## EDITOR DAN WARNER RETIRES AFTER 44 YEARS IN THE NEWS BUSINESS

### HON. MARTIN T. MEEHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 10, 1999*

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to one of the nation's finest newspaper editors, Dan Warner, who is retiring after 44 years in the news business and 27 years as Editor of The Eagle-Tribune, in Lawrence, Massachusetts. Under the leadership of publishers Irving E. Rogers Jr., who passed away last year, and Irving E. ''Chip'' Rogers III, who is steering the business into the new millennium, Dan has guided one of the last independent, local, family-owned newspapers in America through a period of unprecedented growth, change and success.

As editor and in his Sunday columns, Dan was always a tireless advocate for Eagle-Tribune readers, the community and the people and institutions of the Merrimack Valley. He believed in the intrinsic value of factual reporting and its ability to provoke and inspire readers to get more involved in their community. He created an ethic among reporters that their solemn duty to both readers and subjects was to cover the news fairly and aggressively and always to present the human dimension of a story. Dan also was a pioneer in the use of bright colors, bold graphics and innovative design to deliver the news in a more attractive and reader-friendly package. He leaves his successor, Steve Lambert, a publication that has been recognized as one of the best regional newspapers in the United States.

Under Dan Warner's stewardship, The Eagle-Tribune received the highest honor in journalism, the 1998 Pulitzer Prize for general news reporting for its probe of the Massachusetts prison furlough program. He also led the newspaper to be honored twice as a Pulitzer Prize finalist for exposing corrupation in international hockey and telling the story of the tragic fire that nearly destroyed Malden Mills in the heart of Lawrence's poorest neighborhood, and the heroic effort to rebuild the business. Dan also guided The Eagle-Tribune to 11 awards as New England Newspaper of the Year and scores of prizes for exemplary reporting, photography, commentary, design and public service.

Born and raised in Ohio, Dan adopted the Merrimack Valley as his home 30 years ago and displays the love and caring for the region of a native born citizen. He is a devoted friend and dedicated family man. Even when he disagrees with you, as I have experienced more than once, Dan always gives you a fair hearing to present your point of view.

Mr. Speaker, Dan Warner is a man who prodded leaders of government, industry and community to do better, and always remembered that the people he spoke for did not always have a voice in the corridors of power. On behalf of the people of the Merrimack Valley, I wish him a happy retirement with his wife, Janet, his two children and his beloved little dog, Rewrite.

## TRIBUTE TO PALISADES PARK, NEW JERSEY ON THE OCCASION OF ITS CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

### HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 10, 1999*

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize the Borough of Palisades Park on the occasion of its centennial anniversary.

During the last decade of the last century, the New Jersey State Legislature passed legislation which made it possible for any community to organize itself into a Borough. The residents living in the area that would become Palisades Park took advantage of this opportunity and filed the requisite papers with the court in Hackensack. In 1899, the Borough of Palisades Park was created.

Over the past 100 years, Palisades Park has grown into a vital part of Bergen County and the State of New Jersey. While its tree-lined streets evoke memories of a simpler time in our nation's history, the hustle and bustle of its main thoroughfares make it clear that Palisades Park has grown into a modern and thriving community.

Over the course of the past one hundred years, Palisades Park has grown into one of New Jersey's most vibrant towns. It has developed into a vital economic force and can boast of being called home by a rich mosaic of cultures. The countless gifts and special talents of its residents have helped make it a terrific place to live and raise a family.

The many individuals whose tireless efforts and contributions have imbued Palisades Park with its unique spirit of community should be commended for giving her sons and daughters a rich legacy from which to learn. Palisades Park's future is bright and I anticipate hearing news of its newest successes and triumphs in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to come and visit Palisades Park to experience the Borough's beauty firsthand.

## HOYER-GREENWOOD BILL RESTRICTING LATE-TERM ABORTIONS

### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 10, 1999*

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, abortion is one of the most difficult and divisive issues facing the public today. Like most Americans, I would prefer that there were no abortions. Also, like most Americans, I believe the decision is one that is for the woman and family involved, not the Government.

However, I oppose late-term abortions, except for the most serious and compelling of reasons. I am specifically and adamantly opposed to what some refer to as ''abortion-on-demand''—after the time of viability. For that reason, I and others have introduced the ''Late Term Abortion Restriction Act of 1999.''

The specific intent of this legislation is to adopt as Federal policy, a prohibition on post-viability, late-term abortions. Critics of this legislation point out that there are exceptions. They are correct. We believe that in the event that the mother's life is in danger or where the continuation of the pregnancy will pose a threat of serious, adverse health consequences to the woman, then and only then can this prohibition on late-term abortions be overcome.

I introduced this legislation in both the 104th and the 105th Congress. I did so then because I am opposed to abortions being performed after the viability of a fetus, except for the most serious of health risks if the pregnancy is continued.

This prohibition is similar to restrictions on late-term abortions in 41 of our States, including my own State of Maryland. Those States believed that it was appropriate policy to prohibit late-term abortions ''on demand.'' We share that view.

Those who oppose abortion under almost all circumstances at any time during the course of pregnancy have criticized this legislation as meaningless. They do so because they believe that some doctors will contrive reasons to justify a late-term abortion. I do not doubt that may happen. But if it does, it will be illegal under this act and subject the doctor to the penalties set forth in the bill and to such professional sanctions as are imposed by the appropriate medical societies and regulatory bodies.

This legislation is much broader than the partial-birth abortion bills introduced by others in the 104th and 105th Congress. Those bills and the Partial Birth Abortion Act of 1999 recently introduced in the Senate had and continue to have at their purpose, the elimination of a particular procedure to effect an abortion at any time during the course of the pregnancy.

To that extent it is inaccurate and misleading to define it as many proponents and press reports have, as a prohibition on late-term abortions. It is both much narrower and, at the same time, broader than that. It is my belief that its terms would not prohibit the performance of a single abortion. They would simply be performed by a different procedure.

Congressman JIM GREENWOOD and I are introducing this legislation today with 14 other bipartisan original cosponsors. This bill, in contrast to the partial birth abortion bills, would prohibit all late-term post-viability abortions by whatever method or procedure that would be employed. While there are exceptions to this general prohibition, we believe that our bill will, in fact, prohibit all post-viability, late-term abortions that are not the result of a serious cause.

This legislation establishes a clear Federal policy against late-term abortions. We would hope that the Judiciary Committee would hold an early hearing on this legislation and bring it to the floor so that the Federal Government could adopt this sensible prohibition, which is similar to that adopted by over 80 percent of the States. They did so because their legislatures wanted to make it clear that late-term abortions were, in almost all circumstances, against public policy and against the law.

We should do the same.