Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, whereby it has agreed to apply international standards of physical protection to the storage and transport of nuclear material under its jurisdiction or control.

Continued close cooperation with Canada in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, under the long-term extension of the U.S.-Canada Agreement for Cooperation provided for in the proposed Protocol, will serve important U.S. national security, foreign policy, and commercial interests.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed Protocol and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the Protocol and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediate consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House International Relations Committees as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 24, 1999.*

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY CAUSED BY LAPSE OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1979—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12924 of August 19, 1994, to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 24, 1999.*

IN OPPOSITION TO WORLD BANK LOAN TO CHINA

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the World Bank is about to decide whether to give China a loan to help in its efforts to colonize occupied Tibet with Chinese. Beijing's scheme with the Bank's approval would use $160 million to pay for the relocation of poor Chinese farmers onto the Tibetan Plateau.

Editorials in the Washington Post, the Washington Times and the New York Times have urged the Bank not to go through with this project. I request that copies of these editorials be included in the RECORD.

The U.S. Treasury announced on Tuesday that it is going to oppose the loan. Chinese officials have demarched embassies in Beijing with threats of economic repercussions if member states vote to oppose the loan. Twelve bank board members have cosigned a letter to President Wolfensohn expressing opposition to this project. Activists and parliamentarians from around the globe have deluged the World Bank with letters and e-mail messages opposing the loan. Over 60 Members of this Chamber signed a letter to the President of the Bank urging him to reject the loan.

For Tibetans this is not development or poverty alleviation, it is cultural genocide. This project will lead to increased ethnic tension and conflict over access to scarce natural resources. I ask my colleagues to join in opposition to this loan.

Mr. Speaker, today the World Bank will decide whether or not to give China a loan to help it in its efforts to colonize occupied Tibet with Chinese. Beijing's scheme with the Bank's approval would use 160 million dollars to pay for the relocation of poor Chinese farmers onto the Tibetan Plateau.

This week, editorials in the Washington Post, the Washington Times and the New York Times urged that the Bank not go through with the loan. I ask that copies of the editorials be placed in the RECORD.

The U.S. announced on Tuesday that it will oppose the loan.

Chinese officials have demarched embassies in Beijing with threats of economic repercussions if member states vote to oppose the loan.

Twelve Bank Board members have cosigned a letter to President Wolfensohn expressing opposition to the loan project.

Activists and parliamentarians from around the globe have deluged the World Bank with letters and e-mail messages opposing the loan.

Over sixty Members of this chamber signed a letter to the President of the Bank urging him to reject the loan.

China's population transfer program is a long-standing effort to resettle Chinese in Tibet to increase its assimilation.

The World Bank loan would be the first time international financing, including U.S. dollars would be funding population transfer.

For Tibetans, it is not development or poverty alleviation, it is cultural genocide.

The World Bank, in violation of World Bank policy, failed to make an environmental analysis available to the public before the project went to appraisal.

The Bank also failed to undertake a full environmental assessment, provided no accounting of the impact on indigenous Tibetan and Mongolian peoples in the resettlement area, and neglected to evaluate the impact on fragile natural habitats.

The project will likely lead to increased ethnic tension and conflict over access to scarce natural resources.

And opposition to the project could land Tibetans in a Chinese prison. The official Chinese news agency has labeled opposition to the resettlement as a part of an ''anti-China'' plot.

Mr. Speaker, the World Bank has been placed on notice that it has to stay out of politics. It should stick to its mandate of poverty alleviation and not disenfranchise people who are struggling for their very existence.

China is one of the major recipients of World Bank money. It should not be dictating to terms of the loans to anyone.

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1999]

THE U.N.'S NEW CHINA PROJECT

The World Bank's technical people, having launched 31 ''poverty reduction projects'' in China, saw no problem with No. 32. That is why, incredibly, only when British Tibet advocates started spreading the word seven or eight weeks ago did the bank learn of the project's political aspect: It would resettle some 60,000 poor Chinese farmers on land Tibetans say is traditionally theirs.

