome haven in the land of the Taliban.

If these barbaric actions were not enough, the Taliban has now decided to emulate the most heinous and reviled regime of the 20th century, Hitler's Germany, by forcing Hindus and other non-Muslims to wear yellow identity badges.

The edict issued by the Taliban, Mr. Speaker, is reprehensible, and it clearly echoes Nazi German policies stigmatizing Jews and others. We cannot allow the Taliban to systematically oppress Afghan Hindus in such an eerily similar manner.

Afghanistan, Mr. Speaker, sits at the crossroads of Europe and Asia. For centuries, it has been one of the marketplaces of the world where traders of all countries and races and religions came together. This rich history and tradition of tolerance is being dismantled by this dark and brutal regime. The Taliban's actions, Mr. Speaker, are beyond comprehension. At a time when millions of Afghan people are on the edge of starvation and thousands of Afghan children are dying every day of

malnutrition, the Taliban are intent on driving away any international support through their offensive and inhumane policies.

Just last week, the Taliban expanded their restrictions on foreign aid workers, further limiting their movement and freedom and making it nearly impossible for its humanitarian workers to continue their efforts to bring relief to the people of Afghanistan. One must wonder if the Taliban are trying to commit genocide against their own people.

We cannot stand idly by and watch while the Taliban continued their reign of darkness and despair. We cannot countenance their deliberate attempt to undo centuries of civilization. We must find a way to stop this insane regime.

If there is one country left on Earth, Mr. Speaker, that seems to have any influence with the Taliban, it is the country of Pakistan. The government of Pakistan has been all too reluctant to use its influence with the Taliban and we are calling on the government of Pakistan to stand with the international community and call a halt to the reprehensible policies of the Taliban regime.

I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for introducing this resolution, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this resolution and as chair of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, I urge strong support for H. Con. Res. 145, and I want my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

□ 1515

This resolution was prompted by the Taliban's decree of May 22, forcing Hindus to wear identity labels such as this one on their clothing to brand and degrade this religious group even further.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this reprehensible policy is but a microcosm of the terrible actions taken by the Taliban against all minorities in Afghanistan. As the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination has stated, Afghanistan epitomizes the religious extremism, and it underscores that "the Taliban uses religion as a political tool in the interests of power and has taken an entire society hostage."

In January of this year, for example, the Taliban issued a decree to apply capital punishment to Afghans who converted from Islam to either Judaism or Christianity. Just a few months ago, in the aftermath of the Taliban's destruction of sacred statues, Amnesty

International reported that the Taliban massacred hundreds of civilians with impunity. On May 14 of this year, it was revealed that the Taliban has an ethnic cleansing manual to eliminate entirely the presence of religious minority groups in areas which are not yet under Taliban control.

Women have also felt the brunt of the Taliban's intolerance and extremism. According to Afghan women interviewed by a non-governmental organization in France, "women live like animals." Women are excluded from treatment by male doctors, who are the only ones allowed to practice medicine. Even when exceptions are made, because the woman is accompanied by her husband, doctors are still prohibited from actually touching the women, and this obviously limits the possibility of any meaningful medical treatment.

The Taliban's policy of treating women as subhuman is also reflected in decrees mandating that women must be accompanied by a male relative when leaving their homes and that they must be covered in the Taliban-approved dressing shown here. It says in Taliban-held areas of Afghanistan, women can rarely work outside the home, girls can attend only same-sex schools, and women can be beaten for not wearing this veil. It says, get up, stand up. Refusal to adhere to these rules will result in beatings.

The Taliban's intolerance and extremism has even spilled over to international humanitarian workers. Just a few weeks ago, the Taliban arrested U.N. aid workers in Afghanistan. Militants who fight for the Taliban and are loyal to terrorist Osama bin Laden have threatened to kidnap and even kill international aid humanitarian workers.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not render our unequivocal support for House Concurrent Resolution 145, we will be sending a message to the Taliban that it can continue to escalate the persecution and the repression that they are undergoing with impunity.

I ask Members to think of the Afghan women, such as this one pictured here, and vote with your conscience today. I ask you to think of the Hindus who are being required to wear yellow identification labels, such as this one. I ask Members to think about the plight of all minorities in Afghanistan and vote yes on this powerful resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 5½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the author of this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for yielding me time. I want to thank the gentleman, and the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) as well, for working with me so quickly for bringing this resolution to the floor.

As was mentioned by my colleagues, I too am wearing a yellow ribbon. In

fact, I have many yellow ribbons here, and I would like every Member of Congress to wear a yellow ribbon for today, since this resolution is on the floor today. I think if we all wore the yellow ribbons, it would be a very powerful symbolism of the fact that we stand with the oppressed people of Afghanistan, with the Hindus of Afghanistan, just the way during the terrible Nazi era, when the Jews were told that they had to wear the yellow star to identify them, to single them out from everyone else, all the Danes wore yellow stars of David and said that we are all Jews. I believe here in Congress, all of us should wear these yellow ribbons, and today we all should be Hindus and stand in solidarity with those oppressed people.

Mr. Speaker, just over 2 weeks ago, I heard the disturbing news that Afghanistan's Islamic Taliban regime had issued an edict requiring Afghan Hindus to wear yellow identification badges and Hindu women to fully cover themselves in a veil and for Hindu families to have curtains that are yellow or some such identification, clearly showing that they are different from everyone else.

This is absolutely an outrage. My colleagues have mentioned all the outrages of this Taliban regime, from Osama bin Laden getting cover there and planning his terrorist attacks all over the world from the safe confines of Afghanistan, being protected, by the Taliban's destruction of the Buddhist statues that were thousands of years old, to making it impossible for aid workers to help the starving people of Afghanistan. Indeed our country, the United States, is the leading country in terms of providing humanitarian aid for those starving people.

