

truth. Many of the ads say that the bill would raise the cost of insurance. Not true. What they fail to say is that in the past 3 years or so, the cost of managed care has already increased at an average of 7.1 percent, and the increase is projected to be in double digits for this year. The ads also fail to tell us that while the costs have gone up, less services are covered.

Where the same provisions have been enacted in States, there have not been any extraordinary increases in premiums or significant increases in lawsuits. What has happened is that the people in those States have been able to access medically necessary health care, and we need to extend that to the rest of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let us pass the bill and let us move on to reduce disparities and provide universal coverage.

DENY OLYMPICS TO CHINA

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, what fellowship does light have with darkness? What fellowship does the symbol of the human spirit, the Olympic Games, have with Chinese tyranny?

Sixty-four years ago the Nazi propaganda machine proudly flaunted the 1936 Olympic Games as an example of the leadership of Adolph Hitler. That horrible miscalculation by the International Olympic Committee gave credibility to a man and a regime that killed 6 million Jews.

□ 1415

Amazingly, 44 years later, the IOC granted the games, the 1980 games to the Soviet Union on the very eve of their launch of the war against Afghanistan. Today, the IOC is ignoring history and considering awarding the international games of peace to the People's Republic of China in 2008.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, what fellowship does light have with darkness? What fellowship does the symbol of the human spirit have with Chinese tyranny? Let it be the voice from this citadel of liberty that the International Olympic Committee should say "no" to Beijing for the 2008 Olympic games.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Once again, we are taking up the Patients' Bill of Rights in this House. We have already passed a good, a true, an honest Patients' Bill of Rights in the House of Representatives. We passed it in the 105th Congress; we passed it in the 106th. It was a bipartisan effort. Now we are going to be presented with a new Patients' Bill of

Rights that they say is 80 percent like the real Patients' Bill of Rights, the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that we are going to try once again to fool the American people and trick them into believing that the insurance companies are not going to control their destiny when it comes to health care. The fact is, if we do not pass the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry bill in this House, the American people will still be at the mercy of the insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry Patients' Bill of Rights.

A STRONG NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, today the Blue Dog Democrats will unveil our version of what our national energy policy should look like and should be. We believe that most, if not all, of our colleagues will find tremendous interest in a program that creates a balanced approach, one that expands energy supplies, one that recognizes that energy production in the United States is equally important as that produced outside of the United States. In fact, more so. It enhances environmental standards. It promotes energy efficiency. It promotes research and development, and it provides reliable and affordable supplies.

Mr. Speaker, it matches a very important truism: we cannot produce food and fiber in the United States without oil and gas, and we cannot produce oil and gas without food and fiber. We need to be a partnership in all aspects of producing the energy needs of this country.

We encourage our colleagues to take a good look at our suggestion. We look forward to working with both sides of the aisle in developing this national energy policy, as well as with the administration.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE MARK E. SOUDER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable MARK E. SOUDER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 3, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that my office has been served with a civil subpoena for documents issued by the Superior Court for Allen County, Indiana in a civil case pending there.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that it is consistent with the precedents and privileges

of the House to advise the party who issued the subpoena that I have no documents that are responsive to the subpoena.

Sincerely,

MARK E. SOUDER,
Member of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

ENCOURAGING CORPORATIONS TO CONTRIBUTE TO FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 170) encouraging corporations to contribute to faith-based organizations.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 170

Whereas America's community of faith has long played a leading role in dealing with difficult societal problems that might otherwise have gone unaddressed;

Whereas President Bush has called upon Americans "to revive the spirit of citizenship . . . to marshal the compassion of our people to meet the continuing needs of our Nation";

Whereas although the work of faith-based organizations should not be used by government as an excuse for backing away from its historic and rightful commitment to help those who are disadvantaged and in need, such organizations can and should be seen as a valuable partner with government in meeting societal challenges;

Whereas every day faith-based organizations in the United States help people recover from drug and alcohol addiction, provide food and shelter for the homeless, rehabilitate prison inmates so that they can break free from the cycle of recidivism, and teach people job skills that will allow them to move from poverty to productivity;

Whereas faith-based organizations are often more successful in dealing with difficult societal problems than government and non-sectarian organizations;

Whereas, as President Bush recently stated, "It is not sufficient to praise charities and community groups; we must support them. And this is both a public obligation and a personal responsibility.";

Whereas corporate foundations contribute billions of dollars each year to a variety of philanthropic causes;

Whereas according to a recent study produced by the Capital Research Center, the 10 largest corporate foundations in the United States contributed \$1,900,000,000 to such causes;

Whereas according to the same study, faith-based organizations only receive a small fraction of the contributions made by corporations in the United States, and 6 of the 10 corporations that give the most to philanthropic causes explicitly ban or restrict contributions to faith-based organizations: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) Congress calls on corporations in the United States, in the words of the President, "to give more and to give better" by making greater contributions to faith-based organizations that are on the front lines battling some of the great societal challenges of our day; and

(2) it is the sense of Congress that—

(A) corporations in the United States are important partners with government in efforts to overcome difficult societal problems; and

(B) no corporation in the United States should adopt policies that prohibit the corporation from contributing to an organization that is successfully advancing a philanthropic cause merely because such organization is faith based.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 170, which calls on America's corporations to increase their support of faith-based charities.

In 1999, the last year in which facts were available, a total of \$190.16 billion were contributed to charities throughout America. Of that amount, corporations contributed \$11.02 billion to charities, which is 5.8 percent of the total amount given to charities in America came from corporations. Unfortunately, some of America's largest corporations as a matter of policy explicitly discriminate against faith-based organizations.

Now, there are many effective charitable groups throughout our country. These organizations have developed effective programs to assist people to recover from drug and alcohol addiction, provide food and shelter for the homeless, rehabilitate prison inmates, and to teach job skills that will allow individuals to move from poverty to productivity, from dependence to independence.

