

congressional vote on a trade agreement before it is signed by the President.

From on high, the President cuts all the special interest deals. We saw that in the Bush years and, frankly, we saw it too often in the Clinton years, the first Bush and the Reagan years also. The trade negotiators would cut their special interest deals, send the agreement to Congress, and Congress had to vote, after the President had signed on, either up or down. Reasserting congressional authority must also ensure Congress's public policy prerogatives are respected by international trade organizations such as the World Trade Organization. We must not find our public policy subject to corporate rights of action at the WTO or NAFTA that outweighs the Government's responsibility to preserve the public welfare.

What has happened is the corporate rights have been respected but not rights of workers, not rules to protect the environment or consumer safety and food safety.

A global system such as the WTO that doesn't give countries policy space risks the very legitimacy of global institutions. Countries should have sovereignty. If Canada wants to pass a strong environmental rule, if Mexico wants to pass a strong food safety law, who are we, in a world trade body or as another government, or who is someone in a corporation to tell those countries they can't pass a strong environmental law or a strong food safety law.

I recognize the framework I have outlined is only one strategy, but we can all agree our current trade model has not been working. When we change the process for writing trade deals, we can make trade deals work for more people in our country and for people living in the countries who are our trading partners. We have seen demonstrations in Central America against trade agreements, understanding that these trade agreements have so often overridden consumer protection rules in their countries. We see people in our country complain of trade agreements because workers lose jobs, because safe drinking water is not protected under these agreements. It is time these trade agreements are written for communities, for workers, and for small businesses. They have not been in the past. This is our chance to set out a new direction on trade.

#### CONGO CONFLICT MINERALS ACT OF 2009

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I want to pause from the press of daily business to consider the situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo. I have frequently come to the floor to talk about the tragedy in Darfur—yet the situation in Congo is worth as much attention.

The Democratic Republic of Congo has been devastated by civil war, conflict and a humanitarian crisis. Since

1998, there have been an estimated 5.4 million deaths. The poverty and insecurity in Congo is pandemic. Illegal armed groups and military forces commit widespread human rights violations with impunity. The conflict there still results in an estimated 45,000 deaths each month.

This is a tragic situation, deserving of the international community's attention.

My colleague from Kansas, Senator BROWBACK, and I traveled to the DRC together a couple of years ago. Congo is, in many ways, a beautiful country, rich in natural resources.

But, like so many other places in the world, Congo's natural resources have also become a curse. Warring factions struggle for control of resources to pursue their own political aims. During our trip, Senator BROWBACK and I learned that armed factions are plundering the mineral resources of eastern Congo and that illegal trade in these minerals is essentially financing the violence there.

We witnessed first-hand atrocities in eastern Congo—atrocities of horrific and inhumane proportions. Armed groups perpetrate unspeakable acts of sexual violence against women and girls to humiliate and terrorize communities and weaken their resistance.

I have met several times with a true modern day hero, Dr. Denis Mukwege, who runs the Panzi hospital of Bukavu, Congo. The Panzi hospital specializes in treatment for victims of sexual violence. The hospital performs surgeries and provides psychological counseling for these victims, but Dr. Mukwege and his staff are overwhelmed by the number of women seeking assistance.

Last year, I held a Judiciary hearing on rape as weapon of war. This is happening every day in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Rape and other forms of sexual violence affect hundreds of thousands of women and girls there, resulting in severe injuries, longterm psychological trauma, and immeasurable destructive impacts on the communities there. This war is being financed, at least in part, by the illegal trade in these minerals.

So what can we in the United States do about this? Well, many of these minerals end up right here in the U.S. and in many other countries, because they are used for everyday electronics products. Our cell phones, BlackBerrys, computers, and many other commonly used electronics contain these minerals.

Senator BROWBACK and I, along with Senator FEINGOLD, who chairs the Africa Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, have introduced legislation to create more transparency about the end users of these minerals in the United States.

The Congo Conflict Minerals Act of 2009 would require companies that are involved in commercial activities involving three minerals (coltan, cassiterite, and wolframite) to disclose the country of origin of the minerals to

the Securities and Exchange Commission. If the minerals are from DRC or neighboring countries, companies would have to also disclose the mine of origin.

We want to know where U.S. companies are getting these minerals, and we want to work with them to promote responsible practices and due diligence to ensure that their suppliers provide raw materials in a way that does not support the armed conflict or contribute to human rights abuses.

