

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMARKS BY DR. MICHAEL BISHOP BEFORE THE CONGRESSIONAL BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH CAUCUS

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues some remarks made by Dr. Michael Bishop before the Congressional Biomedical Research Caucus on Monday, October 28, 1991. But first I would like to say a few words about our Dr. Bishop.

Dr. Michael Bishop is a 1989 winner of the Nobel Prize in Medicine for his work on oncogenes, along with Dr. Harold Varmus, our first caucus speaker and, who served over the past year as a program advisor to the caucus. Dr. Bishop teaches and studies microbiology at the University of California, San Francisco and is internationally recognized as an authority on viruses that cause cancer. He was born and raised in rural Pennsylvania, and graduated from Gettysburg College as valedictorian. He earned his medical degree at Harvard and launched his biomedical research career at NIH's Research Associated Program. The title of Dr. Bishop's talk is "Genes: The Answer to Cancer?" The text of his remarks follows:

REMARKS BY DR. MICHAEL BISHOP

I am Professor of Microbiology, Immunology, Biochemistry and Biophysics, and Director of the G.W. Hooper Research Foundation at the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF), where I teach and do research with equal pleasure. I am honored by the opportunity to address this group. More to the point, I am grateful.

From the moment I first decided to devote myself to biomedical research, every step of the way to this podium has been paved with federal funds: I withdrew from medical school for one year in order to get my first taste of the laboratory, supported by a fellowship from NIH; after finishing my training in Internal Medicine, I did my formal apprenticeship in research at the NIH in Bethesda, as a member of the Research Associates program that has supplied U.S. medical schools with many of its most distinguished faculty, throughout my career as an independent scientist at UCSF, I have been supported primarily by grants from the NIH, support that provided not only the ingredients and equipment for our work, but the talented personnel without whom I would have nothing much to report and even vital portions of my own salary.

Whatever I may have accomplished as a scientist I owe to the enlighten altruism with which the US public, through Congress, has supported education and research during the past decades. I am grateful beyond measure and that is one of the reasons I am eager to tell my tale to you.

But there is another and more important reason. Over the past decade, one of the

great and most recalcitrant nemesis of human health has been brought to bay. We have found a new way to think about cancer, a way that should lead eventually to decisive control over this dread disease. It is important that you know about this remarkable progress—the hope it offers and the hard work that still needs to be done.

In August, this group heard Dr. Mary-Clair King describe how the fruits of genetic research are being used to attack the baleful problem of breast cancer. Today, Dr. Bert Vogelstein and I will expand the scope of the story to include all cancer, in the hope that you can see why excitement continues to mount in cancer research. My task is to explain how basic research sowed the seeds of the fruit. Dr. Vogelstein will then tell you how that fruit is being taken to the bedside of the cancer patient.

One person in every four among us here will develop cancer, one in every five will die of the disease. These are tragic dimensions, but they are no larger than the intellectual challenge cancer presents. Every second, twenty five million cells reproduce themselves in our bodies. Each of these reproductions carries the inherent risk of cancer: if the reproductions are not properly controlled, cancer may arise.

How are the reproductions controlled? Why do the controls sometimes fail? What hope do we have of penetrating the complexities of the cancer cell?

These questions have been before the human mind for a very long time, and until recently, the answers had seemed distant indeed. But over the past decade, a great change has occurred in how we think about cancer. Where once we viewed cancer as a bewildering variety of diseases with causes too numerous to count, now we are on the track of a single unifying explanation for how most or all cancers might arise, an explanation that lays open new paths to diagnosis, prognosis, therapy and prevention. The explanation came from attention to genes.

Genes are the chemical vocabulary of the instructions that direct the lives of our cells, carried by that remarkable molecule known as DNA. Several yards of DNA are crammed into each human cell: how the cramming is accomplished remains a great mystery. It now appears that cancer results from mistakes in the instructions carried by DNA, mistakes that originate from damage to genes. We first uncovered those mistakes by using viruses.

Viruses are tiny packages of genes that must enter living cells in order to reproduce. We have known for more than fifty years that some viruses can cause cancer in birds and animals; now we know that they do this by using genes.

The story began in 1910, when a chicken farmer in upstate New York discovered a tumor on the breast of a prized Plymouth Rock hen. Determined to save the hen, the farmer took it to the Rockefeller Institute in New York City (then the center for medical knowledge in the U.S.; the center has since moved West, to San Francisco). There he asked for a cancer researcher and was referred to a young scientist named Peyton Rous.

After what I imagine must have been some fast talking, Rous killed the hen, removed the tumor and performed a landmark experiment that was to bring him great grief and lasting fame. He mashed the cells of the tumor so that they were broken open, passed the extract through a filter to remove debris and still living cells, and then found that injection of the filtered extract into chicken elicited tumors exactly like those in the hen from upstate New York.

Rous immediately and correctly concluded that he had discovered a virus that could cause cancer. For this remarkable discovery, Rous was for many years criticized and disparaged; his finding was beyond the ken of most scientists of this time. Fifty five years later, when Rous was more than eighty years of age, he received the Nobel Prize for his historic discovery. The rest of the scientific community had finally caught up with him.

We now know that the virus discovered by Rous exemplifies a group of distinctive creatures known as retroviruses (among which is HIV, the cause of AIDS); that it does indeed cause cancer; and that it contains but four genes, arrayed along a single molecule. Three of these genes are used to reproduce the virus, but the fourth causes cancer—it is an "oncogene" (tumor gene). We call this oncogene src because of the cancers it induces: sarcomas.

Here you see dramatized the value of viruses to the experimentalist. In studying the cancer caused by the virus of Peyton Rous, we need explain the action of only a single gene in order to get a view of how a cancer cell can arise. The same soon proved true of many other cancer viruses: they too have oncogenes.

The discovery that many viruses use genes to elicit cancer brought new clarity to cancer research. There had been hints before that the elemental secrets of cancer might lay hidden in the genetic dowry of cells. But in cancer viruses we found the first explicit examples of genes that can switch a cell from normal to cancerous growth.

Might the cell itself have such genes? Can the complexities of human cancer be reduced to the chemical vocabulary of DNA? The answer came from asking yet another question, based on the logic of evolution. The oncogene src serves no obvious purpose for Peyton Rous' virus: it contributes nothing to the growth or survival of the virus. Why then is it there?

When that question was asked, it led to a penetrating discovery. Src is present in the virus of Peyton Rous because of an accident of nature. The gene was acquired from the cells in which the virus grows, in an elaborate molecular ballet that copies a normal cellular gene into the genetic apparatus of the virus. The virus is a pirate; the booty is a cellular gene with the potential to become a cancer gene.

Soon it became apparent that src was not alone. The DNA of vertebrates like ourselves and the chicken of Peyton Rous contains many genes that can become cancer genes when pirated into viruses. Of course, these genes were not put there by evolution to cause cancer. Normally, they play vital roles in the lives of our cells. But the pirating into

* 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.

viruses damages the genes, and as a result, they become cancer genes. We call these cellular genes proto-oncogenes because each has the potential to become a cancer gene in a virus.

These discoveries also allowed us to reason backwards, to deduce that the same genes might contribute to cancer while in the cell from which they come. Our reasoning was successful beyond all hope. We now know that among the 100,000 or more genes in our cells, there are a few dozen whose abnormalities underlie most if not all human cancers. Among these genes are several of the proto-oncogenes first discovered in viruses as oncogenes. Consider, then, what retroviruses have done for us. Piracy of proto-oncogenes by retroviruses is an accident of nature, serving no purpose for the virus. But the event has profound implications for cancer research. In an extraordinary act of benevolence, retroviruses have brought to view cellular genes whose activities may be vital to many forms of carcinogenesis. It might have required many decades more to find these genes by other means amongst the morass of human DNA. Instead, we have the genes made manifest in retroviruses, excerpted from amidst the morass and made available for our closest scrutiny.

The discovery and exploration of proto-oncogenes provided a new view of the cancer cell. But there is another set of genes that are equally important in the genesis of cancer whose time has now come. Their story goes as follows.

Geneticists call us diploid organisms because our cells possess two copies of most of our genes. The oncogenes we have discussed until now are functionally dominant: their abnormalities are felt even when a normal copy of the same gene is also present in the cell: evil overrides good, to use an image I find useful for medical students, physicists, perhaps even members of Congress.

But it now appears that most or all human tumors also bear genetic lesions that make their presence known only when both copies of a gene have been lost or inactivated. These lesions we call recessive. The possibility that recessive mutations, that the loss or inactivation of genes, might contribute to cancer emerged in two ways.

First, it is possible to induce the fusion of two different cells and thus to cause the intermingling of their genetic endowments in a single progeny. Experimental fusion of normal and cancer cells often suppresses the abnormalities of the cancer cell: the hybrid cells grow normally rather than as cancer cells. The cancer cells therefore appear to be defective in functions that are required for the regulation of cellular proliferation and other behavior. Fusion with a normal cell restores the necessary functions and, thus, suppresses cancerous growth. The responsible genes are now known as "tumor suppressor genes" and their defectiveness in cancer cells represents an example of recessive genetic damage.

Second, the cells of some human cancers contain chromosomes that have lost part of their DNA, a lesion that we call deletion and that is sometimes visible through a microscope. The loss of genes is a recessive lesion, of the sort imagined from the experiments with cell fusion.

SLIDE It has required several decades for these findings to have an impact, but now that impact is being felt in spades. Evidence has been obtained for recessive genetic lesions in most if not all forms of human cancer. At least six of the affected genes have been identified directly by the use of recom-

binant DNA, including genes involved in retinoblastoma; cancers of the breast, bowel, bladder and kidney; and tumors of the nervous system.

There are probably many more of these genes: I expect that they will eventually equal proto-oncogenes in their numbers. It is worth noting that even the earliest anticipated fruits of the often maligned human genome project would make tumor suppressor genes easier to find.

Moreover, the identification of lesions in tumor suppressor genes has added another dimension to the molecular genetics of cancer, because some of these lesions account for inherited predispositions to specific cancers. This is the topic about which Dr. King spoke to you in August. Like her, I emphasize that inherited cancer seems to be the exception, not the rule. Most cancer genes arise in cells other than the sperm or the egg and, thus, affect only a single individual.

In summary, two sorts of genetic damage figure in the genesis of human cancer: dominant—with targets known as proto-oncogenes; and recessive—with targets known most commonly as tumor suppressor genes. The proto-oncogene causes trouble only if it is goaded to an excess of action, whereas the recessive tumor suppressor gene causes trouble only when it is defective or lost.

These are diametrically opposite maladies, yet they both play on the cell to give an identical outcome: cancer. How does this happen?

The proliferation of cells is driven by an internal engine that is governed in at least two ways. First, multiple accelerators activate the engine when it has been idling and keep it running as long as cell division is required. Proto-oncogenes exemplify these accelerators. Damage to a proto-oncogene jams the accelerator and drives the cell to relentless proliferation.

Second, multiple brakes retard or arrest the engine when the cell should cease proliferation. Tumor suppressor genes exemplify the brakes. Remove a brake, and the cell is unleashed to relentless reproduction.

So the story of cancer reduces to these fundamentals: dominant and recessive genetic lesions: diametrically opposite maladies that combine to maim and kill. This is a powerful view of cancer. The seemingly countless causes of cancer—cigarette smoke, sunlight, asbestos, chemicals, viruses, and many others—all these may work in a single way, by playing on a genetic keyboard, by damaging a few of the genes in our DNA. An enemy has been found and we are beginning to understand its lines of attack.

It has already been possible to apply these findings in the diagnosis and prognosis of cancer. And when we understand how cancer genes work, we will be able to put that knowledge to work in the treatment of cancer; we will be able to aim our therapeutic weapons at the real malady in the cancer cell, not at a black box as we do now.

I believe that these visions may be realized quickly. The pace of discovery and application has been dizzying. I question the commonplace criticism that biomedical research in the U.S. lags in technology transfer: I have seen otherwise in my work-a-day world. The proto-oncogene src was discovered in chickens just 15 years ago, yet now we can paint at least partial genetic portraits of many human cancers and we are beginning to convert those portraits into applications at the bedside.

The story of cancer research in our time embodies a great truth about scientific dis-

covery that I want to emphasize. We cannot prejudge the utility of scholarship, we can only ask that it be sound. The Golden Fleece Award was a misbegotten gesture.

Remember that Peyton Rous isolated his virus from chickens, beasts not renowned for glamour—witness this quote from the German film director, Werner Herzog: "Stupidity is the devil. Look in the eye of a chicken and you will know. It's the most horrifying, cannibalistic and nightmarish creature in this world."

The chicken virus discovered by Peyton Rous seventy years ago was the first cancer virus to be isolated. Decades later, the src gene of the virus became the first oncogene to be identified; the action of the src gene, the first biochemical mechanism implicated in cancerous growth; and the discovery of src in normal cells, the first sighting of potential cancer genes in our cells.

Here is a familiar but oft-neglected lesson: the proper conduct of science lies in the pursuit of nature's puzzles, wherever they may lead. We cannot always assault the great problems of biology at will; we must remain alert to nature's clues and seize on them whenever and wherever they may appear, even if it be in a chicken.

In the words of H.G. Wells: " * * * the motive that will conquer cancer will not be pity nor horror; it will be curiosity to know how and why * * * Pity never made a good doctor, love never made a good poet. Desire for service never made a discovery."

These words exemplify the spirit in which the members of Congress and the U.S. public have supported fundamental research. I have been a scientist for 25 years and I have never doubted that most members of Congress understand the unpredictability of science, the creative power of the unfettered imagination, the need for unencumbered support, the truth in the words of Alfred Nobel when he said that he wanted "to help dreamers, as they find it difficult to get on in life".