Now, in this resolution, we are not encouraging faith-based groups to do any proselytizing. As a matter of fact, they do not proselytize and recommend their particular religion. They are there for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to provide assistance to people who need assistance.

For example, charities like the Alpha Alternative Pregnancy Care Center in

my hometown of Hopkinsville, Kentucky. Alpha Alternative is a place where women in an unwanted pregnancy situation can turn for Christian compassion and help in a time of great personal crisis. They minister to their clients with parenting skills, classes, material assistance, and counseling. If this faith-based charity were to receive more corporate support, perhaps Alpha Alternative could also expand its services to include other medical diagnostic services and job training programs. But with corporate policies banning support for worthwhile faith-based charities, community groups like Alpha Alternative will never reach their true potential.

I ask my colleagues today to join with me in voting for this resolution calling on the conscience of America's largest companies not to discriminate against an organization that is successfully advancing philanthropic and human causes, and not to discriminate merely because they happen to be faith based. As I said earlier, these groups are not out proselytizing. They are not out trying to impose their religion on anyone, and this legislation is not trying to impose religion on anyone. This legislation simply asks corporate America to help effective organizations, whether they be faith based or secular.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure exactly what role Congress should have in trying to dictate to American families or American corporations how they should contribute their charitable contributions and to whom they should contribute those dollars, but I would point out that this particular resolution has, in effect, no real legal teeth to it. Much of it is a sense of Congress, and to the extent that the goal of this resolution is to say to individuals and corporate leaders to take a look at faith-based organizations in America, they are doing a lot of good work addressing social problems, then I endorse that approach.

Were this resolution more than, in effect, a sense of Congress and was actually going to dictate policy to corporate trusts, I certainly would have thought it would have made sense for the House committees to have met either the Committee on the Judiciary, or the Committee on Commerce, to at least have a hearing on this to try and direct \$1.9 billion in charitable giving. It is my understanding that there was no House committee hearing of either the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Commerce on this measure. However, because this resolution is basically a voluntary message to corporations to consider the good work of many faith-based charities, I would not adamantly object to the principal goal of this.

But what, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on today is why this vol-

untary approach toward giving to faith-based charities is much more acceptable to me and other Members of Congress and religious leaders than the President's faith-based initiative. The President's faith-based initiative in contrast to this has several fundamental flaws, and if this bill had any of these flaws built into it in the essence of law, I would oppose this resolution.

First of all, the President's faith-based initiative as exemplified in H.R. 7 would, for the first time in our country's history, direct Federal tax dollars going immediately into the coffers of our houses of worship, our churches, our synagogues, and other houses of worship. I think that approach to supporting faith-based charities is patently unconstitutional. I think giving billions of Federal dollars directly to faith-based organizations, tax dollars to faith-based organizations would inevitably and absolutely lead to government regulation of religion and our churches.

Thirdly, I think the administration approach toward faith-based initiatives as exemplified in H.R. 7 would lead to religious strife, as thousands of different faith-based groups would be coming to Washington, D.C. competing for tens of billions of Federal tax dollars. If one wants to write a prescription for religious strife in America, Mr. Speaker, I could think of no better way to do it than to have thousands of churches and houses of worship coming to our Nation's capital and competing before Cabinet Members for tens of billions of dollars of Federal money.

The fourth problem I have with the faith-based initiative and the President's program in contrast to this resolution is that the President's faith-based initiative would actually subsidize, subsidize religious discrimination. It would actually take Federal tax dollars and allow a faith-based group to put up a sign, paid for by our tax dollars, that would say, no Jew, no Catholic, no Mormon, no Baptist need apply here for a federally funded job. I think that type of approach to helping charities is really a great retreat in our 40-year march toward greater civil rights in America.

The fifth objection I have to the President's proposal on faith-based initiatives versus this sense of Congress resolution is that the President's proposal really puts Congress and faith-based groups into a Catch-22. If we say that they cannot use Federal dollars to proselytize, to push their religion and their faith upon others, then, in effect, what we are doing is giving Federal dollars to faith-based groups and saying that one cannot use their faith in carrying out one's social mission. So in effect, the President's program, if implemented, would actually take the faith out of faith-based organizations, the very thing I would believe the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and I would agree makes many faith-based organizations so special, the fact that they can inject their faith into

their process of turning around people's lives and solving their problems.

□ 1430

So my point, Mr. Speaker, is this: I am not sure exactly whether this should be a top priority today for Congress, and in fact a sense of Congress resolution, to be telling corporate foundations how to spend billions of dollars, but I do applaud the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) in what I interpret is his basic approach, to send a message to America to say, look at the good work of faith-based organizations.

As a person of faith, I believe these organizations are doing excellent work in many cases. Not in all cases, but in many cases, they truly are changing people's lives in a positive manner.

But I think it is very important for Members to know that in supporting this resolution today, they are not adopting the provisions of H.R. 7 as proposed by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) and others. We are not endorsing those resolutions that would actually allow Federal tax dollars to go directly to houses of worship. I would passionately oppose such a bill, such a proposal, or such a resolution.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), who was the author and primary sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, for yielding time to me, and for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, the seeds for this resolution come from a speech that our President gave at the University of Notre Dame commencement ceremony a few months ago. In that speech, President Bush laid out for America a great challenge. In his words, that challenge "was to revive the spirit of citizenship, to marshal the compassion of our people to meet the continuing needs of our Nation."

He went on to remind us that, in his words, "It is not sufficient to praise charities and community groups. We must support them." This is both a public obligation and a personal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, unlike my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, I hope this body will take up H.R. 7, the Community Solutions Act, and take it up soon. It will create enhanced incentives for charitable giving, it will expand charitable choice, it will break down the barriers that prevent charitable sectors from being greater partners in the war on poverty.

