

Beyond the campus boundaries, the couple is part of the philanthropic and civic life of North San Diego County, where they make their home in Rancho Santa Fe. Although heir to the famous cereal maker, Mr. Kellogg made his own fortune in the paper products business.

Mrs. Kellogg is a long time civic volunteer and friend of higher education. She is active in the Rancho Santa Fe Library Guild, and serves as a member of the Scripps Research Institute of Medicine and Science Foundation Board.

The couple received the first President's Distinguished Service Awards at commencement in 1998—when they also received a standing ovation from the assembled students for their dedication in helping establish a permanent library at Cal State San Marcos.

Universities are built by people. Given the centrality of the Library to the academic enterprise, and the centrality of the Kellogg's role in developing the campus, the approval by the Trustees to name it the Kellogg Library is a broad beam of inspiration through the windows these two people have opened to so many in the 51st congressional district.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND SECURITY ISSUES IN THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2002

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on September 24, the Helsinki Commission held a hearing on democracy, human rights and security in the Republic of Georgia. Despite the progress that country has made in the development of civil society, in the last few years much of the optimism about Georgia's future has dissipated. Last year, a Georgian official devoted a large part of his public address in Washington to refuting the notion—which was being discussed at the time—that Georgia is a “failed state.” I reject that characterization, but the hearing offered a good opportunity to discuss the serious problems Georgia does face.

Preeminent among them is systemic, rampant corruption, which has impeded economic reforms and sickened the body politic. Despite lectures from the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the U.S. Government, the Georgian Government has proved incapable or unwilling to do what is necessary to stamp out this multidimensional problem—even though President Shevardnadze himself has called corruption a threat to Georgia's security.

There are also grounds for concern about democratization. The last few elections have clearly not met OSCE standards, which raises questions about the important parliamentary election scheduled for 2003, and the 2005 presidential election that will usher in the post-Shevardnadze era in Georgia, with all the attendant uncertainties. Meanwhile, the media and NGOs have been under severe pressure. Last fall, a foolish ploy by the Ministry of Internal Affairs to intimidate Rustavi-2 Television backfired, resulting instead in the fall of the government. While society's response was heartening—thousands of people came out into the streets to defend the station—the attempt to silence one of the country's most

popular media outlets indicated that some Georgian officials are still mired in Soviet patterns of thinking.

Especially appalling is the ongoing religious violence in Georgia. Since 1999, there has been a campaign of assaults against members of minority faiths, especially Jehovah's Witnesses, which Georgian authorities have tolerated. Occasionally, policemen have even participated in attacks on defenseless men, women and children who have congregated for the purpose of worship. Attempts to bring the perpetrators to justice have foundered, as throngs of fanatics hijack the trial proceedings. If such travesties are allowed to continue, the country's entire judicial system is at risk of falling victim to mob rule.

Though Jehovah's Witnesses have borne the brunt of this savagery, other religious minorities have suffered as well, including Baptists, Pentecostals and Catholics. Earlier this year, for example, a mob invaded a Baptist warehouse, threw the religious literature outside and burned it. How awful to think that events in Georgia today remind us of Germany in the 1930s!

Georgians have a long tradition of religious tolerance, of which they are rightly proud. It is all the more puzzling, therefore, why religiously-based violence has erupted and continued only in Georgia, of all the post-Soviet states. The leadership of the Helsinki Commission and other Members of the House and Senate have been in correspondence with President Shevardnadze about this disturbing trend. He has assured us that the problem will be corrected and the perpetrators arrested.

Georgia's Ambassador, Levan Mikeladze, testified at the September 24 hearing and suggested that Georgia has so little experience with religious persecution that it has been difficult to cope with its sudden emergence. He too offered assurances that Georgia fully recognizes the gravity of the problem and that legal and practical actions are being taken to ensure there will be no more violent attacks.

Alas, extremists in Georgia must not have been listening. Since the September 24 hearing, more assaults have taken place. The next day, some 15 extremists of the ultra-Orthodox “Jvari” organization in Rustavi forcibly entered a private home where Jehovah's Witnesses and their non-Witness guests had gathered for Bible study. Two Witnesses and one non-Witness visitor were physically assaulted. On September 26, in the village of Napareuli, masked men with firearms burst into a private home where meetings were underway, beating those in attendance and ransacking the house. Most striking, eyewitnesses claim the attack was led by the village administrator, Mr. Nodar Paradashvili, who beat one of the victims into unconsciousness. In a third incident, on September 29, a mob gathered outside the residence of a Jehovah's Witnesses in Tbilisi. They refused to let others enter the premises where a meeting was to be held, seized Bibles and literature from the group, verbally abusing those arriving for the meeting and assaulting at least one person. In all three cases, police reportedly refused to intervene after learning that the incidents involved attacks on Jehovah's Witnesses—as has often been the case in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, there may be many explanations for this peculiar phenomenon but there can be no excuse for state toleration of such barbarity. It must end, and it must end now.

