his selfless service to America and to his 50 combat flights. These are distinctions one earns for going above and beyond the call of duty.

I am proud to honor Fritz with this Congressional Tribute as he is truly an American hero who exemplifies the spirit of patriotism. He is one individual who added to the collective effort to perpetuate peace and reconciliation following World War II. I commend his notable service and his efforts on the behalf of this country and wish him all of the best in the years to come.

EUROPEAN UNION OPPOSES BEIJING’S OLYMPIC BID—CONGRESS REMAINS SILENT

HON. TOM LANTOS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 2001

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on July 5th the 626-member European Parliament meeting in Strasbourg, France, adopted a resolution opposing China’s bid to host the 2008 Summer Olympics. In finding that China “clearly fails to uphold universal human, civil and political rights, including freedom of religion,” the European Parliament urges that the International Olympic Committee (IOC) “reconsider Beijing’s candidacy,” only when China has made “fundamental change in their policy on human rights, including freedom of religion and the rule of law.”

Last month, with an overwhelming bipartisan vote, the House Committee on International Relations expressed itself against China holding the Olympics by approving H. Con. Res. 73. Now the 626 Members of the European Parliament have voted and approved a similar resolution, yet we in the U.S. House of Representatives have not been given the opportunity to speak as a whole on this critical moral issue. I implore the Speaker and the Majority Leader—stop bottling up this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the entire text of the resolution concerning Beijing’s application to host the 2008 Olympic Games, as adopted by the European Parliament on July 5th, be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I urge my colleagues to review this resolution and consider our obligation to join our European colleagues in speaking out on China’s Olympic bid in the few hours that remain before the IOC vote on Friday in Moscow. Religion is persecuted; political freedom does not exist, media freedom does not exist; our airplane is forced down, our servicemen and women are held in captivity for 11 days; yet this body is not allowed to vote on whether the Olympics should be held in Beijing.

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION ON BEIJING’S BID TO HOST THE 2008 OLYMPIC GAMES

The European Parliament resolution on Beijing’s bid to host the 2008 Olympic Games The European Parliament, having regard to its previous resolutions on the situation in the People’s Republic of China (PRC), having regard to the conclusions of the General Affairs Council of 19 March 2001, in which the Council expressed its concern at the serious human rights violations in the PRC, recalling the city of Beijing hosted the 2000 Olympic Games, noting that the Charter of the Olympic Games states that Olympics has as a goal “to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of humankind, with the object of creating a peaceful society with the preservation of human dignity.”

A. Whereas the repression of freedom of opinion and freedom to hold demonstrations in favour of democracy that has been practised for decades, is continuing in the PRC, despite international protests.

B. Having regard to the repression of religious, ethnic and other minorities, in particular Tibetans, Uighurs and Mongolians and the Falun Gong movement.

C. Having regard to the frequent imposition of capital punishment, leading to over a thousand reported executions in China every year, as well as the widespread use of torture on the part of the Chinese police and military forces.

D. Recalling that the PRC has still not ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

E. Whereas the Chinese authorities have taken no significant initiatives on respect for human rights, despite the ongoing political dialogue between the EU and the PRC.

F. Concerned with regard to environmental and animal welfare issues in the PRC.

G. Stressing that the plans relating to Beijing’s bid to host the 2008 Olympic Games would involve the destruction of a large part of the old city and the obligatory transfer of the inhabitants to the surrounding areas.

H. Recalling that the International Olympic Committee is due to designate, on 13 July 2001 in Moscow, the city that will host the 2008 Olympic Games.

1. Invites the International Olympic Committee to establish guidelines to include respect for human rights and democratic principles to be applied as a general rule to host countries of Olympic Games.

2. Regrets that the PRC clearly fails to uphold universal human, civil and political rights, including freedom of religion and therefore believes that this negative record and the repression in Tibet as well as in Uighourh and in South Mongolia, make it inappropriate to award the 2008 Olympic Games to Beijing.

3. Urges the International Olympic Committee in any case to make a thorough environmental impact assessment with regard in particular to the recurrent water shortages, the impact of mass tourism and the social repercussions in the region surrounding Beijing.

4. Invites the International Olympic Committee to reconsider Beijing’s candidacy when the authorities of the PRC have made a fundamental change in their policy regarding human rights, and the promotion of democracy and the rule of law.

5. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, the Presidents of the parliaments of the Member States, and to the International Olympic Committee.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. JERRY MORAN
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 2001

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the House this week begins debate on campaign finance reform. This debate is important for a number of reasons. We need to end the practice of unlimited soft money contributions from corporations and labor unions. We need to improve disclosure requirements so that ordinary citizens know who is paying for campaigns. Most importantly, we need to restore people’s confidence that their elected officials are looking out for their interests.

In previous debates on campaign finance reform, I have supported a ban of soft money. These unregulated, unlimited contributions have cast a shadow of impropriety over electioneering efforts by both political parties. Soft money circumvents current campaign finance laws which prohibit corporate contributions to federal campaigns and limit how much an individual can contribute. Banning soft money would eliminate the largest source of questionable campaign money in elections and would help repair Congress’s tarnished public image.

Another key principle of campaign finance reform is improved disclosure. Voters have a right to know who is contributing to campaigns, how much and when. They also have a right to know who is paying for advertising and other political activities on behalf of or in opposition to candidates. Armed with this information, voters are more than capable of judging who is representing them and who is representing special interest contributors. Reform legislation should strengthen disclosure requirements and improve electronic access to campaign finance information.

I strongly support reforming our campaign finance laws, I do not support taxpayer financing of federal elections. Nor do I support proposals that infringe on the free speech rights of individuals or groups. The freedom to support or oppose candidates is fundamental to the American system of government. Public financing forces citizens to support with their tax dollars candidates they oppose at the ballot box. Similarly, it is wrong to prohibit citizens from using their own resources to advocate the election or defeat of a candidate. We need to ensure that we do not use the banner of reform to silence the voices of those who oppose us.

I will work to pass and send to President Bush a campaign finance reform bill that accomplishes true reform while protecting the rights of all citizens to participate in our democracy.

INDIAN MINORITIES SEEKING THEIR OWN STATES

HON. EDO ench TOWNs
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 2001

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in a Washington Post article on Sunday, July 8 which reported that across India, minorities are demanding their own states. For example, the article reports that the Bodos, who live in the northeast part of India, are demanding a separate state of Bodoland.

This demand underlines the fact that India is not one country any more than the Soviet Union was. Much of India’s instability can be traced to the fact that it is a multinational state