

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### IN SUPPORT OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

HON. BOB RILEY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Balanced Budget Amendment.

For too many years Congress has made broken promises and halfhearted attempts to balance the Federal budget. With a national debt in excess of \$5 trillion, we cannot wait another day.

I am committed to enacting a Balanced Budget Amendment for the sake of our children and their future.

My message is simple, the Federal Government must learn to exercise the same fiscal restraints that families and businesses operate under each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, the Balanced Budget Amendment is the only way to guarantee that the Federal deficit will continue on a downward path to zero.

The real victor in the balanced budget debate is the American family. A balanced budget would result in an enormous savings for working Americans.

A balanced budget is not about numbers, its about people and families. Most importantly, its about our moral obligation to stop robbing future generations of the opportunities and prosperity they deserve.

It is irresponsible for us to keep passing our burdens onto our children. The time has come for Congress to represent the will of the people and take responsibility for balancing our Federal budget.

I urge my colleagues to support enactment of the Balanced Budget Amendment.

### THE PRESIDENT IS CORRECT—NOW IS THE TIME TO APPROVE THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, for at least two decades, Republican and Democratic administrations have worked to develop an international convention that will ban the production of chemical weapons and establish an international control regime to make it more difficult to produce these horrible weapons of mass destruction.

Shortly after I became the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations and Human Rights of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in early 1993, President Clinton and Secretary of State Christopher submitted the Chemical Weapons Convention to the Senate for ratification. Since legislation to implement the con-

vention requires the approval of both House of Congress, officials of the administration briefed me and members of my subcommittee on its provisions and the legislation necessary to implement that agreement.

This is truly an agreement with broad bipartisan consensus. International negotiations were begun on this agreement during the Reagan administration. The complex negotiations were continued and then completed during the Bush administration. It was the Clinton administration which conducted the final review of the agreement and then submitted the completed agreement to the Senate for ratification, and completed final drafting of the implementing legislation which it then submitted to the House and Senate for adoption.

Mr. Speaker, the convention and the implementing legislation have been before the Congress now for almost 4 years. The time has come for ratification of the agreement and the adoption of legislation to implement it. It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we move to complete this important international convention. The international agreement and the implementing legislation were worked out with the strong support and in close consultation with chemical manufacturers in the United States. The industry understands that it has a very strong interest in the adoption of the convention and the implementing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues in the other body to act responsibly, to move quickly and decisively to ratify this important agreement, and I urge my colleagues in this House to move quickly to adopt the implementing legislation. The requisite number of countries have already ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention—it will go into effect with or without the participation of the United States in April of this year. As President Clinton said in his excellent State of the Union Address earlier this week, it is essential that the United States ratify this agreement before it goes into effect so that we will be full and active participants in establishing the international system that will be responsible for enforcing the convention.

It is unfortunate when politics gets in the way of good policy, and I fear that this may be happening in the other body. There is broad bipartisan support and broad expert agreement upon the merits of this agreement. In this regard, I call to the attention of my colleagues an opinion article on the Chemical Weapons Convention that appeared in the Washington Post, January 6, 1997 by retired Adm. Elmo Zumwalt, Jr., the former Chief of Naval Operations, 1970–74. Mr. Speaker I ask that Admiral Zumwalt's article be placed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to give it careful and thoughtful attention. Admiral Zumwalt, who has always had the security interests of the United States as the highest priority, makes an exceptionally strong case for quick approval of the convention.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1997]

A NEEDLESS RISK FOR U.S. TROOPS

(By E.R. Zumwalt, Jr.)

It has been more than 80 years since poison gas was first used in modern warfare—in

April 1915 during the first year of World War I. It is long past time to do something about such weapons.

I am not a dove. As a young naval officer in 1945, I supported the use of nuclear weapons against Japan. As chief of naval operations two decades ago, I pressed for substantially higher military spending than the nation's political leadership was willing to grant. After retiring from the Navy, I helped lead the opposition to the SALT II treaty because I was convinced it would give the Soviet Union a strategic advantage.

Now the Senate is considering whether to approve the Chemical Weapons Convention. This is a worldwide treaty, negotiated by the Reagan administration and signed by the Bush administration. It bans the development, production, possession, transfer and use of chemical weapons. Senate opposition to ratification is led by some with whom I often agree. But in this case, I believe they do a grave disservice to America's men and women in uniform.

To a Third World leader indifferent to the health of his own troops and seeking to cause large-scale pain and death for its own sake, chemical weapons have a certain attraction. They don't require the advanced technology needed to build nuclear weapons. Nor do they require the educated populace needed to create a modern conventional military. But they cannot give an inferior force a war-winning capability. In the Persian Gulf war, the threat of our uncompromising retaliation with conventional weapons deterred Saddam Hussein from using his chemical arsenal against us.

Next time, our adversary may be more berserk than Saddam, and deterrence may fail. If that happens, our retaliation will be decisive, devastating—and no help to the young American men and women coming home dead or bearing grievous chemical injuries. What will help is a treaty removing huge quantities of chemical weapons that could otherwise be used against us.

Militarily, this treaty will make us stronger. During the Bush administration, our nation's military and political leadership decided to retire our chemical weapons. This wise move was not made because of treaties. Rather, it was based on the fact that chemical weapons are not useful for us.

Politically and diplomatically, the barriers against their use by a First World country are massive. Militarily, they are risky and unpredictable to use, difficult and dangerous to store. They serve no purpose that can't be met by our overwhelming conventional forces.

So the United States has no deployed chemical weapons today and will have none in the future. But the same is not true of our potential adversaries. More than a score of nations now seek or possess chemical weapons. Some are rogue states with which we may some day clash.

This treaty is entirely about eliminating other people's weapons—weapons that may some day be used against Americans. For the American military, U.S. ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention is high gain and low or no pain. In that light, I find it astonishing that any American opposes ratification.

Opponents argue that the treaty isn't perfect: Verification isn't absolute, forms must be filled out, not every nation will join at

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

first and so forth. This is unpersuasive. Nothing in the real world is perfect. If the U.S. Navy had refused to buy any weapon unless it worked perfectly every time, we would have bought nothing and now would be disarmed. The question is not how this treaty compares with perfection. The question is not how this treaty compares with perfection. The question is how U.S. ratification compares with its absence.