Though such attacks have been one reason for Georgia's prominence in the news lately, more attention has been focused on Moscow's campaign of intimidation against Georgia. Russia has been leaning on pro-Western, strategically-located Georgia for years, but the temperature has in the last few weeks approached the boiling point. President Putin's request for United Nations backing for Russian military action against Georgia was not any less objectionable for having been anticipated.

I have been watching with growing alarm as Russia ratchets up the pressure on its small neighbor. Georgian parliamentarians on September 12 unanimously approved an appeal to the United Nations, the OSCE, the European Union, the Council of Europe, and NATO for protection from anticipated Russian military aggression. Georgian lawmakers should know that their American colleagues have heard their appeal and stand with them. While we are cooperating with Russia in the war against terrorism, we have in no way given Moscow leave to attack Georgia, nor will we do so.

The United States is now more than ever directly engaged in the Caucasus and is stepping up military cooperation with the region's governments, especially Georgia. While we have many issues of concern to raise with Georgia's Government, when it comes to Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity, there is no more ardent supporter than the United States. That has been the case for the last ten years, and it will be the case in the future as well.

INTRODUCTION OF WYANDOTTE NATION LAND CLAIMS SETTLEMENT LEGISLATION

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2002

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will settle certain land claims of the Wyandotte Nation, an Indian tribe with longstanding roots in the Third Congressional District of Kansas.

I have been joined as an original cosponsor of this measure by Representative DON YOUNG of Alaska, the chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. As the former chairman of the House Resources Committee, Mr. YOUNG has a longstanding record of actively addressing the concerns of Indian Nations across the United States and I am proud to have his name on this legislation.

This measure will resolve all land claims the Wyandotte Nation has in Wyandotte County, Kansas, established pursuant to an agreement between the Wyandotte Nation and the Delaware Nation dated December 14, 1843, which was ratified by the United States Senate on July 25, 1848.

The Wyandotte Nation's land claims in the Third Congressional District, which are now the subject of litigation in Kansas federal district court, cloud the title on 4,080 parcels of land valued at a total of \$1.9 billion for tax purposes. Approximately 40 percent of the property tax base in Kansas City, Kansas, is affected by the claim, as are 1,300 landowners.

This bill will permanently settle the claims of the Wyandotte Nation and remove all clouds

on title affecting Kansas City landowners. Under the legislation, the Secretary of the Interior would take into trust for the benefit of the Wyandotte Nation a parcel of real property located in Edwardsville, Wyandotte County, Kansas. Concurrently, the Wyandotte Nation would relinquish all claims to lands in Kansas and would acquiesce to dismissal with prejudice of their lawsuit.

Currently, the Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas, along with the municipal leadership of Edwardsville, is negotiating a legally binding Memorandum of Understanding with the Wyandotte Nation regarding the operation of any gaming facility that the Wyandotte Nation may establish on its settlement lands under this measure. The Mayor and Commissioners of the Unified Government support my introduction of this legislation at this time. I anticipate that these negotiations will reach a satisfactory conclusion within a few weeks; if that does not come to pass, however, I reserve the right to withdraw my support for this proposal if a Memorandum of Understanding is not endorsed by all parties within a reasonable time.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation will provide significant support to ongoing economic development efforts in my congressional district. In 1996, a nonbinding, county-wide referendum registered an endorsement of nearly 80 percent for legalized gaming in Wyandotte County. For this reason, past measures I have introduced to assist the Wyandotte Nation's efforts to bring gaming to Wyandotte County have had broad support among my constituents, including local elected officials, consumers, labor organizations and the business community.

I hope that all members of the Kansas congressional delegation and Governor Bill Graves will join me in supporting this important proposal, so that we can see it signed into law prior to the adjournment of the 107th Congress.

PROVIDING A PRELIMINARY AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF FORCE AGAINST IRAQ

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2002

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks since the president's speech to the United Nations, I have taken time to listen to Coloradans and to discuss with military leaders and other experienced voices the threat posed by Iraq. This has been a difficult, even soul-searching time for all Americans, and I have taken my responsibility very seriously because I deeply believe that this vote will be among the most important I cast in Congress.

The U.S. Constitution assigns the power to declare war to the Congress, and if we are on the path to war, I believe this Congress has the grave responsibility to join with the president in determining whether this path will be short or long, who will be on that path with us, and ultimately what kind of war we intend to wage.

