

a 28-year sentence before his "early" release. Ngawang Sandrol, a member of the famous Tibetan "Singing Nuns" who was released last year, had served over 10 years in the infamous Drapchi Prison before her release. According to the Tibet Information Network, the State Department, and the testimony of former Tibetan nuns like Ngawang Sandrol, many of these prisoners have been severely beaten and subjected to other extreme forms of punishment. Some have died in prison.

The Chinese government has denied repeated requests, including from the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, for access to the 12-year-old boy whom the Dalai Lama recognizes as the 11th Panchen Lama. Government officials have stated that he is being "held for his own safety," while at the same time insisting that another boy is the true Panchen Lama.

The Chinese government's official ban on the Falun Gong movement, in 1999, has meant heightened government repression for all religious organizations designated by the government as "cults." According to Falun Gong practitioners, as many as 100,000 of their members have been sent to labor camps without trial. They claim that as many as 700 may have died as a result of police brutality either while in prison or after their release.

In largely Muslim Xinjiang, religious freedom is severely curtailed by the government, which indiscriminately links Muslim religious expression with "separatist" or "terrorist" acts. The indiscriminate repression of the Uighur people is best exemplified by the arrest and imprisonment of Rebiya Kadeer, a prominent Uighur businesswoman and activist, who was arrested in 1999 after she met with a visiting U.S. congressional delegation. Close supervision of all mosques in the region by local Communist Party officials is now commonplace.

China repeatedly engages in severe—systematic, egregious—violations of religious freedom. If our ideals and what America stands for—both at home and abroad—are to mean anything, then we must not shrink from this issue. We must not allow human considerations to come secondary to the pursuit of trade.

We must dare to speak out for those who have no voice.

THE SYSTEMATIC CORRUPTION OF THE ALIYEV DYNASTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon to address what I consider one of the largest potential factors for destabilization in the entire Caucus' region: The systematic corruption of the Aliyev Dynasty currently ruling Azerbaijan.

I have highlighted the problems with President Heydar Aliyev for years now, but his health has deteriorated recently, and that has put the future of Azerbaijan and the entire Caucus region in doubt.

In July of this year, President Aliyev suffered what has been described by the Cleveland Medical Center, where he currently resides, as congestive heart

failure. Last month, his son Ilham was appointed as Prime Minister. This would seem only appropriate at first, unless you consider that a recent referendum forced through the electorate changed the line of succession from Speaker of the Parliament to Prime Minister. This was widely criticized at the time by domestic Azerbaijani opposition groups and the international community as a clear way for President Aliyev to set up a dynastic regime. Unfortunately, as President Aliyev has become incapacitated during his treatment, the predictions have come true. His son Ilham is now in direct line to take over the Presidency from his father.

The partnership, Mr. Speaker, of the father and the son is not only limited to the fact that Azerbaijan will be the first monarchy established in the former Soviet Union. A Financial Times article on September 13, 2003, clearly shows that power is not the only object of the Aliyevs' desire. Both were implicated in a court case that was unsealed in New York this week. The actual case had been filed against a Swiss banker by the name of Hans Bodmer. In the indictment, he allegedly conspired to facilitate the participation of foreign citizens in Azerbaijan's privatization process of the state-owned oil company, often referred to by its name, SOCAR, through improper payments made to Azerbaijani officials.

This would most likely not have come to light were it not for the fact that Heydar and Ilham Aliyev had never intended to privatize the oil company in the first place. Instead, they stole over \$100 million in the form of vouchers that were designed to give the purchaser disproportionate influence over the privatization process. All of this was alleged to have happened while Ilham Aliyev was the head of SOCAR, a position his father bestowed on him to apparently prepare him for his job as heir apparent of the country of Azerbaijan.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clear example of this administration's misguided policies when it comes to countries that are oil rich. The day that Ilham ascended to his post and forced the former Prime Minister from office, President Bush sent a letter of congratulations to him. This is clearly not in the interest of democracy that the President of the United States has touted lately in regards to the Middle East. How can this administration have separate distinctions about what is democracy and what is not?

