

Through its efforts here in America, it has worked to foster Humanity and Progress; sparing many of thousands from great hardship through the promotion of these principals.

Your challenge, should you choose to accept it, will be to use your wisdom and experience in finding ways to develop peaceful cooperation around Asia and the World, whether you are a representative of Laos or a sensible neighbor, we must now joint hands or accept the failures of our action. We must also educate our young to the old and new systems before their sense of national identity is lost. The adoption of these fundamental principals during this time of reconciliation will not only assure your country's acceptance into the United Nations, but awaken the free world to southeast Asia's immense capability and strength.

Thank you very much for allowing me this opportunity to speak with you today. I wish to express my deepest gratitude for your show of faith. It is with great confidence in you, my friends that I accept this great challenge and reaffirm my delegation's commitment of support.

TURKEY AND POSSIBLE MILITARY EQUIPMENT SALES

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the United States has a longstanding dynamic relationship with our NATO ally, the Republic of Turkey, and I believe that the strength of that relationship relies on forthright candor. I have willingly recognized positive developments in Turkey, and I have sought to present fairly the various human rights concerns as they have arisen. Today, I must bring to my colleagues' attention pending actions involving the Government of Turkey which seem incongruous with the record in violation of human rights. I fear the planned sale of additional military aircraft to Turkey could potentially have further long-term, negative effects on human rights in that country.

As Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I presided over a hearing in March of 1999 that addressed many human rights concerns. The State Department had just released its Country Reports on Human Rights Practices covering 1998. Commissioner and Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor Harold Hongju Koh noted in testimony before the Commission that "serious human rights abuses continued in Turkey in 1998, but we had hoped that the 1998 report would reflect significant progress on Turkey's human rights record. Prime Minister Yilmaz had publicly committed himself to making the protection of human rights his government's highest priority in 1998. We had welcomed those assurances and respected the sincerity of his intentions. We were disappointed that Turkey had not fully translated those assurances into actions."

I noted in my opening statement, "One year after a commission delegation visited Turkey, our conclusion is that there has been no demonstrable improvement in Ankara's human rights practices and that the prospects for

much needed systemic reforms are bleak given the unstable political scene which is likely to continue throughout 1999."

Thankfully, eighteen months later I can say that the picture has improved—somewhat.

A little over a year ago the president of Turkey's highest court made an extraordinary speech asserting that Turkish citizens should be granted the right to speak freely, urging that the legal system and constitution be "cleansed," and that existing "limits on language" seriously compromised the freedom of expression. The man who gave that speech, His Excellency Ahmet Necdet Sezer, is the new President of the Republic of Turkey. Last summer several of us on the Commission congratulated President Sezer on his accession to the presidency, saying, in part:

We look forward to working with you and members of your administration, especially as you endeavor to fulfill your commitments to the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and commitments contained in other Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) documents. These human rights fundamentals are the bedrock upon which European human rights rest, the solid foundation upon which Europe's human rights structures are built. It is worth remembering, twenty-five years after the signing of the Final Act, that your predecessor, President Demerel, signed the commitments at Helsinki on behalf of Turkey. Your country's engagement in the Helsinki process was highlighted during last year's OSCE summit in Istanbul, a meeting which emphasized the importance of freedom of expression, the role of NGOs in civil society, and the eradication of torture.

Your Presidency comes at a very critical time in modern Turkey's history. Adoption and implementation of the reforms you have advocated would certainly strengthen the ties between our countries and facilitate fuller integration of Turkey into Europe. Full respect for the rights of Turkey's significant Kurdish population would go a long way in reducing tensions that have festered for more than a decade, and resulted in the lengthy conflict in the southeast.

Your proposals to consolidate and strengthen democracy, human rights and the rule of law in Turkey will be instrumental in ushering in a new era of peace and prosperity in the Republic. The Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents can serve as important guides in your endeavor.

We all recall the pending \$4 billion sale of advanced attack helicopters to the Turkish army. I have objected to this sale as leading human rights organizations, Turkish and western press, and even the State Department documented the use of such helicopters to attack Kurdish villages in Turkey and to transport troops to regions where civilians were killed. Despite repeated promises, the Turkish Government has been slow to take action which would hold accountable and punish those who have committed such atrocities.

And we recently learned of the pending sale of eight even larger helicopters, S-80E heavy lift helicopters for Turkey's Land Forces Command. With a flight radius of over three hundred miles and the ability to carry over fifty armed troops, the S-80E has the potential to greatly expand the ability of Turkey's army to undertake actions such as I just recounted.