After deep reflection and after listening to those whose experience and judgment in matters of war and peace I respect most, particu-

larly those in the military, I have come to these conclusions about the path to war:

We should only go to war as a last resort and after all diplomatic efforts have been exhausted, and I take some comfort that President Bush apparently agrees with this view.

Unless there is new evidence that Saddam Hussein poses an imminent threat to our national security, I believe we should only go to war against Iraq as part of a broad international coalition authorized by the United Nations.

America can go it alone, and should go it alone where we believe an attack is imminent, but that is not the case with Iraq. In this case, I believe we need the United Nations with us—not so much to win the war and topple Saddam Hussein, but to secure the peace and take responsibility for the costly and difficult nation-building that must follow.

Some say that after 9–11 we cannot afford not to attack Iraq on our own. I say that after 9–11 we should only attack in concert with the international community. Why? Because a preemptive, go-it-alone attack could seriously compromise our efforts to combat global terrorism, particularly in the Islamic world.

Saddam Hussein is a dangerous tyrant and I fully support the goal of disarming him. I have no illusions about the duplicity of this man nor the depth of his cruelty. The world would be safer and breathe easier if he were removed.

Getting the job done and doing it in a way that protects American interests, American values, and American lives is what concerns me most. Moreover, I believe that ridding the world of Saddam Hussein is only part of the job we face. We have to remove Saddam Hussein's threat in the context of other security goals, including winning our war against terrorism and Islamic fundamentalist terrorism in particular.

I have indicated that I cannot support the Congressional Resolution on Iraq that has been reported by the International Relations Committee. This resolution would not meet what I believe to be the solemn responsibility of Congress to declare, authorize, and define war, particularly on a full-scale, preemptive basis.

The current resolution concerns me most because it shortens the path to war. Worse, it vests total discretion with the president to determine how fast we run this path. This path to war is far too complicated and the consequences far too dangerous for Congress to delegate this responsibility to one man.

I believe this path to war should be slower-paced and involve more check-points—check points that include the participation by Congress.

These are the check-points I think should mark any path to war with Iraq:

1. We must secure a tough new resolution from the United Nations Security Council that establishes a timetable for the destruction of Saddam Hussein's arsenal of weapons of mass destruction. This will strengthen the president's hand.

2. If we secure the full support of the United Nations, I believe the UN must join us in deploying a robust and even coercive inspection and disarmament program against Iraq, backed up by a multinational force that America would lead.

3. If we fail to secure the support of the United Nations and unfettered inspections are

not begun, I believe we must cripple Saddam Hussein's ability to acquire and deploy weapons of mass destruction. At that juncture, military force may indeed be necessary as a last resort. But before America launches a massive operation of the kind we saw in the 1991 Gulf War, however, I believe the president should come to Congress to ask for a separate authorization of war.

Congress needs to know whether the United Nations is with us or on the sidelines before we launch a military invasion of Iraq on our own. Not having this information beforehand, with all of the implications it poses for our global war on terror and the consequences for our security in the region, is simply irresponsible in my view.

More important, Congress needs to share responsibility for the decision to go to war on this scale. We cannot simply wish the president the best and wash our hands of the awesome responsibility to send thousands of American men and women to war.

The last time we did so, in 1964, when Congress passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, my father was serving in Congress. The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, like the one we are now debating, was designed to strengthen the president's hand in dealing with an international crisis. It led to the eventual deployment of 500,000 American soldiers in Vietnam, and the deaths of 55,000 American servicemen and women. My father came to regret his support for that resolution when it became clear that it was being used as a substitute for the Constitutional responsibility of Congress to declare war.

My father was an early and outspoken critic of that war, and I know he came to believe that Congress made a terrible mistake when it passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. Let not this Congress, a generation later make a similar and tragic mistake.

The resolution I am offering specifies key questions that should be answered before we send thousands of American soldiers into harm's way. It would also establish the legitimacy of American military action as a last resort because we would have clearly exhausted all other means to eliminate Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Finally, it would preserve the Constitutional responsibility of the Congress to declare war.

The resolution I offer today is intended to avoid the mistakes of the past, while still allowing us to accomplish the important task of ridding the world of the dangers posed by Iraq under Saddam Hussein.

RECOGNITION OF JAMEEL HOURANI

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 2002

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Jameel Hourani of Los Angeles, California. On October 16, St. Nicholas Antiochian Orthodox Christian Cathedral will honor Jameel Hourani as its "Man of the Year." I would like to join the Orthodox Union Club in publicly recognizing this outstanding person.

In 1988, Dr. Jameel Hourani was elected the President of the Parish Council at Saint