

as it celebrates its 25th anniversary of the first open heart surgery in the hospital's Cardiac Center. Located in my hometown of St. Helena in the Napa Valley, St. Helena Hospital is one of the country's premier medical facilities. But I don't say that just because this is the hospital where my mother, my father, one of my sons and I were born and where my wife, Janet, worked as a nurse in the Intensive Care Unit.

The St. Helena Hospital has an outstanding cardiac care facility. It began in May of 1974, when Wilfred Tam, M.D. performed the North Bay's first open-heart surgery at St. Helena Hospital. This made St. Helena Hospital one of the first community hospitals to perform the procedure. The surgery was just one in a series of firsts in the region for the hospital's Cardiac Center, which opened in 1972. Today, St. Helena Hospital's Cardiac surgery team has more than 68 years of combined surgical experience and has performed more than 15,000 open-heart surgeries.

Recognized as a pioneer and a leader in cardiac care, St. Helena Hospital has continued its tradition of high-tech innovation. In 1997, it was the nation's first hospital to purchase the Medtronic Octopus, a device that immobilizes the beating heart during minimally invasive bypass surgery.

Installed in 1993, St. Helena Hospital's digital by-plane cardiovascular catheterization suite was the first of its kind in the United States. Work is scheduled to begin this year to upgrade the hospital's other suite with new, state-of-the-art equipment.

To celebrate its quarter-century of excellence in cardiac care, St. Helena Hospital is hosting a community celebration on September 26, 1999 honoring the physicians and staff who make the Cardiac Center a leader in heart health, and also honoring the "Mended Hearts" for whom they have cared over the years.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we acknowledge and honor the St. Helena Hospital Cardiac Center for its outstanding Cardiac Center and for its tremendous twenty-five year commitment to providing the very best in quality health care.

#### DRUG INTERDICTION OR DRUG SMUGGLING?

### HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend to you the attached article from earlier this summer written by Mr. Frank Calzon, entitled "Behind Castro: Money laundering, drug smuggling." Mr. Calzon is the executive director of the Center for a Free Cuba in Washington, D.C. and is a tireless fighter for democratic causes. I encourage my colleagues to learn from his insightful article.

#### BEHIND CASTRO: MONEY LAUNDERING, DRUG SMUGGLING

State Department and Coast Guard officials last week flew to Havana seeking "to improve U.S.-Cuban cooperation on drug interdiction."

If the Clinton administration would look to history, it would have known that it was a vain mission and would set about probing instead the relationship between Colombia's drug trade and the guerrilla movements over which Fidel Castro exercises inordinate influence.

Havana complains that it lacks resources to combat drug trafficking. But, even if one accepts this at face value, it is unclear how the United States should respond. Should we provide resources to the Cuban Ministry of the Interior—Havana's KGB-Gestapo? Do it while holding in federal custody Cuban spies charged with gathering information about military bases in Florida and linked to the shutdown of the Brothers to the Rescue pilots?

Havana has managed to purchase state-of-the-art radio-jamming equipment and foot the bill for thousands of foreigners to visit the island and condemn the U.S. embargo. Could it be that inadequate funding for drug interdiction is simply the result of Castro's misguided priorities?

In 1982 a federal grand jury indicted four high-ranking Cuban government officials, including a vice admiral of the Cuban navy and a former Cuban ambassador to Colombia. They were charged with facilitating the smuggling of drugs into the United States.

In 1983 then-President Ronald Reagan said that there was "strong evidence" of drug smuggling by high-level Cuban government officials. And in 1989 Castro executed several Ministry of the Interior officials and Cuba's most decorated army officer, Gen. Arnaldo Ochoa, allegedly involved in the drug trade. Castro did so after years of suggesting that U.S. accusations of drug smuggling were lies "concocted by the CIA." He has never explained how widespread Cuba's involvement with narcotrafficking was then or how a military and national hero such as Ochoa, with no oversight over Cuba's harbors or airspace, could have been involved.

Then there is the mystery of how several hundred million dollars appeared in the coffers of Cuba's National Bank. Castro's American supporters assert that \$800 million is sent by the Cuban-American community every year to relatives. However, given the relatively small number of Cuban-American households who still have relatives in Cuba, it is mathematically impossible for that community to generate such funds. The amount is approximately equivalent to the income Cubans derived in 1997-98 from its main export: sugar. Money laundering and drug smuggling are the logical sources of this mysterious income.

It should be noted that, despite major narcotics charges brought against Ochoa and the other Interior Ministry officers, no accounting was ever presented of what should have been multimillion-dollar payoffs.

Claims of Castro's cooperation with U.S. anti-narcotics efforts are a rerun of the Noriega saga. Panamanian strongman Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega currently is serving a long, federal sentence for his role in the drug trade. He had extensive ties to the Cuban dictator. Evidence was presented at his trial that Castro once mediated a dispute between Noriega and the Medellin drug cartel.

Nevertheless, Gen. Barry R. McCaffrey, the Clinton administration's drug czar, recently said that there is "no conclusive evidence to indicate that the Cuban leadership is currently involved in this criminal activity." The general seems to be unaware of a report released by his own office in March, titled "1998 Annual Assessment of Cocaine Move-

ment." It states: "Noncommercial air movements from Colombia to the Bahamas were most prolific in 1998. Most flights fly either east or west of Jamaica, and subsequently fly over Cuban land mass." It adds that the cocaine flown over Cuban territory is dropped "in or near Cuban territorial waters."

Given Castro's sensitivity concerning unidentified aircraft flying over Cuba, as evidenced by the Brothers to the Rescue shootdown, it is inexplicable that not one drug-smuggling airplane has ever been shot down over the island.

There are those who believe that the Cuban leopard has changed his spots. Maybe. But the consequences of taking Castro at his word can be tragic. The impact of the drug epidemic on America's youth is far too important to allow the facts linking Castro to the drug trade to be swept under the rug.

#### BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

### HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 417) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes:

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Shays-Meehan Campaign Finance Reform Act and urge my colleagues to vote against all "poison pill" amendments that will be offered today. I am proud to cosponsor this bipartisan legislation, which represents the best, real opportunity to reform our broken campaign finance system.

The issue of campaign finance reform cuts to the essence of democracy. Our unique American political system will not survive without the participation of the average American citizen. Unfortunately, more and more Americans are dropping out—with each election, fewer Americans are voting. They are doing so because they no longer believe that their vote matters. As they see more and more money pouring into campaigns, they believe that their voice is being drowned out by wealthy special interests.

Despite the cynicism of the American public, Congress has failed to enact significant campaign finance reform legislation since 1974. In that year, in the wake of the Watergate Scandal, Congress imposed tough spending limits on direct, "hard money" contributions to candidates. Unfortunately, no one at that time foresaw how two loopholes in the law would lead to a gross corruption of our political system.

The first loophole is "soft" money—the unregulated and unlimited contributions to the political parties from corporations, labor unions, or wealthy individuals. "Soft" money allows wealthy special interests to skirt around "hard" money limits and dump unlimited sums of money into a campaign.