I believe the debate on the faith-based initiative will be a great and historic one, one that may help us turn the corner in the war on poverty, so I am a strong and passionate supporter.

But in the meantime, this resolution that is before us today is designed to nudge corporate America into providing even more immediate reinforcements to faith-based organizations that are already taking up the mission that the President has called for, organizations that have heeded the President's call, and that of so many, many American leaders that have gone before him.

This resolution seeks to draw attention to charitable efforts that are already under way, that are already working so beautifully; more importantly, to draw attention to the sad lack of support that these groups have received, not from individuals but from America's wealthiest foundations.

This resolution celebrates good news, and it points out tragic news.

First, the good news. As both of the previous speakers have noted, each Member of this House can point with pride and with gratitude to organizations in his or her community that are lifting lives and healing neighborhoods and making a wonderful difference. These groups are the conscience of our people. They are helping people recover from drug and alcohol addiction. They are providing shelter, comfort, and food for the homeless. They are rehabilitating prison inmates and breaking the cycle of recidivism.

Hundreds of these organizations were represented recently at the faith-based summit here in Washington. As a participant in that summit, I can say there was more positive energy for poverty relief gathered here in the Capital than at any time in decades.

There were wonderful organizations like Rawhide Boys Ranch from northeastern Wisconsin. Established nearly four decades ago as a faith-based alternative to juvenile detention, Rawhide accepts 100 troubled boys each year without regard to race or religious belief or economic background. These boys are counseled, given personal academic and vocational training, and they are taught discipline and given love. This program changes lives because it changes hearts.

There were organizations like Urban Hope, a faith-based ministry in Green Bay, Wisconsin, committed to empowering and revitalizing people and communities through entrepreneurship; yes, entrepreneurship. It teaches credit and budgeting, entrepreneurial ideas, and has a microloan program. In its brief time of existence, it has launched over 121 new businesses in the Green Bay area.

Of course, nearly every community in America has a Bureau of Catholic Charities. There are over 1,400 agencies, institutions, and organizations that make up Catholic Charities. Over 9½ million people each year, people who are in need, turn to them for services ranging from adoption to soup kitchens, child care to prison ministry, disaster relief to refugee and immigration assistance.

In summary, these armies of compassion are fighting brush fires all across this great land.

Now the sad news, the tragic news. According to the Capital Research Center my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) has just mentioned, the 10 largest U.S. corporate foundations have given out roughly \$2 billion each year to charities, but a mere fraction of that has gone to these very organizations that each of us have referred to.

It has given little to them regardless of their effectiveness. In fact, of the 10 largest corporations in America, six have specific restrictions that either ban outright giving to faith-based organizations, or greatly restricting it. In fact, of the 10 which have provided enough information, not one of them has given 5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, according to that same Capital Research Center report, the leading 1,000 foundations in America have targeted just 2.3 percent of their grants to faith-based organizations. The top 100 foundations have given just 1.5 percent.

I do not know if this is political correctness, I do not know if this is a lack of awareness of what these great organizations are doing. I am wondering if these organizations, these corporations, these foundations, have become conscientious objectors in the battle against poverty. I hope not. I am sure my colleagues share that sentiment.

Whatever the cause, whatever the reason, it is time for these restrictions to fall. It is time for the reticence of corporate America to end. It is time for corporate America, it is time for foundations and American citizens everywhere, to take up the cause of these organizations; to contribute, to give them what they can, whether it be financial resources, tools, expertise, whatever they can give to help them help us fight poverty and the consequences of poverty.

We are not asking these corporations to do any more than we should do each as individuals to turn citizenship and civic responsibility from an all too passive term to an activist philosophy, because it is only when each of us and these foundations and these corporations take up the fight, I believe it is only when that happens that we will make a difference.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. It is a sense of the Congress resolution, but it shines a spotlight on the wonderful work that is being done, and it shines a spotlight on the sad tragedy that too many corporations, too many foundations have not been there to help. I think shining this spotlight is important, and I hope it will make a difference.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out, not knowing the facts, since there was not a committee hearing on this, that some of the corporations whose charitable contributions are in effect

being criticized today might not want to give to some faith-based groups because they do proselytize.

I know the gentleman from Kentucky talked about groups that do not proselytize. There are many faith-based groups that provide soup kitchens, alcohol and drug rehabilitation programs, and they do not proselytize. But there are many other faith-based groups that part of their very mission as a religious, pervasively sectarian entity is to proselytize, to sell their faith to others to try to change their lives.

So not knowing what the policy is, these corporations, that might be one valid reason why many of these corporations choose not to give their philanthropy to faith-based organizations.

Again, I commend the gentleman from Kentucky today for pointing out the good work done by faith-based groups of many different religious faiths across the country. But Mr. Speaker, as we begin this opening chapter in the debate this summer on the role of government and faith-based organizations, I think it is important that we keep in historical perspective the reason why our Founding Fathers felt so strongly about the separation of government and its ability to regulate religion.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans would be surprised that God is not mentioned in America's governing document, our Constitution. Was this an unintended omission? Did our Founding Fathers intend to show disrespect toward God and faith? Did they not understand the importance of religion in our country?

One could imagine modern-day politicians railing against this "discrimination" against religion shown by our Founding Fathers. Worse yet, they could be attacked for beginning the Bill of Rights with these words: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

Were Madison, Jefferson, and others guilty of anti-religious, anti-faith discrimination? The truth is, our Founding Fathers did not mention God in our Constitution not out of disrespect to God or religion, but out of total reverence for religious liberty. They believed human history proved that government involvement harmed rather than helped religion.

Jefferson wrote reverently of the wall of separation between church and State. Mr. Speaker, that wall of separation is not designed to keep people of faith out of government, but rather, to keep government and its regulations out of religion and our faith.

