

October 6, 2000

National Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization conference in Paris that negotiated an international treaty on the transferability of academic credits and credentials. He has received numerous awards from education and community groups.

Before coming to Ramapo, Dr. Scott was assistant commissioner for the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and an associate dean and senior administrator at Cornell University. He holds a bachelor's degree in English from Bucknell University and his doctorate in sociology and organizational ethnography from Cornell.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Dr. Scott and wishing him many years of continued success in his new role at Adelphi University.

COMMEMORATING THE REPUBLIC  
OF CHINA ON IT'S NATIONAL  
DAY, OCTOBER 10, 2000

**HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 6, 2000*

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the Republic of China on Taiwan has emerged as a major economic power throughout the world. Much of this economic success is attributable to the efforts of Taiwan's leaders who understand that a strong economy is necessary for true political progress and reform. The Republic of China has now become a true democracy with several strong political parties. Earlier this year, the people of Taiwan elected as President Mr. Chen Shui-bian of the Democratic Progressive Party. His election underscored the vitality and diversity of Taiwan's democratic form of government.

Like his predecessor, former President Lee Teng-hui, President Chen continues to seek a proper role for the Republic of China in the international community. At the same time, President Chen also seeks a dialogue with the People's Republic of China. While the pace of this dialogue may evolve slowly, President Chen will continue to work with his countrymen to transform Taiwan into a high tech island that will be seen worldwide as a successful model for emerging democracies.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to show our admiration to our friends in the Republic of China by congratulating them on their forthcoming National Day.

IN HONOR OF HOLY FAMILY HIGH  
SCHOOL REUNION 2000

**HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 6, 2000*

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Holy Family High School, as it celebrates Reunion 2000. On October 7, 2000, many of Holy Family's alumni will attend a reunion to celebrate the school that guided them through their formative years and prepared them for future success.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Holy Family High School was founded in the late 1800s, and was known as Columbia Business School. In the early 1920s, Franciscan nuns and priests took stewardship of the school, changing its name to Holy Family. They dedicated their lives to providing support and guidance, creating an environment that facilitated learning. Because of the exceptional education Holy Family provided, many of its students had the opportunity to go to college.

The closing of Holy Family High School in 1972 was a sad moment for everyone who had been a part of its history, and sad moment for the community. However, with this reunion, Holy Family's alumni share their memories and experiences, their triumphs and difficulties. In so doing, they breathe life back into their school and their childhood.

Today, I honor Holy Family High School and the students who passed through its halls on the way to realizing their dreams. And I ask my colleagues to honor them, as well.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 6, 2000*

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, due to an error, I was incorrectly shown as voting "yes" on rollcall No. 473. I was present during this roll call vote and intended to vote "no."

This was a vote on the Souder amendment to H.R. 4942, the DC Appropriations Bill for FY 2001. This amendment would prohibit the District of Columbia from using any funds, Federal or local, for a needle exchange program. I am strongly opposed to such a prohibition.

Needle exchange programs, which are used in over 30 states, have been proven to drastically reduce the transmission of HIV among intravenous drug users. Such programs have the support of the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, the United States Conference of Mayors and the Surgeon General of the United States. In fact, the Surgeon General has said, "There is conclusive scientific evidence that syringe exchange programs as part of a comprehensive HIV prevention strategy are, in effect, public health intervention that reduces the transmission of HIV and does not encourage the use of illegal drugs."

The District has budgeted its own funds for the implementation of this program. However, the Souder amendment denies the District the right to local control over local policy, implemented by local dollars. It is not the responsibility of this Congress to impose the personal moral beliefs of certain of its Members on the public health policy of any local jurisdiction. Yet that is exactly what the Souder amendment does. I oppose this amendment and ask that this statement be entered into the record to clarify my position on this important issue.

21847

## WRONG ON KAZAKHSTAN

**HON. DAN BURTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 6, 2000*

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a very disturbing Op Ed article by Professor Amos Perlmutter ("More words than deeds on Kazakhstan?" in the Washington Times of October 4, 2000), detailing how the Clinton-Gore Administration has dropped the ball in promoting democracy and respect for human rights in Kazakhstan.

Time after time, Kazakhstan's ruthless and corrupt President, Nursultan Nazarbayev, has made promises to Vice President GORE and others in the Administration and has then failed to deliver on those promises. And so, as Professor Perlmutter puts it, the Nazarbayev regime continues its campaign of "relentlessly destroying the opposition, closing the free press and involving itself in corrupt schemes."