So what we are attempting to do here today is saying that the United States can make a difference. We can make a difference in providing humanitarian aid, so that the people of Afghanistan are not suffering because of their regime. And they are suffering, but we can make the suffering a little bit better. Also what happens in this Congress is listened to around the world. I think it is so important for us to take a moral stand.

Now, what the Taliban are doing is just an outrage that cannot be ignored. The Taliban's edict accompanies the 1999 law forbidding non-Muslims from living in the same houses as Muslims, from criticizing Muslims, and from building places of worship. This resolution calls upon, demands, that the Taliban regime immediately revokes its order stigmatizing Hindus in Afghanistan and to conform its laws to all basic international civil and human rights standards, and, of course, condemns the recent order by the Taliban regime to require Hindus to wear these different identification symbols.

Now, combined, these edicts have the effect of stigmatizing, separating, and disadvantaging the Hindus because of their religious beliefs. It should be

pointed out that when the Nazi edicts in Europe came against the Jews, initially it was just small edicts, and there were people that said, well, this is only a very minor thing, and it will pass.

I think we have learned from history that if we ignore these so-called minor things, they turn into catastrophes; and we do not want to ignore this because this is not minor, and it will get worse if the world just turns its back.

Now, to add insult to injury, according to the Taliban regime this action was taken, they say, to protect Hindus from the religious police, who often arrest Hindus for not following Muslim law or who beat Hindus for not conforming to Muslim law. This, of course, adds insult to injury, to claim they are putting in this oppressive law in order to protect the Hindu citizens. Obviously this is a bunch of nonsense.

This type of religious discrimination has no place in the world today. Forcing Hindus to wear distinctive clothing does nothing to protect Hindus from the religious police; rather it makes them more vulnerable to police and mob violence.

So, again, we cannot allow the Taliban to systematically oppress Afghan Hindus in such an eerily similar manner to the way the Nazis oppressed Jews, homosexuals, Romas, and others.

This is not the first time the Taliban has singled out Afghan Hindus. Prior to 1992, Afghanistan had a population of over 50,000 Hindus. Most fled due to anti-Hindu violence. There are now only 500 Hindus, approximately, left in Afghanistan, subject to the Taliban's edict.

The international community, including our friends and allies around the world have joined us in condemning the Taliban's edict; and Pakistan, one of only three countries recognizing the Taliban as a legitimate government, said that they deplore these discriminatory practices. That is why this resolution calls upon Pakistan to try to use its influence with Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues in solidarity with the Afghan Hindus; and again I would urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution, to come over, and we will give them ribbons so everyone can wear ribbons. Again, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who has been so gracious.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I would like to thank personally my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), for the leadership that he has demonstrated, even though he does have a beard now, like I used to have. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and I have worked on many causes together, and I would like to just begin my remarks today by reminding people that the gentleman

from New York (Mr. ENGEL) was a hero of the Muslim people in the Balkans who were finding themselves under torturous attack, and sometimes being murdered in great numbers, especially the people in Kosovo and other places in the Balkans. So today it is very fitting that the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) stands up and points out where another group of people are committing repression.

This time this is a Muslim group; but in the past, when Muslims have been attacked and their rights have been destroyed, he has been the first one to stand up and speak up for their rights. So this is not a religious determination. What we have today is a determination of principle, that we in this body stand together for human rights and are against the type of fanaticism that is demonstrated by the Taliban regime.

The same, of course, is true with the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). We have worked on many human rights issues. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and I have, of course, worked on the China policy as well; and the gentleman is one of the most renowned and most respected leaders on human rights in this body. As chairman of the Committee on International Relations, he made his mark.

But today this resolution condemns the Taliban regime, not just for what it is doing against Hindus, which is today what we were using as our hook to draw attention, and I will be wearing one of those yellow badges, but this is symbolic of the repression that the Taliban and the fanaticism that the Taliban have brought to Afghanistan.

As someone who spent considerable time in Afghanistan, I would say that I am probably the only Member of this body who actually at one point fought alongside with Afghans against the Russian troops during their long war against Russian occupation, and I found the Afghans not to be fanatics.

The Afghans were very devout in their religion, but they were not the fanatics that the Taliban portray today. In fact, I would like to let my colleagues know that, by and large, the Taliban were not and are not the Mujahadeen, which is a mistake that many people make.

Most of the Taliban leadership, as well as most of the Taliban, sat out the war against Russia in Pakistan. The Taliban means students, and they were in what supposedly were schools, although many of them were illiterate, being financed by the Saudis and the Pakistanis. That is where they were during the war, while many of the people who opposed them today were out fighting the Russians.

Many of the people who I was with are now being repressed by Afghans who were not out there fighting the Russians, who now call themselves the Taliban, as if they have some corner on the understanding of God. What the Taliban are doing is using Islam as a weapon for their own power.

We have seen this in other faiths as well. We have seen the fanatics and the charlatans use their religion, whether they are Christians or Muslims or whoever, in order to gain their own power.

□ 1530

Well, that is what has happened in Afghanistan. It is getting worse and worse, because the Taliban, ever since they have been in power, have allied themselves with the worst elements in the world, people who the Afghan people would have nothing to do with if they had some choice in their government.

Of course, as we know, 60 percent of the world's heroin has been growing in Afghanistan all of these years that the Taliban have been in power. The Taliban now tell us this year they are no longer growing any poppies, and the heroin production is down in their country. Of course, how convenient. At a time when they have a massive drought that has been going on in Afghanistan that has killed all of the crops, now they voluntarily are not growing any more poppies. How convenient. We will wait and see what happens when the water comes back whether or not they enforce this supposed edict.