But the dreamers in American science are finding it increasingly difficult to get on: they must eat before they can dream, they must have viable laboratories before they can discover. Leon Laderman, a great American physicist and Nobel Laureate framed the issue well with these recent words: " * * * something very dark and dramatic is taking place in our universities, a deep sense of discouragement, despair, frustration, resignation, a quenching of the traditional optimism of research scientists."

Make no mistake: this is NOT hyperbole: I have seen and felt the mood of which Laderman spoke.

The seat of the problem is known to you all, although I realize that some of you may not accept its validity: inadequate money for our spectacularly successful and still burgeoning community of scientists. Even those of us in the highly visible and financially favored microcosm of cancer research are gripped by the vice of fiscal constraint. I must renew my NIH grant this coming year: I am wracked with doubt that I will succeed.

As a citizen and taxpayer, I do not believe that these dark clouds are necessary. If we as a nation can find a trillion dollars to rescue dubious financial institutions, if we can find a billion dollars a day to fight an unexpected war, surely we can find the far more modest sums required to sustain and enhance the vibrancy of our research enterprise, to save our dreamers.

Double the budgets of NIH and NSF by the year 2000, as others have suggested before, and you will see wonders beyond imagining. Do less, and you may foreclose our ability to

set the international pace in fundamental research.

From the American essayist, Annie Dillard:

"[Who can read] what the wind-blown sand writes on the desert rock? I read there that all things live by a generous power and dance to a mighty tune; or I read * * * that all things are scattered and hurled."

Will we live by a generous power and dance to a mighty tune, or will we be scattered and hurled? The answer must come from this hill.

SEDANO'S SUPERMARKETS HONORED AS 1 TOP 10 HISPANIC BUSINESSES

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to recognize Sedano's Supermarkets which was recently selected as 1 of the 10 most important Hispanic businesses in Dade County by the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce and the Hispanic Heritage Council.

Along with the other businesses, Sedano's Supermarkets was presented with this award at the Omni International Hotel at a luncheon honoring these distinguished firms. The businesses were selected from a list of the 100 most important Hispanic firms in the United States which was published in Hispanic Business magazine.

Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce President-Elect Carlos Arboleya said that these firms were selected for their efforts for the Hispanic community and for their contribution to the economic development of Dade County.

Accepting the award for Sedano's Supermarkets was vice president of publicity Jorge Guerra. He credited the loyalty of his firm's customers for the selection of his company.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Sedano's Supermarkets for the contributions it has made to the economy of south Florida, providing economic opportunity, economic development and employment for the people of the Miami area.

UNDER ASSAD'S THUMB

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 6 months Secretary Baker worked tirelessly to bring the leaders of the Middle East together to negotiate a regional peace settlement. This week we are witnessing the culmination of those efforts.

I admire and share the administration's strong desire to bring peace and stability to the Middle East. However, despite this worthy goal, I do not approve of Mr. Baker's apparent willingness to accommodate the whims of such notorious terrorists as Syria's Hafez Assad. To my mind, the ends do not justify the

means. However, now that the parties have come to the table, I hope that we will witness a return to the same ideals which made Americans so proud during the war in the Persian Gulf.

I found the following article, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on October 25, particularly troubling in that it cites several examples in which the administration seems to have compromised itself for the sake of a peace settlement. I commend it to my colleagues' attention.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 25, 1991]

UNDER ASSAD'S THUMB

(By Steve Emerson)

JERUSALEM.—Editorialists across the U.S. are lauding Secretary of State James Baker for his "tenacity" in arranging the Middle East conference that will convene in Madrid next week. But documents and letters sent by Mr. Baker to both Israel and Syria over the past five months paint a less flattering portrait of Mr. Baker's diplomacy.

As the Bush administration began laying the groundwork last spring for a Middle East peace conference, the State Department provided both the Arab states and Israel with confidential statements spelling out clearly the basis for the proposed talks. The statements, which became the basis for the letters of invitation issued to the conference, form an explicit definition of the Bush administration's view of the peace process.

DIRECT TALKS

In the statement received by Israel, dated May 16, the State Department promised a "dual track process . . . [that will include] bilateral and multilateral negotiations" between Israel and Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and the Palestinians. In Israel, the fact that Syria had apparently agreed to direct bilateral talks with Israel was perceived as a major step forward by Damascus toward an acceptance of the legitimacy of the Jewish state.

But bilateral talks by themselves were not enough to demonstrate a genuine intention in Syria or any other Arab state to live in peace with Israel. Only through multilateral talks with all of its neighbors—on issues such as arms control, missile proliferation, water rights, etc.—could Israel be assured that its neighbors had finally come to terms with its existence. The U.S. accepted the logic of Israel's position, and promised in its May 16 statement that "multilateral negotiations will be launched within two weeks [of the bilateral talks] to address regionwide issues."

It was Syria's apparent acceptance of this commitment to multilateral talks that prompted Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir to hail "revolutionary change" in the Syrian attitude, and to accept in principle the administration's plans for an international peace conference—a negotiating format that Israel had long opposed for fear that it was a device by the Arab states to avoid direct negotiations. If Syrian leader Hafez Assad were prepared to talk about all areas of concern to Israel, then it meant that he was not interested solely in regaining the Golan Heights at the bargaining table, but in real peace.

But something happened on the way to the peace conference. According to American diplomats, almost as soon as Mr. Baker began his shuttle diplomacy between Jerusalem and Damascus to nail down the specifics of the conference, Mr. Assad began to retreat from his commitment to participate in mul-

tilateral talks with Israel. Without multilateral talks there would be no discussion of arms control—a matter of some importance to Israel in light of the massive purchase by Syria of Scud-C missiles and other weapons in the months following the Gulf War.

At the same time, Saudi Arabia was also backing away from its implied promise to participate in multilateral talks with Israel. Instead of standing firm and cashing in the IOUs earned during the American-led war against Saddam Hussein, the U.S. began to waver. In discussions with Arab officials, according to a senior American diplomat involved in the negotiations, "after discovering the vehemence of the Arab reaction [against multilateral talks] we decided not to try breaking down the brick wall."

The State Department notified Israel and the Arab states in November that "multilateral talks will still be launched within two weeks" of the bilateral talks—but only "to organize discussions on regional issues." (Emphasis added.) In other words, the U.S. was promising to have the conference participants meet to discuss having discussions.

Having won one concession from Mr. Baker, Mr. Assad tried for—and obtained—another. In early October, the U.S. informed Israel that participation in the multilateral talks would be purely voluntary: "Those parties who wish to attend multilateral negotiations will convene two weeks after the opening" of the bilateral talks. Syria was a party that plainly, did not wish to. When an Israeli negotiator questioned a State Department official as to the utility of multilateral talks in the absence of Syria, the official responded with the good news that Mauritania and Morocco would be attending.

Nor was this the end to Mr. Baker's acquiescence to Syrian demands. Originally, the U.S. had said the objective of the conference was "peace treaties" between the quarreling states of the Middle East. But the term "peace treaties" was unacceptable to Mr. Assad, and so was deleted.

Likewise, the choice of Madrid as the site of the talks was a concession to Syrian pressure. The State Department says that Madrid was chosen for reasons of "security." The 1992 Olympics are to be held in Barcelona, and so—State Department officials have told reporters—Spanish authorities have made elaborate preparations to secure their country from terrorist attack.

But Israeli officials say—and this is confirmed by American diplomats based in Israel—that they had been led to believe that the negotiations, like those conducted in the past with Egypt and Lebanon, would be held in Israel and the Arab countries. The Camp David accords, for example, were first negotiated at alternating sites in Israel and Egypt and only wrapped up at Camp David. Syria's willingness to allow Israeli negotiators onto its territory and to send its negotiators to Israel would have confirmed the peaceful intentions of its Arab leader and helped to prepare the Arab populations for a real peace.

But Syria refused to consider on-site talks and the U.S. backed down. The U.S.'s second offer was to hold the talks in Europe, and it specifically suggested the Hague—a popular venue for peace talks for nearly a hundred years—as an appropriate location. Damascus again said no. The Hague is the capital of the Netherlands, a country that, the Syrians complained, was "too pro-Israeli." Syria—not the U.S.—then proposed Madrid, the capital of a country that has tilted toward the Arab side of the Middle East dispute and that hosts the largest Palestine Liberation Organization embassy in Europe.

ATTACK AMERICAN TARGETS

American indulgence has emboldened Syria to go even further. This past week, Iran hosted a conference of Muslim fundamentalists at which participants vowed to destroy Israel and attack "American targets around the world." Among those attending—and with the loudest voices—were two Palestinian terrorist leaders who are headquartered in and trained, financed and supported by Damascus: Ahmed Jabril, head of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command, who carried out the bombing of Pan American Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, and Col. Abu Mousa, head of Fatah-Uprising. Both men vowed to kill anyone who attended the peace talks in Madrid. When the Tehran conference ended, Abu Mousa returned to his headquarters in Damascus, located on a Syrian military base.

In the end, the credibility of America's assurances to Israel that its Arab neighbors truly desire peace will be the determining factor in any decision by Israel to make tangible concessions in exchange for Arab leaders' intangible promises. And only if the Arab leaders prepare their population for the reality of peace with Israel—by their declared willingness to sign peace treaties with Israel and meet face to face with Israelis on home territory—will peace ever come. The track record of the U.S. and Syria over the past five months suggests that neither condition will be met.

NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY
HOLDS ANNUAL SESSION

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on October 18 a delegation of Members of the House attended the annual session of the North Atlantic Assembly which was held in Madrid, Spain. The Assembly met in committee sessions on October 18 and 19 and in plenary session on October 21.

The North Atlantic Assembly is the interparliamentary body of the member countries of the North Atlantic Alliance and periodically brings together members from all the NATO countries to discuss alliance issues.

This year's meeting took place at a critical period in Western history. It was fitting that the meeting took place in Madrid, a city which had placed its stamp on the evolution of new institutions of Europe such as the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and which served as host to the Middle East Peace Conference.

The issues confronting the Western Alliance are increasingly complex within Europe. During 4 days of meetings, members of the Assembly wrestled with questions ranging from nuclear arms control, immigration, to the disastrous environmental pollution in the former Warsaw Pact countries. In a development which has proven increasingly useful in this forum, these issues are now discussed with those same countries—Poland, Hungary, the Czech and Slovak Republics, the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, and Romania—which were formerly considered enemies of the West, but which now have been accepted as associate

members of the Assembly. To these additional participants were recently added the newly independent Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and, on an observer basis, the Russian Republic.

Against this multinational background, presentations were heard on politico-military affairs from the Chief of the Soviet General Staff, General Vladimir Lobov, and the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, U.S. General John Galvin, as well as from the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner.

Issues discussed included the future of the armed forces on both sides of the former division of Europe, security of Soviet nuclear weapons, confidence-building and arms control measures agreed and contemplated between the two sides, the future role of United States forces in Europe, and the European commitment to its own defense.

In the economic arena, members were brought up to date on the latest prospects for economic reform in Eastern Europe and the Uruguay round of trade talks.

In the area of human rights, much attention was given to the continuing civil war in Yugoslavia and attempts at its mediation, as well as to the question of minority rights, in the newly emerging democracies in Eastern Europe.

Finally, in the area of science and technology, discussions were held on combined responses to the problems of climate change and the political and environmental aspects of chemical weapons in Europe. Each of these subject areas was covered by a separate committee of the Assembly for half the session, and it is impossible to convey the depth and range of issues discussed in a brief statement. I do believe, however, that the experience was most useful for the U.S. Members in attendance as well as their European counterparts.

A unique characteristic of these meetings has been the experience of discussing this variety of issues with members of the newly democratic parliaments of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. It is my sincere hope that their exposure to the ingrained traditions of free and open political disclosure will help these new parliamentarians in their search for the routes to a more pluralistic and open political system, one in which their countries' citizens are fully represented, rather than repressed, in the governmental processes which so affect their lives. In fact, an underlying sentiment in every meeting was the desire to extend a friendly hand to the East.

House Members played a key role in both the committee meetings and the plenary session. In the Political Committee Representative GERALD SOLOMON was elected Vice Chairman of the Political Committee. Representative LARRY SMITH was reelected Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Southern Region. Both participated actively in the drafting and amendments of the resolutions discussed in the committee.

In the Defense and Security Committee Representatives BILL RICHARDSON and NORM SISISKY led the debate for the House delegation. Representative RICHARDSON was reelected Co-Rapporteur of the Subcommittee on Defense Cooperation between Europe and North America. He was also elected Vice Chairman of the Special Committee on Re-

structuring the Alliance. Representative DOUG BEREUTER presented the report of the Special Committee and was reelected Co-Rapporteur.

Representative ALEX McMILLAN was reelected Vice Chairman of the Economic Committee. In the Economic Committee there were extensive discussions of the issues relating to the economies in Eastern Europe and conversion to a civilian economy and East-West trade.

Representative CARLISS COLLINS was reelected Vice Chair of the Civilian Affairs Committee although illness prevented her participation. In her absence Representative NANCY PELOSI played a key role in the debate on immigration and human rights issues.

Representative TOM LEWIS presented an important report on hypersonic and supersonic transportation which was well received by the Scientific and Technical Committee. Representative RICHARD RAY made an important intervention on environmental pollution caused by military forces in Europe. At the conclusion of the meeting Representative SHERRY BOEH- LERT, who was unable to participate for family reasons, was reelected Vice-Chairman.

