

against human rights. We must stand for human rights around the world.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, this was an outstanding effort to raise up the bonding between Africa and the United States, and I believe it is only a start and we must continue to work together to make it a reality.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN MUST BE DISQUALIFIED AS A SITE FOR REPOSITORY OF DEADLIEST MATERIAL EVER MADE BY MAN

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of storing nuclear waste in Nevada suffered a huge setback last week when scientists from the California Institute of Technology and Harvard University reported that the strain in the Earth's crust near Yucca Mountain makes it at least 10 times more prone to earthquakes and lava flows than government scientists previously estimated.

The study commissioned by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission concluded that the ground around Yucca Mountain could stretch more than 3 feet over the next 1,000 years. While this may not sound like a great deal of movement, this distance is a distance that would easily crush any canister of nuclear waste buried there, exposing a wide area including the water table of the Southwest to deadly radioactivity and pollution.

When the original criteria for a long term nuclear storage site was created, the Environmental Protection Agency ruled that any site that would be stable for 10,000 years would be appropriate for a high-level nuclear waste dump. However, now this latest data shows that the ground around Yucca Mountain will not be stable for even one-tenth of that time. It is a sure bet though, if we give the U.S. Department of Energy a scientific reason to doubt the wisdom of storing high-level waste at Yucca Mountain, the agency will simply ignore the findings.

Nevada ranks third in the Nation for current seismic and earthquake activity. Earthquake databases indicate that since 1976 there have been 621 seismic events of a magnitude greater than 2.5 within a 50-mile radius of Yucca Mountain. The most notable event that occurred this period was a earthquake with a magnitude of 5.6 that occurred in 1992.

Now, the mountain ranges and valleys in the Yucca Mountain area are a result of millions of years of intense faulting and volcanism. With 33 earthquake faults and more than 30 earthquakes a year, Yucca Mountain is not geologically safe. Any nuclear accident at Yucca Mountain could send invisible but deadly radioactive dust across the Nation, contaminating everyone and everything in its path, since the winds blowing across the country move from West to East.

Mr. Speaker, on December 1997 an incident occurred near Kingman, Arizona in which a truck carrying radioactive waste had leaked from one of its nuclear waste containers. The nuclear waste canister leaks proved that transporting this refuse poses a real threat to our children and our communities. DOE's previous statement and guarantees made about the safety of transporting nuclear waste are now clearly irrelevant.

Their findings confess to four reasons why this incident occurred. First, containers were used for shipping after design flaws were identified in earlier container failures. Second, lack of understanding of the properties of the waste, specifically that excess free liquid would form during transportation. Third, lack of formality and rigor in contractor oversight between DOE Fernald and DOE Nevada. And finally, fourth, failure to provide the appropriate attention and oversight to these shipments because of the relatively low potential threat to public health and safety.

Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management Jim Owendoff stated, "We are troubled by lapses in contractor management and DOE oversight, especially because problems with the containers had been identified on previous occasions."

These canister leaks were not caused by an accident or other large catastrophe. The Accident Investigation Board concluded that stress fractures caused the leaks in the shipping containers and were widened by vibration and wear associated with normal highway transport. Yet the DOE would have us believe that canisters that cannot withstand highway travel are impervious to earthquakes and other natural disasters.

When looking ahead to the possibility of canisters carrying high-level nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain, Nevada, canisters that carry 10 times the long-lived radiation that the bomb on Hiroshima released, citizens across this country must be protected, and cannot be threatened and endangered by canister leaks caused by simple highway vibrations.

Yucca Mountain must be disqualified as a site for a temporary or a permanent repository for the deadliest material ever made by man. The Department of Energy cannot safely transport nuclear waste, and this Congress wants to store the refuse in the third most active earthquake area in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it becomes apparent that the lives of our constituents and their communities depend on the decisions we make on this floor. I encourage all Members and the American people to learn the true science surrounding this issue, for our children and their future depend on it.

THIS IS NOT THE END OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I notice the gentleman from Nevada, who is just leaving the room, arrived here almost 12 hours ago and began the session today. It is now ended, we are in special orders, and it has been quite a day.

This was the day we were supposed to deal with substantive debate on campaign finance reform. It is now 11 p.m. in the Nation's Capital. As I speak, here in the East they are watching the last minute of the national collegiate basketball championships. We have Members, as you heard earlier, that came back from Africa today; we had Members that spent the day in New Mexico. It has been quite a day.

But I think what is so shocking to me and to many other people who spoke today is that today, with all of these other activities, was the day we were going to try to adopt in this House a comprehensive campaign finance reform bill, and we had votes on bills. There were four bills up today. They were under extraordinarily difficult procedures. No amendments were allowed, no Democratic bills, there were not bipartisan bills on the floor. A vote was taken on the Republican bill, H.R. 3581, and that vote, I think after you heard the comments, people were not surprised that that bill because what it did was, it did not do campaign reform.

It tripled the total Federal limit from \$25,000 to \$75,000 that can be given to a campaign, it tripled the party contributions from \$20,000 to \$60,000, and it doubled the individual, which under present law is \$1,000, and would increase it to \$2,000. I think what this body saw was by putting more money into campaigns you cannot call that campaign finance reform.