If we refuse to ratify, some governments will use our refusal as an excuse to keep their chemical weapons. Worldwide availability of chemical weapons will be higher, and we will know less about other countries' chemical activities. The diplomatic credibility of our threat of retaliation against anyone who uses chemical weapons on our troops will be undermined by our lack of "clean hands." At the bottom line, our failure to ratify will substantially increase the risk of a chemical attack against American service personnel.

If such attack occurs, the news reports of its victims in our military hospitals will of course produce rapid ratification of the treaty and rapid replacement of senators who enabled the horror by opposing ratification. But for the victims, it will be too late.

Every man and woman who puts on a U.S. military uniform faces possible injury or death in the national interest. They don't complain; risk is part of their job description. But it is also part of the job description of every U.S. senator to see that this risk not be increased unnecessarily.

---

#### MAKING PROGRESS ON THE WAR ON DRUGS ABROAD

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, late last month, the dedicated and courageous Colombian National Police elite antidrug unit DANTI raided a major cocaine processing laboratory in southeast Colombia. They made a startling find on that raid by uncovering a cocaine processing laboratory capable of producing more than 1 ton a day of deadly cocaine. Not many years ago, we used to talk in terms of kilos of cocaine seized, now we are talking in terms of tons per day. The drug threat grows more serious and challenging for all of us, both here and abroad.

Nearly 8 tons of cocaine already processed and ready to be shipped to our streets and communities was also seized that day. The destruction of the lab was a major blow to the drug cartels and their narco guerrilla allies in Colombia. Now, fewer American kids will be exposed to these drugs, due to high prices and less available cocaine from this police action in southeast Colombia last month. We all owe them a debt of gratitude.

On January 31, 1997, the Miami Herald reported the commanding Colombian National Police General's account of this impressive and historymaking major counternarcotics raid that, "Police swooping into the complex aboard six helicopters and an aircraft overheard drug traffickers frantically calling via two-way radios for leftist guerrillas to shoot down the mosquitos."

Those mosquitos the guerrillas wanted shot down were excess U.S. Army Huey helicopters, several of which had recently been delivered by the United States Government to

Colombia. The helicopters were provided to the police only after endless prodding and requests by myself and Representative DAN BURTON. We have long been concerned that the administration was neglecting our allies like the DANTI in the war on drugs in Colombia.

I was extremely proud to have one of these helicopters named *Big Ben* by the Colombian police. I am sure Mr. BURTON is also equally as proud of the chopper named *Dangerous Dan* by the Colombian National Police for his efforts in helping the DANTI take the law enforcement fight to the drug traffickers at its very source, before this scourge hits our streets and helps destroy our youth and communities.

These courageous police officers who dealt a severe blow to the drug trade in that raid not long ago in southeast Colombia, and their many other operations and eradication efforts, are constantly under fire from better armed traffickers on these missions. They have lost 3,500 police officers in the last 10 years in our common struggle against drugs and the drug trade.

We must continue our efforts to support these dedicated, courageous police officers with our helicopters, miniguns, spare parts and other necessary equipment to do the job. Together, we must rid both of our nations of those who would traffick in illicit drugs, which poison not only our youth, but our democratic institutions and very way of life.

---

#### GUATEMALA PEACE

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which congratulates the government and people of Guatemala for the extraordinary peace accords signed recently between the Government and the Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemala [URNG].

With the signing of the accords on December 29, 1996, 36 years of civil strife ended and Guatemala embarked on a new era of reconciliation, reconstruction, democratization, and economic development.

The peace process, which culminated in the accords, was a comprehensive effort involving all sectors of the country. The development of the actual agreements took 11 years of tough negotiation and include some far reaching reforms of the political, economic, social, and judicial system in Guatemala.

Lasting peace in Guatemala is not only beneficial to the people of that nation, but it is in the best interest of all of the nations of the hemisphere, including the United States.

My resolution congratulates the government of President Alvaro Arzu for his efforts in negotiating a final end to the hostilities. It recognizes the commitment of the UNRG to end the warfare and to resolve their differences within the political arena. And, it commends all of the people of Guatemala for their strong commitment to democratic principles and social justice for all.

#### RECOGNIZING HOLMES REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER AS RECIPIENT OF 1997 NOVA AWARD

HON. DAVE WELDON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Holmes Regional Medical Center which recently received the American Hospital Association's prestigious NOVA award on January 27, 1997. Holmes Regional Medical Center is very deserving of this great honor for its strong commitment to providing quality health care to needy residents in Brevard County, FL. Through its HOPE program, Holmes serves the needy in our community whose medical needs might otherwise go untreated. HOPE serves as a model program for hospitals across the United States.

Holmes is one of only five recipients across the United States and the only recipient from the State of Florida that received this year's NOVA award. Those who have dedicated themselves to ensuring HOPE's success deserve this honor for their commitment to increasing community health, expanding services, managing limited resources, and building community trust among the residents of Brevard County, FL.

HOPE's medical expertise and compassionate care are commendable. Their concern for and commitment to the welfare of the most needy in our community is apparent in their focus on health, outreach, prevention, and education. This is especially evident in HOPE's practice of providing free medical treatment to those without health insurance, Medicare, or other health care coverage. In addition to serving more than 5,000 adults a year, HOPE meets the needs of over 500 children on a daily basis. This is highly commendable and should be an example to all.

As a physician who has treated some of these same patient needs in our community, I know HOPE's unique approach in bringing various community agencies together to establish a multi-agency program for children with disabilities has had a powerful impact on our community. The program teaches and encourages intervention, and provides support to parents with children with disabilities by providing them with expert knowledge and services from community specialists. This is just one example of how HOPE is serving our community.

HOPE's commitment to serving and providing quality, low-cost, compassionate care to the needy is inspiring. We, in Brevard County, are grateful for the way in which Holmes Regional Medical Center's HOPE program has served the people of our county. HOPE has brought true hope to many of our friends and neighbors.

---

#### COMMEMORATING THE 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF MR. AND MRS. ROBERT KELLY

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a truly remarkable accomplishment. On

January 29 Robert and Mildred Kelly celebrated their golden wedding anniversary. It is with great respect and admiration that I offer them my congratulations on reaching this glorious milestone.