The debate theme for the session was entitled "NATO After the Soviet Union". Thirty-one amendments were introduced and debated and voted on during the plenary session on Monday. Representative LARRY SMITH played a major role in debating and voting on these resolutions.

The meetings were long and arduous and I want to thank all of the Members of the delegation for their faithful participation in the work of the Assembly. Because of their hard work the United States was represented on all the issues that were discussed.

I don't want to let the opportunity pass to commend the work of our staff who prepared background papers, briefing notes, speeches, and recommendations on amendments in addition to the administrative work that goes into a North Atlantic Assembly session. Peter Abbruzzese, the Delegation Secretary, organized a bipartisan staff team which, in addition to providing support at the meetings, worked late in the evenings and over the weekend to ensure that the delegation was prepared for each session. I would like particularly to mention Arch Roberts, Mike Ennis, and Ron Bartek who provided staff assistance and recommendations on the debate theme.

At this point I would like to include in the RECORD a list of Members of the delegation and staff.

Finally Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that Representative CHARLIE ROSE was reelected president of the Assembly. He has been an outstanding president and had led the assembly in pioneering a new and stable relationship with our allies and our new friends to the East. He made an outstanding speech at the Plenary session and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

U.S. HOUSE DELEGATION TO THE NORTH
ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

Hon. Dante Fascell.
Hon. Jack Brooks.
Hon. Charlie Rose.
Hon. Larry Smith.
Hon. Bill Richardson.
Hon. Ron Coleman.
Hon. Nancy Pelosi.
Hon. David Price.

Hon. Ben Nighthorse Campbell.
 Hon. Eni Faleomavaega.
 Hon. Norman Sisisky.
 Hon. Richard Ray.
 Hon. James Bilbray.
 Hon. Gerald Solomon.
 Hon. J. Alex McMillan.
 Hon. Doug Bereuter.
 Hon. Thomas Bliley.
 Hon. Tom Lewis.
 Hon. Marge Roukema.
 Hon. Floyd Spence.
 Hon. Joel Hefley.
 Hon. Herb Bateman.
 John J. Brady, Jr., Chief of Staff.
 R. Spencer Oliver, Chief Counsel, CSCE issues.

Peter Abbruzzese, Delegation Secretary.
 Arch W. Roberts, Jr., Economic Committee, Plenary resolution.

Mike Ennis, Special Committee, Plenary resolution.

Jo Weber, Administrative and clerical support.

Dara Schlieker, Administrative and clerical support.

Nancy Bloomer, Administrative and clerical support.

Sharon Matts, Administrative and clerical support.

Ron Lasch, Scientific and Technical Committee.

Maryanne Murray, Political Committee.

Dean Curran, Civilian Affairs Committee.

Bob Shea, Liaison with NAA leadership.

Ron Bartek, Defense and Security Committee.

Georgia Osterman, Defense and Security Committee.

Evelyn Mackrella, Defense and Security Committee.

ADDRESS BY CHARLIE ROSE, PRESIDENT OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

President Gonzalez, Secretary General Wörner, Foreign Minister Jeszensky, honourable colleagues, and distinguished guests.

It is my great pleasure to open the 37th Annual Session of the North Atlantic Assembly here in Madrid. This is the first occasion on which the Assembly has held its Annual Session in Spain—a country which offers a glowing example to all nations that the transition from authoritarianism to democracy, political stability, and economic prosperity can be forged. At the international level, this transformation is particularly visible in Spain's active and constructive membership of the Atlantic Alliance, the NATO Defense Planning Committee, Western European Union, and the European Communities.

Our Assembly meets during a period of immense significance. The decisions taken over the next several weeks and months—in Rome, Maastricht, Helsinki, and the capitals of the Soviet republics—will affect the future course of security and stability in Europe in fundamental and perhaps irreversible ways.

We have all welcomed the great changes taking place in Europe and the steady consolidation of freedom and democracy.

First, we welcome the regained independence of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and are honoured by the presence of deputies from the three Baltic nations. Your achievement demonstrates to the whole world that legitimacy can only flow from the will of the people.

And, second, we salute the courageous and historic action by the leadership of the Russian Federation during those three days in August—three days that shook the world and ushered in yet another watershed on the road

toward democracy and respect for the principles of Helsinki. We look forward to working with the deputies of the Russian Federation to further enhance mutual knowledge and co-operation in constructing a new system of collective security. And I am pleased to see them here with us today.

May I also point out, colleagues, that it is a testament to our pioneering efforts that joining our deliberations, as he has since 1989, is General Vladimir Lobov, today the Chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces as well as a Deputy of the Supreme Soviet and Leader of his delegation. His presence is surely a sign of the times, and I thank him for being able to attend despite his enormous responsibilities back home.

But we also know that the abortive coup in August was a clear indication of the dangers that lie ahead, of the sources of turbulence yet to be extinguished.

The road to political and economic stability in Central and Eastern Europe is going to be longer and more difficult than most of us initially thought. Frustrated expectations, social unrest, ethnic and national rivalries, and territorial disputes are surfacing with worrying rapidity and intensity. The European geopolitical landscape has many profoundly troubling features, of which the present civil war in Yugoslavia is the most extreme, frustrating, and tragic illustration thus far.

Our discussions here in Madrid will form a prelude to the forthcoming NATO Summit in Rome, the European Community Summit in Maastricht, and the next meeting of the CSCE Foreign Ministers in Prague. In view of current conditions these will be vitally important meetings, particularly in terms of defining the relationships and respective competence of the various institutions involved in European security.

Each has a valid role and each a special contribution to make. However, it is important to ensure that complementarity does not become duplication, and that duplication does not lead to crippling paralysis of action. Therefore, we need to identify more clearly than before where certain organizations are better suited to fulfill certain roles than others. We should look for a division of labour among these organizations that makes the most effective use of the collective potential available.

But in such a division of labour, NATO must remain the custodian of our collective security.

I know that I reflect the vast majority of Congressional opinion when I say that the United States will remain fully engaged in Europe, for a long as our European partners, including our partners in Central and Eastern Europe, welcome that engagement. For us NATO continues to be the primary transatlantic forum for Allied consultation and co-operation on any issues that affect our vital interests.

Indeed, it is no accident that during the attempted coup in Moscow, it was to NATO that the Central and Eastern European nations, as well as President Yeltsin, looked for reassurance that nothing less than restoration of the Soviet constitutional order would suffice. And that reassurance was provided, immediately, and in no uncertain terms.

To sustain its primacy the Alliance will have to adjust and adapt to the new conditions. It is in the process of doing so. We recognize and welcome these changes. Of course, important questions remain to be answered—most notably the institutional division of

labour to which I referred earlier. These questions will be addressed at the forthcoming NATO Summit in Rome. Perhaps, in his presentation, Manfred Wörner will give us some indication of what will be decided in Rome.

But our message to the Rome Summit is clear. The leaders of the Alliance must seize the opportunity offered by the new conditions to ensure that NATO remains the central organization in preserving stability and security in Europe. We all know that Rome will not provide the final chapter in this debate—but it should make sure that we know how that chapter will read.

NATO's future role and relevance and the issue of institutional competence will be central to our Plenary Debate today. I hope the theme "NATO after the Soviet Union" will facilitate a free and frank discussion. I am grateful to the General Rapporteur and former Chairman of the Political Committee, Mr. Bruce George for accepting my invitation to introduce this debate.

We, parliamentarians, also have an important role to play during this transitional era. In the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, democratic institutions are still in their infancy. They need our assistance. This assistance can take many forms. At one level, it is the practical experience we can share with our new colleagues in achieving transparency and accountability in government. At another, it is the psychological element of demonstrating co-operation and partnership. By providing a forum for dialogue, we are building understanding and confidence and contributing a much needed element of reassurance.

Most important, our actions constitute a model which our governments could well follow as they design relations between NATO and the new democracies. We have responded imaginatively and flexibly to the requirements of the countries of Eastern Europe—by, for example, establishing the status of associate delegations and by tailoring much of our work to their needs.

In this respect, I am pleased to see that proposals made by Foreign Minister Genscher and Secretary of State Baker reflect some of our ideas, namely more formal diplomatic consultations between the North Atlantic Council and the new democracies.

Some delegates have asked: Where are we going with these contacts? Where will they lead to? My answer is that this is one area where vision should, for a brief moment, take a back seat to pragmatism. Let us concentrate on the urgent needs of the moment. Common sense will inform us when we have reached the limits of our effectiveness. But let me add, where would our new colleagues be now if we had not responded, if we had just sat still? And what sort of group would we be if we talked only to ourselves—comfortable, yes, but less and less relevant.

As an Assembly, we have already achieved a great deal and with the help of the initiative that Senator Roth and I have launched, I hope we will go even further. This initiative is well under way and will result in a number of activities and projects during the coming year geared specifically to the requirements of our associate delegates.

I know I can count on the moral, political and practical support of all delegations in pursuing this initiative, and sharing parliamentary experience on critical issues of mutual interest, such as: building firm foundations for parliamentary democracy; controlling defence expenditure; assuring civilian control of military and security forces; converting defence-oriented industries for

the service of all citizens; and respecting human rights and those of national minorities.

As the face of Europe changes, our responsibility for pursuing dialogue and co-operation among parliamentarians will also expand. I am confident that we are up to the task. And that our work will contribute to building the understanding, experience and confidence which we know is essential for our common security.

Finally, I should also mention today one new development in the search for peace and stability in the world. The announcement by Secretary of State James Baker and his Soviet opposite number of a Middle East Peace Conference, to be held here in Madrid at the end of this month, is a major step forward. We in the Assembly wish the conference well in its endeavors.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

In closing let me express my sincere gratitude to those who put in the long hours to organize this year's Session, including in particular the members of the Spanish delegation and the International Secretariat. A special word of thanks is due to President Gonzalez, who has accepted our invitation to address members here today. I am certain that his remarks will offer an excellent reminder to us of the opportunity and challenges confronting this Alliance and our Assembly.

AMERICA SAYS NO TO MARIJUANA USE

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the war against drugs is a difficult fight. There is much we have yet to accomplish. However, there are times when it is appropriate to examine the progress we have made to date, as we continue to work toward total victory. I am pleased to report that in our effort to reduce domestic demand for illicit narcotics, indications that we are headed in the right direction.

Numerous drug consumption surveys have indicated that use of all types of deadly drugs is on the decline. Equally important, people's attitude toward narcotics have also changed. Where once drug consumption was viewed by many as a harmless pleasure, it is now recognized as a dangerous and risky activity that jeopardizes one's health, as well as one's career.

There are many reasons for this change in behavior. They include strong law enforcement programs on the Federal, State, and local level, as well as widespread education campaigns, especially the creative advertising initiatives of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. Strong leadership from President Bush, and drug czars Bill Bennett and Bob Martinez, have ensured that initiatives to combat drugs gained the attention and resources they required to have positive impact.

An excellent illustration of the progress we have made can be found in a front page story in The New York Times of October 29, 1991. The story discusses how and why Americans are now rejecting marijuana consumption. I strongly recommend that my colleagues review this article and am inserting the full text of the article at this point in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 29, 1991]

COSTLY AND SCARCE, MARIJUANA IS A HIGH MORE ARE REJECTING

(By Joseph B. Treaster)

Not long ago, hosts at some Upper East Side dinner parties would set out little silver bowls of home-rolled marijuana cigarettes along with the after-dinner drinks. Rock concerts unfolded under canopies of marijuana smoke, and the drug's syrupy aroma drifted across schoolyards and campuses, construction sites and corporate offices, public parks and private patios.

But as quietly and gradually as the widening of a waistline, America's infatuation with the herb of many names—grass, pot, dope, weed, ganja, sess, sens, smoke, skunk and, quaintly, in the long ago, Mary Jane—has been fading.

In New York and throughout the country, lighting up is no longer hip, not in high school, not at college, not at most social events and, with the advent of widespread random drug testing, certainly not on the job.

"IT'S NOT COOL ANYMORE"

The great marijuana cloud has grown wispy as rebellion and the quest for nirvana have yielded to conformity and the struggle for survival, as health concerns and a vague fear of getting into trouble have risen above the desire to get giddy.

Part of the shift, undoubtedly, has also been because of relentless police pressure that has transformed an abundant drug once available for \$20 or \$30 an ounce into a scarce commodity selling in some quarters in New York for \$800 an ounce, more than twice the price of gold.

"It's not cool anymore," said a high school senior in Manhattan, capturing the mood of the 90's with the language of the 60's.

Although the glory days of the Beatles are generally remembered as the peak of the marijuana craze, the popularity of the drug gathered momentum through the 70's and stayed relatively strong until the late 80's.

Advocates insist that marijuana—the mildest and by far the most widely tried illegal drug in America—is no more harmful than alcohol, not even the latest strains, which are 10 times more potent than the grass of the flower children. Still, it has been as much a target of the national antidrug campaign as cocaine, heroin, LSD and barbiturates, and many people have clearly taken the warnings and prohibitions to heart.

Nonconclusive medical evidence on the long-term effects of marijuana has been developed. But Federal officials contend it is a steppingstone to other drugs. Many addicts do report that marijuana was their first drug. But legions of former smokers say they never went on to anything stronger. "Most of us," said one professional woman in her mid-40's, "just dropped out of drugs and called it a day."

Ultimately, it seems, marijuana just does not fit the personal visions of growing numbers of New Yorkers and other Americans. Nor do most other drugs, including cocaine, alcohol and nicotine, all of which are being increasingly rejected.

Some of those most militantly opposed to marijuana and other drugs are schoolchildren who for several years now have been attending antidrug classes and watching antidrug messages on television. One junior high student in Queens said she had no interest in experimenting with marijuana. "It just doesn't seem like it would be fun or anything," she said. "We've heard so much about it, that it's horrible and stuff."

