

RECOGNIZING THE EIGHTH AVENUE SENIOR CENTER'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2003

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize the 10th anniversary of the Brooklyn Chinese-American Association's Eighth Avenue Senior Center.

As part of the tradition, this very special anniversary will be marked by millennial tables, which seat twelve seniors, each with a combined age of over 1,000 years. It is anticipated that over 2,000 senior members will be in attendance at this year's celebration to be held in a local Brooklyn restaurant.

The Eighth Avenue Senior Center is part of the Brooklyn Chinese-American Association (BCA), which was founded in 1987 as a community-based social services agency to meet the growing needs of the Asian-American community in the Brooklyn neighborhoods of Sunset Park, Borough Park, and Bay Ridge.

Now BCA has developed into a community development organization with centers along Eighth Avenue for employment training, day care, youth and cultural activities, and the senior center, which celebrates its decade-long existence this month. Combined, the BCA's facilities make our Brooklyn neighborhoods better, safer, more vibrant places to live.

Over the past 10 years, the Eighth Avenue Senior Center has provided critical services to Brooklyn's senior community. This includes providing meals, bilingual information, English and citizenship classes, health services and recreational activities. The Eighth Avenue Senior Center is now a cornerstone of our community, and will continue to be for many decades to come.

COMMENDING NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT AROUND THE WORLD ON THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS ESTABLISHMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 2003

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my grave concerns over H. Con. Res 274. The misnamed National Endowment for Democracy (NED) is nothing more than a costly program that takes U.S. taxpayer funds to promote favored politicians and political parties abroad. Madam Speaker, what the NED does in foreign countries, through its recipient organizations the National Democratic Institute (NDI) and the International Republican Institute (IRI), would be rightly illegal in the United States. The NED injects "soft money" into the domestic elections of foreign countries in favor of one party or the other. Imagine what a couple of hundred thousand dollars will do to assist a politician or political party in a relatively poor country abroad. It is particularly Orwellian to call U.S. manipulation of foreign elections

"promoting democracy." How would Americans feel if the Chinese arrived with millions of dollars to support certain candidates deemed friendly to China? Would this be viewed as a democratic development?

In an excellent study of the folly of the National Endowment for Democracy, CATO Institute scholar Barbara Conry notes that:

"NED, which also has a history of corruption and financial mismanagement, is superfluous at best and often destructive. Through the endowment, the American taxpayer has paid for special-interest groups to harass the duly elected governments of friendly countries, interfere in foreign elections, and foster the corruption of democratic movements . . .

" . . . the controversy surrounding NED questions the wisdom of giving a quasi-private organization the fiat to pursue what is effectively an independent foreign policy under the guise of 'promoting democracy.' Proponents of NED maintain that a private organization is necessary to overcome the restraints that limit the activities of a government agency, yet they insist that the American taxpayer provide full funding for this initiative. NED's detractors point to the inherent contradiction of a publicly funded organization that is charged with executing foreign policy (a power expressly given to the federal government in the Constitution) yet exempt from nearly all political and administrative controls . . .

" . . . In the final analysis, the endowment embodies the most negative aspects of both private aid and official foreign aid—the pitfalls of decentralized 'loose cannon' foreign policy efforts combined with the impression that the United States is trying to 'run the show' around the world."

The National Endowment for Democracy is dependent on the U.S. taxpayer for funding, but because NED is not a government agency, it is not subject to Congressional oversight. It is indeed a heavily subsidized foreign policy loose cannon.

Since its founding in 1983, the National Endowment for Democracy has been headed by Carl Gershman, a member of the neo-Trotskyite Social Democrats/USA.

Perhaps that is one reason much of what NED has done in the former Communist Bloc has ended up benefiting former communists in those countries. As British Helsinki Human Rights Group Director Christine Stone has written:

Both (IRI and NDI) are largely funded by the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) . . . which, in turn, receive money from the American taxpayer. Both have favoured the return to power of former high-ranking Communists which has also meant co-opting foot-soldiers from the new left who have extremely liberal ideas . . .

Skender Gjinushi, speaker of the Albanian parliament, thanks the IRI for its assistance in drafting the Albanian constitution in 1998. What the IRI does not say is that Gjinushi was a member of the brutal Stalinist Politburo of Enver Hoxha's Communist Party until 1990 and one of the main organizers of the unrest that led to the fall of the Democratic Party government in 1997 and the death of over 2000 people.

President Stoyanov of Bulgaria drools: "Without IRI's support we could not have come so far so fast." Indeed. Indeed. So far did they come that Ivan Kostov (who supplies another encomium to IRI) was catapulted from his job teaching Marxism-Leninism at Sofia University to being prime minister of Bulgaria and a leader of 'reform.'"