It seems that Robert and Mildred understand devotion to one another, as well as, to family, friends and community. They are a shining example of all that is good in life. For 55 years, Robert worked as a union carpenter and is highly respected in his field. Mildred, Mimi to those close to her, is truly an angel. One is always delighted to see the two of them on one's doorstep, know that Mimi is delivering one of her special homemade angel-food cakes with her buttercream frosting and other homemade goodies. Their thoughtful acts of kindness are unlimited and they are always at the side of a family member, friend or neighbor in need of assistance.

I recall the day I met these fine folks. I was at a local shopping center where I had just purchased a large item. I was in the parking lot struggling with the item as I was trying to fit it into the trunk of my car. Robert and Mildred noticed my situation and offered to help. Robert and Mildred graciously loaded the item into their trunk and followed me to my home, some 15 miles out of their way. With smiles on their faces they said they were glad to be able to help me out. This gesture of kindness is just one example of what makes this couple so very special.

Mr. Speaker, Robert and Mildred Kelly's dedicated service to each other, to their family, and to their fellow citizens has set a tremendous example for the Nation. I wish them many more happy years of marriage and it is my great pleasure to represent them in the U.S. Congress.

#### BREAST IMPLANT ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, in April 1994, an immense multibillion dollar class action suit was filed against the silicone breast implant manufacturers, possibly the largest in American history. Since the 1980s, about 400,000 cases have been filed in Federal court against 40 makers of breast implants and their components. Thousands of cases have been filed in State courts as well.

A \$4.2 billion compensation fund was established by Dow Corning, Baxter Healthcare Corp., Bristol Myers, and several other corporations. The settlement distributes compensation money to several designated funds: A general compensation program, a medical diagnostic fund to pay unreimbursed costs of exams for women with implants, and an explanation fund to cover unreimbursed costs associated with removal of implants. There is also a rupture fund to compensate women whose implants have broken as well as a fund to cover administration and attorney's fees.

At the time the settlement was negotiated, Dow Corning denied rumors of a bankruptcy filing. The women coplaintiffs agreed to bypass the court system and entered into the settlement in good faith, under the impression that Dow Corning would fully honor the agree-

ment. In May 1995, Dow Corning reversed its position and filed bankruptcy under chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code.

Dow Chemical, the parent company of Dow Corning, may be held directly liable for breast implant claims under a recent ruling by a Federal district court. In May 1995, Dow Chemical filed a cross-claim against Dow Corning. One week later Dow Corning—which is 50 percent owned by Dow Chemical and has interlocking boards of directors with Dow Chemical—filed for bankruptcy. Dow Chemical then claimed that, under an April 19, 1995 Supreme Court ruling, all litigation against them should be put on hold because of their cross-claim. I find it hard to believe that Dow Chemical, as the parent company of Dow Corning, was not aware of Dow Corning's pending bankruptcy filing when they filed their cross-claim.

I believe that there is strong evidence that Dow Chemical and Dow Corning colluded to manipulate the legal system to avoid the bulk of their liability in the \$4.2 billion settlement. In addition, there is documented evidence that Dow Chemical suppressed information they had in their possession from as early as the 1940's that silicone posed significant health hazards to humans. Despite knowledge of this information, Dow Chemical and its subsidiary, Dow Corning, sold hundreds of thousands of silicone breast implants to women.

On October 10, 1995, the \$4.23 billion global breast implant settlement collapsed, closing the door on 440,000 women who desperately need medical treatment. Of those 440,000 women who qualified for funding under the settlement, an estimated 75 percent of the women still have ruptured or leaking implants in their bodies with no financial means to pay for surgical explanation. While a few women will be fortunate enough to win exorbitant law suits, as evidenced by the recent \$10 billion Nevada case, this practice will eventually bankrupt the manufacturers, leaving hundreds of thousands of women with no recourse.

As a result, I have introduced H.R. 366, the Breast Implant Accountability Act, to provide a fair solution for all parties involved, and I invite you to join me by cosponsoring the legislation. The Breast Implant Accountability Act does the following:

First, requires silicone breast implant manufacturers to notify breast implant recipients that funds will be provided for the surgical removal of breast implants which were implanted before January 1, 1994. Patient participation is completely voluntary; explanation will be performed only at the request of the individual.

Second, allows the notice recipient to select the physician and hospital or surgery center for the explanation procedure. The provision would prevent manufacturers from forcing women to travel great distances or to one central location for the explanation.

Third, ensures that the explanted breast implants become the property of the individual from which it was removed. The implant shall be given to the individual in an appropriate condition.

Fourth, requires further research on the physiological, neurological, and immunological effects of silicone on the human body. Individuals in the class action suit shall be included in the research, should they volunteer.

Fifth, requires all future implant candidates to be informed of the health risks of implants and to sign a consent form stating that she has read and understands the risks involved.

Sixth, prohibits the donation of blood and organs by individuals with breast implants.

As with any faulty product that threatens the health or safety of consumers, the manufacturer should issue a recall of the product. The fact is, per woman, the cost of explanation provided for under H.R. 366 is generally far less than the settlement award. If you support a fair and equitable solution for your constituents, without bankrupting the manufacturers, I urge you to cosponsor H.R. 366.

#### MUSIC TO LIVE BY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1997

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Frankie Yankovic, America's Polka King, the Elvis of ethnic musical expression, ambassador of the great American melting pot, prolific composer, band leader, performer, and Cleveland.

Frankie Yankovic was born to Slovene immigrants in 1915. In their hardscrabble working lives, music expressed their hope and joy. Frankie began by playing accompaniment to the boarders in his family home.

He was an obvious talent and was instantly loved by all who heard his music. At age 23, Frankie had his first band and his first hit album. He began a lifetime of touring. Frequently, he made 300 appearances per year. Over the years, his bands have played in every major concert hall in America.

Frankie Yankovic heralded many polka tunes known widely to American listeners. In 1948, Frankie recorded "Just Because" with Columbia records. The tune was a breakthrough release, attracting both a polka and popular music audience. "Just Because" sold 1 million copies. In 1949, Frankie released the "Blue Skirt Waltz," which attained the coveted gold status even more quickly.

Frankie was also a great mentor. He discovered and cultivated the talent of the famous virtuoso, Joey Miskulin.