Unfortunately, when we are talking about American relations with Afghanistan, what we have found over the last 8 years with the last administration, every time we had a chance to overthrow the Taliban, and I was involved with several organizations whose efforts were in that direction, the last administration, the Clinton administration, rode to the rescue at the last minute every time. That is unfortunate.

During the last 8 years while we gave refugee relief supplies to Afghanistan, those supplies, our foreign aid, the foreign aid we have been giving to Afghanistan and those poor suffering people of Afghanistan, they needed some help; but yet, the last administration saw to it that those supplies were only distributed in Taliban-controlled areas.

I can tell the Members that I fought tooth and nail, I went time and time again to the State Department, to try to see that those supplies were distributed in non-Taliban areas. But instead, the Clinton administration insisted that those supplies go to Taliban-controlled areas.

Why is that? I believe, and I have said this before, the last administration and unfortunately the United States, thus, had a covert policy of supporting the Taliban for a while, perhaps as part of some situation with Pakistan and the Saudis. I do not know.

But I would hope that the United States policy has changed, and that indeed our goal be the elimination of the Taliban regime and support for those Afghans who are struggling for their country and struggling to have a moderate and a decent government.

The Taliban had, by the way, rejected all elections as being incon-

sistent with Afghan tradition. There are a group of people today fighting against the Taliban whose goal and idea is to have an Afghanistan directed by the democratic process.

Commander Massoud and many others who fought against the Russians, Abdul Haq and his family who are fighting there, fought against the Russians, Pashtun as well as minority members, were fighting against the Taliban.

Our goal should be to be on the side of those people who want to replace that regime and to help those people. If we send supplies to Afghanistan, they should go to the people in need, whether they are with Taliban or not.

There is a group called the Knightsbridge organization headed by Ed Artis and Dr. James Law that have \$2 million worth of humanitarian supplies ready to go now to the people of Afghanistan, but they do not have the money for the transport, and they have not been given help because it might go to some non-Taliban areas.

So I would hope that we do what is right in this country, that we condemn this repression as exemplified by repression against the Hindus, but we put ourselves on the line against the Taliban and their fanaticism and support for terrorism and drug dealing.

It is time the people of Afghanistan deserve a break after these last 20 years of struggling.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), an indefatigable fighter across the globe.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), a strong voice for freedom and human rights, and my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), who, as the previous speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), pointed out, has been such a strong, strong courageous voice for human rights wherever they are undermined in the world.

Mr. Speaker, this week our Nation closed a chapter on the deadliest act of terrorism ever perpetrated on American soil. We were reminded again of the dangers of fanaticism, its assault on civil society, its attack on our values, its rejection of the rule of law. We were confronted again by the evil that works within the zealot's heart, where basic human decency is drowned in a sea of arrogance, ideology, and hatred.

As we attempt to heal the wounds caused by this madman at home, let us recognize that as the leader for democracy, freedom, and human rights throughout the world, we must fight fanaticism, bigotry, and hatred wherever it rears its head. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this critically important resolution introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Today the people of Afghanistan toil under the boot of the brutal Taliban regime, whose crimes, as have been catalogued earlier in this debate, are

legion. Since ceasing power in 1996, the Taliban has systematically denied Afghani women and girls their basic human rights. They are prohibited from attending school. They are prohibited from working outside the home. With few exceptions, they are prohibited from appearing in public with nonrelative males.

The Taliban's chokehold on the Afghani people has only tightened recently. It destroyed two ancient statues of Buddha, in spite of all the world's protests. It shut down a hospital opened by an Italian charity. It prohibited Afghani women from working with the international relief agencies, even as an estimated 4 million people are at risk of starvation this year in Afghanistan.

In an order reminiscent of Nazi Germany, the Taliban rulers decreed in May that all non-Muslims would have to wear an identifying label on their clothing to distinguish themselves.

Earlier in this debate, the experience of the Danes and the Jews was referenced. My father was born in Copenhagen. King Christian, when the edict came down from the Nazis, said "I will wear the Jewish star," and all Danes wore the Jewish star to indicate their solidarity with their Danish brethren, not distinguished by other forms of discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, through this resolution today we join the world community in condemning the Taliban regime for their flagrant human rights violations. As the leading voice for freedom and human rights throughout the world, it is our responsibility, it is our duty, it is our opportunity and our cause. We must state unequivocally the savaging of human rights by misanthropic fanaticism has no place in a civilized world, and it must not stand.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is an important statement, and we must join with others to confront this evil perpetrated by the Taliban.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), a member of our Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. It gives us an opportunity to at least condemn the Taliban in forcing the wearing of these symbols.

Sometimes I think, though, that this type of legislation is more feel-good legislation, makes us feel better, but does not do a whole lot to solve our problems. I think it would be more important to take this opportunity to think about our policy of foreign interventionism.

We have been involved in Afghanistan now for more than two decades, and have spent over \$1 billion. Last year we spent \$114 million in humanitarian aid. This year it is already \$124 million.

It is said that it is not sent to the Taliban, but the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), who is a bit of an expert on Afghanistan, just revealed to us earlier that indeed some of this money and some of this aid was designated to go to the Taliban-controlled areas.

I think more important is that regardless of the intention of where we send the aid, the aid is beneficial to the government in charge. The Taliban is in charge. They can get control of aid, of food and other commodities, and use it as weapons, and they do.

The point that I would like to make is after these many, many millions of dollars and over \$1 billion have been spent, we have come to this. They are in worse shape than ever. Yes, we can condemn what they are doing, but we should question whether or not our policy in Afghanistan has really served us well, or served the people well. It may well be that when we send aid, that it literally helps the Taliban, because they do not have to then buy food. They can take their money and use it to enforce these rules and to be a more authoritarian society, to buy weapons.