"DOING DRUGS DOESN'T HELP"

And the Manhattan high school senior said that although marijuana was widely accepted as recently as her freshman and sophomore years, she now finds that "everyone is really scared about getting into college and getting good jobs and doing drugs doesn't help." The two young women, like many other people interviewed for this article, spoke on the condition that they not be identified because they were socially uncomfortable about being associated with drugs in any way.

"Using pot," the high school senior said, "is like dropping out of the race"; which, of course, was precisely the attraction for many in her father's generation.

Former pot smokers—or almost former pot smokers—are everywhere. Nathan J., a 20-year-old college sophomore, rarely smokes now because he found he was losing his edge in volleyball and Frisbee games. A 28-year-old dancer who said she smoked heavily in high school takes a drag every couple of years and finds to her disappointment that she becomes paranoid and self-conscious and ends up wondering why she tried it again. Her friend, a graphic artist, said she decided she could not tolerate the loss of hand-eye coordination. A lawyer in her 40's said that while she didn't believe smoking was bad, it began to seem "foolhardy" to risk an arrest that "could wreck your career."

Marijuana smoking reached its peak in 1979, when the National Institute on Drug Abuse estimated, based on its survey, that more than 31.5 million Americans had used the drug at least once during that year. By 1990, when the most recent statistics were compiled, the marijuana-smoking crowd had diminished by more than a third, to 20.5 million.

With the nation's population steadily rising, those smoking marijuana in 1990 represented 10.2 percent of all Americans over the age of 12, compared with 17.8 percent in 1979.

More than 66 million people have tried marijuana at least once, compared with 22.7 million who have sampled cocaine, the National Institute on Drug Abuse says. In 1993, the institute estimated that 10.2 million Americans had used marijuana within the last month, compared with 1.6 million who had used cocaine.

EVEN ROCK FANS LOOK AROUND FIRST

These estimates may understate total marijuana use, many drug experts say, but probably accurately reflect a pronounced decline. Even organizations that advocate making marijuana legal and regulating it like alcohol say there has been a significant decrease.

People still smoke marijuana at rock concerts. But they look around before they pull out a joint and they hold off if they see an usher coming. A New York woman studying at the University of Rhode Island said most of her circle of friends smoked marijuana. "But," she added, "it's become much more of a taboo topic, much less socially acceptable. It's gone under the rug."

Back in 1979, almost all the marijuana smoked in the United States was grown in other countries and it all seemed to have romantic names. There were Thai Sticks, Cambodian Red, Colombian Gold, Panama Red and some from Mexico known simply by place names, Oaxaca and Michoacán. The United States Customs Service seized more than 3.5 million pounds of marijuana in 1979. Last year, Federal agents intercepted 222,274 pounds, or 15 times less.

The great wall of boats, planes and radar thrown up by the Federal Government may

not have dented the cocaine trade, but it nearly killed marijuana smuggling. Marijuana is much bulkier and harder to conceal than cocaine and, until recently, it sold for much less.

"We used to call it the Big Green Elephant," said a charter boat captain in Miami. "You could smell it a quarter of a mile away." He, like others with intimate knowledge of the trade, agreed to speak only with the promise of anonymity.

Unable to get through the barriers or unwilling to risk jail for the lower profits from marijuana, some smugglers dropped out; others shifted to cocaine. "For a lot of guys, bringing in a load of marijuana was a form of high adventure," the Miami skipper said. "But it became very dangerous and guys said, 'This is ridiculous.'"

MAUI Wowie EMBARRASSES BUSH

As recently as 1984, the biggest percentage of America's marijuana was from Colombia. Now Mexico is the main foreign supplier and the most sought-after marijuana is grown in California, Oregon and Hawaii.

The war against domestically grown marijuana accelerated in early 1990, after President Bush was embarrassed at a conference on drugs in Colombia at which Alan Garcia, then president of Peru, suggested that Washington could hardly expect Latin America to stop growing the raw material for cocaine when marijuana farmers flourished in the United States.

Government spray planes wiped out 85 to 90 percent of Hawaii's marijuana, administration officials say. Millions of other marijuana plants were destroyed in national parks and on other public lands that farmers had begun cultivating to avoid the Government seizing private property used for illegal crops. Scores of greenhouses, each containing hundreds of plants, were raided and Federal agents began tracking marijuana farmers through the records of companies that sell nursery supplies.

"You can't wink at marijuana," said Robert C. Bonner, the chief of the Drug Enforcement Administration. "It is not a benign drug. It affects productivity and general alertness. It has a corruptive influence on law enforcement and public officials. And if we want other countries to control cocaine production, we have to lead by example."

Federal spending to fight marijuana at home nearly doubled in the 1991 fiscal year, to \$35 million, and the administration requested \$87 million for 1992.

After the air raids in Hawaii, the retail price of marijuana there leaped from \$2,000 a pound to \$6,000, which is \$375 an ounce, or \$16 more than an ounce of gold.

Prices fluctuate around the country, but in the Northeast these days it is not unusual to pay \$280 an ounce. Most sales, the dealers say, are of quarter-ounce packets. Street hustlers still offer plastic sandwich bags of what looks like marijuana for \$10. But quite often, experienced smokers say, the hustlers are peddling diluted marijuana or a jumble of nonintoxicating herbs.

As a hedge against being ripped off, many buyers get friends to refer them to reputable dealers. One New York dealer wears a beeper and promises delivery in midtown within half an hour of receiving a telephone order. Another works out of his tasteful apartment on the Upper West Side of Manhattan, offering three grades of marijuana for as much as \$800 an ounce.

Cocaine is currently selling in New York for \$800 to \$1,200 an ounce. The same amount of heroin is fetching more than \$5,000.

The Upper West Side dealer's customers are lawyers, doctors, stockbrokers and other

well-paid professionals. To them, price is of little consequence. But it does matter to many people.

"If it goes up anymore, I'm going to stop smoking," said an art major at one Northeastern college.

Some marijuana users have turned to growing their own. One professional, for example, has a small garden in a closet of his home on Staten Island. Hundreds if not thousands of other New Yorkers are growing a few marijuana plants on windowsills.

But the best quality comes from plants that require more attention than most people want to give. So a legion of outlaw horticulturalists are developing throughout the country. One of them, a young man who lives in Maryland, told of setting up nurseries in the recreation room and basements of three houses not far from Washington, and of tending marijuana bushes on small plots of Government land in the capital.

"D.C. is an excellent growing environment for marijuana," he said. "With all that concrete, it retains about five degrees more heat than the outlying areas and you get approximately one to two weeks more growing time."

COMPETITION AND SEMATECH

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in the matter of high-tech industries, the Federal Government ought to adopt a policy to encourage the formation of consortia and joint ventures, both within industry and between industry and Government. Never has there been a more crucial time for Government to show appropriate support for business-Government efforts in the high-tech field.

I call Members' attention to an editorial published by the Washington Post yesterday on Sematech, a Government-business consortium of semiconductor and computer companies in Austin, TX, whose aim is to revive the semiconductor manufacturing equipment industry. The editorial goes to the heart of why we need Sematech, and points out some of the achievements of Sematech.

The editorial, which I commend to all Members, also emphasizes that we must continue Sematech and encourage initiatives like it. Sematech is indeed a new model of Government and business cooperation and the Federal Government ought to build on the successes we have already realized because of Sematech. I submit yesterday's editorial for the RECORD.

COMPETITION AND SEMATECH

Until a decade ago, the United States dominated the market for the highly sophisticated machines that manufacture semiconductors. In 1980 American companies held 75 percent of the worldwide market, and all 10 of the world's largest producers were in this country. But by 1990, American companies held only 45 percent of the market, Japanese companies held 44 percent, and four of the five largest producers were Japanese. The figures come from a study by the U.S. International Trade Commission—a portrait of declining American competitiveness in a key industry.

The industry itself is not large. Its world sales run about \$9 billion a year. But it's the base of a tremendous food chain. It supplies the production equipment for the semiconductor manufacturers, whose sales in this country alone are \$25 billion a year. They in turn supply the American electronics industry with sales of \$226 billion a year.

A vigorous experiment is now underway to rescue the American industry, and it's beginning to show results. The American equipment firms tend to be small and have trouble financing research. Sematech, a consortium of 14 U.S. companies that make semiconductors, is a collaboration in high-powered R&D. Its purpose is to ensure that this country's microchip industry does not become dependent on slightly obsolescent production equipment from foreign firms whose preferred customers might be elsewhere. The idea is to keep a crucial industry alive, not with the usual subsidies or protection from imports, but through engineering skill and manufacturing quality.

Sematech violates some of the hands-off rules of free-market ideology. Half its budget, about \$200 million a year, is put up by the companies, but the other half comes from the Defense Department. The consortium represents one kind of industrial policy. It means intervention in the market by public investment. But it's making the market worldwide more competitive. The machines it develops are for sale to anybody anywhere in the world who wants to buy.

It's still much too early for a judgment on Sematech, but there are encouraging signs—such as the highly advanced semiconductor plant that Motorola opened last spring in Austin, Tex., with mostly American production equipment. If its successes continue, Sematech will establish a new model for industrial organization in high technology. It doesn't try to shut off the flow of technology to the rest of the world or to close American markets to anybody. But with a modest amount of federal money, it is beginning to make a large change in the ways firms in this esoteric business work with, and for, each other.

GLORIA ESTEFAN RECEIVES VICTORY AWARD IN WASHINGTON, DC

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, Gloria Estefan, a constituent of my congressional district, will be presented with the Victory Award at the 6th annual celebration on Monday, November 18, 1991, at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, DC. The Victory Award was established by the National Rehabilitation Hospital in 1986. It honors individuals from across the Nation who exemplify unusual strength and courage in the face of adversity.

Gloria Estefan has managed to overcome not only great obstacles in the musical arena but also in her personal life. After a very serious bus accident where she suffered a serious back injury, her determination in life helped her to succeed and completely recuperate from this tragic injury. She will soon be ending the "Into the Light Tour" which will have been viewed by more than 10 million people across

the world. This award truly demonstrates Gloria Estefan's great feats in life.

It is indeed an honor for me to recognize such an outstanding member of our community who is determined to strive for excellence in everything she sets her mind to accomplish for the betterment of her life as well as her community. I cannot think of anyone who deserves to be a Victory Award honoree more than Gloria Estefan.

She was born in Cuba and raised in the Miami area. After having graduated from the University of Miami, she went on to join Emilio Estefan's "Miami Latin Boys," and thus in 1975 "The Miami Sound Machine" was born. Gloria Estefan is the interpreter of the work of Emilio Estefan, the director, producer, and coordinator of "The Miami Sound Machine." Gloria Estefan helped bring the musical group to its all time height of success.

Gloria Estefan has catapulted to stardom by joining two worlds through her talents of music and writing. She has combined American pop music with her Latin rhythm to create a music all her own, Miami style. Gloria Estefan and Emilio Estefan have promoted their Latin roots through music and have broken barriers across five continents.

Her talents extend beyond musician and writer. Generosity and commitment to community work have made her the perfect role model as a Cuban-American for young adults not only in Miami but for Americans across the country. She has served and been personally involved in many worthwhile causes to help disadvantaged adults and children.

Upon nomination to the Victory Awards, Gloria Estefan would like to say, "It is truly a great honor to receive this Victory Award. I am very proud to be recognized as a Victory Award recipient. Thank you."

PEACE CONFERENCE PUZZLE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am not very confident that there will be a successful conclusion of the Middle East peace conference currently underway in Madrid. So long as the conference remains focused on the Arab-Israeli dispute over the occupied territories, and fails to address the equally important issues such as resolving the struggle for Arab dominance, reducing weapons proliferation, and the cessation of terrorist activities, I fail to see how there can be a conciliation with Israel. Until Israel can be assured that the promise for real peace does indeed exist, she would be foolish to give up her only true bargaining chip.

The following article, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on October 25, highlights many of the real problems which must be addressed if the peace conference is to be successful. I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

PEACE CONFERENCE PUZZLE

If you've been reading—or trying to read—all the coverage these many weeks about the Middle East peace conference now scheduled

for next week in Madrid, and thinking that in the wake of the Iraq war it somehow doesn't all quite add up, here's why:

George Bush and James Baker have untied U.S. Mideast policy from its traditional mooring—Israel and democracy—and set it adrift in neutral waters between Israel and that mythical land, the unified Arab world. It's a strange voyage.

Many of us had thought that one of the primary fruits of the Iraq war would be a reorientation of the Gulf and other Arab states toward the political system that exists in most of the world—that is, away from dictatorships and absolute monarchies and toward a greater degree of popular self-determination. But no.

To soothe Arab sensitivities George Bush decided to spare Saddam Hussein and his dictatorship. Turkey's Turgut Ozal is the first victim of this mistake. When Mr. Bush withdrew, Mr. Ozal was left out on a limb with the Kurdish issue festering on his border. Saddam Hussein has been arming the Kurds to fight for independence from Turkey. Last week Turkish voters took out their frustrations for this mess on Mr. Ozal, who remains in power but with a greatly reduced base of support.

American submissiveness to Arab sensitivities also has scotched U.S. Gulf security plans. According to the Washington Post, the U.S. is withdrawing the weapons stockpile that it had hoped would be part of a postwar security umbrella for the region. The Arab regimes prefer to build up their own armies.