Frankie received many honors in his lifetime. He was inducted into the International Polka Association Polka Hall of Fame as well as the Cleveland Style Polka Hall of Fame. In 1986, Frankie received the first Grammy awarded for polka music.

Beyond being the consummate performer, Frankie was also a lifetime union member of Local 4, American Federation of Musicians, and a patriot. Married and the father of two, he nevertheless voluntarily enlisted in the U.S. infantry in World War II and fought at the Battle of the Bulge. There, under extreme weather conditions, Frankie contracted gangrene in his limbs. Against the advice of doctors, Frankie resisted amputation. With a great deal of courage and persistence, Frankie brought his fingers and hands back to life. How fortunate we all are.

I commend Frankie Yankovic for his skill, his energy, and his ability to make people happy through the sounds and rhythms of polka.

A SALUTE TO JAMES W.  
GALLAGHER

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 10, 1997*

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding American, James W. Gallagher. A resident of Newtown Square, PA, I am proud to call this fine man a resident of the Seventh Congressional District.

A tireless servant of his local community and the entire Nation, Jim served his country as a U.S. marine in World War II. Beyond his military service, Jim continued his service to the public. He has been an active member of the American Legion for over two decades, serving in numerous local and State leadership posts.

And each Christmas, Jim led a local Toys for Tots effort for the Marine Corps. This important program provides both the toys and the means for the area's poor to give their children a more joyous holiday season. For these and other charitable works, Jim is well-known and respected throughout the community.

I rise today to mark a special moment in Jim's life, a passing of the torch, if you will. This past Christmas Day, on the 220th Anniversary of George Washington's crossing of the Delaware River during the American Revolution, Jim portrayed General Washington his 12th and final year in Pennsylvania's annual reenactment of the famous crossing.

More than 9,000 individuals were on hand as Jim surveyed his troops for his final time, reciting "These are the times that try men's souls" from Thomas Paine's "The Crisis," a work credited with boosting the morale and courage of General Washington's small army. And, quite fittingly, Jim delivered Washington's farewell address upon his retirement from the Army, saying to his troops "I now take my leave of you."

Jim will be remembered for years to come for his memorable portrayal of George Washington, not just in the annual reenactment of the Delaware River crossing, but also in parades and even in our Nation's Capitol Building.

But even more importantly, Jim will be remembered for embodying the ideals of George Washington through his dedication and service to the country and the entire community. His work and effort will not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring James Gallagher, a true American.

NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL OF MEDICINE SUPPORTS MEDICINAL USE OF MARIJUANA

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 10, 1997*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in the early 1980's, our late colleague Stewart McKinney of Connecticut was the sponsor of a bill to allow doctors to prescribe marijuana for medical purposes when they found this to be in the inter-

est of their patients. When Mr. McKinney tragically died in 1987, depriving this Congress of one of its most valuable Members, the bill lapsed. A few years ago, at the urging of some people interested in this subject, I reintroduced the bill, essentially the legislation which Mr. McKinney had initiated. While no action was taken on that bill in the previous Congress, and while some of the prior co-sponsors had in the interim changed their mind on the bill—for example, Mr. GINGRICH of Georgia—I will be reintroducing the bill this year. In the interim, voters in the States of Arizona and California have given their endorsement by solid majorities to this principle. I hope we will in this Congress seriously debate this issue. I have been disappointed by the failure of the Clinton administration to be more forthcoming, but I have been encouraged by the increasing interest in debating this subject seriously among many members in the medical profession.

Recently, one of the leading outlets for informed opinion about medicine, the *New England Journal of Medicine*, carried an editorial by Dr. Jerome P. Kassirer, editor of the *Journal*, on this subject. His title—*Federal Foolishness and Marijuana*—accurately sums up his point of view.

Dr. Kassirer says in this editorial that he believes "that a federal policy that prohibits physicians from alleviating suffering by prescribing marijuana for seriously ill patients is misguided, heavy handed and inhumane." I should note that it is now in direct conflict with the wishes of the people of Arizona and California as expressed in referenda. Indeed, I await the support for my bill that I assume will be forthcoming from my conservative colleagues who are great supporters of States rights, and who in particular believe that when the public has expressed its view in referenda, Federal officials should acknowledge the validity of that point of view.

Mr. Speaker, in the hope that we may again be able to change your mind so that you go back to your position of the 1980's in support of this proposition, and in the interest of furthering debate on this matter, I ask that the thoughtful editorial by Dr. Kassirer be printed here.

[From the *New England Journal of Medicine*  
Jan. 30, 1997]

FEDERAL FOOLISHNESS AND MARIJUANA

(By Jerome P. Kassirer, M.D.)

The advanced stages of many illnesses and their treatments are often accompanied by intractable nausea, vomiting, or pain. Thousands of patients with cancer, AIDS, and other diseases report they have obtained striking relief from these devastating symptoms by smoking marijuana. (1) The alleviation of distress can be striking that some patients and their families have been willing to risk a jail term to obtain or grow the marijuana.

Despite the desperation of these patients, within weeks after voters in Arizona and California approved propositions allowing physicians in their states to prescribe marijuana for medical indications, federal officials, including the President, the secretary of Health and Human Services, and the attorney general sprang into action. At a news conference, Secretary Donna E. Shalala gave an organ recital of the parts of the body that she asserted could be harmed by marijuana and warned of the evils of its spreading use. Attorney General Janet Reno announced that physicians in any state who prescribed

the drug could lose the privilege of writing prescriptions, be excluded from Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement, and even be prosecuted for a federal crime. General Barry R. McCaffrey, director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, reiterated his agency's position that marijuana is a dangerous drug and implied that voters in Arizona and California had been duped into voting for these propositions. He indicated that it is always possible to study the effects of any drug, including marijuana, but that the use of marijuana by seriously ill patients would require, at the least, scientifically valid research.