In the longer-term, we hope that Congo and its neighbors will establish a regional framework to prevent the illicit trade of these minerals. In the meantime, we can take this step to work with U.S. companies to ensure they are not inadvertently fueling the conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

#### MUSLIM MIDDLE EAST

Mr. KYL. Madam President, in an April 16 Wall Street Journal column, "Speaking Truth to Muslim Power," former CIA officer and Middle East expert Reuel Marc Gerecht writes about the fierce internal debates over Islam, jihadism, and modernity within the Muslim Middle East.

As Gerecht writes, while Western countries cannot determine the outcome of those debates, they can help shape them and provide a boost to Muslim reformers. While it is fashionable to criticize President George W. Bush's Middle East policies, Gerecht says that Arab democracy activists "have never been so hopeful as they were" from 2002 to 2006, during which time democracy promotion flourished. He argues that President Bush's pro-democracy rhetoric "energized the discussion of representative government and human rights abroad."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gerecht's column be printed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to consider his thoughtful views.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Wall Street Journal, Apr. 16, 2009]

#### SPEAKING TRUTH TO MUSLIM POWER

(By Reuel Marc Gerecht)

"The United States is not at war with Islam and will never be. In fact, our partnership with the Muslim world is critical in rolling back a fringe ideology that people of all faiths reject."

So spoke President Barack Hussein Obama in Turkey last week. Following in the footsteps of the Bush administration, Mr. Obama wants to avoid labeling our enemy in religious terms. References to "Islamic terrorism," "Islamic radicalism," or "Islamic extremism" aren't in his speeches. "Jihad," too, has been banished from the official lexicon.

But if one visits the religious bookstores near Istanbul's Covered Bazaar, or mosque libraries of Turkish immigrants in Rotterdam, Brussels or Frankfurt, one can still find a cornucopia of radical Islamist literature. Go into the bookstores of Arab and Pakistani immigrant communities in Europe, or into

the literary markets of the Arab world and the Indian subcontinent, and you'll find an even richer collection of militant Islamism.

Al Qaeda is certainly not a mainstream Muslim group—if it were, we would have had far more terrorist attacks since 9/11. But the ideology that produced al Qaeda isn't a rivulet in contemporary Muslim thought. It is a wide and deep river. The Obama administration does both Muslims and non-Muslims an enormous disservice by pretending otherwise.

Theologically, Muslims are neither fragile nor frivolous. They have not become suicide bombers because non-Muslims have said something unkind; they have not refrained from becoming holy warriors because Westerners avoided the word "Islamic" in describing Osama bin Laden and his allies. Having an American president who had a Muslim father, carries the name of the Prophet Muhammad's grandson, and wants to engage the Muslim world in a spirit of "mutual respect" isn't a "game changer." This hypothesis trivializes Islamic history and the continuing appeal of religious militancy.

Above all else, we need to understand clearly our enemies—to try to understand them as they see themselves, and to see them as devout nonviolent Muslims do. To not talk about Islam when analyzing al Qaeda is like talking about the Crusades without mentioning Christianity. To devise a hearts-and-minds counterterrorist policy for the Islamic world without openly talking about faith is counterproductive. We—the West—are the unrivalled agent of change in the Middle East. Modern Islamic history—including the Bush years—ought to tell us that questions non-Muslims pose can provoke healthy discussions.

The abolition of slavery, rights for religious minorities and women, free speech, or the very idea of civil society—all of these did not advance without Western pressure and the enormous seductive power that Western values have for Muslims. Although Muslims in the Middle East have been talking about political reform since they were first exposed to Western ideas (and modern military might) in the 18th century, the discussion of individual liberty and equality has been more effective when Westerners have been intimately involved. The Middle East's brief but impressive "Liberal Age" grew from European imperialism and the unsustainable contradiction between the progressive ideals taught by the British and French—the Egyptian press has never been as free as when the British ruled over the Nile valley—and the inevitably illiberal and demeaning practices that come with foreign occupation.

Although it is now politically incorrect to say so, George W. Bush's democratic rhetoric energized the discussion of representative government and human rights abroad. Democracy advocates and the anti-authoritarian voices in Arab lands have never been so hopeful as they were between 2002, when democracy promotion began to germinate within the White House, and 2006, when the administration gave up on people power in the Middle East (except in Iraq).

The issue of jihadism is little different. It's not a coincidence that the Muslim debate about holy war became most vivid after 9/11, when the U.S. struck back against al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Saddam Hussein in Iraq. Many may have found Mr. Bush's brief use of the term "Islamofascism" to be offensive—although it recalls well Abul Ala Maududi, a Pakistani founding father of modern Islamic radicalism, who openly admired European fascism as a violent, muscular ideology capable of mobilizing the masses. Yet Mr. Bush's flirtation with the term unquestionably pushed Muslim intellectuals to debate the le-

gitimacy of its use and the cult of martyrdom that had—and may still have—a widespread grip on many among the faithful.

