

1999, regarding certain provisions of S. 1059, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

As I noted during floor debate, I strongly support the vast majority of this bill, particularly the pay and retirement provisions. But this good bill is marred by some of the text that sets up a National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) as a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy (DOE). I have reservations about the way these provisions were inserted in the bill—with little discussion among the Members of the Conference Committee—and I have reservations about the substance of some of these provisions.

I will not speak on the conference process at length, but I cannot dismiss it because I cannot remember the Congress acting on such an important matter with so little information and so little discussion among the Members of the conference committee. Neither the House nor the Senate Defense Authorization bill contained language requiring a comprehensive restructuring of the Department of Energy, yet we ended up with about 50 pages worth of text. We did have former Senator Warren Rudman testify before the committee prior to conference, but we did not take testimony from the Energy Department itself, or from the senior statesmen of the labs and nuclear weapons complex, men like Johnny Foster or Harold Agnew. The legislation that the conference committee ultimately produced was not vetted in any meaningful manner among the Members, the Administration, or outside experts. This is not a good process for an important piece of national security legislation.

My first and foremost concern on the substance of the legislation is that we have blurred the lines of accountability when it comes to preventing and ferreting out future espionage at our nuclear labs and weapons complex. I think one thing we can all agree on is that counter-intelligence requires a clear line of command and accountability. A clear chain of command was at the heart of Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 61, which the Cox Committee unanimously recommended be implemented. This legislation contradicts PDD 61 by setting up two different counterintelligence offices with overlapping responsibilities, and no clear direction on how the offices are supposed to interface with each other. As a member of the Cox Committee, I find it disturbing and ironic that the restructuring provisions fail in what should have been its top priority: setting up clear lines of command and accountability on counterintelligence.

My second and more general concern is that the Secretary's ability to conduct oversight of the complex could be seriously hampered by this legislation. We already know that the price of no oversight is a legacy of contaminated sites that will cost hundreds of billions to clean up. Revelations about contamination of workers at Paducah show that we cannot disregard the health and safety concerns for workers in the nuclear weapons complex and the communities that surround these sites. The history of the last few decades tells us that the nuclear weapon sites and activities of the Department of Energy require more sunshine, more scrutiny, and more oversight, not

less. Any Secretary of Energy must have strong oversight authority, and I fear that this legislation detracts from rather than adding to the Secretary's oversight powers.

Having criticized these provisions, let me say that I do not think they were drafted with bad intent. But they were drafted hastily, without adequate hearings, with no vetting among outside authorities, without the benefit of constructive criticism that comes in the mark-up process, and without any discussion among members of the conference committee.

A good example of the type of confusion that arises from these hastily-drafted provisions is the work of the Energy Department's non-weapons facilities—the science labs. The science labs perform a great deal of work for almost every element designated as part of the new National Nuclear Security Administration. This is especially true for the current Offices of Non-Proliferation and National Security (NN), Fissile Materials Disposition, Naval Reactors, and the Office of Intelligence. The language of the conference report, though, raises the question of whether the current cooperation between the science labs and weapons facilities will be allowed to continue, or be prohibited by the language separating the weapons labs from the rest of the DOE complex.

For the Office of Non-Proliferation and National Security for example, the science labs provide a significant portion of the technologies and expertise for such programs as Materials, Protection, Control and Accountability (MPC&A), a program I helped establish. This is also true for the Nuclear Cities Initiative, in which a science lab (Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, or PNNL) co-chairs the U.S. effort in one of the first three Russian nuclear cities selected. That arrangement is especially fruitful because PNNL is the only U.S. lab with real-life experience making the transition from a closed U.S. "nuclear city," Hanford, which produced key nuclear materials for the WWII-era nuclear weapons, to a non-weapons community in which such scientific expertise is put to more peaceful use.

The science labs play a major role in providing technical expertise and collaboration for the Initiatives to Prevent Proliferation (IPP) program, attempting to develop self-sustaining, U.S. and Russian scientific collaborations that are mutually beneficial. The science labs provide valuable technologies and expertise of the NN efforts in Safeguards and Transparency regarding Russian nuclear warheads. Science lab personnel, in fact, chair important working groups in that effort, and have developed technologies that will be used in identifying and securing Russian warhead materials.