We do know that when we sent weapons in the eighties, those weapons actually ended up in the hands of the violent Taliban, and they are still in their hands to some degree. Yes, our policy is well-intended. We would like to do good and save all the suffering that is happening in this country. But quite frankly, it has not worked very well.

We should question this. I believe we should assume some responsibility in the sense that our aid does not always do what it was supposed to do and actually ends up helping the very people that we detest. I think that is exactly what has happened here. It has been specifically pointed out that some of this aid has gone into the area where the Taliban has been helped and strengthened.

All I am suggesting is, why not question this a little bit? Why should we go on decade after decade after decade expanding aid and getting these kinds of results that we all detest?

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just respond to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL). While I am pleased he is supporting the resolution, he needs to gain some historical perspective. It was billions and billions of dollars of Marshall aid which resulted in the rebuilding of Western Europe and in creating our allies in NATO, and providing us with a prosperous Europe as our single most important trading partner.

So this melancholy call for isolationism is not supported by the historic evidence. The historic evidence shows clearly that in Republican and Democratic administrations, overwhelmingly United States participation in Europe and elsewhere contributed in a major way toward building democratic and prosperous societies.

I was present at the end of the Second World War, as my friend knows,

when Europe was in ruins, and it was the farsightedness of a group of Republican and Democratic leaders in this country, from Harry Truman to Senator Vandenberg, who created a framework which allowed the countries of Europe to rebuild themselves to become our powerful NATO allies, our democratic friends, and our most significant trading partners.

There is no evidence for the statement that the previous administration directed aid to go to the Taliban. This is an unsubstantiated statement. What we voted for and what I think we will vote again is to provide humanitarian assistance to the destitute people of Afghanistan. It is most unfortunate that the bulk of Afghanistan today is in the hands of this despicable regime.

But I think it is important to realize and to be true to historic facts that the bulk of our economic aid since the end of the Second World War has succeeded in creating prosperous and democratic societies ranging from Taiwan to Denmark. These were destroyed societies, poor societies, destitute societies, and American aid was critical in building them up as democratic and prosperous allies.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTOS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have time to get into the Marshall Plan, but there is a pretty strong case to indicate that the major part of the rebuilding of Europe came from private capital and not specifically from the immigration plan.

But the point that I would like to answer to is the term "isolationism." I am not a protectionist. I am not an isolationist. I am for openness, travel, trade. I vote consistently that way, so the term "isolationist" does not apply to the policies that I am talking about, because I am probably for more openness in trade and travel than most anybody in this body.

□ 1545

So the term is not isolationism.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations, my friend.

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me the time.

Firstly, let me thank the gentleman from the Bronx, New York (Mr. ENGEL), my friend and colleague, for authoring this resolution.

Let me thank the leadership and the Committee on International Relations and the leadership of the House for bringing this timely resolution to the floor so quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we must speak out quickly when tyranny raises its

ugly head; and, once again, it has raised in Afghanistan. To require any minority to wear any symbol harkens back to another age of the subjection of religious minorities, the coddling of terrorism, the destruction of world treasures.

We simply cannot let this go on without stating our opposition to that. It is shear, shear fascism. This fanaticism though has the potential to spread, unfortunately.

Having talked to some friends in the Bangladeshi community, their concerns that this could possibly spread to other moderate Muslim countries in the region is also a concern of mine.

This is a very, very difficult part of the world to begin with and to have this taking place there now is only going to exacerbate that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I will also wear this ribbon in remembrance of the Hindus of the Afghanistan.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for his strong support for this and other issues of human rights. We have worked together on many issues in Ireland, Bangladesh, and elsewhere; and we thank him for his poignant remarks today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 145 to condemn the treatment of Hindus in Afghanistan by the Taliban Government, and I wear my yellow badge.

It is a government that continues to commit blatant violations of human rights. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for introducing this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be one of the many original cosponsors. Since taking power over 90 percent of Afghanistan in the fall of 1996, the Taliban regime has restricted the freedoms of women by limiting their social participation, their work, and education. Not only do Hindu women have to wear the badge, they wear a veil. They are required to.

State Department and international human rights groups report that violence against women continues to be one of the regime's largest human rights violations. The Taliban regime has established a Ministry for the Promotion of Virtue and the Suppression of Vice to monitor how its moral laws are followed and to punish those who do not comply.

Individuals in violation have found their homes burned, livestock killed, irrigation systems destroyed. Over the past 2 years, more than a dozen politically active citizens have been arrested and killed by the Taliban regime.

Since its implementation, the protection and freedoms of women have been stripped, making women the property

of their husbands, their fathers, or the state.

Reports site acts of violence that include rape, kidnapping, and forced marriages that were in many cases perpetrated by the Taliban.

Most recently, the Taliban leaders have imposed laws mandating the public identification of all Muslims and that is this required yellow identification symbol. It echoes the feelings associated with the yellow star of David that Jews were forced to wear in Nazi Germany.

As we take a firm stand against human rights violations, we encourage other nations to recognize the Taliban leadership continues to violate United Nations Security Council resolutions and international standards as identified by Amnesty International.

As we recognize and respect the sovereignty of independent nations, we cannot remain silent when women and children are brutally murdered for not following the moral stands of a barbaric regime. We have acted to economically and politically isolate Afghanistan in efforts to eliminate human rights violations, but the world must also follow suit.

Earlier this year, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and I introduced H.R. 1152, the Human Rights Information Act, in an effort to expose human rights abusers outside the United States. As a world leader, the United States must condemn religious persecution and gender-based discrimination. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 145. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for floor managing the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for bringing this issue to the floor and indeed the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for introducing this very important issue.

Let us all support H. Con. Res. 145.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for her strong supportive remarks and for always being there on human rights situations.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), my friend and colleague.