And so this House in an overwhelming bipartisan effort rejected that bill brought here by the leadership of the House, brought here with the idea that this was going to be the most substantive bill on campaign reform, and as the vote was tallied tonight you saw that it got 74 votes in favor of it and 337 votes against it and one abstention.

I think that the tragedy is that, perhaps for a lot of people leaving tonight in frustration, was that now that we have been there and done that, that campaign finance reform is over. I hope not. The issue started in this House. It started when the President of the United States came and, Mr. Speaker, spoke right in front of the podium you are now at and asked this House to give him a complete, comprehensive campaign finance reform bill in a timely fashion. We missed the deadlines, we missed any action last year on the bill, and now we have a vote that has rejected a bad bill.

Let us hope that that is not the end. Let us hope that we can do several

things. One is regroup, because I think the public is going to be outraged by this action tonight and bring to the floor a true bipartisan bill or all the bills, and allow all of them that were not discussed here today to be voted on. We can do that by signing the discharge petition, and I hope my colleagues have; I know I have and many others have.

But let us bring a bill that does some reform. This bill tonight had no cap or no limit on what you could spend; it had no ban on soft money. What was passed in the House were noncontroversial issues, essentially saying that you have to be a United States citizen to contribute to a campaign. I am very curious that a House that has been so concerned about unfunded mandates would pass such a comprehensive law, requiring the FEC to monitor the nationality and the citizenship of everybody who contributes to a campaign either in kind or by money, because that is going to be very difficult to do, very difficult to enforce.

And so I think what we have passed here tonight is another huge unfunded mandate which may cripple the FEC, the Federal Elections Commission.

The other thing we did was to pass a bill that says let us file reports in a timely fashion electronically, and obviously that had overwhelming support. But this, my colleagues, is not campaign finance reform. Campaign finance reform has not been voted on by the House of Representatives, we have not dealt with the issue in a substantive way, we have not had a bipartisan bill on the floor, and, Mr. Speaker, as I close I hope that you will convey to your leader that we may have had a day discussing some bad bills, but we have not yet dealt with campaign finance reform.

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

(Mr. HUTCHINSON 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 Illinois (Mr. EWING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EWING 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 Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule

I, the Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3579, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-473) on the resolution (H. Res. 402) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3579) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL SERVICES ACT OF 1998

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-474) on the resolution (H. Res. 403) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 1998

A PORTION OF THE FOLLOWING SPECIAL ORDER WAS INADVERTENTLY OMITTED

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to address an extremely significant issue that relates to our schools, that relates to some of our most cherished principles as citizens of the United States of America and that unfortunately involves things which the courts of the United States have thrust upon the people despite the unwillingness of the people, in fact despite great concern and opposition by the public.

This relates, Mr. Speaker, to the matter of what happens in our public schools. It relates to the practices that

have gone on for generations upon generations in this country involving prayer in public bodies, in particular, in our schools.

I am not talking about this just to be talking about it, Mr. Speaker. I am doing it because we are going to have an opportunity in the next few weeks here in the House of Representatives to vote on correcting what the courts in the United States have done, what the U.S. Supreme Court has done in its bans and restrictions and prohibitions on the practice of simple prayers being offered at public school. That particular legislation is the Religious Freedom Amendment, House Joint Resolution 78. I am privileged to be the principal sponsor of it. There are over 150 Members of this body who are sponsors as well. I would like to share with my colleagues the text of that. The Religious Freedom Amendment is very simple and straightforward and tries to return us to what were bedrock principles of this country until the Supreme Court began undercutting those principles some 36 years ago. The text is very straightforward and reads as follows as an amendment to the U.S. Constitution:

To secure the people's right to acknowledge God according to the dictates of conscience, neither the United States nor any State shall establish any official religion, but the people's right to pray and to recognize their religious beliefs, heritage or traditions on public property, including schools, shall not be infringed. Neither the United States nor any State shall require any person to join in prayer or other religious activity, prescribe school prayers, discriminate against religion or deny equal access to a benefit on account of religion.

It is simple and it is straightforward. It states that just as the constitutions of every single State in this country state, we believe in the people's right to acknowledge God, and expressly mentions him, as the constitutions of the States do. No official religion, but not these restrictions that are put on prayer and positive expressions of religious faith but that are not applied to other forms of speech.

Why is religious speech singled out for discrimination? Mr. Speaker, in 1962, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that even when participation was voluntary and even if it was some sort of non-sectarian prayer, it was unconstitutional, they said, for school children to join together in a prayer in their classroom. That was followed by other Supreme Court decisions, *Stone v. Graham* in 1980, in which the U.S. Supreme Court said that the Ten Commandments could not be displayed on the walls of a public school. Mr. Speaker, I would note that that decision came out of your home State of Kentucky because it was Kentucky schools that had the practice. Groups would make copies of the Ten Commandments available and they would be hung with other important documents as the source of law as well as the source of spiritual guidance.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, here in the Chamber of this House as I am facing