

In 1980, President Carter imposed a sanction on the Soviet Union for political purposes. Who did that hurt? It hurt the Olympics, and the American interest in the Olympics, and it hurt American farmers, a market that was a prime market for my farmers in the West. We have yet to get that agriculture market back by virtue of those sanctions back in 1980.

□ 1630

Yesterday in the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies on which I serve as a subcommittee member I introduced a narrower version of H.R. 212 which would lift of the sanctions on food and medicine for these countries that are currently sanctioned, but it would not allow any government spending in connection with the lifting of those sanctions. In other words, the taxpayer would not bear any of the burden for allowing our farmers to deal directly with those countries and make sales. It is a \$6 billion plus market for our farmers in commodities as diverse as rice and corn and peas and wheat and barley. It is a great market that is exposed to our farmers.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, my friends on the appropriations subcommittee defeated this amendment by a vote of 28 to 24. It was a very close vote, but it was a great debate, and we ought to have that debate again on H.R. 212 and on this next version of this amendment that went into the appropriation bill yesterday.

So, I urge my colleagues to study H.R. 212, study the concept of lifting sanctions on food and medicine. It is a humanitarian basis that is good policy for our country, and it will absolutely help our agriculture markets who are struggling to find markets overseas.

One final point: In the event that we lift these sanctions and allow farmer-to-country correspondence and sales, it prevents the agriculture community that is in straits from coming to the Congress and seeking Federal tax dollars. It is the free market approach to agriculture success.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BROADCASTERS FAIRNESS IN ADVERTISING ACT OF 1999

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, today I am here to introduce the Broadcasters Fairness in Advertising Act of 1999. There is a silent and pervasive trend among ad agencies and the companies they represent to engage in discriminatory practices which are called, quote, "no urban/Spanish dictates" end of quote, and they are called, quote, "minority discounts," end of quote. The

term: "No urban slash Spanish dictates" means not advertising products on stations that cater to minorities. "Minority discounts" means paying minority-owned stations far less for advertising the same product that is paid to nonminority-owned stations. These policies have no business rationale and are purely discriminatory.

Madam Speaker, year in and year out minority broadcasters lose millions of dollars in revenues, however the advertising companies would have us believe otherwise. They will contend that they do not advertise in these stations because minorities do not buy their products.

For example, in a study conducted by the FCC, a major mayonnaise manufacturer told a station manager that, quote, black people do not eat mayonnaise, end of quote. Or worse, one minority station salesperson was told that, and I quote again, black people do not eat beef, end of quote. Such a blatantly absurd statement demonstrates the openly racist obstacles minority broadcasters face from the advertising industry.

My bill will prohibit discrimination against minority formatted stations by directing the FCC to adopt regulations to prevent such discrimination. It would also allow private right of action by any minority broadcaster who has been subjected to advertising discrimination. And finally, my bill will prohibit Federal agencies from contracting with ad agencies that utilize these discriminatory practices.

Madam Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this very, very important initiative.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE INAUGURATION OF THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF KURDISTAN

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about democracy, a form of government which was invented in the 5th century B.C. by the Greeks in Athens, great city of Athens. The British honor democracy through their parliament, the Japanese have their Diet, the Duma serves the Russians, and of course here in the United States democracy is exercised right here on the floor of Congress. Democracy still remains the best hope for troubled humanity throughout the world.

With the end of the Cold War, Madam Speaker, we have seen a great expansion of the boundaries of democracy. The world is a better place today because many former Soviet republics now enjoy self determination and are given their rightful seats in the Hall of Nations. But auspicious as has been the

forward march of liberty, the world remains far from being free. Nations remain in captivity. The color of one's skin still bars some from feeling our common humanity. But the hope that we can rise to the challenge of total equality is enduring. People of goodwill are risking their lives against great odds. They know the rewards are worth the risks.

Madam Speaker, on May 24, 1999, just a few days from now, a nation whose voice has been silenced for too long will convene its first congress, unfortunately not in its own land but in Brussels, Belgium, and 150 delegates from around the world representing the Kurdish people of Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Iran and the former Soviet republics will assemble for the purpose of raising their voice for their brothers and sisters who are denied a voice in Kurdistan. I salute the birth of this congress that represents a people as old as the dawn of history.

Madam Speaker, the Kurds are natives of the Middle East who inhabit a mountainous region as large as the State of Texas. They speak Kurdish, which is distinct from Turkish and Arabic but is closely linked with Persian. Having survived in mountain strongholds and ancient empires, they are now persecuted, denied their identity and forced to become Turks or Arabs or Persian by the states that were born in the early 20th century. Thirty million strong, they are viewed as beasts of burden or as cannon fodder, but never as Kurds who should enjoy human rights that we take for granted in this country.

It is a crime to be a Kurd in Turkey, Madam Speaker. Saddam Hussein has used chemical and biological weapons against them in Iraq. The theocracy in Tehran often machine guns the Kurdish dissidents in the city squares. The poignancy of the Kurdish situation hits closer to home when we realize that our own government is sometimes involved in their misery. Turkey boasts of American F-16 fighter planes, Sikorsky attack helicopters and M-60 battle tanks. Saddam Hussein, according to some declassified U.N. documents, had the support of 24 European companies to produce his deadly chemical fumes and biological fumes. Tehran's opposition to the Kurds has gone beyond Iran with the assassination of Kurdish leaders in Vienna and Berlin.

We all revere the words of Thomas Jefferson when he wrote in the Declaration of Independence: "When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."