The word offended the bank's biggest shareholder, the United States. Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin, expressing doubt about the staff-proposed $160 million loan, has said he is ''inclined'' to oppose it. Needless to say, the bank's largest borrower, China, is also among the offended. It has threatened to ''reevaluate its relationship with the bank'' if the project does not unfold as planned.

The World Bank's board is due to vote on the question today. From an American standpoint, any vote on the merits has to be a simple one. As the Tibet lobbyists say, the project puts the bank in the position of underwriting the resettlement of Han Chinese and Chinese Muslims into a traditionally Tibetan and Mongolian area on the Tibetan plateau. Had this factor been fed into deliberations in a more timely fashion, no doubt the project would have been handled differently. It becomes a political embarrassment to deal with the project now. But it is an unavoidable and manageable embarrassment. The World Bank cannot accidentally become the instrument of a Chinese policy that affects the survival of Tibetans as a distinct people and culture.

The bank itself has a structural problem. The line between technical and political is obviously too sharp. Or the bank has been slow to grasp that decentralization works poorly when a heavy burden of accountability is devolved upon countries such as China that do not provide adequately for a free flow of information or for a space for dissent.

[From the Washington Times, June 22, 1999]

ETHNIC CLEANSING AND THE WORLD BANK

In a stunning display of insensitivity towards the plight of the Tibetan people, today the World Bank board is scheduled to vote on a project that would grant the Chinese government a $160 million loan to resettle 57,775 Han Chinese and Chinese Muslims farmers into a historically Tibetan territory. The move is being defended by China and the

World Bank as a simple initiative to give poor farmers greater access to arable land. The undeniable byproduct of such a project would be to undercut Tibetan territory and dilute the Tibetan culture.

It seems inconceivable that in the wake of NATO's air campaign to enforce human rights in Yugoslavia, the World Bank would fund an ethnic cleansing initiative in China. This is what the World Bank project would amount to if approved, however.

''In order to consolidate control over Tibetan areas, the Chinese government has undertaken a policy of moving Chinese citizens into these areas,'' 60 congressmen said in a letter to World Bank President James Wolfensohn. The project would ''facilitate the Chinese government's destructive transfer policy.'' The administration, on the other hand, has failed to voice clear opposition to the project. U.S. Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin said he was ''inclined'' to oppose it. He should try to incline himself to muster vigorous opposition.

The area in which the project would be carried out has the highest concentration of prisoners of any single county in China. According to John Ackerly, a spokesperson for International Campaign for Tibet, the bank would inevitably support prison labor by working in such a territory. The bank would have to depend on either prison labor itself or on goods produced by that labor, Mr. Ackerly added.

Not so, claims the World Bank. David Theis, chief of the World Bank's external affairs, said that local and provincial Chinese authorities assured the bank no ''prison labor will be involved or benefit from this project.'' Somehow, these assurances are not comforting.

The World Bank is also accused of running roughshod over its own environmental guidelines to give the loan swift approval. The bank insists that it gave the project a rigorous environmental review, but circumstantial evidence isn't supportive. China, due to its economical development of the past few years, will no longer be eligible for loans doled out by the bank's International Development Association after July 1. These loans are typically interest free and paid over a 40 year period. Interestingly, the vote on the project was scheduled suspiciously close to the cut off date and the project's environmental review was conducted swifter than most.

Unsurprisingly, China is allegedly pushing hard to get the loan approved. Apart from the obvious economic benefits, the loan would effectively grant the regime an international rubber stamp of its relocation policy. The regime has threatened reevaluated its relationship with the bank if the loan isn't approved. The World Bank should make clear it is free to do so.

The bank has long been derided for aiding and abetting corrupt and spendthrift regimes. It surely doesn't want to be labeled the benefactor of ethnic cleansing campaigns. The board should vote down the project today.

[From The New York Times, June 23, 1999]

LOAN FOR A LAND GRAB

The World Bank's board of executive directors ought to reject a loan package to China that would be used to relocate about 58,000 impoverished Chinese and Hui Muslim farmers to a remote area on the Tibetan plateau traditionally inhabited by Tibetans and Mongolians. In the past, China has used migration policies to tighten control over Tibetan areas and to diminish the viability of the distinct Tibetan culture. The World Bank should not be in the business of financing this destructive scheme.