Were our Founding Fathers right or wrong in separating politics from religion? Let us fast-forward to today's world. In Denmark, churches are subsidized by taxes, and church attendance is extremely low. In China, citizens are put in prison for their religious beliefs. In Afghanistan, the government is taking religious minorities and forcing them to wear identification symbols that evoke Nazi tactics. In the Middle East and Sudan, religious dif-

ferences have been the basis for conflict and hatred and terrorism.

In contrast to those countries where government and religion are so entwined, in the United States religious faith and freedom, tolerance, and generosity are flourishing. The difference is that in the other countries, government and religion are intertwined. But in the United States, our Bill of Rights prohibits government from direct involvement in our religion and our own personal faith.

Madison and Jefferson were not so anti-religion after all when they created the wall of separation between church and State. As I said, that wall is not intended to keep people of faith out of being involved in government or having a voice in government, but rather, it was clearly intended to keep government from being able to control religion.

How wise they were in establishing that wall. Maybe our Founding Fathers expressed true reverence in recognizing that faith should be a matter only between an individual and God, with no need for government interference.

Despite the wisdom of our Founding Fathers and all the lessons of human history, I believe it should alarm Americans of all faiths that the administration and some Members of Congress propose other legislation, in contrast to this, that would allow the Federal government to send billions of dollars directly to churches, synagogues and houses of worship. This proposal, soon to be voted on in the House, is known as charitable choice. Unlike this resolution, it would have the teeth of law.

So-called charitable choice legislation is a bad choice. Direct government funding of our houses of worship would inevitably lead to government regulation of religion. Government simply cannot spend billions of tax dollars without audits and regulations. Do we really want Federal auditors and investigators digging through the financial records of our churches, synagogues, and houses of worship? Do we really want prosecutors going after pastors and rabbis who have not handled their faith-based Federal money properly?

It would be also a huge step backwards in our march of civil rights for charitable choice legislation to not only allow but to actually subsidize religious discrimination. Under that bill, a religious group using tax dollars could refuse to hire someone for a secular job simply because of that person's sincere religious faith.

Do we really want government officials deciding which religions and which houses of worship should receive billions of Federal tax dollars? I could not think of a better cause or a better basis for religious strife in America than to encourage the competition between churches, synagogues, and mosques, causing them to compete for billions of Federal dollars.

Even the short recent debate over the charitable choice issue has already

caused religious tension in our country as some religious leaders have recently said they do not want other religions different from their own to receive Federal tax dollars. The President even several weeks ago accused those opposed to his faith-based initiatives as being skeptics who do not understand the power of faith.

□ 1445

Forgetting the fact that numerous religious leaders oppose the President's proposals on church-State grounds, is it healthy to have a President challenging citizens' religious faith because they differ with him on a public policy issue? I think not.

In the face, Mr. Speaker, of religious strife throughout the world, I would hope that Americans would understand that religious freedom and tolerance, protected by the Bill of Rights, is the crown jewel of America's experiment in democracy. We tamper with that freedom at our own peril.

As a person of faith, I am willing to say that this resolution today is well intended, is intended to voluntarily encourage corporations to give their money to faith-based organizations if they believe those organizations are doing good work for our country. But let us be very clear in drawing the line between this voluntary-type Sense of Congress Resolution and actually using the power of government to regulate and fund our faith in our houses of worship.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor, his enthusiasm for the concept, as he has battled through committee and defended the whole concept, but particularly this in the private sector.

I would like to make a couple other comments here at the beginning as well. Those in the gallery and those who have been here to the House floor can see we are surrounded by lawgivers, all whose heads are turned sideways, except for Moses, who looks straight down on the Speaker of the House, or the acting Speaker; and it says "In God We Trust." Clearly, Congress has decided that what is wrong, and the reason in the Constitution they decided what was wrong, was to use government funds to proselytize for sectarian purposes. They did not mean a total separation of church and State.

When the wall of separation line was developed, it was developed in Virginia because they were paying even for the pastor's home and the actual church in Virginia, and the Evangelicals objected to funding the Anglicans. That is not

what the founding fathers intended. They did not want proselytization, but they did not have a complete separation as long as there was no proselytizing.

I also want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS). I appreciate his support of this resolution today and working with me and others on tax alternatives. He has been consistent. We have a disagreement on charitable choice and government funding, but we do not oppose private funding. It is wrong for us to cast aspersions on others who disagree with certain parts because we have an honest disagreement about what this country should do and how we should proceed. And we have had several good debates on that. This resolution is not part of that debate.

This resolution should be unanimous because those who oppose public funds also speak in favor of private funds, and this encourages more private-sector funding. But if corporate private-sector funding does not go to faith-based and is biased against faith-based organizations as well, where do these resource-poor organizations go?

Many of our most effective poverty-fighting organizations are in the country's poorest areas, in the poorest areas of my hometown of Fort Wayne, of Milwaukee, of Chicago, of New York, of Boston, wherever you go, they are people rich but resource poor. They are often struggling to get through that day or that week. They often have volunteers who work many, many hours and into the night. When government employees often leave at 5 o'clock, we see these people volunteering, because many of the problems in our toughest neighborhoods occur between 10 at night and 4 in the morning; not often when government employees are there. Often they work without health benefits or any other kind of benefits. Also, the churches from which they rise often have no financial resources.

We are not here talking about the church itself or the ministry. Because I agree, if the money goes straight to the churches and gets incorporated and they become dependent on that, we will wreck the churches of America, like has happened to some degree, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) pointed out, around the world. But this is in their outreach ministries. Can they, if they do not proselytize with government funds, can they be included in faith-based organizations?

Now, the problem, as President Bush has pointed out and the Capital Research Center and as previous speakers have previously pointed out, many of our top organizations ban funding for faith-based organizations. Number one, General Motors, says that contributions generally are not provided to religious organizations. Number three, the Ford Motor Company, says as a general policy they do not support religious or sectarian programs. Number four, ExxonMobile, says we do not provide funds for political or religious causes.