Since 1998, there has been recognition in high-level U.S.-Turkish exchanges that Turkey

has a number of longstanding issues which must be addressed with demonstrable progress: decriminalization of freedom of expression; the release of imprisoned parliamentarians and journalists; prosecution of police officers who commit torture; an end of harassment of human rights defenders and re-opening of non-governmental organizations; the return of internally displaced people to their villages; cessation of harassment and banning of certain political parties; and, an end to the state of emergency in the southeast.

The human rights picture in Turkey has improved somewhat in the last several years, yet journalists continue to be arrested and jailed, human rights organizations continue to feel pressure from the police, and elected officials who are affiliated with certain political parties, in particular, continue to be harassed.

Anywhere from half a million to 2 million Kurds have been displaced by the Turkish counter insurgency campaigns against the Kurdistan Workers Party, also known as the PKK. The Turkish military has reportedly emptied more than three thousand villages and hamlets in the southeast since 1992, burned homes and fields, and committed other human rights abuses against Kurdish civilians, often using types of helicopters similar to those the Administration is seeking to transfer. Despite repeated promises, the Government of Turkey has taken few steps to facilitate the return of these peoples to their homes, assist them to resettle, or compensate them for the loss of their property. Nor does it allow others to help. Even the ICRC has been unable to operate in Turkey. And, finally, four parliamentarians—Leyla Zana, Hatip Dicle, Orhan Doğan, and Selim Sadak—continue to serve time in prison. We can not proceed with this sale, or other sales or transfers, when Turkey's Government fails to live up to the most basic expectations mentioned above.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is also time that the United States establishes an understanding with Turkey and a credible method of consistent monitoring and reporting on the end-use of U.S. weapons, aircraft and service. An August 2000 report from the General Accounting Office (GAO) entitled "Foreign Military Sales: Changes Needed to Correct Weaknesses in End-Use Monitoring Program" was a cause for concern on my part regarding the effectiveness of current end-use monitoring and reporting efforts. While we had been assured that end-use monitoring was taking place and that the United States was holding recipient governments accountable to the export license criteria, the GAO report reveals the failure of the Executive Branch to effectively implement monitoring requirements enacted by Congress. For example, the report points out on page 12:

While field personnel may be aware of adverse conditions in their countries, the Defense Security Cooperation Agency has not established guidance or procedures for field personnel to use in determining when such conditions require an end-use check. For example, significant upheaval occurred in both Indonesia and Pakistan within the last several years. As a result, the State Department determined that both countries are no longer eligible to purchase U.S. defense articles and services. However, end-use checks of U.S. defense items already provided were not performed in either country in response to the

standard. DSCA officials believed that the State Department was responsible for notifying field personnel that the criteria had been met for an end-use check to be conducted. However, DSCA and State have never established a procedure for providing notification to field personnel.

Currently, the end-use monitoring training that DSCA provides to field personnel consists of a 30-minute presentation during the security assistance management course at the Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management. This training is intended to familiarize students with end-use monitoring requirements. However, this training does not provide any guidance or procedures on how to execute an end-use monitoring program at overseas posts or when to initiate end-use checks in response to one of the five standards.

In the past there have been largely ad hoc attempts to report on the end-use of U.S. equipment. Therefore, I was pleased to support the passage of H.R. 4919, the Security Assistant Act of 2000 that was signed by the President on October 6. Section 703 of this Act mandates that no later than 180 days after its enactment, the President shall prepare and transmit to Congress a report summarizing the status of efforts by the Defense Security Cooperation Agency to implement the End-Use Monitoring Enhancement Plan relating to government-to-government transfers of defense articles, services, and related technologies. I want to commend House International Relations Committee Chairman BEN GILMAN for his efforts in trying to make our end-use monitoring and reporting programs effective and accurate. I look forward to working with him and others to ensure that an effective and credible monitoring program is put in place without further delay.

We must be consistent in our defense of human rights, and our relations, including our military relations, must reflect that commitment. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to support the sale of additional weaponry and aircraft to Turkey at this time.

TRIBUTE TO BILL BARRETT OF
NEBRASKA

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM L. JENKINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 2000

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, the Honorable BILL BARRETT.

In addition to being a successful businessman, BILL has been a dedicated public servant, serving his country in the U.S. Navy, serving in many local and State capacities, representing Nebraska in the State legislature as speaker, and serving as a hard-working, conscientious Member of this institution since 1991. He has worked tirelessly for his constituents in one of the largest and most rural congressional districts in the country.

During this time he has been an effective advocate for issues of importance to the Nation with his work on the House Committee on Agriculture and Education and the Workforce.

