

the country apart at precisely the time when unity is most fragile is a risk that Indonesia cannot afford to ignore.

The Indonesian military is widely recognized as one of the linchpins of society. With some glaring and regrettable exceptions, it thus far has exercised restraint. (The same cannot be said of the police, who were more brutal during the demonstrations.) Commander-in-Chief Wiranto seems to have served as a force for change, refusing to take Suharto's side last week when the result could have been widespread bloodshed. This Member would like to believe that this restraint is at least, in part, attributable to the salutary effect of years of military-to-military contacts through IMET, E-IMET and other U.S. programs that attempt to raise the level of professionalism of foreign military elites while simultaneously offering human rights training. Whatever the cause, the military will be under enormous pressure as a new government sorts itself out.

Clearly, the economic situation in Indonesia is dire. And most unfortunately, indications are that the situation will get worse before it gets better. It is difficult for us to imagine how desperate conditions are. Credible economists estimate that Indonesia will suffer negative economic growth of between 20–25 percent in 1998. It is hard to over-emphasize the degree of hardship that Indonesia's people have faced in the past months, since the beginning of the Asian financial crisis last summer. Yet, despite the hopeful signs on the political front, Indonesia's economic crisis seems far from over. The economic challenges faced by Indonesia's new government would be daunting under the best of circumstances. But these are anything but the best of circumstances.

The questions now to be addressed include: What steps must Indonesia take to pull its economy out of its nose-dive and restore investor confidence? What are the prospects for Indonesia's future? What political reforms are necessary, and what are possible in the near term and the long term? What institutional factors must first be addressed? And most importantly, what are the implications of Indonesia's current economic and political crisis on U.S. national interests?

These questions about Indonesia's economic and political future raise serious questions for U.S. policy toward Indonesia. For example, as the largest shareholder in the IMF, World Bank, and one of the largest in the Asian Development Bank, we must decide when these institutions should resume their financial assistance to the country and under what conditions. In making these decisions we will appropriately have to decide how long a Habibie caretaker government should last and when elections can reasonably be held.

As a final note, this Member strongly believes this is the time that the United States should focus on the issue of East Timor. For over two decades, East Timor has been a stumbling bloc to Indonesia's relations with the United States and with the European Union. There is a long and complicated history to this troubled corner of Asia, but suffice it to say that the West has never recognized the legality of the Indonesian incorporation of East Timor. It would seem to me that there is an opportunity to put aside the old inflexible positions that the various sides have taken in the past, and to look for new ways to move toward a mutually acceptable solution. Is there any role the United States might play in fostering such a renewed dialogue?

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Indonesia needs America's help and that of the international community. Our actions must be bold, but not rash. We must be thoughtful, but not timid. Certainly, we must take care to preserve and strengthen the delicate unity which has managed to hold Indonesia together, but we must not allow a new government to fall back into the bad practices that doomed the Suharto regime.

IN HONOR OF JONETTE ENGAN

**HON. DAVID MINGE**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 4, 1998*

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Jonette Engan, a truly remarkable person with a distinguished record in her church, community and Minnesota politics. With great sadness, but best wishes, I announce Jonette's resignation from her leadership position as Chairperson of the Minnesota Second District Democratic Farmer Labor party.

Jonette's commitment to the DFL has been remarkable. Born into a family with strong DFL political roots, she has a keen sense of fairness and how the political process can work to improve our society. After years of volunteering for candidates at every level of government, Jonette took over the reigns of Minnesota's Second Congressional District DFL party. District Chairperson is a herculean task anywhere, but the logistics of coordinating 28 counties is incredibly daunting. Jonette thrived in a position most would not even consider taking.

The advice of Jonette Engan is sought by candidates for public office at all levels. Jonette has helped numerous candidates understand the political system and landscape. Minnesota's state capital is populated by those who aptly learned under Jonette's tutelage. When I was a first time candidate, Jonette walked this greenhorn through the nomination and electoral process with great patience, excellent advice, and wonderful counsel.

Despite the long hours, the DFL has not been Jonette's only interest. Jonette has balanced an incredible time commitment to politics as well as remaining active in her church, the Lutheran Women's League and numerous civic functions.

With so many exciting experiences in her life, Jonette will still tell you that her greatest achievement has been her family. Her husband, Dale, has been supportive and helpful in accommodating Jonette's demanding schedule. The love of her children, Natasha and Nick, is obvious in her proud stories of their latest achievements and adventures. I have had the great pleasure of working with Natasha when she interned in my Washington office.

Although I know Jonette will remain a phone call away for advice and support, her absence from the Second District DFL leadership will be sorely missed. My hat is off to Jonette in thanks for all of her assistance to me, her community, and Minnesota. I wish her the best in the new challenges she undertakes.

PROTECTING CHILDREN FROM  
TOBACCO

**HON. STEPHEN HORN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 4, 1998*

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unsettling recent public health trends has been rising tobacco use among teenagers. In 1991, 14 percent of eighth graders, 21 percent of tenth graders, and 28 percent of 12th graders smoked. By 1996, those percentages had risen to 21 percent of eighth graders, 30 percent of tenth graders, and 34 percent of twelfth graders.

What is most infuriating is that tobacco companies have geared their marketing toward children. Our nation was shocked several months ago to read about tobacco companies' documents detailing their plans to market their products to children. In January, *Times* magazine reported that R.J. Reynolds official J.W. Hind, in a 1975 memo, urged the company, maker of Camel, Winston and Salem cigarettes, to "increase its share penetration among the 14–24 age group." In 1976, a ten-year plan written for the board of directors of R.J. Reynolds and stamped "RJR SECRET" said that teenagers ages 14 to 18 were "an increasing segment of the smoking population" and suggested a brand targeted to them. After a subpoena from House Commerce Committee Chairman TOM BLILEY (R-VA), documents were released showing that the tobacco industry misled people with its health claims and covered up potentially damaging research. Other documents showed that when industry officials marketed tobacco products to "young adults," they were referring to children as young as 13.

Their strategy worked. In the first four years that Camel ads featured the cartoon character Joe Camel, smokers under 18 who preferred Camels rose from less than 1 percent to as much as 30 percent of the market. Some studies even show that six-year-olds are as familiar with Joe Camel as they are with Mickey Mouse.

Big Tobacco did not care that people who start smoking at a young age are more likely to become severely addicted than those who start at a later age. Big Tobacco shrugged at the fact that approximately one-third of these children who become smokers will eventually die of smoking-related diseases. Big Tobacco showed no concern that their product acts as a "gateway drug" for children who enter a sequence of drug use that can include alcohol, marijuana, and harder drugs. Big Tobacco's only concern was its bottom line.

It is imperative that Congress passes a bill to curb teen smoking. In an effort to move that process along, I recently joined a group of House members in introducing the Bipartisan No Tobacco for Kids Act, a tough measure which would dramatically reduce teenage smoking.

The Bipartisan No Tobacco for Kids Act would increase the price of a pack of cigarettes by \$1.50 over three years. Health experts say that one of the most effective ways to reduce youth smoking is to raise the price of tobacco products. Except for a small amount of money dedicated to federal tobacco enforcement efforts and payments to settle state lawsuits against the tobacco industry, all