Number six, IBM, does not make corporate donations or grants from corporate philanthropic funds to religious groups.

Where are they to turn? If the biggest funders deny them, if the government denies them, if their churches are poor, and yet they are the most effective, where do they turn?

In President Bush's Notre Dame commencement speech, and I am proud I graduated from Notre Dame and I am thrilled he gave this speech at Notre Dame, he quoted Knute Rockne, certainly the most famous football coach in American history, next to our fellow congressman, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), Knute Rockne said, "I have found prayers work best when you have big players." Big players in this case are the volunteers and also the dollars.

There has been a lot of misunderstanding about President Bush's faith-based initiative. He has always said from the beginning that private giving is first and foremost. The amount of private giving in America far exceeds anything that the government will do in these areas.

Number one are individual contributions, which are in this bill, which would allow nonitemizers to tax deduct, as well as some other incentives for individual giving and corporate giving; and, number two, is to urge corporate foundations and corporate entities themselves to give private donations. That is where the real dollars will come, and that is where there is the least strings. At a minimum, this Congress should not only pass this resolution today but the tax part of the President's initiative.

His second most important part was the so-called compassion fund, because even now faith-based organizations are eligible but they have no idea where the grants are. They have no idea, a lot of times, what the laws are on proselytizing, how to set up 501(c)(3)'s, how to have an isolated fund so they do not get sued and so they do not get intermingled. That compassion fund is a critical part of the President's agenda. All the focus has been on number three, which we have already passed through the House, which is already law in welfare reform, and which is law in other areas, and that is the so-called charitable choice provision. It is important. I strongly support it.

The bill that passed out of the committees just before we left for the July 4th break made the differentiations that I believe are needed to follow constitutional law, and I strongly support that. But it is most important for us to remember that the key thing is to get the dollars to where the resources, the people resources are. And that starts first and foremost with individual giving and corporate giving.

Once again, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for his resolution today, for our House leadership, for the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), and the

gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), and others, for doing this. We are a diverse country. We need to protect our diversity. But our multiple faiths in this country will always be the anchor of our diversity.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the commencement speech the President gave at Notre Dame, which I referred to earlier.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT IN
COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Father Malloy. Thank you all for that warm welcome. Chairman McCartan, Father Scully, Dr. Hatch, Notre Dame trustees, members of the class of 2001. (Applause.) It is a high privilege to receive this degree. I'm particularly pleased that it bears the great name of Notre Dame. My brother, Jeb, may be the Catholic in the family—(laughter)—but between us, I'm the only Domer. (Laughter and applause.)

I have spoken in this campus once before. It was in 1980, the year my Dad ran for Vice President with Ronald Reagan. I think I really won over the crowd that day. (Laughter.) In fact, I'm sure of it, because all six of them walked me to my car. (Laughter.)

That was back when Father Hesburgh was president of this university, during a tenure that in many ways defined the reputation and values of Notre Dame. It's a real honor to be with Father Hesburgh, and with Father Joyce. Between them, these two good priests have given nearly a century of service to Notre Dame. I'm told that Father Hesburgh now holds 146 honorary degrees. (Applause.) That's pretty darn impressive. Father, but I'm gaining on you. (Laughter.) As of today, I'm only 140 behind. (Laughter.)

Let me congratulate all the members of the class of 2001. (Applause.) You made it, and we're all proud of you on this big day. I also congratulate the parents, who, after these years, are happy, proud—and broke. (Laughter and applause.)

I commend this fine faculty, for the years of work and instruction that produced this outstanding class.

And I'm pleased to join my fellow honorees, as well. I'm in incredibly distinguished company with authors, executives, educators, church officials and an eminent scientist. We're sharing a memorable day and a great honor, and I congratulate you all. (Applause.)

Notre Dame, as a Catholic university, carries forward a great tradition of social teaching. It calls on all of us, Catholic and non-Catholic, to honor family, to protect life in all its stages, to serve and uplift the poor. This university is more than a community of scholars, it is a community of conscience—and an ideal place to report on our nation's commitment to the poor, and how we're keeping it.

In 1964, the year I started college, another President from Texas delivered a commencement address talking about this national commitment. In that speech, President Lyndon Johnson issued a challenge. He said, "This is the time for decision. You are the generation which must decide. Will you decide to leave the future a society where a man is condemned to hopelessness because he was born poor? Or will you join to wipe out poverty in this land?"

In that speech, Lyndon Johnson advocated a War on Poverty which has noble intentions and enduring success. Poor families got basic health care; disadvantaged children were given a head start in life. Yet, there were also some consequences that no one wanted or intended. The welfare entitlement became an enemy of personal effort and responsibility, turning many recipients into dependents. The War on Poverty also turned too

many citizens into bystanders, convinced that compassion had become the work of government alone.

In 1996, welfare reform confronted the first of these problems, with a five-year time limit on benefits, and a work requirement to receive them. Instead of a way of life, welfare became an officer of temporary help—not an entitlement, but a transition. Thanks in large part of this change, welfare rolls have been cut in half. Work and self-respect have been returned to many lives. This is a tribute to the Republicans and democrats we agreed on reform, and to the President who signed it: President Bill Clinton. (Applause.)

Our nation has confronted welfare dependency. But our work is only half done. Now we must confront the second problem: to revive the spirit of citizenship—to marshal the compassion of our people to meet the continuing needs of our nation. This is a challenge to my administration, and to each one of you. We must meet that challenge—because it is right, and because it is urgent.

Welfare as we knew it has ended, but poverty has not. When over 12 million children live below the poverty line, we are not a post-poverty America. Most states are seeing the first wave of welfare recipients who have reached the law's five-year time limit. The easy cases have already left the welfare rolls. The hardest problems remain—people with far fewer skills and greater barriers to work. People with complex human problems, like illiteracy and addiction, abuse and mental illness. We do not yet know what will happen to these men and women, or to their children. But we cannot sit and watch, leaving them to their own struggles and their own fate.