The least attractive shift in U.S. policy has been symbolized by the repeated trips James Baker has made to pay court to Syria's murderous dictator, Hafez Assad, one of next week's Madrid "peace" participants. The State Department apparatus that two years ago sanitized Saddam's crimes is now polishing Assad's image. The U.S. winked at Syria's October 1990 invasion of Lebanon and insists that Lebanon is still independent, though even the Syrian defense minister talks about Syria and Lebanon as "one country."

The U.S. has been unruffled by Assad's \$3.5 billion postwar arms buildup (he reportedly spends 60% of his government budget on his army). The Syrian dictator has purchased 150 North Korean Scud Cs, and up to 24 Chinese M-9s. Factories at Damascus and Homs churn out chemical weapons to go in missile warheads. State also avoids mention of Syria's control of the \$4 billion drug trade in the Bekaa Valley and Syrian unwillingness to cooperate with American drug-enforcement authorities.

Meanwhile, with the region bristling with dictators, terrorist armies and chemical weapons, Mr. Baker says the biggest obstacles to peace in the Middle East are West Bank Jewish settlements.

Mr. Assad, who's been around the Middle East even longer than Mr. Baker, knows that in reality the Israeli issue is mainly a playground for larger Arab power struggles.

If Mr. Baker looks around the room at the Middle East conference in Madrid next week, he will see the representatives of Syria, which has been at virtual war with the PLO since 1982, culminating in bloody battles last summer between Syrian and Palestinian forces in South Lebanon; Jordan, whose army massacred 8,000 Palestinians in 1970, and whose king continues to deny self-determination to the 70% of his population that is Palestinian; and Saudi Arabia, which demonstrates its concern for the Palestinians by expelling tens of thousands, and which has

been trying to destabilize the regime of its Arab brother Jordan.

The Madrid peace conference must contend with not only the usual pit of Arab rivalries, but also a postwar power struggle for dominance in the Arab world among Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Syria. By focusing postwar attention on the Israeli dispute rather than economic development or democratization, the U.S. has ensured that Syria will emerge as the dominant Arab power. Egypt and Saudi Arabia are necessarily peripheral.

Perhaps Mr. Assad sees some further advantage for himself in conciliation with Israel, but more likely he wants to string the process along to keep the world coming to his doorstep. He's probably already spiked the peace process by refusing to take part in Phase III, the nuts and bolts cooperation talks on such things as water rights and arms control. To Israel, peace means cooperation between neighbors. Syria is inviting Israel to give up land without any promise of real peace.

Historians will have to figure out if America's bolstering of Syrian power was intentional or the result of Mideast inexperience. Thus far, it looks as if the central image of the peace process is Mr. Baker laboring among the procedural details, while the larger Arab power struggles play out over his head.

THE DETERIORATING SITUATION IN HAITI

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, both the September 30 military coup d'etat that deposed Haiti's first democratically elected President, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, and the ensuing developments in that country, have riveted the attention of many of us. Since the coup, the new military-backed government of Joseph Nerette and Jean-Jacques Honorat has garnered the tacit or overt approval of the Haitian Parliament as well as representatives of the affluent business class, despite the denial or diplomatic recognition by all foreign governments and manifest opposition from the two-thirds of the population that voted overwhelmingly for Aristide in the December 16, 1990 elections. Violent repression of such sentiments have resulted in hundreds of deaths, the flight of thousands more away from cities and towns, and the intimidation of radio and television stations.

Now that the United States has joined the international community in adopting the full economic sanctions recommended by the Organization of American States, with an eye to the reinstatement of President Aristide, pressure is growing on acting Haitian authorities to return the country to its constitutional paths.

Because there are so many contradictions and complexities to the present situation, I recommend that my colleagues read the following insightful article written by Catherine Ross, a research associate at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, which first appeared as an October 30 research memorandum issued by that organization:

DETERIORATING HAITIAN SITUATION PUNCTUATED BY WASHINGTON'S COMPLIANCE WITH ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

The Bush administration announced on October 29 a stoppage of all exports and imports to Haiti, excepting only the delivery of basic foodstuffs. At the same time, Haiti's new military-backed government, already literally running out of gas from the effects of an international oil embargo called for in an Oct. 8 resolution of the Organization of American States, has invited a multinational OAS delegation back into the country to discuss the ending of economic sanctions and the normalization of political relations. The invitation, extended to OAS Secretary General Joao Clemente Baena Soares by Haitian Senate president Dejean Belizaire, failed to make clear whether or not the interim government installed after the coup accepted the fact that the reinstatement of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide was a prerequisite for negotiations, or if was operating on the assumption that such talks could take place without the inevitability of Aristide's return. The offer came after Luigi Einaudi, U.S. ambassador to the OAS, announced imminent U.S. plans for more severe economic sanctions.

OTTAWA TO TAKE SIMILAR ACTION

Observers of developments in Haiti in Ottawa indicate that the Canadian government intends to follow Washington's example in implementing the trade embargo. Such measures, anticipated in the next few days, will cut off aid from the acting Haitian military and political authorities, but will continue providing assistance to non-governmental organizations.

OAS delegation leader Augusto Ramirez Ocampo, former Colombian Minister of Foreign Affairs, could take a representative group of inter-American leaders to Haiti as early as Monday, November 4. The new government's willingness to negotiate with the OAS comes in the midst of a rapidly deteriorating internal situation, as military authorities try to shut down all independent sources of public information, and rank-and-file soldiers continue wanton killing sprees, now aimed at educated youth and members of religious bodies.

VIOLENCE CONTINUES UNABATED

Although conditions in Haiti are no longer front-page news, up to a few days ago, returned eye-witnesses reported continued nightly military-sponsored shootings both in Port-au-Prince and the countryside, as well as kidnappings and lootings. Particularly virulent attacks are being carried out against members of youth groups, grassroots organizations, and religious communities. Bishop Willy Romulus of Jeremie is reportedly under house arrest, and an American missionary said he decided to leave after hearing rumors that armed soldiers intended to kidnap him. In many places, local populations are fleeing into the mountains, hoping to escape the wrath of undisciplined soldiers, at the risk of exposure and starvation in the midst of sparse vegetation. An estimated 100,000 people have fled the capital city, either to the interior of the country or points abroad, an unprecedented migration even for this turbulent country. Roving poses of soldiers are terrorizing and intimidating radio stations and other sources of public information, riddling with bullets the equipment of such broadcasting facilities as Radio Haiti and Radio Lumiere, which dared to broadcast news of the military's violent actions, while other stations censor their own emissions to avoid offending touchy military nerves.

In response to warnings issued by Port-au-Prince-based diplomats, foreign nationals as well as many wealthy Haitians are flocking to the airport to pack commercial planes arriving there empty, and Missionary Aviation Fellowship, a U.S.-based Christian group, is sending in small planes to evacuate endangered religious figures. The U.S. Ambassador to Haiti, Alvin Adams, issued a statement recommending the repatriation of U.S. citizens, almost half of whom already had left the country. Only 25 percent of the American embassy staff remains in Port-au-Prince, the United Nations has taken all non-essential personnel to nearby Jamaica, and some Latin American countries have recalled all embassy staff to home soil.

AMBASSADOR'S STATEMENT DECRIES HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES

The violence has prompted a statement by Ambassador Adams—who has played a key role as well as displayed considerable personal courage—condemning all human rights violations including killings, lootings, illegal searches, intimidation and coercion of the media, and calling on the de facto authorities to respect both human rights and the Haitian constitution. But by urging those in power to "ensure the safety and well-being of all residents in the country" without at the same time reiterating the previous U.S. proviso that President Jean-Bertrand Aristide must resume power, his words may be misconstrued as implying the possibility that Washington might eventually recognize the authorities now in charge. Adams' latest statement was a far cry both from his admirable series of declarations made shortly after the coup, and from one sent to the Haitian Parliament by a deputy from Jeremie who had fled to Ottawa, that emphasized the absolute illegitimacy of the military junta, declaring that any and all decisions made in collaboration with it are equally illegal, as well as calling for all deputies to boycott parliamentary meetings until Aristide returns to power.

Washington's hesitancy regarding the implementation of the trade embargo called for over two weeks ago by the OAS, as well as its earlier unfounded reservations about Father Aristide's supposedly blemished human rights record, are reasons enough for alarm regarding the future of democratic continuity in the island nation. The Bush administration's seeming retreat from its strong initial pro-Aristide stance, when it announced its intention to put into effect a full trade embargo, was not lost either on the general Haitian population or on the nation's business leaders and military commanders. Just the threat of a cessation of imports and exports from Haiti's largest trading partner had brought about a reversal on the part of the Haitian Alliance of Industrialists, which at first had expressed relief at Aristide's ouster. But after the U.S. declared it would impose a trade embargo, the business group quickly reversed itself and issued a call for his return.

The White House's failure to act promptly on implementing the embargo, along with veiled allegations of human rights abuses under Aristide were immediately picked up by broadcast hourly to crowds on the streets. Washington's words helped to bolster the legitimacy of the military-installed government and to heighten the dismay of the majority of Haitians who support Aristide unflinchingly and who now have almost no sources of reliable information. If the introduction of a regional peace force is to be avoided, then an effective economic quarantine must be put into effect immediately.

Up to several days ago when it implemented its embargo, the Bush administration had given no indication that it was prepared to do that expeditiously. The invitation issued by Belizaire to the OAS for renewed talks may be just an indication that the oil embargo alone was seriously hurting the Haitian economy, but rapid progress towards an apparent readiness to negotiate on the part of the acting Haitian government immediately after news broke that Washington's sanctions would become more severe, graphically indicates the influential weight the U.S. carries.

Although no international diplomatic representatives attended the inauguration of the Joseph Nerette—the ailing former Supreme Court Justice chosen to be interim president by Parliament at the behest of gun-waving soldiers, and who has seldom been seen since—Marc Bazin, the U.S. State Department's chosen candidate in last December's presidential election, when Aristide was swept to victory with two thirds of the vote, was in attendance. If Bazin attains a position of influence in the present government, one can expect that the Bush administration will consider finding a way to justify support for the process that swept away Haiti's first democratically-elected administration. As for Bazin, by his presence at the swearing-in ceremony, he has permanently discredited himself as deserving to have a legitimate place in Haiti's political future and is now being seen by many Haitians as just another political opportunist and false prophet who irreversibly has tarnished his democratic credentials.

Washington will have to have firmer grounds for its unjustified concerns about Aristide's human rights' record than the rumor circulating now on the subject, which began to make their rounds shortly after the coup, but not before it. Haitian military representatives and anxious members of the affluent business class have alleged that the firebrand priest commonly incited his followers to mob violence in order to intimidate his political opponents, drawing attention to a speech in which Aristide lauded the practice of "necklacing"—placing a gasoline-soaked tire around a victim's neck and then lighting it. Much more telling, however, are the conditions under which this speech, captured on a murky cassette tape and then copied and eagerly handed out by soldiers to the international press corps, was delivered. The remarks in question were made by President Aristide two days after he returned from a visit to the U.S. Apprised at the airport of a military plot to kill him and overthrow his government, the president zig-zagged through dark back roads towards his residence at the national palace, protected by crowds of supporters who enveloped his motorcade. Two days later, he gave his controversial speech, warning that even though the military authorities and police were against him, the people had their own power.

A human rights analysis carried out by the Washington Office on Haiti also helps to dispel the charges made against Aristide. During his presidency, the total number of human rights abuses declined sharply, with 24 violations per month under Aristide compared to 59 under the predecessor Trouillot government and 73 under Gen. Avril, who served before it. Furthermore, under the previous two interim leaders, 18 percent of all human rights violations were attributed to civilians, a figure which fell to 8 percent under Aristide, while the majority of all abuses were known to be committed by the armed forces. In exile, Father Aristide has

come out with a strong statement decrying the use of any kind of violence.

Clearly, the Bush administration, which never particularly liked Aristide, would not risk the embarrassment of forthrightly coming out in support of a military regime that had deposed a democratically-elected president from office, killed hundreds of civilians in senseless violence, and now tolerates no expression of dissent. But it is by no means certain that it would not look for some way to accuse the ousted government of constitutional circumventions and human rights abuses in order to eventually and quietly grant recognition to the new authorities somewhere down the road, particularly if Bazin assumes a position of prominence in the government.

DISGRUNTLEMENT UNDER ARISTIDE

The military is hardly the only powerful interest group in Haiti which wanted to see the last of Aristide. Although new on the political ballot, Father Aristide has long been a nationally-known figure whose radical ideas and advocacy for the poor have made him the target of at least thirteen assassination attempts. The military complained that Aristide was acting dictatorially in creating a specially-trained presidential guard which he explained was to uphold democratic values, but which the armed forces saw as being reminiscent of the vigilante group Tonton Macoutes of the Duvalier regime, under which the regular defense force grievously suffered. The military also was resisting at all costs Aristide's attempt to reform its institutional structure, which would most likely have resulted in the curtailing of rampant drug-trafficking and smuggling activities that earn most senior officers healthy supplements to their salaries. Businessmen also had reason to be happy to see Aristide overthrown, as they feared his encouragement of factory assembly workers to demand wage increases, in addition to his sweeping populist rhetoric which frequently accused Haitians with accumulated capital of keeping the lower classes under poverty's crushing weight.

Bureaucrats had an axe to grind as well, because of the suggestion of the IMF, Aristide had streamlined the bloated public sector, whose combined salaries accounted for 90 percent of the national budget by the time that Aristide had arrived in office, by dismissing 8,000 of its 45,000 employees. Since the OAS call for economic sanctions following the coup, a total of \$511 million in foreign government and lending agency assistance to Haiti has been suspended.