The science labs are vital parts of all of DOE's efforts to build lab-to-lab relationships and programs that enhance U.S. national security by applying American eyes and know-how to the potentially dangerous situations in the weapons of mass destruction (WMD) complex of the former Soviet Union. The science labs also play a critical role in the NM arms control programs, providing vital technologies for verifying compliance with arms control agreements (reductions, dismantlement, production, testing, safeguard and storage, etc.) and detecting the attempted proliferation of WMD materials. Such technologies are proving useful in terms of all WMD materials—chemical, biological and radiological.

Science labs also make major contributions to the efforts of the Office of Fissile Materials Disposition (MD). A science lab leads the U.S. effort in the International Nuclear Safety Program. Of course, the science labs will continue to contribute a great deal to the DOE offices outside the NNSA, on matters, for example, of energy, the environment and nuclear cleanup. Also, like the weapons labs, have the authority and expertise to "work for others," and often perform important work for other agencies such as the Department of Defense, Justice, State, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

The science labs' contribution to the offices that are scheduled to be in the NNSA is clear, and I do not believe the conferees had any intention of scuttling these contributions by implying that the science labs could not work for NNSA offices. However, the language contained in the conference report is not clear on this question. Title XXXII concentrates solely on the three nuclear weapons laboratories and production facilities, and while it makes specific provision for those weapons labs to perform work for other agencies and for DOE offices outside the new, semi-autonomous administration, it is silent on the role of the non-weapons labs. Such ambiguity breeds confusion and illustrates the flaws in the process of drafting the DOE reorganization title and inserting it into the conference agreement. I served on the conference committee and I was involved in negotiating some of the conference report. I do not think that it was the intention of the conferees for this legislation to impede the continuation of these services in any way.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF RADIOLOGY ON ITS FIRST 75 YEARS

**HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 21, 1999*

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, among the greatest advances of medicine in this century has been the development and professionalization of radiology. Therefore, I rise today to congratulate the American College of Radiology and its 31,000 members on its 75th anniversary.

While the numbers of diagnostic radiologists, radiation oncologists and medical physicists comprising the college have changed dramatically, the ACR's main objective has not. Through the years, working with Members of Congress, key Federal, State, and local agencies and a wide variety of health care and consumer organizations, the college has worked tirelessly to improve the quality of patient care.

The American College of Radiology has met this objective through numerous programs. Beginning with mammography, ACR has initiated several national accreditation programs designed to assure high quality performance from both health care professionals and imaging equipment. In addition to mammography, accreditation programs are in place for ultrasound, radiation oncology, stereotactic needle breast biopsy, magnetic resonance imaging, ultrasound-guided breast biopsy.

ACR's groundbreaking mammography accreditation program, which began as a voluntary effort in 1987, now has become a nationally mandated program. In part, as a result of this program and other breast cancer early detection promotion efforts, the National Cancer Institute has recorded, for the past few years, the first declines in mortality from breast cancer.

In addition to accreditation, the ACR has improved the quality of care through its Performance Standards™, Appropriateness Criteria™, life-saving research through clinical trials and medical continuing education programs for members.

The performance standards are principles for delivering high quality radiological care. They are revised and expanded every year. The standards cover a wide variety of procedures. The Appropriateness Criteria™ ensure that the most appropriate examination is done in the most appropriate setting at the most appropriate time. More than 500 medical experts have assisted in developing these criteria.

The college also offers numerous continuing education seminars each year.

ACR manages the federally funded Radiation Therapy Oncology Group (RTOG). This organization carries out multidisciplinary cancer trials nationwide. RTOG has gathered numerous medical facilities in providing state-of-the-art treatment for a wide variety of cancers.

As a complement to RTOG, the college also operates the Radiological Diagnostic Oncology Group (RDOG). This program evaluates current and emerging imaging technologies used in the management of patients with malignant disease. NCI funds RDOG so that the group may provide a timely approach for the cost-effective use of new technologies.

Even before the ACR initiated its quality improvement and research programs, radiologists were deeply involved in working to improve patient care. World War I, for example, presented a great need and a great opportunity for radiology. One of the founders of the college, Dr. Edwin Ernst, recalls how using a table built by German prisoners, and a rolling floor fluoroscopic gas tube, he pinpointed the location of bullet fragments. And radiologists in general played a major role in treating and diagnosing patients in those rugged field hospitals.

Later, in the 1920's the International Radiological Congress helped to standardize measurement. The ACR also worked to secure financing of the x-ray equipment at the Bureau of Standards.

It was also in the 1920's that the American College of Radiology was born as two dozen radiologists gathered for the first time officially to transact the business of the college: to plan ways to improve their profession's expertise.