There is a great deal at stake. In our attitudes and actions, we are determining the character of our country. When poverty is considered hopeless, America is condemned to permanent social division, becoming a nation of caste and class, divided by fences and gates and guards.

Our task is clear, and it's difficult: we must build our country's unity by extending our country's blessings. We make that commitment because we are Americans. Aspiration is the essence of our country. We believe in social mobility, not social Darwinism. We are the country of the second chance, where failure is never final. And that dream has sometimes been deferred. It must never be abandoned.

We are committed to compassion for practical reasons. When men and women are lost to themselves, they are also lost to our nation. When millions are hopeless, all of us are diminished by the loss of their gifts.

And we're committed to compassion for moral reasons. Jewish prophets and Catholic teaching both speak of God's special concern for the poor. This is perhaps the most radical teaching of faith—that the value of life is not contingent on wealth or strength or skill. That value is a reflection of God's image.

Much of today's poverty has more to do with troubled lives than a troubled economy. And often when a life is broken, it can only be restored by another caring, concerned human being. The answer for an abandoned child is not a job requirement—it is the loving presence of a mentor. The answer to addiction is not a demand for self-sufficiency—it is personal support on the hard road to recovery.

The hope we seek is found in safe havens for battered women and children, in homeless shelters, in crisis pregnancy centers, in programs that tutor and conduct job training and help young people when they happen to be on parole. All these efforts provide not just a benefit, but attention and kindness, a touch of courtesy, a dose of grace.

Mother Teresa said that what the poor often need, even more than shelter and food—though these are desperately needed, as well—is to be wanted. And that sense of belonging is within the power of each of us to provide. Many in this community have shown what compassion can accomplish.

Notre Dame's own Lou Nanni is the former director of South Bend's Center for the Homeless—an institution founded by two Notre Dame professors. It provides guests with everything from drug treatment to mental health service, to classes in the Great Books, to preschool for young children. Discipline is tough. Faith is encouraged, not required. Student volunteers are committed and consistent and central to its mission. Lou Nanni describes this mission as "repairing the fabric" of society by letting people see the inherent "worth and dignity and God-given potential" of every human being.

Compassion often works best on a small and human scale. It is generally better when a call for help is local, not long distance. Here at this university, you've heard that call and responded. It is part of what makes Notre Dame a great university.

This is my message today: there is no great society which is not a caring society. And any effective war on poverty must deploy what Dorothy Day called "the weapons of spirit."

There is only one problem with groups like South Bend's Center for the Homeless—there are not enough of them. It's not sufficient to praise charities and community groups, we must support them. And this is both a public obligation and a personal responsibility.

The War on Poverty established a federal commitment to the poor. The welfare reform legislation of 1996 made that commitment more effective. For the task ahead, we must move to the third stage of combating poverty in America. Our society must enlist, equip and empower idealistic Americans in the works of compassion that only they can provide.

Government has an important role. It will never be replaced by charities. My administration increases funding for major social welfare and poverty programs by 8 percent. Yet, government must also do more to take the side of charities and community healers, and support their work. We've had enough of the stale debate between big government and indifferent government. Government must be active enough to fund services for the poor—and humble enough to let good people in local communities provide those services.

So I have created a White House Office of Faith-based and Community Initiatives. (Applause.) Through that office we are working to ensure that local community helpers and healers receive more federal dollars, greater private support and face fewer bureaucratic barriers. We have proposed a "compassion capital fund," that will match private giving with federal dollars. (Applause.)

We have proposed allowing all taxpayers to deduct their charitable contributions—including non-itemizers. (Applause.) This could encourage almost \$15 billion a year in new charitable giving. My attitude is, everyone in America—whether they are well-off or not—should have the same incentive and reward for giving.

And we're in the process of implementing and expanding "charitable choice"—the principle, already established in federal law, that faith-based organizations should not suffer discrimination when they compete for contracts to provide social services. (Applause.) Government should never fund the teaching of faith, but it should support the good works of the faithful. (Applause.)

Some critics of this approach object to the idea of government funding going to any

group motivated by faith. But they should take a look around them. Public money already goes to groups like the Center for the Homeless and, on a larger scale, to Catholic Charities. Do the critics really want to cut them off? Medicaid and Medicare money currently goes to religious hospitals. Should this practice be ended? Child care vouchers for low income families are redeemed every day at houses of worship across America. Should this be prevented? Government loans send countless students to religious colleges. Should that be banned? Of course not. (Applause.)

America has a long tradition of accommodating and encouraging religious institutions when they pursue public goals. My administration did not create that tradition—but we will expand it to confront some urgent problems.

Today, I am adding two initiatives to our agenda, in the areas of housing and drug treatment. Owning a home is a source of dignity for families and stability for communities—and organizations like Habitat for Humanity make that dream possible for many low income Americans. Groups of this type currently receive some funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The budget I submit to Congress next year will propose a three-fold increase in this funding—which will expand homeownership, and the hope and pride that come with it. (Applause.)

And nothing is more likely to perpetuate poverty than a life enslaved to drugs. So we've proposed \$1.6 billion in new funds to close what I call the treatment gap—the gap between 5 million Americans who need drug treatment, and the 2 million who currently receive it. We will also propose that all these funds—all of them—be opened to equal competition from faith-based and community groups.

The federal government should do all these things; but others have responsibilities, as well—including corporate America.

Many corporations in America do good work, in good causes. But if we hope to substantially reduce poverty and suffering in our country, corporate America needs to give more—and to give better. (Applause.) Faith-based organizations receive only a tiny percentage of overall corporate giving. Currently, six of the 10 largest corporate givers in America explicitly rule out or restrict donations to faith-based groups, regardless of their effectiveness. The federal government will not discriminate against faith-based organizations, and neither should corporate America. (Applause.)

