

(a) The right to the confidentiality of his correspondence;

(b) The right not to give public explanations;

(c) The right to maintain friendly relations with any other pupil;

(i) School faculty may not prohibit pupil's social interactions provided the learning process is not interrupted;

(d) The right to have the assessment and content of his work remain private unless the pupil gives consent.

Article 8

Every pupil shall have the right to rest and leisure, including:

1. The right to reasonable limitation of the number of lessons per day;

(a) Duration of intervals between lessons is not to be reduced by teachers;

2. The right to periodic holidays.

Article 9

Pupils shall have the right to set up and distribute mass media. Mass media shall be independent and shall have the right from freedom of speech and press.

Article 10

1. Every pupil shall have the right to participate in the school government, as well as the right to participate in the development of the school rules and a student bill of rights specific to their school.

2. The pupils shall have the right to establish a school council, and every pupil shall have the right to participate in its activity. The school council shall be formed through the election of representatives from every form.

3. Every pupil and his parents or guardian shall have the right to be informed about all rules which regulate school life, including:

(a) Criteria under which school marks are given;

(b) Attendance policies;

(c) Requirements to the content and execution of subject matter.

4. Pupils shall have the right to the freedom of peaceful meetings and associations. Nobody can be forced to join an organization.

Article 11

1. All pupils shall have the right to learn about world history from an unbiased perspective.

2. Pupil's curriculum is not to include propaganda.

Article 12

All pupils shall have the right to personal, professional, and academic counseling.

(a) Information imparted during counseling session is to remain confidential between pupil and counselor, unless the safety of the pupil or another person is in question;

(b) Counselors shall meet standards of certification set by State.

Article 13

Pregnant pupils, pupils who are parents, or pupils responsible for younger children have the right to continue their education.

(a) State and school shall provide assistance with childcare.

Article 14

1. All pupils shall have the right to select courses of study outside of the mandatory curriculum if such courses and/or activities exist.

2. Supplementary courses recommended by the teacher shall not become mandatory, shall not affect final grades, and shall be free.

(a) All compulsory material shall be taught during compulsory classes.

Article 15

1. Every pupil shall have the right to be treated without discrimination by the teachers, school administration, pupils and their parents, and school employees, irrespective of the pupil's or his family member's race, sex, age, religion, political or other opinion, property status, state of health, or other circumstances.

2. Every pupil with physical and/or mental disabilities shall have the right to attend the same school as pupils who do not share their disabilities. The school must provide for their needs accordingly.

3. Every pupil shall have the right to equal, unprejudiced, and fair treatment when marks are given, and benefits and duties distributed.

Article 16

All pupils shall have the right to a just disciplinary procedure.

1. All pupils shall have the right to due process;

2. Every student has the right to an appeals process.

Article 17

Every pupil shall have the right to be informed of his rights, including but not limited to those stated in such documents as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the European Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the constitution of his own country, and this Declaration of the Pupil's Rights.

Article 18

Nothing in the present Declaration shall affect any provisions which are more conducive to the realization of the rights of the pupil and which may be contained in:

1. The law of a State party;

2. International law in force for that State.

THE U.S. INTERNATIONAL POLICY ON SUSTAINABLE USE

HON. RICHARD W. POMBO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 2001

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, through professional and scientific management, this nation currently enjoys stable and healthy wildlife and marine resource populations. Sadly, there were excessive harvests of wildlife in the 17th and 18th centuries, but that circumstance is history never to be repeated. Today, through appropriate laws and reasoned regulations, the future of these resources is assured for generations to come.

Given this background of successful management and wise use of these renewable resources, I am dismayed when government representatives of this nation participate in international conventions, treaties and bilateral and multi-lateral conservation agreements concerning the sustainable use of wildlife and marine resources, a different agenda seems to be in place; specifically, that agenda rejects science and favors anti consumptive use of those renewable resources.