It seems increasingly clear what the answer is. Those countries that have significant resources that are sent to western markets are allowed to be less Democratic than those that do not.

□ 1445

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am also very concerned about what the Aliyev regime plans to do about the resolution of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict.

Heydar Aliyev was tantalizingly close to reaching a settlement with Armenian President Robert Kocharian in Key West in 2001, but those negotiations soon fell apart when Aliyev returned home. Since then, Aliyev and Kocharian have met many times, but resulted in no progress.

The Organization for Cooperation and Security in Europe's Minsk Group, which is charged with moving the two parties towards peaceful settlement, has been increasingly frustrated with the process. Ilham has recently taken a much harder stance on the Karabakh issue than did his father, and this is of great concern to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Aliyev family is on their way to establishing the first dynastic regime in the former Soviet Union. Not only is this a concern for the entire Caucasus region but also other leaders in the former Soviet Union that must be watching the United States' reaction to this. The message that is sent is not positive. How can we be supportive of this?

Families in the Middle East that have controlled vast oil revenues have scarred the last century with wars and oppressive regimes. Members of the Bush administration know this better than anyone. The current Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, visited Iraq with a delegation in 1988. They met with Saddam Hussein and decided that the stability of his regime and oil revenue was more important than his lust for power, whatever the cost. We are now paying for that tragic mistake with the lives of our Nation's sons and daughters.

It is time for the administration to change its tune on the corrupt and oppressive Aliyev regime. Though stability may be the temporary result of the President's support, the end result could destabilize the entire region.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2658) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes."

LACK OF DIVERSITY IN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACULTIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on two very different and unrelated topics, Mr. Speaker, but both are certainly of national importance.

First, almost every college and university in this country receives very

large amounts of Federal money through grants, appropriations, or student loan money. Yet, there is in some ways a one-sided brainwashing of students on many campuses today because of the lack of true diversity in college and university faculties.

There is also a lack of true academic freedom because conservative students generally feel they cannot express their true views on papers or in person without being penalized on their grades.

Possibly the group most discriminated against today is conservatives who wish to teach on college campuses. They simply are not welcome, to put it lightly, especially at left-wing colleges like Berkeley, Oberlin, Antioch, and many, many others.

I wish our colleges and universities would make true diversity a major goal and hire a few token conservatives at least. I wish so many college and university faculties were not so intolerant toward conservatives.

I wish the speakers who are invited to speak at graduation ceremonies or major college speaking programs were not 100 to one or more liberal to left-wing.

What has spurred these comments, Mr. Speaker, is an article in the September Atlantic Monthly magazine, certainly not recognized as any conservative-type publication, but this article said, "It is striking that the institutions that talk the most about diversity often practice it the least.

"For example, no group of people sings the diversity anthem more frequently and fervently than administrators at our elite universities. But elite universities are amazingly undiverse in their values, politics and mores. Professors, in particular, are drawn from a rather narrow segment of the population.

"A recent study found that roughly 90 percent of those professors in the arts and sciences who had registered with the political party had registered Democratic. Fifty-seven professors at Brown were found on the voter registration rolls. Of those 54 were Democrats. Of the 42 professors in the English history, sociology and political science departments all were Democrats.

"The results at Harvard, Penn State, Maryland, and the University of California at Santa Barbara, other universities that were in the study were similar to the results at Brown."

This article continues, "What we are looking at here is human nature. People want to be around others who are roughly like themselves. That is called community. It probably would be psychologically difficult for most Brown professors to share an office with someone who was pro-life, a member of the National Rifle Association, or an evangelical Christian.

"It is likely that hiring committees would subtly, even unconsciously, screen out any such people they encountered. Republicans and evangelical

Christians have sensed that they are not welcome at places like Brown or other elite universities so they do not even consider working there. In fact, any registered Republican who contemplates a career in academia these days is both a hero and a fool.

