

an entire generation of people have been lost. The people of Southern Sudan are voiceless. They have no big law firms downtown to represent them. They have no powerful lobbyists. They have no interests in this Congress. I am pleased that the gentleman from Ohio took the time to go to be a voice for the voiceless.

Let us hope with his trip, we can begin to put together a process whereby we can bring peace to Southern Sudan and not lose another generation. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his efforts.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend my good friend Rep. TONY HALL for traveling to Sudan to see first-hand what is taking place there. He saw devastation and starvation—an entire generation lost on account of the brutal war that has been raging for over a decade. Slavery, terrorism, starvation, and genocide—all are occurring on a regular basis in Sudan. Now is the time to do more to bring peace to Sudan—a place where over 1.5 million people have died. The Sudanese people cannot take much more. An entire generation has already been lost.

The people of Southern Sudan are poor and voiceless. They have no access to high-priced lobbyists or expensive public relations firms. They are relying on the American Government to help them. They have no other hope.

I am glad my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), went to look at the atrocities taking place in Sudan. I look forward to working with him to help bring an end to this brutal war.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BONIOR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DELAHUNT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ENGEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REMEMBERING ROBERT F. KENNEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, 30 years ago this week, Bobby Kennedy was taken from us by an assassin's bullet. I remember that night all too clearly, and I still feel the sadness of the loss. Today I want to take a moment to honor this public servant who was so committed to the cause of social justice and fairness.

It was my great pleasure, my great honor, to have worked with Bobby Kennedy, to have known him. As I worked with this man, I grew to respect, admire and love him. He cared so much and he cared so deeply. He was a man so full of life, so driven by a vision for a better world. He had a fierce determination to enforce the civil rights laws of this Nation. And later he became a one-man crusade across the country, speaking out against hunger and poverty. To paraphrase his brother, Senator Ted KENNEDY, Bobby Kennedy "saw wrong and tried to right it, saw suffering and tried to heal it, saw war and tried to stop it."

This man, this great man that we lost when he was so young, he spoke from his heart and from his gut. He had the ability and the capacity to look beyond the accepted way.

This was a man who took off his jacket, his coat. He had the ability to loosen his tie and to travel outside of the usual circles. He went to visit poor blacks in the heart of the Mississippi delta and gave them hope. He visited low-income whites in Appalachia to bring them encouragement. He went to the barrios in the Southwest and he brought them inspiration. He went to the reservations and brought care and compassion. He knew that some in this great Nation of ours were in trouble, and he wanted to help.

He was a wonderful, loving, compassionate person and leader. Bobby Kennedy used to say that we did not need a revolution in the streets, but in our hearts and in our minds. He wanted people to engage in meaningful dialogue, on poverty, on race, on the pressing issues of the day.

Today, 30 years after his death, his voice, his commitment and his leadership are deeply missed and remembered. I for one will never forget Robert F. Kennedy, his wisdom, his wit, his moral courage, and his vision.

PROTECTING INNOCENT SPOUSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. EHRLICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EHRLICH. Madam Speaker, a few months ago I wrote an article in one of my local papers concerning a constituent who left her ex-husband 13 years ago after what she described as an abusive marriage. The Internal Revenue Service had targeted my constituent for payment of a \$29,000 tax debt which was her former husband's personal responsibility. As a result, for a decade the IRS became a fixed, unwanted presence in her life.

When my constituent appealed to the IRS for relief under what are known as the innocent spouse provisions of the Tax Code, the IRS told her she did not qualify, even though she is a textbook example of the kind of person the innocent spouse provisions are supposed to help. The fact that she does not qualify for help under existing law told me all I needed to know about the need for change in the IRS code.

The IRS reform bill passed by the House last year did not specifically address the plight of many innocent spouses. Similar legislation under consideration by the Senate, however, does toughen innocent spouse protections. The House should follow suit and enact legislation to ensure women like my constituent will never be twice victimized, first by an abusive spouse and then by the government.

Accordingly, I have introduced H.R. 3650, a bill to repeal joint and several liability of spouses who file their tax returns married filing jointly. My bill will enable a spouse to accept liability for Federal taxes resulting only from his or her income rather than the total liability for all of the couple's taxes. Had the Ehrlich bill been law at that

time, my constituent and countless others would have been spared years of IRS pressure.

Moreover, I am impressed by the fact that someone would step forward in order to help prevent future innocent spouses from going through what my constituent had to go through. Mr. Speaker, I unveiled my bill at an April 15 Tax Day news conference in front of IRS headquarters in Baltimore. That night, a local TV news anchor, informed of how the bill would alleviate unwarranted IRS pressure on innocent spouses, called H.R. 3650 a no-brainer. I am optimistic that a majority of my colleagues in the House will agree.

H.R. 3650 has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. Both Democrats and Republicans have shown a keen interest in the bill. Senator ALPHONSE D'AMATO of New York is actively working to pass identical legislation in the United States Senate. I hope that my colleagues will join me in taking IRS reform a step further to protect many of our Nation's most vulnerable taxpayers.

