Notification allows for early medical treatment which can prolong and improve lives. It also curtails the spread of HIV, and therefore, saves lives.

Studies confirm that only *10 percent or less* of people who have recently tested HIV-positive manage, by themselves, to notify their partners.

Between *50 percent and 90 percent* of those who tested positive cooperate voluntarily with notification. Further, even higher proportions of those partners contacted- usually 90 percent or more- voluntarily obtain an HIV test.

An overwhelming number of Americans believe that the rights of partners of those infected with HIV should be balanced against medical privacy rights held by the infected partners according to a poll published in the New York Post.

Legislation requiring spousal notification has already been signed into law (Public Law 104–146). It makes perfect sense to expand notification to all of those who may have been exposed to HIV.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has concluded that even if only one in 80 notifications results in preventing a new case of HIV-infection, given the huge medical and social costs of every case, notification pays for itself.

The American Medical Association (AMA) has endorsed non-consensual partner notification for HIV infection and CDC has required states to establish procedures for partner notification for AIDS.

More than 30 states have enacted specific HIV partner notification provisions as of July 1994 and several others have passed laws allowing for the disclosure of HIV information in response to a court order.

It is estimated that between 630,000 to 900,000 Americans are living with HIV infection and about 50,000 people became infected with HIV each year. Sadly, most of those infected do not know it and do not get tested until they are already sick with AIDS-related disease. By this point, they have been denied the medical care that can prolong their lives and stave off illness and may have infected others unknowingly.

Aggressive partner notification will also bring greater safety to our nation's blood supply

HIV TESTING FOR SEXUAL OFFENSES

The HIV Prevention Act requires that those accused of sexual offenses be tested for HIV.

Many times the victims of rape and other sexual assaults also become victims of HIV.

Because HIV is incurable, rape and molestation victims must have the right to know if they have been exposed to HIV as soon after exposure as possible so they can immediately begin medical treatment if necessary.

Victims can not rely solely on testing themselves for the disease because there is often a lag time that can last for several months between HIV exposure and infection. Therefore, the only timely, logical and practical way for a victim to know if they may be at risk of HIV is to learn the status of their attacker.

Most states allow for victims to find out whether their attackers have HIV, but only after convicted of an assault, which may take many months or even years.

Even if the victim tests negative, knowing the status of their assailant provides many victims with a sense of relief and allows them to seek further medical advice and take precautions if positive.

HIV AND MEDICAL PROCEDURES

The HIV Prevention Act protects both health care patients and professionals from inadvertent exposure to HIV. It would do this by encouraging medical associations to establish guidelines for providers with HIV to follow in the performance of any risk prone invasive medical procedure on a patient and by allowing providers to test a patient for HIV before performing such a procedure if the provider considers such a test necessary.

Both health care professionals and patients should be given the ability to protect themselves from unwarranted HIV exposure.

A recent study of hospital nurses concluded that workplace stress due to the fear of HIV contagion is high and the most effective way to reduce fear is to inform staff of the HIV status of patients.

Similar proposals regarding patients and health care providers passed the Senate overwhelming in 1991, but were later dropped in conference.

The public would like doctors and dentists with AIDS or HIV to be legally required to inform their patients of their health status according to 93% of those polled in a New York Post survey.

IRRESPONSIBLE BEHAVIORS INVOLVING HIV

The HIV Prevention Act expresses the sense of the Congress that States should criminalize irresponsible behaviors by those who are infected.

Those who are infected with any disease have a responsibility to prevent transmitting the disease to others. Because no cure exists for HIV, those who knowingly place others at risk of infection are endangering innocent lives.

79% of Americans believe that those who knowingly infect another person with HIV should face criminal charges. Half of those surveyed said that people who knowingly transmit the virus should be charged with murder.

CONFIDENTIALITY AND HIV

The HIV Prevention Act expresses the sense of Congress that strict confidentiality must be observed at all times in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2823) to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes:

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2823, the International Dolphin Act, lowers tough U.S. standards, governing the use of the ''dolphin safe'' label on tuna sold in our country, to accommodate foreign fishermen and foreign governments.

In its present form, this bill should be opposed. Not only will it lead to the killing of more dolphins, but it will also break a promise that the House of Representatives made to the American public 4 years ago concerning the North American Free Trade Agreement and other trade agreements with which we comply.

At that time, I brought to the floor a resolution which promised the American public that the United States would not weaken any of its domestic environmental laws, laws protecting public health and safety, or consumer protection laws in order to meet our international trade obligations. That resolution passed the House unanimously.

The bill we are considering breaks that promise we made to the American people. This legislation weakens standards that have been in effect for 6 years governing use of the ''dolphin safe'' label on tuna sold in the United States.

Current U.S. standards prohibit the chasing, harassing, or injuring of dolphin, in order for tuna to be labeled ''dolphin safe.'' These prohibitions have been in the Marine Mammal Protection Act since 1972.

However, H.R. 2823 says the ''dolphin safe'' label could be used as long as no dolphins are killed during the setting of a tuna net. As a result, this bill would let tuna be labeled as ''dolphin safe'', even though the fishermen who catch it may be in violation of the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

Why are we making these changes in longstanding U.S. policy? It is simply because Mexico and other South American governments are pushing for it.

Our first priority should be our promises to American consumers, not the concerns of foreign governments and foreign fishermen.

Proponents of this legislation say we need to change our standards to bring the United States into compliance with our trade obligations. That simply is not true.

This bill goes far beyond what is needed to comply with trade agreements to which we are a party. Mexico and other governments are simply using our trade agreements as an excuse to force other changes in U.S. law that are not justified and should not be made.

Mr. Chairman, an amendment will be offered later by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] which reiterates current U.S. policy on the use of the ''dolphin safe'' label. The amendment would not change, however, those provisions of the bill designed to bring the U.S. into compliance with trade agreements.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. Unless the gentleman's amendment is adopted, the bill should be defeated.

CONGRATULATIONS TO NEW HOPE BAPTIST CHURCH OF NEWARK, NEW JERSEY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1996

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the New Hope Baptist Church of Newark, NJ. On Sunday, September 15, 1996, they will celebrate the 93rd Founder's Day and Mortgage Burning Service. I ask my colleagues to join with me in praising their diligence and applaud them on a job well done. Their level of community service is phenomenal and the 10th District of New Jersey is fortunate to have this church as one of our own.

New Hope Baptist Church was organized in 1903 by two sisters, Addie and Maggie Divine. Their first pastor was Reverend Jesse Williams. The current pastor, Rev. Charles Everett Thomas, began his tenure position at New