

Accreditation these days has little to do with academic rigor or educational outcomes; rather, it serves only to show that a school has the right set of inputs, and virtually every college and university in the nation is able to comply with these standards. Because federal law makes eligibility to receive federal student loan funds conditional upon retaining accredited status from an accrediting association recognized by the Department of Education, schools have a rather large incentive to maintain their accreditation status. This places an enormous amount of influence in the hands of the accreditors, who oftentimes force schools to reallocate resources or even adopt policies at odds with a school's individual mission in order to comply with accreditation requirements and recommendations.

As we continue to pursue policies of accountability for our education institutions and strive to do our part in making higher education affordable for more Americans, we should examine ways that the accreditation process can be changed to play a more useful role—one that provides meaningful information about a school to students and parents. I believe my legislation is the necessary first step to achieve this goal.

RESTORING BUDGET DISCIPLINES

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2002

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the end of September marks not only the end of fiscal year 2002, but also the expiration date for crucial mechanisms of budget discipline. I rise today to inform my colleagues that I have introduced the Restoring Budget Disciplines Act of 2002, a bill designed to extend budget enforcement mechanisms and get us back on the path of balanced budgets. I invite all members, from both sides of the aisle, to co-sponsor this legislation.

The 1990s were a decade of great fiscal progress, as we converted chronic deficits into hard-won surpluses. There is widespread agreement that the discretionary spending caps and the pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) rules—which were originally established in 1990 and which expire today—played a critical role in achieving this progress. Indeed, in his recent appearance before the House Budget Committee, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan testified that the spending caps and PAYGO rules have been effective, and noted that “[f]ailing to preserve them would be a grave mistake.”

The bill I have introduced extends the PAYGO rules through fiscal year 2007. As you know, the PAYGO rules require that the cost of all mandatory spending increases and all tax cuts enacted during a session be fully offset. If this condition is not met and the net effect of all tax legislation and mandatory spending legislation enacted during a session reduces the surpluses or increases the deficit, then the rules provide for a sequestration of resources by the Office of Management and Budget.

The bill also takes important steps toward extending the discretionary spending caps. The precise levels at which these caps should be extended can emerge only from bipartisan

negotiations. But this bill puts the Congress on record as supporting a renewal of the caps, and it provides for the extension of key provisions of the Budget Act pertaining to the caps once such levels are set.

The fiscal progress of the last decade was achieved largely as a result of budget agreements between the White House and Congress. Now is the time for bipartisan action to renew the budget enforcement mechanisms that were created and extended in those landmark agreements.

TRIBUTE TO COL. AND MRS. DOUGLAS RAABERG

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2002

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, if has come to my attention that Claudia and Douglas Raaberg have received the 2002 Gen. and Mrs. Jerome F. O'Malley Award. The Raabergs have demonstrated a strong commitment and dedication to the United States Air Force.

The Gen. and Mrs. Jerome F. O'Malley Award recognizes the wing commander and spouse whose contributions to the nation, Air Force and local community best exemplify the highest ideals and positive leadership of a military couple in a key Air Force position. The Raabergs received this award for their efforts while stationed at Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma.

As commander of the 71st Flying Training Wing, Col. Raaberg secured \$11.5 million and 11 acres of land to build 230 new housing units, the first for the base in 60 years. His emphasis on dormitory improvements resulted in new furniture, carpet, microwaves and free Internet access for assigned airmen.

Claudia oversaw the Vance Spouses Club “compassion coalition,” an initiative to invite spouse clubs across the Department of Defense to contribute to the assistance program for survivors of the September 11 terrorist attacks. She was also an active participant in “Christmas in April,” mustering volunteers and \$20,000 to rebuild and repair 10 homes in a day for local disabled and elderly residents.

Mr. Speaker, Claudia and Douglas Raaberg have distinguished themselves as community leaders in the United States Air Force. Their service to our nation is invaluable and I am sure that my colleagues will join me in wishing the Raaberg family all the best.

GUJARAT VIOLENCE A POGROM AGAINST MUSLIMS, NEWS REPORT SAYS

HON. CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2002

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, an interesting article appeared at Islam Online, an Internet news site. It said that the People's Union for Democratic Rights (PUDR) had found that the recent violence in Gujarat in which, according to The Hindu newspaper, over 5,000 people were killed, was a planned

pogrom designed to reduce Muslims to second-class citizens. Unfortunately, Muslim and other minorities such as Christians, Sikhs, and others are already second-class citizens in India.