INDIA AND PAKISTAN'S RECENT NUCLEAR DETONATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCKEON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago India detonated five nuclear devices, a course of action that it has not followed for 24 years since its first nuclear test in 1974. A week ago Pakistan, too, detonated five devices. This was Pakistan's first testing ever. Through the irresponsible actions of both India and Pakistan, two more nations of the world have declared themselves nuclear weapons states. In the course of these critical 2 weeks, our planet has returned towards the days of nuclear peril, the likes of which have not been seen since the most tense days of the Cold War.

To be fair, both nations gave what were seemingly plausible reasons for their nuclear arms program. For India, Prime Minister Vajpayee stated that its nuclear development was due to the fact that it was surrounded by two hostile neighbors. One, which has clashed with India in three wars this century, engaged in a subversive war in the Indian states of Jammu and Kashmir and has engaged in a provocative ballistic missile program, and the other neighbor, the PRC, a declared nuclear weapons state, has fought against India along its northern border.

□ 1800

Pakistan claims that India provoked it. Pakistan, a nation of 132 million, has been in the shadow of its much larger neighbor since the partition that divided the subcontinent and created both nations in 1947. Fearful of its larger neighbor's intentions, Pakistan began its nuclear program clandestinely after the Indian test of 1974.

But, Mr. Speaker, the real issue here is not who did what to who. Both nations can point to a litany of reasons why they should be suspicious of each other. While the two nations are but 50 years old, their shared cultural history spans thousands of years, and we know that their grievances do as well.

Today, South Asia is on the brink of a nuclear arms race. Yesterday, the New York Times reported that India's defense budget has been increased by 14 percent. In addition, the Indian Department of Space's budget was increased by 62 percent and the Indian Atomic Energy Commission by 68 percent. You can be sure that the military accounts on these two agencies received the lion's share of this increase. In all likelihood, Pakistan is sure to match these increases in their own nuclear and military programs.

The tragedy in this spiraling arms race is that many millions of impoverished and illiterate men, women and children of Pakistan and India are being left out in the cold as scarce resources are being spent on ballistic weapons and nuclear missiles.

Since its adoption, both India and Pakistan have never been party to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; and, despite the fact that 149 nations have endorsed it, both have refused recently to endorse its recent renewal. Their citing of the so-called inequity of the CTBT, which does not require the five declared nuclear states to abandon their nuclear programs, rings hollow in light of their recent actions. Indeed, India has long called for complete worldwide nuclear disarmament. Yet regardless of India's perceived security threats, it has never had to follow this course of action. Equally, Pakistan missed a golden opportunity to take the high road by not performing nuclear tests in response to India's. Despite efforts by the Clinton administration, Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif decided to follow India on the path towards nuclear bliss and strategic uncertainty.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly protest the actions of the governments of India and Pakistan. Nuclear weapons are not the answer. These tests were an act of extreme violence, and the testing of nuclear weapons have opened a Pandora's box in South Asia. Through this violence they show the world how meek they truly are, for it is the emboldened and brave who choose the path of peace.

I ask all my colleagues to join me in sending India and Pakistan a strong message of disapproval and to support the President in his use of economic and military sanctions.

Mahatma Gandhi once said: "Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is the last article of my faith. But I had to make my choice. I believe non-violence is infinitely superior to violence, forgiveness is more manly than punishment, strength does not come from physical capacity, it comes from indomitable will. We have better work

to do, a better mission to deliver to the world."

I sincerely hope that both Pakistan and India remember the words of Gandhi. The prayers of humanity rest on the hope that the millions of India and Pakistan will find a way to live together peacefully in the next century. We know the horrors that nuclear weapons can bring, and that cannot be the road to peace.

GLOBAL NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT: THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE TO A NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, the 11 nuclear detonations conducted by India and Pakistan this past month demonstrated in graphic fashion the weakness of present international efforts to control nuclear proliferation. The tests also revealed the folly of economic sanctions in deterring nuclear proliferation when balanced against asserted interests of national security.

In a recent opinion editorial piece in the Washington Post, physicist Zia Mian and professor Frank Von Hippel of Princeton University provide an answer to proliferation that I fully support, and I want to share this with my colleagues.

They advocate, and I quote, "India's and Pakistan's nuclear tests are a challenge that can be met in either of two ways. One would be to simply recreate the nuclear status quo with two more nuclear weapon states and accept the enormous dangers for the people of India and Pakistan and the rest of the world. The alternative would be to take international steps to devalue nuclear weapons' possessions by moving the nuclear goal posts towards disarmament."

"The history of the past 50 years teaches that nuclear weapons are unusable for rational military purposes and that their existence makes ordinary human miscalculation or madness potentially catastrophic. Yet the nuclear weapon states act as if they are giants in the world of pygmies, creating imagination in many countries and a temptation for nationalistic parties such as India's newly governing BJP."

And I further quote from this article, Mr. Speaker. "India is behaving like a state that has successfully broken into the nuclear club, and Pakistan, after hesitating over the likely ruinous price of membership, has decided that it must join as well. Israel slipped in long ago, thanks to the United States being willing to cast a blind eye in its direction. Other States such as Iran and Iraq and perhaps South Korea, Taiwan and Japan wait in the wings.

"To break this dynamic, the United States, Russia and other charter members of the nuclear club must make it more credible that they really intend to put the nuclear club out of business.