When the United States entered World War II, radiologists mobilized to serve their country. The college volunteered to handle radiology manpower issues for the Army. The growth and development of radiology after World War paralleled post-war growth of the Nation.

In the early 1950's, three dedicated members of the college—Drs. Eddie Ernst, Wally Wasson and Ben Orndoff—began to cajole, badger and convince their fellow radiologists into preserving the history of their profession. In 1955 they gathered for the first time as the

Gas Tube Gang. The gas tube was the symbol of the early imaging technology.

Through their efforts the college's archive's was created and today it is filled with gas tubes, other early radiological devices, mementos from Dr. Roentgen, Madame Curie and other pioneers, and pages and pages of rich history of the ACR and the field of radiology.

So it is with all of this history in mind and the great contributions the ACR has made to the practice of medicine that I wish the American College of Radiology well on its 75th and continued success in the years to come.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 21, 1999*

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 16, Hurricane Floyd slammed into North Carolina, bringing heavy winds and torrential rains to my state, including my Second Congressional District. I have been helping my constituents who are struggling to overcome this devastating disaster, and as a result, I was absent from the Chamber for rollcall vote No. 425 and rollcall vote No. 426. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on No. 425 and "no" on No. 426.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF AGUSTÍN RIVERA

### HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 21, 1999*

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of an extraordinary member of my community. For the past decade, Agustín Rivera has demonstrated time and again his commitment and his vision for his community.

Mr. Rivera was a founding member of Música Against Drugs, a Puerto Rican and Latino, client-driven, community-based agency created to serve the needs of individual and families affected by the HIV/AIDS and drug addition epidemics in the Brooklyn, New York communities of Williamsburg, Greenpoint and Bushwick. Mr. Rivera's skills, talent, and energy helped the late Manny Maldonado, the founder of Música, establish a program to fulfill a desperately acute need. For several years they, like too many who were on the vanguard battling the pandemic of AIDS, worked very hard with very little money.

After three years of volunteer organizing, Música received its first public grant. This gave Mr. Rivera the opportunity to become stipend/outreach worker and, later, Outreach Coordinator. He then became the first program director of an innovative nutritional program, La Cocina del Pueblo, which provides nutritional services to people with HIV/AIDS. Subsequently, he became the Volunteer and Outreach Coordinator and, most recently, the Director of the Community Prevention Project.

Even while giving his all—and then some—to Música, Mr. Rivera found the time for some other impressive accomplishments as well. He was a founding member of the Williamsburg, Greenpoint, Bushwick HIV CARE Network. Last and hardly least, he is married to Marilyn Echevarría, and has an 11-year-old son, Austin.

Robert F. Kennedy once said, "It is from the numberless diverse acts of courage and belief that human history is shaped. Each time a man stands up for an ideal or acts to improve the lot of others or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring, those ripples build a current that can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rivera has gained the respect of all who have had the privilege of knowing him, and all who have been blessed by experiencing his dedication and compassion. He has saved lives, and he has made lives better, all by his example that life is to be lived. He is a ripple of hope, and this world is a better place for his being in it.

#### NORTH KOREA SANCTIONS

### HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 21, 1999*

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, President Clinton announced his decision to lift some sanctions against North Korea. This is an historic move that comes at a time of real opportunity in United States-North Korea relations, one that does as much to ensure a lasting peace in Korea as any diplomatic initiative taken in the past 50 years.

In the past 3 years, I have spent considerable time on the challenges that North Korea represents. I have made five visits there to see first-hand the famine that has claimed 2 million lives, according to most experts. I have met countless times with aid workers, with Korea-Americans, with experts on North Korea, and with officials from U.N. organizations and other nations. I have struggled to understand why North Korea acts as it does, and, like many of our colleagues, I have worried about the threat North Korea's military poses to the 37,000 American service men and women stationed in South Korea.

Mr. Speaker, my experiences convince me that President Clinton's action stands a better chance than any other alternative in helping the people of North Korea, and in safeguarding peace on the Korean Peninsula.

In the long run, I expect it will bring more freedom and less poverty—as we have seen happen in other communist states that open up to market forces. In the short term, this initiative will help maintain peace on the Korean Peninsula—a peace that South Korea's people and our troops depend upon. And, by removing an obstacle to President Kim Dae Jung's bold and innovative initiative to improve relations with North Korea, it lends support to efforts to encourage "the Hermit Kingdom" to become a responsible member of the international community.