As a colleague who also represents a district with significant farming interests, he has been of significant help to me through his work as chairman of the House Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation, and Credit.

Most importantly, BILL is a man of honor and integrity who is respected by colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He has been a tremendous asset to the House of Representatives, working with Members in a bipartisan fashion. As long as I have known BILL, he has been a humble, tenacious, and effective voice for his constituents. I am honored to have had the opportunity to work with BILL BARRETT over the past 4 years. He is a good friend and a great Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 10 years BILL BARRETT has served the people of the Third District of Nebraska and the people of this country with honor and distinction. The House of Representatives will miss his service.

GENETIC ENGINEERING: A TECHNOLOGY AHEAD OF THE SCIENCE AND PUBLIC POLICY?

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, Federal regulatory review of biotechnology products is patchy and inadequate. Spread out over three regulatory agencies—the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)—the system is characterized by huge regulatory holes that fail to safeguard human health and environmental protection. Furthermore, independent scientific advice available to the agencies is severely limited.

Despite the fact that GE food may contain new toxins or allergens, the FDA determined in 1992 that GE plants should be treated no differently from traditionally bred plants. Consequently, the FDA condones an inadequate premarket safety testing review and does not require any labeling of GE food products. The FDA has essentially abdicated these responsibilities to the very companies seeking to market and profit from the new GE products. FDA's recent proposed rule for regulating biotechnology will hardly change the present system. Although the proposal requires that companies notify the Agency before marketing new GE products, it still fails to require a comprehensive pre-market safety testing review or mandatory labeling.

The FDA's 1992 decision to treat GE food as "substantially equivalent" to conventional food (thereby exempting most GE food on the market from independent premarket safety testing or labeling) is a violation of the public's trust and an evasion of the Agency's duties to ensure a safe food supply. The concept of "substantial equivalence" has been challenged in numerous scientific journals. FDA's failure to label GE foods led a 1996 editorial in the New England Journal of Medicine to conclude that "FDA policy would appear to favor industry over consumer protection."

EPA's regulation of environmental hazards is equally inadequate. Under the nation's pesticide laws, EPA regulates biological pesticides produced by plants. It does not, however, regulate the plants themselves, leaving that duty to the USDA. Consequently, EPA regulates the B.t. toxin, but not the corn, cotton or potato plants exuding the toxin. EPA has allowed B.t. crops to come to the market without conducting a comprehensive environmental review. Much further research is needed on the impacts of "pest protected" crops as outlined by a National Academy of Sciences report. For plants engineered for other traits, such as herbicide tolerance or disease tolerance, EPA does no environmental review at all.

The USDA's Animal Plant and Health Protection Service (APHIS) is charged with evaluating potential environmental impacts of field tests of GE crops. However, having virtually abandoned its original permit system which registered an environmental impact assessment before a field test, the Agency can no longer claim to be doing its job. APHIS has adopted a much less rigorous "notification" system which permits researchers to conduct field trials without conducting an

The National Academy of Sciences (NAS), the premier scientific body in our nation, has recently published a scientific assessment of GE foods. Unfortunately, many of the scientists on the NAS review committee had financial links to the biotech industry. The failure of the NAS to find an unbiased panel is problematic because their mission to supply decision makers and the public with unbiased scientific assessments cannot be achieved. This reduces the lack of independent science for our regulatory agencies to rely upon.

POPULAR DEMAND FOR AN EVOLUTION IN POLICY
REGARDING GE FOOD

A strong testament to consumers' desire for labeling and greater safety testing of GE food is the flurry of legislative activity and ballot initiatives that have taken place at the state and local levels. Over the past year, the city councils of Boston, Cleveland and Minneapolis have passed resolutions calling for a moratorium on GE food, and Austin has called for the labeling of all GE food. Boulder, CO has banned GE organisms from 15,000 acres of city-owned farmland. Bills requiring labeling of GE food were introduced in the state legislatures of New York, Minnesota, California and Michigan. The state legislature in Vermont considered legislation that would require farmers to notify the town hall if they were planting genetically engineered seeds. In California, a task force is exploring whether schools should be serving GE food, and in 1999 a petition signed by over 500,000 people demanding labeling was submitted to Congress, President Clinton and several federal agencies including the FDA.

In survey after survey, American consumers have indicated that they believe all GE food should be labeled as such. Consumers have a right to know what is in the food they eat and to make decisions based on that knowledge. While some observe strict dietary restrictions for religious, ethical or health reasons, others simply choose not to be the first time users of these largely untested foods.

The failure to label GE crops and food is short-sighted and could close off key markets