Aristide's neglect in not courting support from new as well as the traditional non-Duvalierist political parties, including the one which placed him on its ballot late in the election campaign, and his failure to offer them some cabinet seats and ambassadorial appointments, may have been a tactical error which would later result in a dearth of political allies when he would need them. But accusations leveled by legislators, as well as by army commanders, of Aristide's flouting the constitution, are entirely unfounded. Article 295 of the Haitian constitution decrees that the president has the authority to "carry out any reforms deemed necessary in the Government Administration in general and in the Judiciary." The legislature approved the same article once again after Aristide took office, allowing him the freedom to go about trying to create a functioning democracy.

Based on the agreement reached in Santiago in June of this year, which modified the OAS' traditional adherence to the

principle of no-intervention, that body had an unprecedented opportunity to enhance its new-found image as an effective organization gained from recent election-monitoring activities, by acting on the suggestion of Argentine Ambassador Guido di Tella to send a multinational peacekeeping force to Haiti. Introduction of the force should be a matter of last resort after peaceful sanctions have failed, and would consist exclusively of Latin American units acting as a defensive military presence in the manner of a U.N. peacekeeping force. Its mission would be to demonstrate the principle that any extra-constitutional overthrow of a democratic government will be met with an immediate and concerted effort by the international community to restore democracy, if need be by force. As most nations in the hemisphere are presently governed by democratic, rather than military governments, now is a crucial time for them to take out some insurance against the possibility that the same fate that toppled Aristide could befall them as well. This is particularly important because any worsening in the condition of their already fragile economies could provide their own military institutions with the justification to stage a coup.

The military-dominated recent history of Latin America ensures the existence of a strong anti-democratic tradition in addition to individual military leaders who remain uncharmed by the prospect of the personal loss of privilege and access to sources of illicit income. Given the right conditions, they could be willing to play for high stakes to again achieve power, cloaking it in patriotic rhetoric. In Argentina, a series of coup attempts were launched against the Menem government last year. In 1989, newly-elected Ecuadorian president Rodrigo Borja suffered a harrowing showdown with his military-backed predecessor, Leon Febres Cordero, after Febres Cordero issued what amounted to a dare against Borja through the press, regarding the merit of his own criminal investigation. During the 1989 presidential elections in Brazil, there was some speculation that military sentiment against the populist candidate, Lula, was strong enough to incite a takeover had he defeated Collor de Mello at the polls.

Nascent civilian governments who see themselves as having to walk a delicate line so as not to arouse the ire of the men with the guns, should be prepared to act collectively when one of their number is challenged by their military. The time has come for the principle of self-determination—the inviolable right of a country's electorate to choose its own leaders through the democratic process—to supersede that of non-intervention, a doctrine which has served largely to protect military regimes that have overthrown constitutional governments, or to wag an ineffectual finger at frequent U.S. interventions in the region.

Charges of constitutional abuses against Aristide, while unfounded, legally-speaking do invite discussion. Unfortunately for Haiti, its governmental institutions and infrastructure do not allow for a smooth and ordered transition to democracy. Before judging him, those who blame Aristide for acting unconstitutionally should take into account not only the fact that he has been demonstrably much fairer to his opponents than any of his predecessors, but also that there is in fact no well-oiled democratic system, or a reliable security force under his control.

Aristide's personal shortcomings are far transcended by the shortcomings of the environment in which he has had to operate, and

the cast of self-serving politicians and greedy entrepreneurs with which he has to deal. Aristide's problem has been that he alienated the defenders of the system before he was able to dismantle the anti-democratic infrastructure already in place and replace it with one open to the average Haitian.

(Catherine Ross is a Research Associate at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs.)

TRIBUTE TO GARY H. TATUM

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent and friend, Gary H. Tatum, one of Vacaville, CA, most prominent and admired citizens, on the occasion of his retirement from the Vacaville Police Department as chief of police.

Chief Tatum began his lengthy law enforcement career in 1958 as an officer for the city of Palo Alto. During his tenure with the Palo Alto Police Department, he directed the protection efforts for the many dignitaries visiting both Palo Alto and the Stanford University. Some of the visiting dignitaries included former President Gerald Ford, the Prince of Laos, and numerous Presidential candidates. Chief Tatum led the enforcement unit that was responsible for the closure in 1976 of all the massage parlors that plagued the city of Palo Alto. His unit's work resulted in successful prosecutions and the failure of any such establishment to open again in the city.

In 1977, Chief Tatum was selected as Vacaville's Chief of Police. He has been characterized as an innovator and a strong practitioner of the accelerated approach to the implementation of law enforcement services during his leadership in the Vacaville Police Department. Chief Tatum has been the recipient of a number of awards for his work in the youth, domestic violence, and crime prevention area. He is respected by the people he serves and his colleagues. But most importantly, the city of Vacaville experiences one of the lowest crime rates for cities its size throughout the State of California.

A native of New York City, the Borough of Queens, Chief Tatum was graduated from the Bayport High School in Long Island. He then served more than 4 years in the U.S. Navy and attained the rank of first class petty officer. Chief Tatum received his undergraduate degree in history with a minor in political science from the college of Notre Dame. He completed graduate course work in public administration from the University of Virginia and he is a graduate of the 101st session of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Chief Tatum's work in law enforcement has gone beyond his service to the Vacaville and Palo Alto Police Departments. His law enforcement memberships and affiliations have been numerous and distinguished. He served as the vice chairperson on inmate population management, the president of the California Police Chiefs Association, and the president of the Police Chiefs Department of the League of California Cities. Chief Tatum is the founding member of both the community advisory com-

mittee for the Vacaville Correctional Medical Facility and First Step—a local assistance program for at-risk youth. He continues to serve as member of both groups. Finally, it is important to note Chief Tatum's past services as president of both the Napa/Solano United Way and the Vacaville Rotary Club.

I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize Chief Tatum for his excellence in law enforcement. His work has made Vacaville and Solano County a better place to work and live. I join my colleagues today in wishing Tatum a happy and fulfilling retirement.

**RESOLUTION COMMENDING THE
PRESIDENT FOR HIS MIDDLE
EAST PEACE CONFERENCE AND
CALLING FOR A COMPREHENSIVE,
JUST, AND LASTING
PEACE**

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, the nineties heralded tremendous changes in world affairs. We have seen the Berlin Wall crumble from the weight of the general will of the German people. The end of the cold war. An arms reduction. And more recently, everyone looked at the images on their screens of Palestinians, Arabs, and Israelis meeting to discuss the need for ending their state of war.

As one of many Americans who have been concerned about war in the Middle East and the human toll and suffering that this conflict created for many families—Israeli, Palestinian, or Arab—I am happy to see all sides willing to sit down and iron out their differences.

I am certain many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join me in sending a message of support to President Bush and Secretary Baker for organizing this peace conference. We would also commend all the conference participants, including the Palestinians, the Israelis, the Soviets, and the rest of the Arab states. We commend them for initiating this historic process and urge them to expend the greatest possible effort toward accomplishing a just, lasting peaceful resolution to all the regional conflicts.

H. CON. RES. 231

Whereas the President in his March 6, 1991, address to the nation before a joint session of Congress set forth specific goals for peace in the Middle East region, including the creation of shared security arrangements, a halt to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, a commitment to "do all that we can to close the gap between Israel and the Arab states—and between Israelis and Palestinians", and support for regional economic development; and

Whereas the President declared that any solution must provide for security and recognition for all states in the region, including Israel, and for legitimate political rights of the Palestinian people, thus fulfilling "the twin tests of fairness and security"; and

Whereas on October 18, 1991, Secretary of State James A. Baker III and Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin issued invitations to a Middle East peace conference to begin in Madrid, Spain on October 30, 1991; and

Whereas this conference began on October 30, 1991, and involved the first ever direct bilateral talks between Israel and her Arab neighbors; and

Whereas the objective of this ongoing process is nothing less than a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, to be achieved through a two-track approach of continued direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab states and Israel and the Palestinians, based on U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) The President and Secretary of State should be commended for their efforts in bringing about this historic conference;

(2) Congress urges all participants in this endeavor to expend the greatest possible effort toward the success of this process and achievement of the ultimate objective, the peaceful resolution of all regional disputes including the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestinian issue; and

(3) Congress affirms its unwavering support of the peace process and its determination to ensure that the negotiations begun in Madrid will lead to a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

**HENRIETTE HARRIS: LONGTIME
BRICKELL RESIDENT RECALLS
MIAMI'S HISTORY**

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to recognize Henriette Harris, a truly remarkable woman who has seen many changes in the 70 years she has lived on Miami's historic Brickell Avenue.

The Brickell Homeowners Association [BHA] newsletter, the BHA News, recently featured Mrs. Harris for becoming the first associate member of the BHA, which until recently accepted only members of condominium associations. The associate member class was established as a non-voting membership for single family homeowners in the area that are not a part of a condominium association.

Mrs. Harris has lived on Brickell Avenue since 1921, which was long before the many condominiums which now dominate the east side of Brickell Avenue were built. When she was 10, her family came from Orlando to live on Brickell Avenue when her father founded Miami National Bank. After 4 years at 1038 Brickell Avenue, the present site of the Dominican Republic Consulate, her family moved into a home on the west side of Brickell Avenue where she has lived ever since.

Until the late 1960's, Mrs. Harris recalls the sprawling estates which occupied the deep lots that now contain the many large condominium buildings. This area on the east, bay side of Brickell Avenue was known as "Millionaire's Row." It was closely knit, very social and a lot of fun, like a small town.

While fondly remembering those days, Mrs. Harris at the same time welcomes the many changes on Brickell Avenue. It has never occurred to her that she would want to live anywhere other than Brickell Avenue.

Mrs. Harris has always been active in the community, and joined the BHA because she "likes to be part of all that's going on, especially on Brickell Avenue". She firmly believes that solutions can be found to Miami's problems, and that "we need to wind our way through life and not run away from" our difficulties.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Mrs. Harris and the other members of the BHA for their hard work to keep Miami a beautiful place to live. Specifically I would like to mention the members of the BHA Board of Directors who include: President T. Sinclair Jacobs, Vice President Marcus A. Kyle, Treasurer Salvador Bonilla-Mathe, Secretary Veena Panjabi, Chairperson Herbert Bailey, Director Samuel Barr, Director Edgardo Defortuna, Director Garth Green, Jr., Director Peter Isaia, Director Roger Kahn, Director Troy Register, Director Neal Sonnett, Director Candido Viyella, and Director Calvin Zemsky.

EVENTS IN HUNGARY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 1991, a historic event took place here in Washington at the Embassy of the Republic of Hungary. Americans of Hungarian descent and their friends, together with the diplomats of the now free Hungary, celebrated the anniversary day of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 for the first time. The symbol of that revolution; the Hungarian tricolor of red, white, and green with a hole in the middle—where the red star had been cut out by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters—was proudly displayed in the Embassy. The newly arrived Ambassador of Hungary, His Excellency Pal Tar praised the ideals and remembered the victims of the Hungarian Revolution. Ambassador Tar, himself a participant in the events 35 years ago, delivered an emotionally charged speech filled with references to his personal experiences.

As the chairman of the Committee to Commemorate the 1956 Hungarian Revolution since 1966, I am moved by the fact that God gave us the unique experience to witness this victory of freedom. This is a victory not only for Hungarians but for East-Central Europe and the Soviet Union.

I would like to enclose Ambassador Tar's remarks in the RECORD with the intent to share his solemn, humble, and yet proud and victorious words with colleagues. The significance of the speech and of the place where it was delivered is evident.

REMARKS OF HIS EXCELLENCY PAL TAR, AMBASSADOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF HUNGARY TO THE UNITED STATES

Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Friends, thirty-five years ago today on October 23, the Hungarian youth initiated the demonstration which, in a few hours, grew into a revolution by the entire Hungarian nation.

Before the eyes of a surprised world, a small nation by the Danube stood up to break the bonds of dictatorship.

The finest of the nation risked their lives in order to attain freedom, independence, and democracy for their country.

And in late October, early November we nearly believed the miracle: the courage of a small nation managed to force the army of a superpower, the representatives of a totalitarian ideology and dictatorship, into retreat.

During those wonderful days, ideas were blossoming that have kept us alive, and have encouraged us, and that have finally allowed today's democratic processes to take place.

And these few days showed the world that the communist regime was not a workers' paradise as promised, but a bloody and murderous dictatorship.

Alas, short-lived was our amazement; short-lived the wonder.

Then came November 4, and the crushing of the revolution began. Flows of refugees set off towards the West.

We realized, because we had to, that Hungary had no place in the game of superpowers.

For some time we thought that all the sacrifices, the many martyrs, were in vain. The country did not regain its independence, the nation did not regain its freedom. In vain did the dead lie on our streets, shrouded by the tricolor of the Hungarian flag.

Let us remember them. Allow me, once, here and now in Washington, to remember those who were closest to me! I recall my classmate Ottó Gal; you were shot down by a AVO bullet in front of the Parliament building. I recall Dénes Kocsis; you were killed in Dunaújváros, so-called Sztálinváros at that time, among Hungarian workers. And I recall you, unknown red cross volunteer; you were murdered by the fire of a Soviet tank in Lónyai utca. In my own arms I carried your body upstairs to your deathbed.

Let us, dear friends, remember all those who gave their lives so that we now may be free.

For this let us all pay homage in silence for a few seconds.

But the sacrifice was not in vain. We knew it already then that communism received such a powerful blow from the Hungarian people that it would not be able ever to recover again. That is why tens of thousands of Hungarians in the free world worked without fatigue for thirty five years for the attainment of freedom in Hungary.