I believe that a federal policy that prohibits physicians from alleviating suffering by prescribing marijuana for seriously ill patients is misguided, heavy-handed, and inhumane. Marijuana may have long-term adverse effects and its use may presage serious addictions, but neither long-term side effects nor addiction is a relevant issue in such patients. It is also hypocritical to forbid physicians to prescribe marijuana while permitting them to use morphine and meperidine to relieve extreme dyspnea and pain. With both these drugs the difference between the dose that relieves symptoms and the dose that hastens death is very narrow; by contrast, there is no risk of death from smoking marijuana. To demand evidence of therapeutic efficacy is equally hypocritical. The noxious sensations that patients experience are extremely difficult to quantify in controlled experiments. What really counts for a therapy with this kind of safety margin is whether a seriously ill patient feels relief as a result of the intervention, not whether a controlled trial "proves" its efficacy.

Paradoxically, dronabinol, a drug that contains one of the active ingredients in marijuana (tetra-hydrocannabinol), has been available by prescription for more than a decade. But it is difficult to titrate the therapeutic dose of this drug, and it is not widely prescribed. By contrast, smoking marijuana produces a rapid increase in the blood level of the active ingredients and is thus more likely to be therapeutic. Needless to say, new drugs such as those that inhibit the nausea associated with chemotherapy may well be more beneficial than smoking marijuana, but their comparative efficacy has never been studied.

Whatever their reasons, federal officials are out of step with the public. Dozens of states have passed laws that ease restrictions on the prescribing of marijuana by physicians, and polls consistently show that the public favors the use of marijuana for such purposes. [1] Federal authorities should rescind their prohibition of the medicinal use of marijuana for seriously ill patients and allow physicians to decide which patients to treat. The government should change marijuana's status from that of a Schedule 1 drug (considered to be potentially addictive and with no current medical use) to that of a Schedule 2 drug (potentially addictive but with some accepted medical use) and regulate it accordingly. To ensure its proper distribution and use, the government could declare itself the only agency sanctioned to provide the marijuana. I believe that such a change in policy would have no adverse effects. The argument that it would be a signal to the young that "marijuana is OK" is, I believe, specious.

This proposal is not new. In 1986, after years of legal wrangling, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) held extensive hearings on the transfer of marijuana to Schedule 2. In 1988, the DEA's own administrative-law judge concluded, "It would be unreasonable, arbitrary, and capricious for DEA to continue to stand between those sufferers and the benefits of this substance in light of the evidence in this record." [1] Nonetheless, the DEA overruled the judge's order

to transfer marijuana to Schedule 2, and in 1992 it issued a final rejection of all requests for reclassification.[2]

Some physicians will have the courage to challenge the continued proscription of marijuana for the sick. Eventually, their actions will force the courts to adjudicate between the rights of those at death's door and the absolute power of bureaucrats whose decisions are based more on reflexive ideology and political correctness than on compassion.

## REFERENCES

1. Young FL. Opinion and recommended ruling, marijuana rescheduling petition. Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration, Docket 86-22. Washington, D.C.: Drug Enforcement Administration, September 6, 1988.

2. Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration, Marijuana scheduling petition: denial of petition: remand. (Docket No. 86-22.) Fed Regist 1992;5759:10489-508.

Copyright 1997, Massachusetts Medical Society.

TRIBUTE TO REV. RONALD  
PACKNETT

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to pay tribute to my constituent and friend, Reverend Ronald Packnett, who died on December 17, 1996.

Rev. Packnett was an extraordinary community leader. He was a vital pillar of the St. Louis community. He pastored a prominent spiritual institution, Central Baptist Church in St. Louis, that has a progressive and active congregation. Under Rev. Packnett's leadership they become important activists in causes that affected the broader community.

I want to share with our colleagues an editorial that tells of the many lives Rev. Ronald Packnett touched both as a spiritual leader and friend of the community. This enlightening story entitled, "Packnett Touched Many Lives, Stood Up For Important Causes" was written by Gregory Freeman and appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on December 20, 1996.

[From the St. Louis (MO) Post Dispatch, Dec. 20, 1996]

PACKNETT TOUCHED MANY LIVES, STOOD UP  
FOR IMPORTANT CAUSES

(By Gregory Freeman)

There's A void today at Del Monico's Diner. The Rev. Ronald Packnett, pastor of Central Baptist Church, was a fixture at the restaurant. He could be found at the restaurant at Delmar Boulevard and Euclid Avenue almost every morning, chowing down on one of their hearty pancakes-and-sausage breakfasts. And he had a passion for Del Monico's fried chicken legs.

Packnett, who died Tuesday at 45 after a long illness, called restaurant matriarch Eva Bodo his mother away from home. His mother lives in Chicago.

The Rev. Gary Tyler was busy working at Del Monico's on Tuesday when he learned of Packnett's death. He said Packnett was his mentor. "I was an associate pastor at Greater Paradise," Tyler said, "Rev. Packnett heard me preach and invited me to his church to speak. Before I knew it, I was speaking there all the time."

Packnett got Tyler, 31, the training he needed, and installed him at Central Baptist.

Other employees and customers overheard our conversation and joined in. "Rev. Packnett? He married me," one man called out.

"He baptized me," yelled another.

Bobo couldn't say enough about him. "He helped my granddaughter," she said. "He carried her to church every Sunday, and he had her involved in everything."

Packnett loved young people. "He'd always make sure the youth could take part in the National Baptist Convention every year," Tyler said.

"That's right," added Bobo, "my granddaughter got to go places she never could have gone."

"San Francisco, Washington, D.C., Atlanta, wherever the convention was held, he always made sure that young people could go," Tyler said. "And then he made sure that they weren't just running around when they got to those cities. They always had some kind of class; and they went to places like churches and historical sites."

Some spoke of programs he had set up through the church, including one that provided clothes and lunch for the homeless every Tuesday, and a "Rites of Passage" African heritage program. Others talked about the hours he spent visiting sick church members at hospitals and in their homes.

In there's one thing a journalist learns early, it's that there are phonies and there are real articles.

Packnett was the real article.

While he often rubbed shoulders with mayors and congressmen and powerful people, he was clearly as much at ease with average people and willing to help anyone. Like the day the restaurant was shorthanded. Packnett took off his coat, went to the kitchen and cheerfully pitched in to wash dishes.

At 5 feet, 6 inches, Packnett wasn't tall in stature. But he was tall in the minds of those whose lives he touched. And he wasn't afraid to speak out, even when he knew he'd be sharply criticized.

Packnett took a great deal of heat last year from some blacks when he endorsed Francis Slay, who is white for president of the city's Board of Aldermen over his black opponent, Alderman Velma Jean Bailey. The criticism didn't bother him. "What's right is right," he said then.