In the same spirit, I hope America's foundations consider ways they may devote more of their money to our nation's neighborhood and their helpers and their healers. I will convene a summit this fall, asking corporate and philanthropic leaders throughout America to join me at the White House to discuss ways they can provide more support to community organizations—both secular and religious.

Ultimately, your country is counting on each of you. Knute Rockne once said, "I have found that prayers work best when you have big players." (Laughter and applause.) We can pray for the justice of our country, but you're the big players we need to achieve it. Government can promote compassion, corporations and foundations can fund it, but the citizens—it's the citizens who provide it. A determined assault on poverty will require both an active government, and active citizens.

There is more to citizenship than voting—though I urge you to do it. (Laughter.) There is more to citizenship than paying your taxes—though I'd strongly advise you to pay them. (Laughter.) Citizenship is empty without concern for our fellow citizens, without

the ties that bind us to one another and build a common good.

If you already realize this and you're acting on it, I thank you. If you haven't thought about it, I leave you with this challenge: serve a neighbor in need. Because a life of service is a life of significance. Because materialism, ultimately, is boring, and consumerism can build a prison of wants. Because a person who is not responsible for others is a person who is truly alone. Because there are few better ways to express our love for America than to care for other Americans. And because the same God who endows us with individual rights also calls us to social obligations.

So let me return to Lyndon Johnson's charge. You're the generation that must decide. Will you ratify poverty and division with your apathy—or will you build a common good with your idealism? Will you be the spectator in the renewal of your country—or a citizen?

The methods of the past may have been flawed, but the idealism of the past was not an illusion. Your calling is not easy, because you must do the acting and the caring. But there is fulfillment in that sacrifice, which creates hope for the rest of us. Every life you help proves that every life might be helped. The actual proves the possible. And hope is always the beginning of change.

Thank you for having me, and God bless. (Applause.)

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Kentucky has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for bringing this important issue to the forefront. We have a lot of people in America reaching out asking for a helping hand. We have a lot of organizations who have programs in place that can assist those people. This resolution today simply calls on corporate America to not discriminate against a group simply because they are faith based.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks today.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of H. Con. Res. 170, which calls for increased support of faith-based charities by U.S. corporations.

The United States is blessed with an industrious people and great wealth; we are the envy of the world. But a great and prosperous nation can and must do better—each of us has a duty to alleviate the suffering of the poor and oppressed in our own communities. Some of the most effective organizations for meeting the needs of impoverished Americans are faith-based, yet these are the very groups that face discrimination by corporate America.

According to Leslie Lenkowsky in last month's edition of *Commentary*, in 1998 only some 2 percent of the money donated by the nation's largest foundations went to religiously affiliated institutions, and much of that was earmarked for institutions like hospitals and universities. The Capital Research Center found that six of the ten largest companies in America explicitly "ban or restrict" donations to faith-based charities.

Why would some of the greatest corporations in the country institute policies that prevent funding of some of America's most effec-

tive charities at a time when Congress has taken a leading role in knocking down discriminatory barriers that prevent faith-based charities from competing for government grants and contracts?

On a bipartisan basis, Congress first started the work of expanding charitable choice in 1996 with welfare reform, and followed up with the welfare-to-work grant program in 1997. In 1998, Congress added charitable choice to the Community Services Block Grant Program and in 2000 we added charitable choice to substance abuse treatment and prevention services under the Public Health Services Act.

We know that these programs work, and the States are also finding great success. A study of Indiana's "Faith Works" program, which allows welfare recipients to get assistance from faith-based charities instead of secular providers, found that those opting for such charities came from more distressed family situations and had deeper personal crises than those opting for the secular alternative. The study concluded that what these people found at faith-based charities was more emotional and spiritual support than what could ever be offered by a secular institution. In some personal situations, that additional support might be the difference between life and death.

I predict that Congress will knock down more barriers against faith-based charities in programs like the Community Health Centers program this year, and many more next year. As Congress has already moved to provide more access to faith-based charities by Americans in the greatest need, I believe that Congress should call on American corporations to give more even-handedly and generously to faith-based charities.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H. Con. Res. 170, a Resolution Encouraging Corporations to Contribute to Faith-Based Organizations.

I am a strong supporter of corporations increasing donations to philanthropic organizations to help the most needy in our society. Even with the strong economy over the past few years, many Americans have not shared in this nation's prosperity. Thus, more corporate donations are needed to help the many Americans living in poverty.

However, I do not support the government advocating corporate support of one charitable organization over another. Our Founding Fathers included the establishment clause in the United States Constitution to ensure that the government did not play the role of endorsing religion. This policy has given Americans the freedom to carry out their religious worship in whichever manner they choose without fear of government oppression. Today, this resolution takes the first step toward the government playing the role of supporting religious charitable organization over others and challenging the Founding Fathers' wisdom to include the establishment clause in our constitution.

Even more disturbing, it appears that this resolution is the first step in the Bush Administration attempt to promote their faith-based initiative that supports the ungodly action of promoting government sponsored discrimination. It has been reported that the Bush administration has agreed to create a regulation that would allow religious charitable organizations to legally avoid hiring gay employees because of their sexual orientation in exchange for these groups' support for their faith-based initiative.

In the mid-20th century, many racial minorities, women and gays began the long fight for equal rights in this nation. It is a fight that still has a long way to go. The struggle of these groups to obtain equality continues to inspire a nation to make America a better place where all men and women are truly created equal.

If the reported allegation about the administration creating a regulation to promote discrimination is true, then the Bush Administration has signaled to the nation that it wants to return to the dark days in this nation's history when our government sponsored discrimination against certain groups. If today, the Bush Administration is willing to support government sponsored discrimination against homosexuals, then which group is next? Will it be women? Will it be African Americans or Hispanics? Will it be religious worshippers of Catholicism, Judaism or the Nation of Islam?