But then again the miracle did happen. Hungary is once again free, independent and democratic. The ideals of the 1956 Revolution have won over dictatorship. The last Soviet troops left the country on June 19. The nation can now breathe freely.

We know, of course, that the road ahead of us will be difficult. We cannot change from one day to the other, the legacy of the past, the foreign debt, the malfunctioning economy, the underdeveloped infrastructure, the lack of housing, the badly equipped, outdated hospitals, the overburdened telephone lines, and I could go on and on.

All this was, of course, not much different in 1956 either. But who ever thought of problems then? We were overwhelmed with joy over the freedom which we, though shabby and poor, attained.

I sincerely hope that the idea of 1956 shall help us in this respect too; they will help us demonstrate to the world what Hungarians are capable of.

I would also like to include in the RECORD the statement by President George Bush commemorating the 35th anniversary of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution. The message was read on November 3, 1991, by my friend, Mr. Istvan Gereben, at a wreath laying ceremony at the memorial honoring fallen victims of the Hun-

garian Revolution in the park of the Alba Regia Memorial Chapel of Berkeley Springs, WV.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 31, 1991.

I am delighted to send warm greetings to the members of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation and to all those who are observing the 35th Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956.

On previous anniversaries of the 1956 Revolution, we commemorated the sacrifices of the Hungarian people in the hope that they might one day enjoy the blessings of freedom and independence. Today, however, we have the opportunity to celebrate the achievement of that noble goal. It is an unusual gift to our generation to have lived to see this day, to be able to celebrate the victory of the ideals of 1956.

While we celebrate the blossoming of freedom throughout central and eastern Europe, we also recognize the challenges the Hungarian people face during this transformation. Establishing a market-oriented economy, as well as stable democratic rule that is based on the principles of political pluralism and tolerance, will require great courage, sacrifice, and patience. The United States will continue to support our brave friends in Hungary as they proceed with the arduous task of rebuilding their country. Through the Hungarian-American Enterprise Fund, the Regional Environmental Center in Budapest, and a number of other initiatives, we will continue to offer help in areas ranging from trade and investment to environmental protection. In so doing, we will help our friends in Hungary to ensure that the hopes of 1956 are now realized.

Barbara joins me in sending best wishes to all Hungarian Americans on this milestone. God bless you.

GEORGE BUSH.

Finally, I would like to add to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the letter I and 19 of my House colleagues recently sent to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. The letter requested that President Gorbachev use the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution to denounce the actions of the Soviet Armed Forces in its suppression. I was pleased to see that the President followed our recommendation. The following is a copy of our letter to President Gorbachev and the text of a statement he released on October 22, 1991, to the Foreign Broadcast Information Service in Budapest.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 16, 1991.

President MIKHAIL GORBACHEV,
The Kremlin,
Moscow, U.S.S.R.

DEAR PRESIDENT GORBACHEV: We congratulate your country on its successful resistance to the coup attempt by reactionary forces in August of 1991. In those difficult days, the people of the Soviet Union completed a revolution against totalitarianism and the abuse of power which your reforms had initiated.

The Supreme Soviet recently took the historic action of condemning the totalitarian methods of the past and declared illegal such actions as the crushing of the Prague reforms of 1968. More recently, these actions were denounced by your government in a bilateral non-aggression pact entered into with Czechoslovakia. Today, we note that, twelve years prior to the crackdown in Prague, in October of 1956, Soviet tanks similarly put down a popular national revolution against totalitarian rule in Hungary.

As the thirty-fifth anniversary of this brutal action approaches, we write to request that you use this occasion to censure the actions of the Soviet government and its military and state security forces in the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. By declaring these actions of the Soviet government and its agents in Hungary illegal and indefensible, you will honor the memory of those many thousands of men and women who helped to preserve the ideals of freedom, democracy, justice, and equality through the years of Communist domination of Eastern Europe. Moreover, you will further distance yourself and your government from those who were responsible for the brutal suppression of a people involved in a just struggle for the achievement of these goals.

We suggest that October 23, 1991, the 35th anniversary of the beginning of the Hungarian Revolution, represents an appropriate date for your government to denounce the Soviet actions in Hungary and demonstrate its commitment to freedom, democracy and human rights. We thank you for your consideration of this request and look forward to your response.

Representatives Frank Horton, Steny H. Hoyer, Edward F. Feighan, Wayne Owens, Eliot Engel, Edolphus Towns, William Jefferson, Tom Lantos, Helen Delich Bentley, Christopher C. Cox, Mary Rose Oaker, Don Ritter, Dick Swett, Bill Green, Dante B. Fascell, Robert K. Dornan, James H. Scheuer, Constance A. Morella, William H. Zeff, Jr., Michael R. McNulty.

GORBACHEV CONDEMNS HUNGARIAN INVASION
(LD2210191491 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 1500 GMT 22 Oct 91)

[Text] The Soviet head of state and his spokesman said that the Soviet leadership regards the Soviet intervention in Hungary in 1956 as contrary to international law. Zoltan Tamasi reports from Moscow:

[Tamasi] It is absolutely clear and obvious that Gorbachev and the Soviet leadership regard the Soviet intervention in 1956 as a violation of the international legal norms. This is what the Soviet head of state's spokesman told Radio Hungary. Grachev pointed out that no such Soviet steps can be repeated. This is a direct consequence of the new way of thinking that has gained ground in the Soviet Union since 1985. The spokesman did not give details as to since when it has been clear and obvious that Gorbachev condemns the deployment of the Soviet Army in Hungary in 1956, for no official document confirms this as yet. When will it? According to Grachev, it is conceivable that a good opportunity will be provided for this, too, by the signing of the Soviet-Hungarian treaty, expected in the near future—in other words, when we agree on the future, then we can also clarify the past satisfactorily.

HONORING TONY O'BRIEN

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, at about this time last year, President Bush announced that our military presence in the Persian Gulf would be doubled, setting the stage for the midwinter conflict. In less than a year's time, the images of fear, loneliness and death have

been replaced in the minds of many by the images of tickertape parades and yellow ribbons.

New Mexico photographer Tony O'Brien returned to Santa Fe from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait with images that recall the chilling emotions we all felt before they were swept away in the euphoria of victory. O'Brien's work is currently on exhibition at the College of Santa Fe, and the significance of the images he captured was the subject of an article by Art Market in the Albuquerque Journal.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to this article and ask that they consider the importance of remembering the harsh realities of war.

WAR PHOTOGRAPHS STRETCH BEYOND
ARTISTIC DEVOTION
(By David Bell)

The American poet Carl Sandburg in 1921 wrote this about the paintings of Santa Fean William Penhallow Henderson: "... the spirit of the inevitable sat upon him. That is, he had to do 'em."

It was a deft summary of the sense of necessity, even compulsion, that seems to run through many artists' work and lives. From Goya's painstaking catalog of the horrors of war, through Cezanne's repeated renderings of Mont St. Victoire, to the obsessive multiple art of Andy Warhol, art has often appeared to be as much a master as a medium. It can drive its practitioners to long hours, far places, unrelenting visions.

As overstated as such a theory might seem if applied to every case, it's not a bad starting point in the evaluation of art. Sandburg wasn't the only one to have suggested that a sense of emotional, philosophical or moral imperative—while not sufficient in itself to guarantee worthwhile art—is among the prerequisites for it.

Certainly you can see something of that sort at work in Tony O'Brien's "War in the Persian Gulf: One Photographer's View," an exhibition that opened last weekend at the Garson Communications Center of the College of Santa Fe. The 40 color images made in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait last winter would not in themselves be altogether remarkable were it not for the sense they communicate of the photographer's need to make them, to be there in the first place.

That sense of time, locale and mission is perhaps one of the components of photojournalism that operate to distinguish it from photography as a merely artistic medium—not that any such distinction carries much weight in today's art media world. Nor is O'Brien's work unartistic on account of its currency. One falls back on the maxim that the particular in art becomes universal when it's good enough.

And some of the photographs are. "Iraqi Prisoners," "Thanksgiving Dinner, First Cavalry," "Belongings Dropped by Iraqi Prisoner," and others have the kind of inevitability, bordering on the commonplace, that at once sums up the subject and the artist's need to treat it.

OFFICE OF NOISE ABATEMENT
AND CONTROL ESTABLISHMENT
ACT OF 1991

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Mr. DURBIN, in

introducing the Office of Noise Abatement and Control Establishment Act of 1991 to restore funding for an office of noise abatement and control within the Environmental Protection Agency.

At a hearing of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families this past July, experts testified that we are all at risk of serious damage or loss of our hearing because of repeated exposure to loud sounds. Of the 28 million people in the United States who suffer from hearing loss, more than one third of these impairments are at least partially attributable to damage from exposure to noise.

Although noise-induced hearing loss can occur immediately from powerful blasts of gunshots or firecrackers, more often it develops gradually, caused by the accumulated impact of noise experience in our day-to-day activities. We are painfully aware of noise that hurts and its sources—planes, trains, automobiles, rock concerts, and construction sites. Work environment noise already has evoked concern, and levels above 85 decibels [dB] require protective measures.

Any exposure to a sound level above 85 dB is a threat, and we are surrounded by lesser-known forms of hazardous noise in our leisure environments. Children's toys, lawn mowers, farm equipment, and school buses have been measured at dangerous levels. Even symphony orchestra music sound levels have led to hearing loss among classical musicians. Hearing witnesses identified personal stereos as a particular threat. According to studies, these devices can emit sound levels several times more dangerous than the 85 dB threshold.

Testimony presented at the Select Committee hearing by scientists, educators, and musicians convinced me that children and adults must be protected from unsafe noise. Prior to its virtual shutdown in 1982, the EPA office of noise abatement and control coordinated government research and enforcement activities in noise control. Since the office's closing, regulation of nonwork noise has been virtually nonexistent.

As our environment has become increasingly noisy, the need for noise control has increased. The legislation I am cosponsoring renews the EPA noise office efforts to protect people from serious threats to their hearing.

Mr. Speaker, we should not wait for excessive noise to bring the sound of silence to our ears. Let us respond before this Nation goes deaf.

The following is a fact sheet on noise-induced hearing loss issued at our hearing:

TURN IT DOWN: EFFECTS OF NOISE ON HEARING
LOSS IN CHILDREN AND YOUTH
LOUD NOISES SIGNAL DANGER
Decibels (dB)¹

140 decibels: Firecrackers, gunshot blast, jet engine.

130 decibels: Rock concerts, jack hammer.

120 decibels: Car stereos, band practice, headphones.

110 decibels: Shouting in ear, dance club.

100 decibels: Snowmobile, subway train, woodworking shop.

¹Sound levels above 85 decibels (dB) are potentially hazardous. Decibel increases are logarithmic, so 90 dB is 10 times as loud as 80 dB, and 110 dB is 20 times as loud as 90 dB.

90 decibels: City traffic, subway, lawn mower, motorcycle.

80 decibels: Alarm clock, hair dryer, factory.

70 decibels: Restaurant, vacuum cleaner, sewing machine.

60 decibels: Conversation, air conditioner.

50 decibels: Average home, refrigerator.

40 decibels: Principal's office.

30 decibels: Quiet library, soft whisper.

MILLIONS ARE HEARING IMPAIRED/NOISE
RESPONSIBLE FOR LARGE PERCENTAGE

Over 8% of the U.S. population have a hearing impairment, including 1.6% (1 million) under age 18 and 4.8% for those ages 18-44. Of the 28 million cases of hearing loss in the U.S., over 1/3 (10 million) are partially or fully attributable to noise-induced hearing loss (NIHL). (U.S. Public Health Service, 1989; National Institutes of Health, 1990)

According to the Annual Survey of Hearing Impaired Children and Youth, 50.1% of hearing impairments among students derived from unknown causes. The remaining proportion derived from known causes, including heredity (13.3%), meningitis (9.0%), infection and fever (4.9%), and prematurity (4.7%). (Gallaudet University, 1990)

CHILDREN AND TEENS FREQUENTLY EXPOSED TO
HAZARDOUS NOISE LEVELS

A survey of 1500 Ohio high school students found considerable exposure to potentially damaging levels of noise. Respondents reported use of personal stereos with headphones (72 percent), stereos (96 percent), dances (71 percent), rock concerts (43 percent), tractor pulls (27 percent), and firearms (30 percent). (Lewis, 1989)

According to a university-based study, the following toys emitted hazardous noise levels at close range: toy robots and cars (82-100 dB), toy sirens and drills (74-102 dB), squeaky toys (78-108 dB), and firecrackers (126-156 dB). Additional studies found that many toys held directly to the ear can emit up to 120 dB, and that toy pistols can emit in excess of 150 dB. (Axelsson and Jerson, 1985; Fay, 1989; Clark 1991)

The average sound level measured at a New Kids on the Block concert was 98 dB (164 percent of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration allowable dose) and levels routinely rose above 100 dB. Earlier generations of concert amplifiers were in the 20,000 to 30,000 watt range; current large concert speakers are equipped with 100,000 to 500,000 watt amplifiers. (Clark, 1991; Brookhouser, et al., 1991)

A study of noise exposure among players of electronic arcade games found that normal noise settings ranged from 73 to 111 dB. (Plakke, 1983)

LOUD NOISES CAUSE HEARING LOSS AND OTHER
PROBLEMS FOR CHILDREN

In a study of 94 diagnosed cases of NIHL in children and adolescents, the following causes were identified: fireworks or firearms (46 percent), live or amplified music (12 percent), power tools (8 percent), and recreational vehicles (4 percent). (Brookhouser, et al., 1991)