When Sunni Arab Muslims viewed daily on satellite TV the horrors of the Sunni onslaught against the Iraqi Shiites, and then the vicious Shiite revenge against their former masters, the debate about jihadism, the historic Sunni-Shiite rivalry, and the American occupation intensified. Unfortunately, progress in the Middle East has usually happened when things have gotten ugly, and Muslims debate the mess.

Iran's former president Mohammed Khatami, whom Bill Clinton unsuccessfully tried to engage, is a serious believer in the "dialogue of civilizations." In his books, Mr. Khatami does something very rare for an Iranian cleric: He admits that Western civilization can be morally superior to its Islamic counterpart, and that Muslims must borrow culturally as well as technologically from others. On the whole, however, he finds the West—especially America—to be an amoral slippery slope of sin. How should one talk to Mr. Khatami or to Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the less curious but morally more earnest clerical overlord of Iran; or the Saudi royal family and their influential state-supported clergy, who still preach hatred of the West; or to the faithful of Pakistan, who are in the midst of an increasingly brutal, internecine religious struggle? Messrs. Khatami and Khamenei are flawlessly polite gentlemen. They do not, however, confuse civility with agreement. Neither should we.

It's obviously not for non-Muslims to decide what Islam means. Only the faithful can decide whether Islam is a religion of peace or war (historically it has been both). Only the faithful can banish jihad as a beloved weapon against infidels and unbelief. Only Muslims can decide how they balance legislation by men and what the community—or at least its legal guardians, the ulama—has historically seen as divine commandments.

Westerners can, however, ask probing questions and apply pressure when differing views threaten us. We may not choose to dispatch the U.S. Navy to protect women's rights, as the British once sent men-of-war to put down the Muslim slave trade, but we can underscore clearly our disdain for men who see "child brides" as something vouchsafed by the Almighty. There is probably no issue that angers militants more than women's rights. Advancing this cause in traditional Muslim societies caught in the merciless whirlwind of globalization isn't easy, but no effort is likely to bear more fruit in the long term than having American officials become public champions of women's rights in Muslim lands.

Al Qaeda's Islamic radicalism isn't a blip—a one-time outgrowth of the Soviet-Afghan war—or a byproduct of the Israeli-Palestinian confrontation. It's the most recent violent expression of the modernization of the Muslim Middle East. The West's great transformative century—the 20th—was soaked in blood. We should hope, pray, and do what we can to ensure that Islam's continuing embrace of modernity in the 21st century—undoubtedly its pivotal era—will not be similarly horrific.

We are fooling ourselves if we think we no longer have to be concerned about how Muslims talk among themselves. This is not an issue that we want to push the "reset" button on. Here, at least, George W. Bush didn't go nearly far enough.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on April 23, 2009, the Joint Committee on

Printing organized, elected a chairman, a vice chairman, and adopted its rules for the 111th Congress. Members of the Joint Committee on Printing elected Senator CHARLES E. SCHUMER as chairman and Congressman ROBERT BRADY as vice chairman. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RULES FOR THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING—111TH CONGRESS

##### RULE 1.—COMMITTEE RULES

(a) The rules of the Senate and House insofar as they are applicable, shall govern the Committee.

(b) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record as soon as possible following the Committee's organizational meeting in each odd-numbered year.

(c) Where these rules require a vote of the members of the Committee, polling of members either in writing or by telephone shall not be permitted to substitute for a vote taken at a Committee meeting, unless the ranking minority member assents to waiver of this requirement.

(d) Proposals for amending Committee rules shall be sent to all members at least one week before final action is taken thereon, unless the amendment is made by unanimous consent.

##### RULE 2.—REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House and Senate are in session. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered and after appropriate notification is made to the ranking minority member. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman, as he may deem necessary or at the request of the majority of the members of the Committee.

(b) If the Chairman of the Committee is not present at any meeting of the Committee, the vice-Chairman or ranking member of the majority party on the Committee who is present shall preside at the meeting.

##### RULE 3.—QUORUM

(a) Five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum, which is required for the purpose of closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders or changing the rules of the Committee.

(b) Three members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

##### RULE 4.—PROXIES

(a) Written or telegraphic proxies of Committee members will be received and recorded on any vote taken by the Committee, except for the purpose of creating a quorum.

(b) Proxies will be allowed on any such votes for the purpose of recording a member's position on a question only when the absentee Committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded.

##### RULE 5.—OPEN AND CLOSED MEETINGS

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of business of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No such vote shall be required to close a meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.