In Slovakia, NED funded several initiatives aimed at defeating the freely-elected government of Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar, who, interestingly, had been persecuted by the previous Communist regime. After the election, an IRI newsletter boasted that "IRI polls changed the nature of the campaign," adding that IRI efforts secured "a victory for reformers in Slovakia." What the IRI does not say is that many of these "reformers" had been leading members of the former Communist regime of then-Czechoslovakia. Is this democracy?

More recently, IRI president George A. Folsom last year praised a coup against Venezuela's democratically-elected president, saying, "Last night, led by every sector of civil society, the Venezuelan people rose up to defend democracy in their country." It was later revealed that the National Endowment for Democracy provided funds to those organizations that initiated the violent revolt in the streets against Venezuela's legal leaders. More than a dozen civilians were killed and hundreds were injured in this attempted coup. Is this promoting democracy?

Madam Speaker, the National Endowment for Democracy, by meddling in the elections and internal politics of foreign countries, does more harm to the United States than good. It creates resentment and ill-will toward the United States among millions abroad. It is beyond time to de-fund this Cold War relic and return to the foreign policy of our founders, based on open relations and trade with all countries and free from meddling and manipulation in the internal affairs of others.

IN HONOR OF REV. EMANUEL CLEAVER, II AND HIS THIRTY YEARS OF SERVICE TO ST. JAMES UNITED METHODIST CHURCH AND THE KANSAS CITY COMMUNITY

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2003

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor "A Man of Vision," the venerable Rev. Emanuel Cleaver, II, whose leadership, ministry, and public service have enhanced the Kansas City community for three decades. A former mayor of Kansas City and the senior pastor at St. James United Methodist Church, Rev. Cleaver is being honored on October 11 for his accomplishments, exceptional vision and contributions to our community as we celebrate the 30th anniversary of his service to St. James Church.

Growing up in a humble household, Rev. Cleaver daily witnessed the need to serve the urban core and its poor. His service as City Council Member and Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Committee, Mayor Pro Tem, Mayor and ordained United Methodist minister reflect the legacy of the Cleaver family tradition of giving back to one's community. Rev. Cleaver's accomplishments are vast and impressive. His dream to complete an \$8 million contemporary sanctuary connected to the old building of St. James will allow many more parishioners to join those who gather to hear his inspirational counsel.

An advocate of jobs for the Fifth District, Mayor Cleaver was a pioneer in persuading

corporations like Transamerica and Gateway 2000 to lay a foundation in our community. His plans for tax abatement, infrastructure and economic development have enriched our city in myriad ways. As the shepherd of our city, he championed the Brush Creek Flood Control project, the Bruce R. Watkins Roadway, the Chouteau Bridge, and the Illus W. Davis Civic Mall. I am proud to be a federal partner in these efforts with Rev. Cleaver, as well as in the expansion of Bartle Hall, the economic renewal of the Hispanic West Side, and the revitalization of the historic 18th and Vine District.

Rev. Cleaver's vision for a strong community includes serving the city's youth and the disadvantaged through safe and enriching recreational activities such as the Mayor's Night Hoops, a nationally recognized program that offers our city's youth a safe haven from drugs and violence. Rev. Cleaver was also instrumental in implementing a welfare to work program that provided 400 jobs to former welfare recipients. He has received numerous distinctions acknowledging his legacy upon Kansas City. He earned the 1999 Conspicuous Service Medal from Missouri Governor Mel Carnahan, the 1993 James C. Kilpatrick Excellence for Government Award, the 1992 NAACP Harold L. Holliday, Sr. Civil Rights Award, and a host of other significant merits.

A trusted advisor, Rev. Cleaver was appointed to President-Elect Bill Clinton's 1992 Transition Team, attended the 1993 White House's Palestinian Liberation Organization/Israeli Peace Accord, was a member of the Democratic Platform Committee in 1996, was a member of the Democratic National Committee and spoke at the 1996 Democratic National Convention. President Clinton sought his counsel and friendship throughout his presidency.

Rev. Cleaver leadership includes: President and Chairman of the National Conference of Black Mayors, Chairman of the US Conference of Mayors Committee on Crime and Social Justice and Chairman for the Task Force on Finances for the District of Columbia. He was a Fellow of the Aspen Institute, a National Board Member of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and for seven consecutive years, he was named one of Ebony magazine's "100 Most Influential African Americans".

To share his expertise on policy and social issues, Rev. Cleaver has appeared on the news programs "This Week with David Brinkley," "The MacNeil/Lehrer Report," and "Face the Nation," and is quoted in newspapers and periodicals such as USA Today, The New York Times, The Economist, and Newsweek.

Members of the St. James Congregation revere Rev. Cleaver as a "Man of Vision," a reference to the biblical passage Proverbs 29:18, which states, "Where there is no vision the people perish. . . ." Kansas City flourishes due to this great leader's vision. He follows a moral and noble path in forging a better future for us all.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring St. James' "Man of Vision," Rev. Emanuel Cleaver for his 30 years of service to his church community and country.