The Chinese Government has rejected criticism of the project and insists on going forward. But approving this loan may violate the bank's own guidelines for assessing the social and environmental impacts of its projects. Dozens of international environmental groups, Tibetan activists and 60 members of Congress have written to James Wolfensohn, president of the World Bank, to oppose the resettlement. The Clinton Administration also announced its opposition yesterday.

The ostensible purpose of the project is to give desperately poor farmers in Western China a better life. But this plan would move them from badly eroded land to a barren high-altitude plain, currently used by nomads, that is itself environmentally fragile. Even though the project would involve construction of a dam and extensive irrigation works, it did not receive a full environmental assessment. Nor does it appear that the plan fully complies with World Bank policies designed to protect ethnic minorities and indigenous peoples from the adverse effects of development.

The World Bank has worked hard to overcome its reputation for insensitivity to local cultural and ecological concerns. Approval of this loan would be a significant step backward.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, 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 Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS 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 gentlewoman 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.)

BASEBALL

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, America has a long-standing fascination with baseball.

Perhaps only apple pie and the American flag can compete with its association to this country.

And with good reason.

Baseball, like many team sports, is beloved in part because of the unity it brings to our nation's communities.

Poet Walt Whitman once wrote, ''I see great things in baseball. It's our game—the American game. It will take our people out-of-doors, fill them with oxygen, give them a larger physical stoicism. (It will) repair these losses and be a blessing to us.''

Throughout times of hardship and strife, baseball has been a constant source of entertainment and pride, on both a local and national level.

In towns and cities across the country, friends and family gather together to pull for the home team, play baseball together in their backyards, or gather around their televisions to cheer for their favorite players.

In the Third District of North Carolina, which I am proud to represent, a group of young men recently gave their community and the entire state a reason to celebrate.

The Rose High baseball team from Greenville, NC had an undefeated season this year, winning 28 games and capturing the second 4–A State title in three years.

These 29 young men embody the spirit of teamwork.

They have proven that with enough hard work and dedication, success is within the reach of every young person who dares to achieve it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that every one of these outstanding baseball players can appreciate their victory.

But what they have learned on their path to success may be even more valuable than a perfect 28–0 season.

One of the greatest lessons that I learned growing up, playing team sports, is the ability to work together to accomplish a goal.

Playing baseball and basketball in school, I learned to work hard because I knew that my teammates were depending on me to always do my best.

This work ethic is something that I have carried with me throughout my life.

I use it now in Congress to face the challenges of working with 434 other Members of the House.

Sometimes we have disagreements, but our greatest successes come when we work together as a team.

The Rose High Rampant's have already mastered this lesson.

And all the while, they have let us watch and cheer from the sidelines.

Mr. Speaker, part of the enjoyment in watching these young men play and succeed is watching the families and the community that rally behind the players.

Baseball is a team sport and its instills a sense of excitement and enthusiasm to all that watch and participate behind the scenes.

Because of the community spirit that baseball inspires, when Rose won, we all won.

I salute the players, coaches, families, and fans that made this championship possible.

To the players . . . James Bengala, Jr., Kenneth Biggs, Jeffrey Blick, William Brinson, Ashley Capps, David Creech, John Finch, Brian Flye, Michael Gordon, Matthew Grace, Michael Harrington, Kelly Hodges, Dylan Jackson, John Landen, Vincent Langston, Jefferson Lea, Vincent Logan, Demond Mayo, Julian Morgan, Adrian Moye, James Paige, IV, Bryan Pair, Justin Phillips, Robert Riggs II, William Teel, Reid Twine, Adam Tysinger, Joseph White, and Jesse Williams III.

Coach Ronald Vincent and assistant coaches . . . Paul Hill, Marvin Jarman, Steven Lovett, Ryan Meadows, and Eric Jarman and coaches, congratulations.

You brought together your community.

And through your dedication and hard work, you have made us all proud.

Thank you Rose High State champions for letting us share in your success.