"So, in a semi-self-selective pattern brainy people with generally liberal social mores flow to academia and brainy people with generally conservative mores flow elsewhere.

"The dream of diversity is like the dream of equality. Both are based on ideas we celebrate even as we undermine them daily. On the one hand, the situation is appalling. It is appalling that Americans know so little about one another. It is appalling that many of us are so narrow-minded that we cannot tolerate a few people with ideas significantly different from our own. It is appalling that evangelical Christians are practically absent from entire professions such as academia, the media, and filmmaking. It is appalling that people should be content to cut themselves off from everyone unlike themselves." That is, as I said, quoting from an article in the September issue of the Atlantic Monthly magazine.

VULNERABILITY IN FUTURE ELECTRICAL BLACKOUTS

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press reported a few days ago that the fix for the recent blackout in the Northeast ironically may make us even more likely to have such blackouts in the future. The AP story said the proposed improvements "are making the electricity supply vulnerable to a different kind of peril: computer viruses and hackers who could black out substations, cities, or entire States."

Now, I know that everyone is supposed to worship the computer god today, and I know computers can do miraculous things that make our lives better in many ways. But when we decide what to do about the recent blackouts, surely we should not allow love for computers to make us even more vulnerable in the future.

To quote the AP story, it says, "In the past the grid's old electro-mechanical switches and analog technology made it more or less impervious to computer maladies, but now switches and monitoring gear can be upgraded and programmed remotely with software and that requires a vulnerable connection to a computer network. If that network runs on Microsoft Corp. operating systems, which virus-writers favor, or connects to the Internet, the vulnerabilities are increased."

Also, we should not have an electric power grid that is nationwide—even though that has some advantages—because a nationally integrated system also makes us even more vulnerable.

It is ridiculous that we have allowed ourselves to get into a situation where a minor incident in suburban Ohio can black out almost the whole Northeast, and part of Canada, and cause 40 to 50 million people to lose their power.

Bigger is not always better, and smaller, more independent utilities, with free competi-

tion, would make our power both more secure and less expensive.

AMERICA FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, the President has asked the United States Congress in the name of the American people to borrow \$87 billion to continue the actions in Iraq and to rebuild the nation of Iraq. That is going to be paid for by a couple of generations of working Americans, and there are an awful lot of questions about the request by the President.

Now, let us look at some of the details here: \$20.3 billion to rebuild Iraq borrowed by the American people and sent to Iraq, perhaps utilizing some U.S. contractors such as Halliburton. Here are some of the things we are going to pay for: \$20 million for executive job training, a 4-week class at the cost of \$10,000. I have community colleges in my district that would provide that same class for a tiny fraction of that cost whose budgets are underfunded because of the cuts in the Federal Government's spending on education. \$10,000 a person for a 4-week class, send them to my community college. We can house them and educate them for a lot less.

Then we have the \$100 million for the witness protection program. What witnesses? Well, the witnesses that might come forward to tell us something about the nonexistent weapons of mass destruction, among other things. That will be to pay for 100 Iraqi families at \$1 million each. In the United States of America when we put people in the witness protection program, it generally costs \$120,000 per family. So it is going to cost us roughly eight times more per family, but I guess that is because of the high cost of living in Iraq, or the life-style to which they would like to become accustomed. Again, the American people will borrow this money, or the President is asking Congress to borrow it on behalf of the American people.

It is going to cost \$255 per person in Iraq to rebuild the electricity infrastructure. They said we are not just rebuilding the bomb damage; they have this horribly outdated system, and we have to rebuild it.

Mr. Speaker, guess who else has a horribly outdated electricity infrastructure system? The United States of America. Did the President notice that the lights went off in one-third of the country? Also, we had a big blackout in the West a few years ago. Our system is operating on the edge. What is the President proposing here, \$255 will be borrowed for each Iraqi by the American people, sent to Iraq to rebuild their electricity infrastructure, and the President is asking for 71 cents on behalf of every American here in the United States.