The article says that the violence was well organized and planned long before the train attack in Godhra. It reports, that “the organizers of the carnage tapped on a seam of hatred, based on anti-Muslim propaganda which had been carefully cultivated over many years.” It clearly points the finger at the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP) and the Bajrang Dal, militant Hindu fundamentalists organizations inclined to violence which are under the umbrella of the militant, Hindu nationalist, pro-Fascist Rashtriya Swayamsewak Sangh (RSS), whose political wing is the BJP, the party that leads India's government. It was the RSS that published a booklet last year on how to implicate Christians and other religious minorities in fake criminal cases. It was the VHP that murdered missionary Graham Staines, yet has not been punished for it. In New York a couple of years ago, Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee told an audience proudly, “I will always be a Swayamsewak”.

This reveals the reality of so-called democracy in India. It is a democracy for the Brahmins, but it is a tyranny for the minorities. We should stop our aid to India until they allow human rights and we should declare our support for self-determination for all the people living within its borders. Otherwise, I am afraid, violence will be even more a way of life in South Asia than it already is, and that would be a tragedy for all the people there. If we can do anything to prevent that, we should do so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add the Islam Online article to the RECORD at this time to give more detail on the pogrom in Gujarat.

GUJARAT POGROM AIMED AT REDUCING MUSLIMS TO SECOND CLASS CITIZENS

NEW DELHI, JUNE 3 (ISLAMONLINE).—The People's Union for Democratic Rights (PUDR), one of India's premiere human rights organizations, said in its report on the violence in Gujarat, “The whole intent of the pogrom has been to reduce Muslims to second class citizens in their own country.”

The PUDR is a well-known independent human rights organization in India monitoring human rights violations against minorities and weaker sections of society.

The PUDR report “Maaro, Kaapo, Baaro: State, Society and Communalism in Gujarat” said that the organizers of the carnage tapped on a seam of hatred, based on anti-Muslim propaganda which had been carefully cultivated over many years.

The report said that the anti-Muslim carnage was planned well before the Godhra train tragedy. It says that the hate propaganda increased in the six months prior to February 2002.

The PUDR report says that the VHP (World Hindu Council) and its youth wing, the Bajrang Dal, organized trishul (tridents) distribution ceremonies in villages with Muslim populations. Speeches were made abusing and threatening Muslims during these ceremonies.

The report gives the instance of Pandarwada village where one of the worst massacres and sexual abuse cases took place. A meeting was held in this village about a fortnight before the attack.

The PUDR report provides detailed lists of people named as organizers and attackers.

Many of these are functionaries of the ruling party, BJP, the VHP and the Bajrang Dal.

The report gives a list of victims in some of the mass killings, which establishes that their numbers were higher than the ones the government admits.

The PUDR has accused the state government of abetting the anti-Muslim pogrom. "The fact that the Gujarat government supported the bandh (general strike) of February 28 and March 1 despite its experience of large-scale violence against Muslims after a similar bandh in 2000, is evidence of its complicity in the violence right from the start," it said.

The report also accuses the judiciary of not performing its duty. It illustrates as to how the criminal justice system in the state is complicit in the denial of justice to the riot victims. It corroborates the widely-reported fact that the police make a mockery of the investigative process. And that even courts have shown reluctance to do their duty.

The PUDR team visited 21 relief camps and 75 villages and towns where it spoke to government officials, members of traders' associations, the VHP, the Jamait-e-Ulema-e-Hind and NGOs.

It has demanded the Narendra Modi government in Gujarat be dismissed and asked for an independent probe by the Central Bureau of Investigation into major incidents of communal violence, and expressed doubts over the Modi government's intentions to take action against the perpetrators of riots.

HONORING THE ONE HUNDREDTH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE
MCLENNAN COUNTY COURT-
HOUSE

HON. CHET EDWARDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2002

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of McLennan County, Texas are celebrating today, September 26, 2002, the 100th Anniversary of the McLennan County Courthouse, located in my hometown of Waco.

On April 28, 1900, at the turn of the last century, the needs of a growing Central Texas population demanded a new courthouse and jail. To pay for a structure, bonds were approved by the voters, and construction of the Courthouse began with the purchase of land on the corner of North 5th and Washington St. In December 1900, a contract for construction of the Courthouse was awarded, and in June 1901, the cornerstone was laid. Less than a year later, in 1902, the project was completed.

Today, the McLennan County Courthouse is a Texas Historical Landmark and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. With its classic Renaissance Revival design, it is widely recognized as one of the most beautiful public buildings still in use. Recent additions to the Courthouse include a series of paintings celebrating the rich history of Waco and McLennan County.

Atop the building stands Themis, the Greek personification of Justice, Justitia, her Roman counterpart, and Liberty, the torchbearer, representing the importance of justice and the law to the citizens of McLennan County for the past hundred years. Although much has changed in that hundred years, the McLennan County Courthouse continues to provide integral services to the community, and stands as an important monument to the long tradition of the rule of law in Central Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating, with the City of Waco, Texas and its surrounding communities, the 100th Anniversary of the McLennan County Courthouse.