Others didn't care for him four years ago when he made a stink after taking his two children to Union Station to see Santa and discovering that they had no black Santas. He called the company that supplies Santa to malls nationwide and learned the company had supplied no black Santas here.

He faxed letters to marketing directors at seven malls and a department store on behalf of the St. Louis Clergy Coalition, a group of black ministers that represents various denominations. The letter said, in effect, we spend money in your stores and we want a black Santa. Two of the malls told him they would hire a black Santa right away.

Last year, a day before the Million Man March, Packnett led more than 100 people in prayer at Central Baptist Church before they headed off to the event in Washington. After praying, he led the audience in song, delighting the crowd when he changed the words to a spiritual from "Ain't gonna let nobody turn me 'round'" to "Ain't gonna let Newt Gingrich turn us 'round'".

The members of his church remember him best for his work at Central Baptist. "He was always helping people, doing for people, teaching people right from wrong," Bobo said.

"We'll not get any more pastors like that," Bobo said adding, "If they do, it'll probably be long after I'm not around anymore."

THE RETIREMENT OF REAR ADM.  
LUTHER F. SCHRIEFER, USN

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Rear Adm. Luther F. Schriever, U.S. Navy, retired on February 1, 1997, after nearly 37 years of honorable and distinguished service.

Rear Admiral Schriever served as the Division Director for the Navy's Environmental Protection, Safety and Occupational Health Division since November 1994. As the Navy's senior environmentalist, he was responsible for several key initiatives that have enabled the Navy to operate in harmony with the natural environment by achieving safe and environmentally sound ships, aircraft, and installations. He has testified before congressional committees to ensure that members and their staffs understand the Navy's impact on the environment, as well as the effects of environmental laws and regulations on the operations of our Nation's Navy.

Prior to his assignment as the senior environmentalist, he was the Director, Inter-American Region, International Security Affairs, Office of the Secretary of Defense. He was the director of the Caribbean task force during the 1994 Haitian and Cuban crises. Prior to his assignment for the Secretary of Defense, he was the Commander at the Naval Base in San Diego.

Rear Admiral Schriever was assigned to numerous other commands over the course of his distinguished career, including Commander, Anti-Submarine Warfare Wing, U.S. Pacific Fleet at Naval Air Station North Island and Director Tactical Air, Surface, Electronic Warfare Research and Development (OP-982). He was selected for two commands at sea: the amphibious assault ship USS *Belleau Wood* (LHA 3) and the amphibious cargo ship USS *Mobile* (LKA 115). He also held three air commands: the Air Anti-Submarine Wing 1 at Cecil Field, FL, Carrier Wing 3 onboard the USS *Saratoga* (CV-60) and Air Squadron VS-22 aboard the aircraft carrier USS *Intrepid* (CV 11). He served his country as an officer at the VRC-50 Detachment at Danang Air Base, Republic of South Vietnam, and VS-28 on board the USS *Independence* (CV-61).

Rear Admiral Schriever has enjoyed several proud moments in his service to our country, including several exhilarating moments as a junior officer flying for our Navy resolving technical challenges associated with his aircraft's performance. He retires as the Navy's "Gray Eagle," a term reserved for the senior aviator in the Navy.

Rear Admiral Schriever is a native of Oshkosh, WI. He graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1960 and was designated a naval aviator in October 1961. He studied naval communications management at the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, CA. He also attended the Naval War College in Newport, RI, and graduated in June 1971. He was awarded a master of science degree in international affairs from George Washington University. He is married to the former Sandra N. Swanson of Detroit, MI. The Schriefers have four children: Kim, Scott, Michael, and Kelly.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to a superb naval officer, an outstanding gentleman, and a real leader, Rear Adm. Lou Schriever.

H.R. 630—CLEANER-BURNING FUEL MEANS CLEANER AIR FOR CALIFORNIA

HON. BRIAN P. BILBRAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, the quality of the air we breathe is of great concern to all of us. Young and old, rich and poor, liberal or conservative, we are all vulnerable to poor air quality. While we have seen great strides in the last decade in terms of improved air quality, it is incumbent upon us to work to ensure that sound science lies at the foundation of any modifications or improvements to existing law. By the same token, when opportunities exist to actually improve the service provided by our environmental and public health strategies, we have not only the right, but also the responsibility to implement them, based on that same common denominator of sound science.

Such an opportunity now exists in California, which has long been at the forefront of our national efforts to improve air quality and reduce ambient pollution levels. As a former member of the California Air Resources Board [ARB], I am very proud of California's historic role in this regard. I am pleased to be able to introduce bipartisan legislation, H.R. 630, which will further enhance the air quality of my State by building upon the progressive work already done by the State of California, under the direction of the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 directed the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] to adopt a Federal reformulated gasoline program for urban areas with the most serious smog problems. The 1990 amendments required that Federal reformulated gasoline contain various specified properties, and established limitations on the level of flexibility that EPA could build into the program. Federal reformulated gasoline regulations were promulgated in early 1994, and became applicable in December of that year. In California, the Federal regulations now apply in the greater Los Angeles, San Diego, and Sacramento regions.

At the same time, the California Air Resources Board [CARB] was developing a comprehensive clean fuels program. These regulations, which were adopted in 1991 and became applicable in the spring of 1996, established the most stringent and comprehensive gasoline standards in the world. It includes specifications for eight different properties which affect emissions of toxic air pollutants and ozone forming compounds. The State regulations also contain a predictive model which is based on analysis of a large number of vehicle emission test studies. Refiners have the option of using this predictive model to produce reformulated gasoline, subject to an alternative set of specifications, that has been shown by the model to achieve equivalent or greater reductions in emissions than result from use of the Federal RFG. This model is being utilized in California to produce much of

the reformulated gasoline now consumed in the State. Recent studies have shown that the expanded use of reformulated gasoline in California has resulted in measurable and continuing decreases in emissions and air pollution in that region. I would like to include with this statement a recent article from the January 16, 1997 San Diego Union Tribune which elaborates further on these air quality improvements.