It should have been possible for the United States, which has had the support of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe as well as numerous non-governmental human rights organizations, to insist that Nazarbayev fulfill the promises he made on human rights and free elections as a price for legitimacy in American eyes. Sadly, however, it seems clear that the Clinton-Gore Administration has pulled its punches, because it wants oil rich Kazakhstan's support for an oil pipeline that does not go through Russia. What is particularly troublesome in this regard is that the United States should not be turning a blind eye to repression and corruption in order to persuade Kazakhstan to do something that is in its interest in any event.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Professor Perlmutter's article for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 4, 2000]

MORE WORDS THAN DEEDS ON KAZAKHSTAN?

(By Amos Perlmutter)

The Clinton-Gore administration relationship with Nursultan Nazarbayev's corrupt dictatorship in Kazakhstan is, once again, making news. Not without reason.

The case is that the administration failed to defend political freedom and free enterprise in Kazakhstan. They talked the talk without walking the walk when it came to challenging the Nazarbayev dictatorship.

Promises from Mr. Nazarbayev went unfulfilled. The administration failed to support the claims of human rights organizations, non-government organizations (NGOs), and the OSCE that the Nazarbayev government is not only failing to undergo democratic changes as a price for support from the United States, but also is relentlessly destroying the opposition, closing the free press and involving itself in corrupt schemes.

The effort to support this regime was conceived in conformity with the American national interest. After all, there are three reasons for U.S. strategic interest in Kazakhstan: oil, nukes and independence. Kazakhstan has been one of the Soviet Union's major oil reserves, and continues to be a most significant oil reserve and also a Caspian littoral state. Josef Stalin made Kazakhstan a Soviet nuclear arsenal.

Independence was the goal of both the Bush and Clinton administrations, to

strengthen Central Asia non-Russian Muslim states, and to move them in the direction of democracy and free enterprise. There was a tacit strategic purpose in separating Kazakhstan from Russia's historical imperial linkages (an exercise in futility). Kazakhstan is the most Russified Central Asian state, with close to 30 percent of its population Russians who serve as the main scientific, industrial and business elite.

However, the Clinton administration sank into the pool of oil that inadvertently led to the most serious corruption of the Nazarbayev dictatorship by failing to resist the dictatorship. One of the administration's major foreign policy goals was humanitarian intervention to help bring an end to former communist dictatorships in the former Soviet Union and the Balkans.

In fact, the administration conducted a "humanitarian war" in Kosovo. The idea of a humanitarian and exemplary intervention, i.e. support of opposition groups in Kazakhstan, free press, and democracy was sacrificed, unfortunately, to the pool of oil.

The administration was not directly involved in support of the dictatorship. But it failed to vigorously resist the Nazarbayev violation of human rights, dissolution of the Kazakh parliament on two occasions and above all closing the only two opposition papers and the rigging of the 1999 elections.

In defense of the administration you could say diplomatic gobbledygook and securing unfulfilled promises from Mr. Nazarbayev was unfortunately subordinated to oil and nuclear strategic policies. The embassy in Kazakhstan continuously reported to the U.S. State Department on Mr. Nazarbayev's violations of human rights.

In fact, the OSCE, human rights groups, non-government organizations (NGOs), and other groups have warned the administration and continuously protested Mr. Nazarbayev's dictatorship and suppression of freedom in Kazakhstan. Leon Fuerth, Vice President Al Gore's national security adviser, and his assistant, Richard Brody, met on Sept. 15, 1999, at the Old Executive Office Building to discuss the upcoming visit of President Nazarbayev to the United States. Attending were several people from the State Department, regional and human rights bureaus, as well as the Human Rights Foundation, and the Kazakhstan 21st Century Foundation.

Mr. Fuerth was on the defensive throughout the meeting, as the various representatives pressed hard the argument that the meeting was a mistake at that time, since Mr. Nazarbayev would interpret it as an endorsement of his behavior. According to one of the participants, Mr. Fuerth was unpersuasive and ineffective in defending the purpose for the visit of Mr. Nazarbayev to the United States.

The issue at stake was Kazakhstan's MiG sales to North Korea and the failure of democracy. When Mr. Nazarbayev promised Mr. Gore the next election "would be better," the OSCE report on the 1999 elections in Kazakhstan were still pending. Mr. Fuerth said at the meeting, "We will adopt its [OSCE's] findings as leverage on Nazarbayev." Mr. Fuerth continued, "Our government has been saying repeatedly, and the vice president personally, pay attention to what the monitors are saying about your, i.e. Nazarbayev's, elections." Mr. Fuerth said Mr. Nazarbayev is "not your poster boy" for democracy and freedom. Mr. Fuerth said, "Gore sees his personal relationship as essential to prodding Nazarbayev toward democracy."

America's goals include, says Mr. Fuerth, "carrying Kazakhstan to a modern self-sus-

taining state at every level of societal concern. . . . We are into their affairs at a fantastic level of detail, and that is only possible with the political support of Nazarbayev and this [Gore-Nazarbayev] commission and the commitment of the United States to a face-to-face meeting with the vice president.