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the cochair of the India Caucus to support this initiative. Today we all wear the yellow in emulation of the Danish king who said we are all Danes. There are not Jews and Catholics and Protestants, we are all Danes. But what this means is not that we are Hindus, but that we are all human beings.

When we fail to keep that clearly in mind, when we mix religion and gov-

ernment and get it all mixed up, we wind up with some very terrible situations. We cannot just look out at the Taliban. We have to look at ourselves, because Martin Niemoller, who was a Lutheran minister who died in the camps in the 1940s said, When they came for the Communist, I was not a Communist, so I did not stand up. When they came for the homosexuals, I was not a homosexual, so I did not stand up.

When they came for the socialists, I was not a socialist, so I did not stand up. When they came for the trade unionists and the Catholics, I did not stand up and when they came for the Jews, I did not stand up.

Then they came for me, and there was no one to stand up.

What this is about is all of us standing up for the right of people to have their own religion and to live in peace in a country where they can raise their children as they want to and not force anybody to do anything.

We must look at that separation of church and state in our own country. We will consider out here soon the issue of faith-based initiatives and what that does to the separation of church and state.

All we have to do is look at Afghanistan to see what happens when we meld the two together. That is a frightening possibility, and it starts one at a time. As it did in Germany. They did not go out and get the Jews first and grab them all. They started with a lot of other people that they did not like, and that is why this is so important that everyone wear this, not just today, but in their mind every day.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my neighbor, friend and colleague, an indefatigable fighter for human rights.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding the time to me, and I want to commend him and the majority side of the Committee on International Relations for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor.

This committee has challenged the conscience of this Congress and of our country on many occasions. Today I am sorry I missed the debate on Sudan but will be submitting a statement on the record for that.

But I also want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for his leadership in introducing this resolution. I am proud to be an original sponsor of it.

In his dear colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) calls what is happening in Afghanistan a horror, a horror. That is a perfect word for it.

The Taliban in their activities that I will talk about a bit and that our Members have addressed over and over again today, their activities there have placed them outside the circle of civilized human behavior.

It is very important that people in the rest of the world speak out; the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) gives us that opportunity here today. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

We have written, under the leadership of the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), to the President of the United States because we were concerned about this yellow badge that the Hindus were obliged to wear in Afghanistan. We are appreciating his considering our request that our Nation lead in its opposition to this dangerous, dangerous plan.

Mr. Speaker, much has been stated on the floor of this House about our commitment to religion and the free expression of religion, and that is why it is so important that we all join the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the committee and join with people of all faiths around the world in standing against the religious persecution by the Taliban regime.

The gentleman's resolution strongly condemns the Taliban's use of Nazi tactics to force Hindus in Afghanistan to wear symbols identifying them as Hindus. These are strong words. But these are terrible actions, and this is how we can meet this challenge.

So I am pleased to be, as I said, an original cosponsor. I commend the maker of the motion, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Engel). I once again applaud the Committee on International Relations for challenging the conscience of this Congress. Hopefully our whole country will rise to that challenge.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the opportunity to have the last comments.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has the right to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, I again want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for bringing this important resolution to our attention. I trust that we will have a unanimous consent vote which would reflect the views not only of the Congress but of the American people that we do not stand for religious discrimination or persecution in any form. I urge all of my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Taliban regime is a threat to the stability not only of the Asian regime but the entire world. Our Nation needs to join with other nations that are seeking to reinstate that regime.

The former king of Afghanistan has suggested that all of the parties come together in Afghanistan for a grand as-

sembly known as a Loya Jirga. This could be an appropriate way to bring peace to that Nation.

Another method could be to work with the Northern Alliance that has been opposing the Taliban. No matter what route our Nation takes, we must help to restore stability through the formation of a representative form of government in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with our colleagues on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to approve H. Con. Res. 145.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I rise today to talk about an issue that concerns me greatly—the recent actions of the Taliban regime.

I visited Afghanistan nearly 25 years ago. I was impressed by the resilient independence of its people. I deeply lament the destruction of art and the censorship of literature.

The giant statues of Bamiyan, which I had the privilege of seeing and admiring long ago, have been demolished.

All of this is very lamentable, but the recent violations of human rights and religious freedom must be condemned as crimes of a higher order.

Last month, the Taliban Islamic militia imposed a rigid new social code requiring Hindus in Afghanistan to wear a distinctive yellow piece of cloth identifying them as Hindus. The similarities between this recent action and those of pre-war Nazi regimes are disturbing.

Even more disturbing are the other similarities between pre-war Nazi Germany and the Taliban militia.

From what we have seen, the government of Afghanistan is waging a war on its certain members of its populace—particularly women and religious minorities. Before the Taliban took power in 1996, the women of Afghanistan had relative freedom: they could work, even as professionals, dress generally as they wanted, and drive and appear in public alone. Under the Taliban, women have lost not only these "privileges" but also all their rights as persons.

Now, the women of Afghanistan must ensure that not even an inch of their flesh shows; they must screen the windows of their homes so they cannot be seen, or see.

Women can no longer work and are forbidden to go out in public without a male relative. Even in their own homes, they are not allowed to be heard; they must wear silent shoes and obey and serve silently.

The slightest violation of the Taliban law is punishable by beating and stoning, often to death.

And now the Taliban regime has turned its hatred toward religious minorities. Recently, the world watched in horror as the Taliban militia destroyed ancient Buddhist statues, simply because they were of another religion.

And now, we are witnessing the Taliban's policy to mark its religious minorities. I fear what this action will lead to.

We already know what it can lead to.

Calling the Taliban's actions a "human rights violation" is a gross understatement.

We must—the world must—condemn it.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution which not only condemns the Taliban's use of Nazi tactics, but it also demands that the Taliban regime immediately revoke its order stigmatizing Hindus and other non-Mus-

lims in Afghanistan and conform its laws to all basic international civil and human rights standards.