However, the overlapping applicability of the Federal and State reformulated gasoline regulations has reduced the ability to take advantage of the flexibility and public health benefits provided by the more stringent California program. Compliance with the Federal standard is still required, despite the fact that the California standard has been demonstrated to achieve equal or superior air quality benefits. H.R. 630 will streamline this unwieldy process, and build upon the existing Clean Air Act to permit the more stringent California regulations to apply in lieu of the Federal standards, only if they will achieve equivalent or greater emission reductions. The EPA has already provided this determination in the form of a final rulemaking for California reformulated gasoline, which was published in the Federal Register on February 16, 1994. In that rule, EPA drew the following conclusions: First, that VOC and toxic emission reductions resulting from the California Phase II standards would be equal to or more stringent than the Federal reformulated gasoline standards; second, that the content standards for oxygen and benzene under the California Phase II standards would in practice be equivalent to the Federal content standards; and third, that the California Air Resources Board's compliance and enforcement program is sufficiently rigorous.

Additionally, the California standards have been approved by the EPA as part of California's State Implementation Plan [SIP], and thus are federally enforceable.

H.R. 630 has been carefully written to apply exclusively to the State of California. As prescribed by section 211(c)(4)(6) of the Clean Air Act, a State which has received a waiver under section 209(b)(1) may "at any time prescribe and enforce, for the purpose of motor vehicle emission control, a control or prohibition respecting any fuel or fuel additive." In order to receive a 209(b)(1) waiver, a State must have adopted emissions standards for new motor vehicles prior to March 30, 1996. Because California is the only State which has qualified for a waiver under section 209(b)(1), H.R. 630 is therefore applicable only to California—no other State is eligible.

This bipartisan bill is supported by the California Air Resources Board, and I am grateful for the continued dialog and input I have received from colleagues, the State, industry, and several public health organizations, which has helped to further focus and clarify the intent of the legislation. I believe that H.R. 630, while narrowly targeted, will help to further accomplish the broader goals of the Clean Air Act that we all share, which are to provide the cleanest and healthiest air possible for the American people. I further believe that this bill can provide an example of how we ought to interpret and manage our environmental and public health laws, so that they can be made more effective in terms of product, by being kept as dynamic and flexible as possible in terms of process. Just as the vehicles which we all drive need to be fine-tuned from time to

time in order to keep them running efficiently, so too do our environmental strategies.

[From the San Diego Union-Tribune, Jan. 16, 1997]

NEW GASOLINE FORMULA IS FUELING AIR-POLLUTION DECLINE—IT DRAMATICALLY CUTS SMOGGY DAY NUMBERS

(By Steve La Rue)

San Diego County had fewer smoggy days in 1996 than in any year since health standards were set and air-pollution measurement began. Most of the credit is being given to a new blend of gasoline.

The air was unhealthy to breathe by state standards on 51 days last year at one or more of the county's nine monitoring stations—a sharp drop from the 96 smoggy days in 1995, 139 days in 1990, and the 151 smoggy days in 1978, the year the California Clean Air Act applied the state standards.

The pollutant involved is ozone, a colorless, odorless gas that can sting the throat and eyes. It also can reduce lung capacity temporarily or permanently, depending on the exposure.

"We have had a dramatic reduction in the number of days over (health) standards, and there was no dramatic meteorological difference in the two years," said Richard Sommerville, county air pollution control officer.

"That implies that the big change that did occur was due to the introduction of reformulated gasoline."

County air quality violated federal health standards, which are about 25 percent less stringent than the state's, only twice last year. That is the fewest federal violations since air quality monitoring began here in 1955, county officials said.

By comparison, smog made the air unhealthy to breathe on 12 days in 1995 under the federal standard, 39 days in 1990 and 90 days in 1978. It was also the first year on record that all of the county's federal violations were caused by smog migrating south from Los Angeles and Orange counties.

The state's refiners and service stations started selling the cleaner-burning fuel early last spring to meet state specifications for a fuel that produced fewer hydrocarbon and nitrogen emissions. Southern California's sunny summer and fall skies cook those emissions into a stew of pollutants, mostly ozone.

Scientists say this lower-level ozone pollution never rises 18 miles or higher to merge with the ragged atmospheric ozone layer that shields the earth from ultra-violet radiation.

Air quality also made dramatic gains last year in the South Coast Air Quality Management District, which includes Los Angeles and Orange counties and parts of Riverside and San Bernardino counties.

As of the end of October, the end of the smog season, there had been seven Stage 1 smog alerts in the district, compared with 14 in 1995, 23 in 1994, and 40 in 1992.

Such alerts are called when ozone levels are twice the federal health maximum. During the alerts, the public is advised to reduce strenuous activity. The last Stage 1 alert in San Diego County occurred in 1991.

Peak ozone levels during smog sieges in 1996 were calculated to be 10 to 11 percent less severe than expected in the San Francisco Bay Area and the Sacramento area, said state Air Resources Board spokesman Allan Hirsch.

"Much of the state showed improvements in air quality in 1996, and cleaner burning gasoline was the main clean air measure that was introduced last year, so we think it had a significant effect," he said.

"We are very confident that the same thing occurred in San Diego County, too."

Jan Cortez, program director for the San Diego-Imperial County branch of the American Lung Association, voiced concern that the drop in ozone pollution may cause people to overlook the danger of ultra-fine particulate matter—from diesel exhaust and various types of combustion—that the federal Environmental Protection Agency is seeking to regulate.

“The report doesn't even mention particulate air pollution, so it is giving the public only part of the picture,” she said. The public is still breathing particulate pollution, she said, and it contributes to asthma attacks and increased visits to the hospital.”

The smog decline has not come without a price. The estimated \$4 billion cost to retool refineries was considered an important factor in the steep rise in gasoline prices last spring and early summer.

Many motorists still wonder how much the less-volatile fuel has reduced their gas mileage, although state spokesmen estimate the penalty at 1 to 3 percent. Averaging three-year periods, which minimizes the influence of weather, the number of days of ozone pollution in San Diego County under the state standard declined 55 percent between 1979-1981 and 1994-1996.

LEGISLATION TO MOVE THE 4.3-CENT GAS TAX INTO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

HON. STEVE C. LaTOURETTE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 10, 1997*

Mr. LaTOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to move the 4.3-cent gas tax from the general fund to the highway trust fund.