Mr. Fuerth continued to say the United States must persuade them to "more and more perfect democracy," and he is "perfectly aware of the imperfections." According to Mr. Fuerth, Mr. Gore's message is "Democracy is on the agenda. Democracy is not our idiosyncrasy." He describes Mr. Gore's agenda as follows: "Democracy and elections are essential parts of the relationship Nazarbayev wants with the U.S. Gore will explain why a valid election is indispensable if he [Mr. Nazarbayev] wants the relationship he seeks."

After meeting with the president, Mr. Nazarbayev went back home and continued in his oil-mired practices, human-rights violations and the creation of his position as president for life.

Since Mr. Gore was given the portfolio on Russia and the independent states of the former Soviet Union, the essential difference between what the Cox Report finds in the case of Russia and the administration policy toward Kazakhstan is that in the case of Russia it was mired with good intentions for reform that turned sour because of support for Boris Yeltsin's corrupt, undemocratic government. You cannot tell Russia, a major power, what to do, while the situation in Kazakhstan was totally different.

Not only was the United States in the position to help implement the recommendations for democracy and freedom in Kazakhstan, it coddled the dictator and made no impact whatsoever or follow up on the promises made by Mr. Nazarbayev to Mr. Gore to advance the democracy in Kazakhstan.

In the case of Kazakhstan, the United States was in a stronger position than in Russia, with the support of OSCE, multiple human rights organizations and NGOs, to impose upon the dictatorship to implement their promises made on human rights and free elections as a price for legitimacy in American eyes.

They did not do it. The administration tacitly accepted Mr. Nazarbayev's defense that there is an emergent democracy in Kazakhstan and it is a question of "time."

It seems the Clinton-Gore administration did not try very hard to institutionalize and implement their commitments to democracy, free elections, and an open press in the case of Kazakhstan.

#### MOTOR VEHICLE FRANCHISE CONTRACT ARBITRATION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

**HON. KEN BENTSEN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 3, 2000*

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of legislation I cosponsored, H.R. 534, the Fairness and Voluntary Arbitration Act. This important legislation addresses an imbalance in the relationship between automobile manufacturers and automobile dealers.

Today, motor vehicle manufacturers regularly force small business auto and truck deal-

ers into mandatory binding arbitration clauses by including the clauses in non-negotiated dealer agreements. Under the current system, automobile and truck dealers have no choice but to accept mandatory binding arbitration provisions in franchise agreements provided by motor vehicle manufacturers. These "take it or leave it" contracts undermine the "freedom to contract," a tenet of modern commercial law, and run counter to basic principles of fairness.

H.R. 534 would make arbitration of dealer-manufacturer disputes totally voluntary. H.R. 534 does not prohibit arbitration but rather seeks to make arbitration one of several avenues to dispute resolution. H.R. 534 makes arbitration one of several fair choices that both parties may willingly and knowingly select. I believe that we should reject the one-size-fits-all approach of arbitration and recognize that there are less expensive, more efficient, non-judicial modes of dispute resolution like mediation and other types of informal negotiation.

Under the current system, legitimate state protections are unavailable for dealers because of overly broad federal policy favoring arbitration. The landmark Supreme Court case, *Southland Corporation v. Keating*, 107 S. Ct. 852 (1984), established that federal law preempts state laws that prohibit mandatory binding arbitration in adhesion contracts or prohibit waivers of judicial or administrative remedies of a contract. Preemption prevents states from enforcing protective laws that limit or regulate unfair arbitration practices in contracts, despite the fact that enforceability of private contracts is ordinarily a question of state law. These arbitration clauses substantially deteriorate dealers' rights and remedies as provided under protective state franchise laws.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government has no business dictating the terms of contracts between small business auto and truck dealers and automotive manufacturers. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 534, legislation to untie the hands of small business auto and truck dealers in their negotiations with automotive manufacturers.

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND JOHN ALPHONSO FERGUSON FOR A CAREER OF SERVICE

**HON. CARRIE P. MEEK**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 6, 2000*

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend John Alphonso Ferguson is the founding pastor of the Second Baptist Church of Richmond Heights, in my Congressional District. On Saturday, October 28, 2000, our entire community and Rev. Ferguson's friends, admirers and members of his congregation will gather at the Dadeland Marriott Hotel to wish him Godspeed upon his retirement after 36 years of service.

Ordained a minister at the First Baptist Church of Logan Park in Norfolk, Virginia on November 17, 1959, he moved in 1961 to Florida to establish the Second Baptist Church in South Dade's Richmond Heights community. Amidst the countless sermons he