It is time that the leaders in this country stood up together and stopped usurping the principles of separation of church and state and the principle that all are created equal. These principles help to create a nation that cherishes tolerance for all groups and should be preserved.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H. Con. Res. 170 and say no to discrimination.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 170, which encourages corporations in the United States to increase their support of faith-based organizations.

America is privileged materially, but there still remains poverty and a lack of hope for some. Government has a duty to meet the needs of poor Americans, but it does not have to do it alone. The indispensable and gracious work of faith-based and other charitable service groups must be encouraged as a means of people helping people—as a significant addition to government service.

Faith has played an important role in America's handling of serious social problems. Faith-based organizations in the United States help people recover from drug and alcohol addiction, provide food and shelter for the homeless, and teach people job skills that will allow them to move from poverty to productivity. These organizations have proven to be effective in solving some of society's troubles.

Corporations donate billions of dollars to philanthropic causes every year. However, of these billions of dollars, faith-based organizations receive only a small portion. In fact, many corporations specifically ban or restrict contributions to faith-based organizations.

This legislation encourages them to make greater contributions to faith-based organizations and recommends that they refrain from policies that prohibit corporations from donating to faith-based organizations. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 170.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 170.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS IN SUPPORT OF VICTIMS OF TORTURE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 168) expressing the sense of Congress in support of victims of torture.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 168

Whereas the people of the United States abhor the use of torture by any government or person;

Whereas the existence of torture creates a climate of fear and international insecurity that affects all people;

Whereas torture results in mental and physical damage to an individual that destroys the individual's personality and terrorizes society and the effects of torture can last a lifetime for the individual and can also affect future generations;

Whereas repressive governments often use torture as a weapon against democracy by eliminating the leadership of their opposition and frightening the general public;

Whereas more than 500,000 survivors of torture live in the United States;

Whereas torture has devastating effects on the victim which often require extensive medical and psychological treatment;

Whereas both the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-320) and the Torture Victims Relief Reauthorization Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-87) authorize funding for rehabilitation services for victims of torture so that these individuals may become productive and contributing members of their communities;

Whereas the United States played a leading role in the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and has ratified the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Forms of Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment; and

Whereas June 26th of each year is the United Nations International Day in Support of Victims of Torture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That, on the occasion of the United Nations International Day in Support of Victims of Torture, Congress pays tribute to all victims of torture in the United States and around the world who are struggling to overcome the physical scars and psychological effects of torture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the concurrent resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment underscores that freedom, justice, and peace rests on the recognition of the inalienable rights of all members of the human family.

It further states that these basic rights derive from the inherent dignity of the human person. Thus, when one individual suffers, all of humanity suffers. When one individual is tortured, the scars inflicted by such horrific treatment are not only found in the victim but in the global system, as the use of torture undermines, debilitates, and erodes the very essence of that system.

Torture not only terrorizes individuals but entire societies, the impact of which is felt in future generations as well. It is used as a weapon against democracy by eliminating the leadership of the opposition and by frightening the general population into submission.

As a Member of Congress who represents men, women, and children who have fled repressive regimes, I have witnessed firsthand the mental and physical damage that torture inflicts on the individual and on society as a whole. I have constituents who are Cuban refugees, for example, who have been subjected to electroshock treatment by Castro's authorities because of their pro-democracy activities.

I represent one of the largest Holocaust survivor communities in North America. My district includes victims of right-wing authoritative regimes as well as oppressive leftist totalitarian dictators. I have seen the anguish in their eyes as well as the strength of their spirit, their courage, and their determination.

There are more than 500,000 survivors of torture in the United States; and this resolution, Mr. Speaker, seeks to honor them.

House Concurrent Resolution 168 uses the occasion of the United Nations Day in Support of Victims of Torture as an opportunity to remember and pay homage to the victims of torture and to underscore the commitment that the United States Congress has outlined in the last few years through passage of the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 and the Torture Victims Relief Reauthorization Act of 1999.

It is a message to the survivors in the U.S., and indeed throughout the world, that the U.S. has not forgotten their suffering nor its obligation as a global leader to help prevent such violations of the inherent dignity of human beings. I ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and I rise in strong support of H. Res.

168. I want to commend my dear friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), for introducing this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have the dubious distinction of being the only Member of Congress ever to have lived under and fought against both a Nazi and a communist dictatorship. So torture is something with which I am personally and intimately familiar with.

The resolution before this House today pays tribute to the millions of courageous men and women who have suffered truly terrible mental and physical damage perpetrated by other human beings. It is an unfortunate reality, Mr. Speaker, that around the globe on every continent men, women, and even children are abused by those who are in positions of authority and who abuse their power by inflicting harm on others.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, every year our Department of State in its country reports on human rights practices, catalogs for us the numerous countries involved in this heinous practice. Torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment is a violation of international law, Mr. Speaker, as reflected in the Convention Against Torture to which I am proud to say the United States is a party. But more than that, it is an attack on the decency of every human being who lives in a world where such heinous practices exist.

Mr. Speaker, this House has been at the forefront of trying to ease the suffering of the many who have survived these awful practices. We have initiated and passed legislation creating U.S. programs that address the psychological and physical needs of those who have survived brutal torture. These programs have helped thousands of such victims. It is only fitting that the House pay tribute to all of the victims of torture around the globe who are struggling to overcome the effects of torture.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 168.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, although the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) has been with us only a short time, she has made an excellent name for herself in her commitment to the finest causes that we deal with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be part of a special organization located in Minnesota. It is The Center for Victims of Torture. The Center was established in 1985 to heal the emotional and physical scars of government-inflicted torture on individuals, their families, and