The 4.3-cent gas tax, which was enacted in 1993, currently pumps an estimated \$6 billion annually into the general fund. This is wrong, plain and simple. Motorists should benefit from a fee which they alone must pay.

While no one enjoys paying gas taxes, many studies have shown that Americans are much more willing to pay gas taxes if they are used only to make our country's roads and bridges safer. This, unfortunately, has not been the case with the most recent 4.3-cent increase. Last Congress, when many had talked about repealing the 4.3, I studied the various ways to use the funds generated by the gas tax, trying to come up with a common-sense, useful proposal.

My legislation will not add one dime to the deficit, and instead will force the Federal Government to be honest with taxpayers and use the gas tax for needed infrastructure improvements.

For example, a recent study found that bridges throughout the State are badly deteriorating and in need of repair. At the local level,

last year we experienced a frustrating and costly detour on Interstate 90 after the bridge over the Grand River shifted about 2 inches. Fortunately, workers from the Ohio Department of Transportation worked tirelessly to repair what could have been a perilous situation, and tried to minimize the inconvenience to motorists.

It seems to me that if Government has a function it should be to make sure our Nation's roads and bridges are as safe as humanly possible. When you put your children in your car, you need to be assured that the bridge you travel over won't crumble, drop a few inches or collapse.

Under my new bill, the 4.3-cent gas tax would be transferred from the general fund to the highway trust fund. As a result, \$6 billion a year would be freed up for infrastructure improvements, and 20 percent of those funds would be earmarked for mass transit projects. This will come as welcome news for our cities that are struggling to meet the increasing demand for mass transit. Also, under this proposal we will not have to search for a way to offset the \$6 billion a year in lost revenues. We will simply be transferring funds from one account to another, meaning it will be budget neutral.

Ohio is not alone when it comes to needing road, bridge and infrastructure improvements. Studies show that we should be spending \$60 billion per year on our highways but are only spending \$6 billion. This is a national problem, and one that could be greatly eased if we simply leveled with the taxpayers and used the gas tax for the purpose it was intended.

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, February 11, 1997, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

## MEETINGS SCHEDULED

## FEBRUARY 12

9:30 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting, to mark up S. 104, to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, and to consider the nomination of Federico Pena, of Colorado, to be Secretary of Energy, and to consider other pending calendar business. SD-366

Environment and Public Works  
To hold hearings on the ozone and particulate matter standards proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency. SD-406

Governmental Affairs  
International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on the future of nuclear deterrence. SD-342

Labor and Human Resources  
To hold hearings on the implementation of the Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act (TEAM). SD-430

Rules and Administration  
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing biennial expenditures by standing, select, and special committees of the Senate, and to consider other pending legislative and administrative business. SR-301

Small Business  
To hold hearings on the nomination of Aida Alvarez, of New York, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration. SR-428A

10:00 a.m.  
Budget  
To hold hearings on issues relating to public investment. SD-608

Finance  
To hold hearings on the Administration's budget and revenue proposals for fiscal year 1998. SD-215

2:45 p.m.  
Armed Services  
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1998

for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program. SH-216

## FEBRUARY 13

8:00 a.m.  
Foreign Relations  
To hold hearings on the nomination of Pete Peterson, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. SD-419

9:00 a.m.  
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
To resume hearings on proposals to reform the Commodity Exchange Act. SR-332

10:00 a.m.  
Budget  
To hold hearings on biennial budgeting and appropriations. SD-608

Finance  
To hold hearings on the Administration's budget for fiscal year 1998, focusing on Medicare, Medicaid and welfare proposals. SD-215

1:45 p.m.  
Governmental Affairs  
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-342

2:00 p.m.  
Environment and Public Works  
Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on the implementation of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act and transportation trends, infrastructure funding requirements, and transportation's impact on the economy. SD-406

Governmental Affairs  
To hold hearings on S. 207, to review, reform, and terminate unnecessary and inequitable Federal subsidies. SD-342

Labor and Human Resources  
Employment and Training Subcommittee  
To resume hearings to examine proposals to reform the Fair Labor Standards Act, focusing on S. 4, to provide to private sector employees the same opportunities for time-and-a-half compensatory time off, biweekly work programs, and flexible credit hour programs as Federal employees currently enjoy to help balance the demands and needs of work and family, to clarify the provisions relating to exemptions of certain professionals from the minimum wage and overtime requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. SD-430

## FEBRUARY 25

9:00 a.m.  
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
To hold hearings to examine the impact of estate taxes on farmers. SR-332

FEBRUARY 26

9:00 a.m.  
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
To hold hearings to examine the impact of capital gains taxes on farmers. SR-332

9:30 a.m.  
Environment and Public Works  
Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of

the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act. SD-406

Labor and Human Resources  
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-430

Small Business  
To hold hearings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 1998 for the Small Business Administration. SR-428A

## FEBRUARY 27

9:30 a.m.  
Labor and Human Resources  
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Higher Education Act. SD-430

10:00 a.m.  
Armed Services  
To hold hearings concerning the Department of Defense actions pertaining to Persian Gulf illnesses. SD-106

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings to examine violence in television programming. SR-253

## MARCH 5

9:00 a.m.  
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
To hold hearings to examine the Department of Agriculture's business plan and reorganization management proposals. SR-332

## MARCH 6

9:30 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the legislative recommendations of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Jewish War Veterans, the Retired Officers Association, the Association of the U.S. Army, the Non-Commissioned Officers Association, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Blinded Veterans Association. 345 Cannon Building

## MARCH 11

9:00 a.m.  
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for agricultural research. SR-332

## MARCH 12

9:30 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings to examine universal telephone service. SR-253

## MARCH 13

9:00 a.m.  
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for agricultural research. SR-332

## MARCH 18

9:00 a.m.  
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for agricultural research. SR-332

MARCH 19

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the legislative recommendations of the Disabled American Veterans.

345 Cannon Building

MARCH 20

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for agricultural research.

SR-332

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the legislative recommendations of AMVETS, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, the Veterans of World War I, and the Vietnam Veterans of America.

345 Cannon Building

CANCELLATIONS

FEBRUARY 12

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Consumer Affairs, Foreign Commerce, and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on product liability reform issues, focusing on the success of the General Aviation Revitalization Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-298).

SR-253