CONGRESS MUST NOT UPSET THE
DELICATE ECOLOGICAL BALANCE
OF THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

HON. JOHN M. MCHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2002

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, for all the aspects of natural beauty that grace the North Country, few equal the splendor of the St. Lawrence River. From the wide expanse of its Gulf to the grandeur of the Thousand Islands, the St. Lawrence River is truly a wonder to behold.

For those of us who call this special region home, the St. Lawrence has long been a vital source of commercial and recreational activity. From its waters and its fragile environs, many thousands earn their living and renew their lives. Simply put, our welfare in very tangible and vital ways is inextricably linked and dependent upon the vitality of the St. Lawrence.

It is, therefore, both understandable and logical that many who know this river best have viewed with great skepticism recent initiatives that seek to measure the potential impact of conducting a massive construction and dredging project designed to significantly expand the existing shipping locks and channel depths to accommodate Seaway access to a larger class of freight vessels. Their concern has focused on the unavoidable scope of such an undertaking and the disruptive effects that would result upon a delicately balanced ecosystem that even today is severely stressed by existing Seaway traffic.

As someone who has been granted the honor of representing the entire New York State span of the St. Lawrence, I have spent much time in recent months considering the views of both those who doubt and those who embrace the proposed project. Clearly, the Seaway serves a vital purpose both to this region and to others throughout the Great Lakes that utilize the shipping it accommodates. Just as evident is the need to reformulate this vital system's operations to ensure its highest utilization into the future. Indeed, the observation that the proposal in question is no more than a study designed to identify the existence and scope of any resulting problem is not without merit.

In the final analysis, however, my foremost responsibility is to assume those positions that represent the greater interests of those I represent. In my opinion, no matter what merits any study may offer, the inescapable fact remains that the perils of such a project, if initiated, would far outweigh any benefits that may result to our region. The viability of our vital tourism industry, the generation of economically stimulating hydropower, and the untold enjoyment that the St. Lawrence provides derives less from the shipping that the river supports than the delicate environment it nurtures. As past studies have invariably found, the effects of a project of the magnitude in question would unavoidably and unilaterally upset the delicate ecological balance of the St. Lawrence River and all that prospers from it.

Given the great importance of this issue to our region, I feel compelled to declare my opposition to the proposed study and the requested funding to advance it. I fully recognize the likely reality that my views may be shared by few in the House of Representatives. While the area I represent affords me the distinction of being the only Member from New York to have the St. Lawrence River shores within their district, it also means that many others hail from areas that stand to realize greater benefits any expansion of the existing systems might afford. The fact that both the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee and full House Appropriations Committee have provided \$2 million to advance this study attest to the support this initiative has gained thus far. Nevertheless, I have no intention of abandoning the higher interests of my district because the odds may be long.

I have begun the preparation of an amendment that will seek to remove the \$2 million in study funding currently contained in the FY03 House Appropriations bill should this legislation be advanced. I will submit that amendment to the Rules Committee requesting that it be approved for consideration if and when the full bill is brought to the House Floor for a vote. In this way, I hope to convey to other Members the peril that such an initiative holds and, hopefully, gain the support of those who recognize the need to stand on the side of preserving a resource that is so critically important to so many.

S. 1105 THE GRAND TETON NATIONAL
PARKLAND EXCHANGE
ACT

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 2002

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Grand Teton National Park Land Exchange Act (S. 1105) and specifically its amended version that includes legislation that I introduced named the McLoughlin House Preservation Act (H.R. 3434).

Standing six feet four inches, John McLoughlin cast a giant of a shadow on the early development of the Oregon frontier. For twenty-one years his powerful voice was the only influence of law and order over an empire two and a half times the size of Texas. He had absolute control, and he maintained it peacefully and profitably with a balanced sense of justice. With an overwhelming sense of compassion and generosity beyond reproach, it's of little wonder that he was regarded by Native Americans as, "The Great White Eagle." John McLoughlin, did indeed, walk taller and cast the greatest shadow that ever fell so humbly on the changing face of Oregon.

McLoughlin was born in 1784 outside of Quebec, Canada. When McLoughlin was only 14 years old, he began an apprenticeship with a doctor and in 1803, at the youthful age of 19, was granted his license to practice surgery and pharmacy. Shortly thereafter Dr. McLoughlin obtained an appointment as medical officer for the North West Company, fierce competitor of the Hudson's Bay Company in the fur trade. McLoughlin continued his employment and partnership with the North West