For example, policy positions taken by the United States Delegations at the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Annual Meetings of the International Whaling Com-

mission (IWC) of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW) reflect a political agenda rather than a science-based policy. Through the past leadership of the United States at CITES and IWC, several nations have followed this flawed and imprudent policy to the detriment of various wildlife and marine species.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note President Bush's recent remarks to the Environmental Youth Award winners regarding this Administrations foundation for environmental policy. He affirmed that it will be "based on sound science, not some environmental fad of what may sound good—that we're going to rely on the best evidence before we decide [on policy]." Currently, the United States is developing its position for the upcoming 53rd Annual Meeting of the IWC.

Due to the significance of the event, I recently sent a letter to the Secretary of Interior, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce concerning the background of United States policy at the IWC meetings. Mr. Speaker, at this time I hereby submit to the RECORD for my colleagues consideration the letters (referenced above) to the Bush administration.

I believe the time has come for the United States to truly reflect an international commitment to the sustainable use of renewable wildlife and marine resources based on science. As I stated in my letters, this conservation policy should be followed whether the subject species are elephants, turtles, whales, or trees. Such leadership by the United States is the responsible and ethical policy that must be pursued for the benefit of renewable wildlife, marine resources and humankind itself.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2001.

Hon. GALE NORTON,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Interior,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY NORTON: I am writing to express my strong support for the need for science to be the fundamental guide in United States participation in international conservation commitments as legally recognized under the Uruguay Round Agreements of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

Unfortunately, the United States policy under the former-Clinton administration acted contrary to this legal concept under the tenets of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW). Specifically, it did so by continued opposition and obstructionist positions on the resumption of limited and managed whaling by island and coastal nations.

Although it is true that there was over exploitation of certain whale stocks in the 18th and 19th centuries for commercial oil products, this is not the case today. In fact, no whale stocks were ever threatened by whale harvests for human food consumption. The Scientific Committee of the governing body of the ICRW and the International Whaling Commission (IWC) has found that limited harvests would have no adverse impact on population stocks.

However, in the past, the United States and other nations have consistently opposed the resumptions of limited whaling on what amounts to purely a political agenda. For instance, the United States supported the adoption of the Southern Ocean Sanctuary

for whales without any scientific basis for such a position. Further, the United States is supporting the adoption of a Pacific Ocean Sanctuary where there is no scientific basis for the establishment of such a sanctuary. Even after the Bush administration took office, the Department of State has opposed legal trade in whale products between Norway and Japan. I would sincerely urge the Bush administration to carefully review the United States policy in terms of science and law.

I must say, I was extremely pleased to note President Bush's recent remarks to the Environmental Youth Award winners about environmental policy. As you know, the President stated that decisions regarding environmental matters in his Administration would be, and I quote, "based upon sound science, not some environmental fad or what may sound good—that we're going to rely on the best evidence before we decide [on policy]."

After representing the Congress at two Conferences of the Parties (COP) to Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), as well as having chaired several hearings in the Congress about the sustainable use or renewable resources on the international level, I know the United States is certainly a nation that supports the consumptive use of renewable wildlife and marine resources under scientific management.

As such, I respectfully request that any future policy regarding various species—whether the subject species are elephants, whales, turtles, or trees—be based on sound science and the legal ramifications of the Uruguay Round Agreements of GATT.

I appreciate your attention to this request, and I look forward to your response. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have questions or comments.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. POMBO,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2001.

Hon. COLIN POWELL,
Secretary, U.S. Department of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY POWELL: I am writing to express my strong support for the need for science to be the fundamental guide in United States participation in international conservation commitments as legally recognized under the Uruguay Round Agreements of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

Unfortunately, the United States policy under the former-Clinton administration acted contrary to this legal concept under the tenets of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW). Specifically, it did so by continued opposition and obstructionist positions on the resumption of limited and managed whaling by island and coastal nations.

Although it is true that there was over exploitation of certain whale stocks in the 18th and 19th centuries for commercial oil products, this is not the case today. In fact, no whale stocks were ever threatened by whale harvests for human food consumption. The Scientific Committee of the governing body of the ICRW and the International Whaling Commission (IWC) has found that limited harvests would have no adverse impact on population stocks.