We must not be silent on these atrocities.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 145. Recently, the Taliban in Afghanistan has issued a decree that all non-Muslims should wear a yellow identity symbol in addition to the requirement that women must fully cover themselves in a veil. This decree, although affecting all in Afghanistan, is directly targeted toward a minority Hindu population. It is unthinkable that we, here in America, would remain silent while religious persecution is actively promoted. Furthermore, this sort of action by the regime is reminiscent of previous leaders and governments that also set out a path of differentiation between people. In many of these cases, including the Nazis coercing Jews into wearing a yellow Star of David, a small action such as this, was only the precursor for larger, more violent forms of discrimination.

In addition, the Taliban has ordered the destruction of all pre-Islamic statues in Afghanistan, including a pair of 1600-year-old, 100-foot statues of Buddha that were carved out of a mountainside.

I find no other choice but to rise up with my colleagues to condemn these actions and to condemn the Taliban. I join with all people from around the world, people of all faiths and nationalities, to denounce this latest action of religious discrimination by the Taliban in Afghanistan.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for H. Con. Res. 145. I commend my colleague Mr. ENGEL, for introducing this important piece of legislation that condemns the Taliban for requiring Hindus and non-Muslims in Afghanistan to wear identifying symbols.

The Taliban regime's policies are inhuman, and clearly resonate Nazi tactics used to stigmatize Jews during the Holocaust. The Taliban policies are reprehensible, and not only should this Congress and the international community condemn the Taliban for their action against Hindus, I also call upon Pakistan to take a stand and use its influence with the Taliban to end these reprehensible policies.

The Taliban's record on human rights and support for terrorism have been documented in several reports, including the U.S. State Department's Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000 Report. The findings in these reports on the Taliban exemplify a clear pattern of basic human and civil rights to the Afghan people, especially women, minorities and children. The statistics of violence against women and girls is simply overwhelming.

Not only is the Taliban's record on human rights atrocious, the State Department's Patterns of Global Terrorism reports that "The Taliban continued to provide a safe haven for international terrorists, particularly Osama bin Laden and his network, in the portions of Afghanistan it controlled." Not only does the Taliban house Osama bin Laden, the Taliban allows Afghanistan to be used for a base of operation for worldwide terrorist activities and training.

The people of Afghanistan are being held hostage in their own country under the terrorist regime of the Taliban. Their recent policy of requiring Hindus to wear identification badges, mandating Hindu women to fully

cover themselves in veil, demanding Hindu homes to be identified, and prohibiting Muslims and Hindus to live together all further exacerbate the current situation and indicate that the Taliban is trying to implement a genocide against their own people.

I urge Pakistan to step up to the plate and use its influence to allow Afghan Hindus to continue to live their lives and practice their religious beliefs and I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 145, which condemns the Afghanistan Government for requiring non-Muslims to wear identifying symbols and other acts of human rights violations.

A recent order by the Taliban regime of Afghanistan to require Hindus and other non-Muslims in Afghanistan to wear symbols identifying them as non-Muslim is very disturbing.

It is inconceivable that after the experience of World War II, when Jewish members of European countries were forced to wear the Star of David as a means of identifying their religious beliefs that we should see this type of action again on the part of any government.

Women, minorities, and children suffer disproportionately. The U.S. State Department's Country Report on Human Rights Practices found that violence against women and girls in Afghanistan occurs frequently, including beatings, rapes, forced marriages, disappearances, kidnappings, and killings.

Amnesty International's Report 2001, covering events from January–December 2000 and issued May 30, 2001, states in its findings on Afghanistan that:

Human rights abuses, including arbitrary detention and torture, continued to be reported in the context of the ongoing conflict between warring factions. The Taliban continued to impose harsh restrictions on personal conduct and behavior as a means of enforcing their particular interpretation of Islamic law. Fighting in the northern provinces intensified during the second half of the year as the Taleban and anti-Taleban forces fought for control of territory. Forced displacement of the civilian population was used by the Taleban to gain control of territory in areas north of Kabul, creating a severe humanitarian crisis.

The Taliban has repeatedly interfered with United Nations relief programs and workers, preventing the provision of much-needed food and emergency relief services to the people of Afghanistan.

There are more than 25 million internally displaced persons within Afghanistan, and more than 2 million refugees who have left the country.

The Taliban's Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan, headed by Mullah Mohammad Omar, is recognized as a government by only three countries, including Pakistan, the United Arab Emirates, and Saudi Arabia. Of the three, Pakistan's relations with the Taliban are the most extensive, including military and economic assistance. The anti-Taliban alliance's Islamic State of Afghanistan, headed by Burhanuddin Rabbani, is recognized as a government by other governments and the United Nations. According to the State Department's report Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000, issued in April 2001, "The Government of Pakistan increased its support to the Taliban."

According to the State Department's Patterns of Global Terrorism:

The Taliban continued to provide safehaven for international terrorists, particularly Usama Bin Ladin and his network, in the portions of Afghanistan it controlled.

On May 29, 2001, a jury in Federal District Court in Manhattan convicted four bin Laden followers on all 302 counts they faced in connection with the August 7, 1998, bombings at the U.S. Embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, which killed 224 people, including 12 Americans, and wounded thousands.

The State Department's Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000 report states:

Islamic extremists from around the world including North America, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and Central, South, and Southeast Asia continued to use Afghanistan as a training ground and base of operations for their worldwide terrorist activities in 2000. The Taliban, which controlled most Afghan territory, permitted the operation of training and indoctrination facilities for non-Afghans and provided logistics support to members of various terrorist organizations and mujahidin, including those waging jihads (holy wars) in Central Asia, Chechnya, and Kashmir.