CLOSE THE FLIGHT DECK OFFICER LOOPHOLE

HON. RICHARD H. BAKER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2003

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that enhances our national security by closing a loophole in the Federal Flight Deck Officer Program.

Last year, both the House and Senate overwhelmingly passed provisions to the Homeland Security Act to allow both commercial and cargo pilots to voluntarily possess a firearm in the cockpit. Yet, during conference of that bill, cargo pilots were excluded.

Mr. Speaker, we should not have excluded these individuals. Clearly, we must allow these cargo pilots to defend the cockpit, themselves and the public. A cargo jet can just as easily be turned into a weapon of mass destruction as a passenger plane. Some might ask, "Why arm cargo pilots if they carry no passengers?"

I believe that is a vital question. Consider these points. Some cargo planes do carry a limited number of passengers, yet they do not receive equal security received by passenger airlines. Personnel that load cargo planes are not required to have the same criminal background check that the flight crew receives. The airport perimeter around cargo plane facilities is vulnerable. Finally, non-cargo company employees are rarely screened prior to gaining access to many operations.

Mr. Speaker, suppose from any of these scenarios a terrorist made his way onto a cargo aircraft. Then, shortly thereafter takeoff, a terrorist made his way to the cockpit. Without a doubt, the cargo pilot would literally be defenseless to a terrorist. Unlike commercial passenger flights, cargo flights do not have federal air marshals or flight attendants. Unlike our commercial aircraft, cargo planes do not have reinforced cockpit doors. That terrorist would then have the opportunity to turn that aircraft into a weapon of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow that to happen and it is our duty to protect the American people. There are no logical reasons to exclude cargo pilots from being allowed to defend the cockpit, themselves and the public. This loophole needs to be closed as it should never have been opened.

BIOTECH AND FORTRESS EUROPE

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2003

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member commends to his colleagues the following column written by Sonja Hillgren, editor of the Farm Journal, which appeared in the Summer 2003 issue of the publication.

This column highlights the improper hurdles that the European Union (EU) has put in place to block the importation of American agricultural products. The current EU restrictions on the importation of food with genetically modified organisms (GMOs) have cost agricultural producers billions of dollars in recent years. As the column indicates, some of the products the EU uses and exports have long been GMO-based.

The intransigence by the EU is having a very detrimental effect on American farmers. Also troubling are the indications that the EU is planning to move forward with labeling and traceability requirements that will continue to act as a mechanism to block U.S. agricultural products. This clearly runs counter to the WTO principle that rules should be based on scientific evidence.

The EU's GMO standards are transparently devoid of any relationship to sound science and are either based strictly on emotion or are designed quite simply as trade barriers—or both. The U.S. must take strong action to bring reason back to this issue.

BIOTECH AND FORTRESS EUROPE

[From Farm Journal, Summer 2003]

(By Sonja Hillgren, Farm Journal Editor)

Those wily Europeans have devised a scheme that could freeze out imports of U.S. crops and food products. Their vehicle is labeling and traceability for genetically modified (GM) food and feed. Approved last month by the European Parliament, the plan is on a path for implementation next year.

"It is clearly about restricting trade," says Criss Davis, a Shullsburg, Wis., farmer who chairs the international marketing committee of the United Soybean Board.

I don't want to contemplate the consequences for the U.S. farm economy if we fail to respond aggressively at the same time as we continue a respectful dialogue with consumers, processors and retail grocers in the European Union (EU). That is how U.S. soybean growers have kept open the market for the past seven years.

Under the new EU rules, any food or feed with more than 0.9% of an EU-approved GM product must be labeled as biotech. Food with more than 0.5% of a GM product not approved by the EU would be barred from the European market.

Tough to implement. Especially onerous is the requirement for labels and traceability for processed products like soybean oil, even though tests cannot detect whether or not processed products have been genetically altered. An invitation for fraud, it is a big change from current rules that require labels only if a modified gene can be detected. "They are going to have a terrible time implementing it," warns Davis.

Soybean meal, corn gluten feed and other livestock feed also will have to be labeled for the first time.

The rules do not require labels on meat, milk and eggs from animals fed GM feed or on yogurt, beer or other products produced from GM yeast or enzymes—all of which are abundantly produced in Europe.

Europeans say these new rules are a necessary prelude to lifting a nearly five-year ad hoc moratorium on their approvals of a pipeline of biotech crops. The Bush administration recently challenged that ban before the World Trade Organization (WTO). And the EU began suing its member nations to lift individual country bans on biotech.

Europeans also say they are doing the U.S. a favor because traceability will be necessary for the next generation of biotech products.

Those are valid points. But Americans counter that there is no scientific reason for tracking current biotech crops that are no different from non-GM products. As soon as the new rules are in place, the administration should file another WTO case.

Let's examine the deeper problem by focusing on more than \$1 billion in yearly soybean exports to Europe, the single largest customer of U.S. soybeans. The vast majority of our soybeans are biotech, and European consumers and retail stores have indicated that