However, in the past, the United States and other nations have consistently opposed the resumption of limited whaling on what

amounts to purely a political agenda. For instance, the United States supported the adoption of the Southern Ocean Sanctuary for whales without any scientific basis for such a position. Further, the United States is supporting the adoption of a Pacific Ocean Sanctuary where there is no scientific basis for the establishment of such a sanctuary. Even after the Bush administration took office, the Department of State has opposed legal trade in whale products between Norway and Japan. I would sincerely urge the Bush administration to carefully review the United States policy in terms of science and law.

I must say, I was extremely pleased to note President Bush's recent remarks to the Environmental Youth Award winners about environmental policy. As you know, the President stated that decisions regarding environmental matters in his Administration would be, and I quote, "based upon sound science, not some environmental fad or what may sound good—that we're going to rely on the best evidence before we decide [on policy]."

After representing the Congress at two Conferences of the Parties (COP) to Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), as well as having chaired several hearings in the Congress about the sustainable use or renewable resources on the international level, I know the United States is certainly a nation that supports the consumptive use of renewable wildlife and marine resources under scientific management.

As such, I respectfully request that any future policy regarding various species—whether the subject species are elephants, whales, turtles, or trees—be based on sound science and the legal ramifications of the Uruguay Round Agreements of GATT.

I appreciate your attention to this request, and I look forward to your response. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have questions or comments.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. POMBO,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2001.

Hon. DON EVANS,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY EVANS: I am writing to express my strong support for the need for science to be the fundamental guide in United States participation in international conservation commitments as legally recognized under the Uruguay Round Agreements of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

Unfortunately, the United States policy under the former-Clinton administration acted contrary to this legal concept under the tenets of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW). Specifically, it did so by continued opposition and obstructionist positions on the resumption of limited and managed whaling by island and coastal nations.

Although it is true that there was over exploitation of certain whale stocks in the 18th and 19th centuries for commercial oil products, this is not the case today. In fact, no whale stocks were ever threatened by whale harvests for human food consumption. The Scientific Committee of the governing body of the ICRW and the International Whaling Commission (IWC) has found that limited harvests would have no adverse impact on population stocks.

However, in the past, the United States and other nations have consistently opposed the resumption of limited whaling on what amounts to purely a political agenda. For instance, the United States supported the adoption of the Southern Ocean Sanctuary for whales without any scientific basis for such a position. Further, the United States is supporting the adoption of a Pacific Ocean Sanctuary where there is no scientific basis for the establishment of such a sanctuary. Even after the Bush administration took office, the Department of State has opposed legal trade in whale products between Norway and Japan. I would sincerely urge the Bush administration to carefully review the United States policy in terms of science and law.

I must say, I was extremely pleased to note President Bush's recent remarks to the Environmental Youth Award winners about environmental policy. As you know, the President stated that decisions regarding environmental matters in his Administration would be, and I quote, "based upon sound science, not some environmental fad or what may sound good—that we're going to rely on the best evidence before we decide [on policy]."

After representing the Congress at two Conferences of the Parties (COP) to Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), as well as having chaired several hearings in the Congress about the sustainable use or renewable resources on the international level, I know the United States is certainly a nation that supports the consumptive use of renewable wildlife and marine resources under scientific management.

As such, I respectfully request that any future policy regarding various species—whether the subject species are elephants, whales, turtles, or trees—be based on sound science and the legal ramifications of the Uruguay Round Agreements of GATT.

I appreciate your attention to this request, and I look forward to your response. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have questions or comments.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. POMBO,
Member of Congress.

ERADICATION OF TUBERCULOSIS
ON A WORLD-WIDE BASIS

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 2001

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, as you know, infectious diseases are needlessly killing millions of people every year and cost the global community billions in healthcare costs and lost revenue. Diseases such as Tuberculosis (TB) are on the rise around the world, and due to their infectious properties, are threatening the health and welfare of Americans. TB cannot be stopped at our national borders and the only way to eliminate TB here at home is to control it abroad. In fact, according to the National Intelligence Council, new and re-emerging infectious diseases will pose a rising global health threat and will complicate U.S. and global security over the next twenty years. We must take action to address these dangers now.

I feel strongly that Congress should make a significant investment in low-cost, high-impact