On October 15, 1999, the U.N. Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 1267, in which it demanded that the Taliban in Afghanistan turn over Osama bin Laden, in order that he might be brought to justice, and required the Taliban to cease the provision of sanctuary and training for international terrorists and their organizations. The Taliban took no steps to comply with the Security Council's demands.

The willful act of segregating groups in any society based on their innate human differences is wrong, it was wrong in the southern United States before the civil rights movement forced a change in our Nation's policy regarding African-American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian members of our society. It was wrong for South Africa to impose apartheid on the majority African and Indian population, and it is wrong for Afghanistan. The 56th session of the United Nation's Commission on Human Rights reported that a constitutional vacuum exists in Afghanistan. The Taliban government acknowledges the need for a constitution that would encompass an inclusive process, which would enable all segments of the Afghan population to participate in working out an acceptable constitutional framework and procedures for its acceptance and approval by the Afghan people.

There continues to be a denial to women of access to education, health and employment. The rights of women have been curtailed by limitation on their freedom of movement of women, with little access to employment or education. I have also heard about refugees stories concerning refugees and reports that chronicle the abduction of women, rape, infliction of the punishment of stoning, lashing, and other forms of inhuman punishment.

I would strongly encourage the Taliban government to rethink this decision along with their treatment of women in light of the strong negative connotations that are implied by their action. I do not reject the right of the Afghanistan people to self-determination, but I do reject any attempt to abuse women or to ostracize members of their diverse society.

The road that they are traveling on has been traveled on before with dire consequences for those who attempted to enforce

laws and policies based on prejudice or fear. The intent of the government may not be to take action against these religious groups, but the end result could indeed lead to untold violence against others because they worship God in their own way.

America was willing to aid the Afghan people in their struggle for freedom from the former Soviet Union. Our Nation's support came from our shared interest in stopping the violence that was being committed against their people because of their deep faith in God expressed in their commitment to Islam.

I would ask that the Taliban not forget their history with those who were intolerant of them, and remember that a nation like the United States gains its strength from the diversity of the people who call her home.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 12, 2001, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—420

Abercrombie	Burton	DeLauro
Ackerman	Buyer	DeLay
Aderholt	Callahan	DeMint
Akin	Calvert	Deutsch
Andrews	Camp	Diaz-Balart
Armey	Cannon	Dicks
Baca	Cantor	Dingell
Bachus	Capito	Doggett
Baird	Capps	Dooley
Baker	Capuano	Doolittle
Baldacci	Cardin	Doyle
Baldwin	Carson (IN)	Dreier
Ballenger	Carson (OK)	Duncan
Barcia	Castle	Dunn
Barr	Chabot	Edwards
Barrett	Chambliss	Ehlers
Bartlett	Clay	Ehrlich
Barton	Clayton	Emerson
Bass	Clement	Engel
Becerra	Clyburn	English
Bentsen	Coble	Eshoo
Bereuter	Collins	Etheridge
Berkley	Combest	Evans
Berman	Condit	Everett
Berry	Conyers	Farr
Biggert	Cooksey	Fattah
Bilirakis	Costello	Finer
Bishop	Cox	Flake
Blagojevich	Coyne	Fletcher
Blumenauer	Cramer	Foley
Blunt	Crane	Frank
Boehrlert	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Crowley	Frost
Bonilla	Cubin	Galleghy
Bonior	Culberson	Ganske
Bono	Cummings	Gekas
Borski	Cunningham	Gephardt
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Gibbons
Boucher	Davis (FL)	Gilchrist
Boyd	Davis (IL)	Gillmor
Brady (PA)	Davis, Jo Ann	Gilman
Brady (TX)	Davis, Tom	Gonzalez
Brown (FL)	Deal	Goode
Brown (OH)	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Brown (SC)	DeGette	Gordon
Bryant	Delahunt	Goss

Graham	Markey	Sabo
Granger	Mascara	Sanchez
Graves	Matheson	Sanders
Green (TX)	Matsui	Sandlin
Green (WI)	McCarthy (MO)	Sawyer
Greenwood	McCarthy (NY)	Saxton
Grucci	McCollum	Scarborough
Gutierrez	McCrery	Schaffer
Gutknecht	McDermott	Schakowsky
Hall (OH)	McGovern	Schiff
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Schrock
Hansen	McInnis	Scott
Harman	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner
Hart	McKeon	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	McKinney	Sessions
Hastings (WA)	McNulty	Shadegg
Hayes	Meehan	Shaw
Hayworth	Meeks (NY)	Shays
Hefley	Menendez	Sherman
Herger	Mica	Sherwood
Hilleary	Millender-	Shimkus
Hilliard	McDonald	Shows
Hinchey	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Hinojosa	Miller, Gary	Simmons
Hobson	Miller, George	Simpson
Hoeffel	Mink	Skeen
Holden	Mollohan	Skelton
Holt	Moore	Slaughter
Honda	Moran (KS)	Smith (MI)
Hooley	Moran (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Horn	Morella	Smith (TX)
Houghton	Murtha	Smith (WA)
Hoyer	Myrick	Snyder
Hulshof	Nadler	Solis
Hunter	Napolitano	Souder
Hutchinson	Neal	Spence
Hyde	Nethercutt	Spratt
Inlee	Ney	Stark
Isakson	Northup	Stearns
Israel	Norwood	Stenholm
Issa	Nussle	Strickland
Istook	Oberstar	Stump
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Stupak
Jackson-Lee	Oliver	Sununu
(TX)	Ortiz	Sweeney
Jefferson	Osborne	Tancred
Jenkins	Ose	Tanner
John	Otter	Tauscher
Johnson (CT)	Owens	Tauzin
Johnson (IL)	Oxley	Taylor (MS)
Johnson, Sam	Pallone	Taylor (NC)
Jones (NC)	Pascrell	Terry
Jones (OH)	Pastor	Thomas
Kanjorski	Paul	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Keller	Pelosi	Thornberry
Kelly	Pence	Thune
Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (MN)	Thurman
Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (PA)	Tiahrt
Kerns	Petri	Tiberi
Kildee	Phelps	Tierney
Kilpatrick	Pickering	Toomey
Kind (WI)	Pitts	Towns
King (NY)	Platts	Trafficant
Kingston	Pombo	Turner
Kirk	Pomeroy	Udall (CO)
Klecza	Portman	Udall (NM)
Knollenberg	Price (NC)	Upton
Kolbe	Pryce (OH)	Velazquez
Kucinich	Putnam	Visclosky
LaFalce	Quinn	Vitter
LaHood	Radanovich	Walden
Lampson	Rahall	Walsh
Langevin	Ramstad	Wamp
Lantos	Rangel	Waters
Largent	Regula	Watkins (OK)
Larsen (WA)	Rehberg	Watson (CA)
Latham	Reyes	Watt (NC)
LaTourette	Reynolds	Watts (OK)
Leach	Riley	Waxman
Lee	Rivers	Weiner
Levin	Rodriguez	Weldon (FL)
Lewis (CA)	Roemer	Weldon (PA)
Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)	Weller
Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)	Wexler
Linder	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen	Wicker
LoBiondo	Ross	Wilson
Lofgren	Rothman	Wolf
Lucas (KY)	Roukema	Woolsey
Lucas (OK)	Roybal-Allard	Wu
Luther	Royce	Wynn
Maloney (CT)	Rush	Young (AK)
Maloney (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Young (FL)
Manzullo	Ryun (KS)	

NOT VOTING—12

Allen	Ferguson	Fossella
Burr	Ford	Hill

Hoekstra	Johnson, E. B.	Lowey
Hostettler	Larson (CT)	Meek (FL)

□ 1622

So 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.

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 and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 145, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

CALIFORNIA'S ENERGY CRISIS

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, the California delegation, 52 strong, including our two United States Senators, Republicans and Democrats, met with the Vice President. The subject of the meeting was energy.

Californians are reeling from the sticker shock in the bills that they are receiving. We know that the Federal Energy Commission has said that there is gouging. We know that there is gaming. Californians are hurt and hurting badly by this.

I will place into the RECORD as part of what I am saying this morning a report that has come out from CNN. It is entitled "Power of advertising fights electricity rate caps".

Well, together with the White House and the GOP majority in the House, those gouged prices from Californians are now going to be put into an advertising campaign. The dollars that we are paying are going to be placed into an advertising campaign to try to defeat price relief in California.

This is an outrage, and it is an equivalent to what the tobacco companies did as they tried to wage their war on America and say that tobacco was good. This is an outrage, and we are going to fight this.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article that I referred to earlier as follows:

POWER OF ADVERTISING FIGHTS ELECTRICITY RATE CAPS

WORRIED GOP, WHITE HOUSE GIVE BLESSING TO UTILITIES' CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN

(By Major Garrett)

WASHINGTON (CNN).—Major U.S. utility companies—at the behest of senior congressional Republicans and with White House approval—will launch a multimillion-dollar advertising campaign this week to fight federal

caps on electricity prices in California, several sources tell CNN.

No exact dollar figure has been set for the television campaign, but congressional and administration sources said the first phase will cost less than \$5 million and run only in California. Media buyers for the utilities will also purchase airtime on Spanish-language television.

"Every penny right now will be spent in the Golden State," said a source intimately involved in the ad campaign.

Over time, the utilities' ad campaign could easily cost more than \$10 million. Leading congressional Republicans have urged the entire energy industry to spend upwards of \$50 million on the ads—or about as much as the tobacco industry spent to defeat comprehensive tobacco legislation in 1998.

Congressional GOP leaders have issued dire, albeit private, warnings to the energy industry that they may not be able to block legislation imposing caps on prices or other measures designed to give the federal government a greater role in setting rates for wholesale electricity, oil or natural gas.

The ad campaign reflects a deepening sense of dread among congressional Republicans that the Bush energy policy, while long on specifics, has failed to address short-term political pressure on Republicans.

Republicans inside and outside of Congress tell CNN they are terrified about confronting a summer of Democratic attacks on energy prices as they gear up for re-election campaigns. The concerns are all the more acute because of the GOP's narrow, five-seat House majority and fear among Senate Republicans that they could lose more ground to the Democrats in next year's elections.

The final straw for many House and Senate Republicans was Mr. Bush's trip to California, which, in effect, put the issue of price caps in the spotlight.

"It was a total disaster," said an adviser to the House Republican leadership. "He came out there to let every Californian, including Republicans, know he was against price caps. Now everyone in California knows (Democratic Gov.) Gray Davis is for them and the president is not."

What's worse, several senior Congressional Republican sources told CNN, the White House returned from the trip thinking the president had the upper hand.

"It's ludicrous," said another House Republican. "Members have lost confidence in their ability to understand how this issue is affecting us."

Congressional Republicans will not play any role in the content or overall strategy of the campaign. Neither is the White House involved. But House and Senate GOP leaders have shared their concerns with top White House officials, among them Mr. Bush's senior political adviser, Karl Rove.

"The White House is aware and approving of the effort," said a senior Senate Republican aide.

House Republican leaders, beset by complaints from rank-and-file Republicans about the beating they're taking on the energy price issue, have been demanding action from energy companies to make the public case against price caps or other controls on energy markets. Chief among the advocates has been House Majority Leader Tom DeLay of Texas.

DeLay and his wife, Christine, dined with President Bush and the first lady on Wednesday. Sources close to the situation said the evening was mostly social, but they added that DeLay expressed concerns about the withering attacks the House GOP has been absorbing from Democrats on the energy issue.