In a Connecticut study of 20 adolescents and 7 adults attending a school dance with amplified music, all but two experienced at least a 5 dB temporary hearing loss and all but one reported tinnitus (ringing of the ears). Of those re-tested three days later, two-thirds demonstrated only partial recovery. (Danenberg, et al., 1987)

A study examining children attending elementary schools near a busy metropolitan airport found that children from these noisy schools had higher blood pressure, were more

likely to fail on a cognitive task, and were more likely to give up on an assigned task than were children from quiet schools. (Cohen, et al., 1980)

A study of 538 teenage boys found that they were routinely exposed to hazardous sound levels during daily activities; 15 percent showed hearing loss in high frequencies. (Axelsson, et al., 1981)

A Wisconsin study found that over half of children actively involved in farm work experienced NIHL, twice the rate of their peers not involved in farm work. (Broste, et al., 1989)

PERSONAL STEREO USE POSES SPECIAL HAZARDS TO YOUNG PEOPLE

At least 80 percent of children in middle class elementary school owned or used personal stereos at least occasionally. Other surveys indicate a range from 37 percent of school children ages 11-18 in England to 81 percent of children attending youth clubs in Hong Kong. One study revealed that personal stereo use among young people increased significantly with age—9 to 11 years (10 percent), 13 to 16 years (12 percent), and 18 to 25 years (35 percent). (Clark, 1991; Fearn and Hanson, 1984)

A British study concluded that young people ages 15-23 who regularly use personal stereos and attend concerts suffered hearing loss at twice the rate of young people without such exposure. The study revealed diminished sensitivity to sound and reduced ability to discriminate between pitches. (West and Evans, 1990)

A study of personal stereo use by teenagers asked participants to listen to music at an enjoyable level for one hour; the mean temporary hearing loss was 9 dB with a maximum up to 35 dB. (Hellstrom and Axelsson, 1988)

Maximum output levels of 35 personal stereos were found to range from 115 to 126 dB SPL (sound pressure level). When participants listened to personal stereos at a comfortable volume, levels ranged from 83 to 107 dB SPL. A study of 18 personal stereos found that, at one-half volume, the units emitted an average of 104 dB playing rock music and 102 dB playing easy listening music. (Kileny, unpublished; Rintelmann, unpublished)

In a survey of 89 personal stereo users, 31 percent reported listening levels which exceeded OSHA risk standards; of this group, half exceeded the Auditory Risk Criteria limit by more than 100 percent. Another survey of 750 personal stereo users found that one-fifth reported symptoms of tinnitus or dullness of hearing after using their devices. (Catalano and Levin, 1985; Rice, Rossi, and Olina, 1987)

EXERCISE, ALCOHOL, AND SMOKING WORSEN EFFECTS OF NOISE ON HEARING LOSS

Studies suggest that those who listen to loud music while doing aerobic exercises, which increase blood flow to the extremities decrease oxygen around the ear, and increase the flow of adrenalin, may be at additional risk of suffering some hearing loss. (Navarro, 1989)

A 1987 study found that smoking is associated with increased risk of hearing loss in a noise-exposed population. (Barone, et al., 1987)

Alcohol consumption can increase the amount of noise needed to trigger the acoustic reflex (which protects the ear by reducing sound intensity) by 5-13 dB. (Robinette, et al., 1981)

HEARING LOSS PREVENTION SUCCESSFUL, BUT IN SHORT SUPPLY

An education hearing conservation program presented to normal hearing elemen-

tary school children improved knowledge about NIHL by an average of 23 percent. A pre-program survey found that only 6 percent of the children reported use of ear protection; following the program, 97 percent intended to use ear protection during noisy activities. (Chermak and Peter-McCarthy, 1991)

Following a high school hearing conservation program in West Virginia, students' correct responses to hearing-related questions improved by nearly one-fifth. (Lass, et al., 1986)

In a survey of Ohio high school students, only 61 percent of questions regarding hearing loss and protection were answered correctly. In a study of adult hearing health knowledge, participants had correct responses to only 52 percent of the test items. (Lewis, 1989; Singer and Brownell, 1984)

In a survey of industrial arts teachers, over half reported that they had no background in hearing conservation. Two-thirds felt that they needed more background in this area. (Plakke, 1985)

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF NEW LIFE DWELLING PLACE

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work of the New Life Dwelling Place of Thonotosassa, FL. Organized by Sister Claire LeBoeuf and Sister Pam Nolan 5 years ago, the New Life Dwelling Place is a unique residential program serving two generations of the abused, single-parent mother, and her child.

Child abuse is a terrible act of injustice. It can take many forms, from physical and mental abuse to neglect. Furthermore, in nearly 100 percent of child abuse cases, one or both of the abused child's parents were also abused at a very young age.

This devastating cycle of emotional neglect and violence needs to be stopped for the good of families and society as a whole. The New Life Dwelling Place does just that by offering mothers counseling, comfort, and a place to grow. Currently the New Life Dwelling Place can serve 10 families at a time. All participants enter voluntarily seeking an opportunity to salvage or heal the severed bonds of the mother-child relationship that occurs with abuse.

This excellent organization, Mr. Speaker, is an alternative to foster care. It gives the mother and child time to restore bonds. During the approximately 6-month period of the program, the mother-child relationship is strengthened and a more stable family unit is assisted back into the community. The mother and child live in an environment conducive to emotional, intellectual, and spiritual growth.

In a November 5, 1989 feature article in the St. Petersburg Times newspaper, Sister Claire LeBoeuf explained her philosophy that placing a child in a foster home may keep the child safe, but it does very little for the healing of the family unit. A warm, supportive environment and the encouragement of gentle, respectful parent-child interactions aids this healing at the New Life Dwelling Place. Not only is the mother instructed in basic child-caring and homemaking skills at New Life Dwell-

ing Place, she is able to obtain a high school diploma or prepare for vocational training.

Mr. Speaker, New Life Dwelling Place helps give the individual hope and provides society with a more educated and caring person. I strongly believe this organization has succeeded in helping to break the devastating cycle of child abuse. Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the past efforts of New Life Dwelling Place and pledge my continued support of its approach to healing families. Mr. Speaker, this program is a model well worth duplicating throughout our great Nation.

A TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN VETERAN

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the 15th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, the world experiences momentous changes. As we witness the collapse of Soviet communism, and the democratization of countries throughout Eastern Europe, we pause to remember the events and the people who brought us to this point in history. In their ceaseless protection of America's values and interests, our Nation's veterans are owed an enormous debt of gratitude for helping to secure a measure of peace and hope, not only for our citizens, but for peoples throughout the world.

American national consciousness and thought were irrevocably altered on that fateful December morning, 50 years ago, when our Nation was caught with its guard down. The surprise attack on Pearl Harbor forced America's entry into World War II, and contributed to our Nation's emergence as a world superpower. The fear of being caught off guard again shaped our defense and nuclear strategy for the decades to follow.

Today, as we celebrate the victory of our ideals and the spread of freedom throughout the world, we remember the invaluable contributions made by our veterans. In answering their Nation's call to duty, all of our veterans have made enormous personal sacrifices to protect our vital interests. They have paid the costs which have won us the privileges we enjoy today. Their victory is our victory, and our victory theirs.

Five decades after Pearl Harbor, the rhetoric of America's entrance into World War II has become reality. America's veterans truly have made the world safe for democracy and freedom. There can be no finer tribute.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO BLANCHE SEAVER

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to honor an outstanding philanthropist, Mrs. Blanche Seaver, who recently celebrated her 100th birthday.

Mrs. Seaver is rightly hailed as one of the greatest supporters of California higher education, and is perhaps best known for establishing Pepperdine University's Frank R. Seaver College, soon to mark its 20th anniversary.

Pepperdine President David Davenport put it best when he said:

Mrs. Seaver had the foresight to invest in a small campus that has become a notable institution of higher learning—in large part because of her generosity. Her magnanimous support has made our Malibu campus possible. Seaver College is an extraordinary legacy for an extraordinary woman and the husband she cherished.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, few of us are privileged to begin a college. I can think of no one who began a project of such dimensions at the age of 80.

But then, Mrs. Seaver has always been a can-do person. Born the 10th child of Norwegian immigrants in 1891, she was teaching piano at Chicago's Hull House by age 6 with famed social services leader Jane Addams as her sponsor and mentor.

She graduated from the Chicago Music School in 1911 and moved to Los Angeles 4 years later to work as a teacher and voice coach. Her future husband, then a successful lawyer and author of the Los Angeles County Charter, spotted her while riding a trolley in downtown Los Angeles. After a formal introduction several weeks later and a whirlwind courtship, they married on Sept. 16, 1916.

During her husband's service as a lieutenant commander aboard a Navy vessel during World War I, Mrs. Seaver wrote her most famous song, "Calling Me Back to You," made popular by the well-known Irish tenor John McCormack. In addition, her arrangement of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" was performed by the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra under the baton of the legendary Leopold Stokowski in 1919.

Mrs. Seaver's call to philanthropy came during the 1920's, when she and her husband lived in Mexico, where Mr. Seaver was directing drilling operations for oilman Edward L. Doherty. Saddened by the plight of homeless children, she founded an orphanage in Mexico City, and upon her return to Los Angeles, she cofounded the Los Angeles Orphanage Guild in 1931. She also was a founding member of the Social Service Auxiliary and the Board of Directors of Children's Hospital.

In honor of her generosity and leadership on behalf of charitable organizations, she was named Woman of the Year by the Los Angeles Times in 1963 and was presented with the "Sallie" humanitarian service award by the Salvation Army on the organization's 100th anniversary in 1986. Her many other honors include the Religious Heritage of America's Distinguished Patriot Award, the L.A. County Distinguished Americanism Award, the Freedom Foundation's George Washington Award, and being named Republican Citizen of the Year for Los Angeles in 1982.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Blanche Seaver truly represents the best of the traditional American values of service to others. Her generosity and her example have helped improve the lives of countless southern California residents, and I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring her for her accomplishments. Truly, one person

can make a difference, and Blanche Seaver proves that better than almost anyone else.

WHERE IS THE OUTRAGE?

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the people of Croatia have suffered greatly at the hands of the Federal Yugoslav Army and the decisions of Serbian President Milosevic. With the violence entering its fifth month, thousands have died and have been wounded in the armed conflict. By some estimates, the death toll is estimated to be as high as 4,000 dead and hundreds of thousands displaced and homeless.

Many of these casualties are innocent civilians. Churches, museums, schools, hospitals, and other culturally significant buildings have been destroyed—what a tragedy. Sadly, Mr. Chairman, the continued and growing aggression and violence in Yugoslavia is snuffing out lives and destroying livelihoods and historical architecture.

I believe time is running out.

Following the meetings which our colleague, FRANK WOLF, and I had while in Croatia and Serbia in late August and early September, we have discussed our analysis and grave concern about the situation in Yugoslavia with policymakers at all levels, including National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft.

We and others have felt the frustration of a seeming reluctance on the part of the United States to be outspoken and a desire to relegate the ultimate responsibility of resolving this conflict to the European Community.

The loss of life demands that the Yugoslav conflict not be left on the backburner. Furthermore, the escalation of fighting and aggression has major implications for the entire region. Certainly, the ethnic conflict exacerbates the situation, making peace seem even more elusive.

While the numerous cease-fires in recent months have been fleeting, I am encouraged that the European Community has given an ultimatum to the Yugoslav Federal Government and the Republics. I fear that the Federal Yugoslav Army will again ignore the deadline.

It is my hope that Lord Carrington and the European Community will impose strategic economic sanctions, as announced, if a permanent cease-fire is not agreed upon by today. Furthermore, I trust that the United States would join the EC in applying restrictive measures.

I believe the offending parties must have a clear understanding that continued violence will mean isolation in the international political and economic community. This is certainly the message that we delivered to President Milosevic when we met in early September. When meeting with President Tudjman, Congressman WOLF and I made it clear that he too must guarantee the rights of the Serbian minority.

The poignant message of Anthony Lewis' op-ed in yesterday's New York Times must be heeded. Indeed, "it is time to listen, and to

act." The objectives of the aggression are becoming more clear, as Mr. Lewis writes

The tragedy that has overtaken Yugoslavia is the direct result of the ambitions of the Serbian Communist leader, Slobodan Milosevic. Over the last 4 years he has schemed to impose Serbian domination—and his own—on Federal Yugoslavia * * *. The attacks on Dubrovnik best illustrate the nature of Mr. Milosevic's war: Its punitive nature.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to submit Mr. Lewis' editorial for the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Monday, Nov. 4, 1991]

(By Anthony Lewis)

WHERE IS THE OUTRAGE?

BOSTON.—Suppose that at this moment Venice were being shelled and bombed in a civil war, its treasured monuments menaced, its population starved. Would the Western world be silent? Of course not. It would react in outrage. It would intervene to stop such a crime against history and humanity.

But across the Adriatic today another historic jewel of a city, Dubrovnik, is being bombed, its population strangled by blockade. And where are the world's protests? Where is any effective action to stop the crime?

George Bush has not been reluctant to condemn aggression in the world, or to play an active peace-making role. But in the Yugoslav conflict the American voice has been muted. Why?

The answer to the puzzle must lie in part, I believe, in memories of what happened in Yugoslavia during World War II and afterward. Political memory has inhibited our recognition of, and willingness to deal with, a new Yugoslav reality.

During the war Tito and his partisans fought courageously against the occupying Nazi armies, while Croatian Fascists set up a pro-Nazi puppet state. Afterward Tito, as President of a Communist Yugoslavia, broke with Stalin; the first such defiance in the Communist world and one that won Yugoslavia much admiration and support in the West.

That past must help to explain the cold shoulder that Croatia and Slovenia got: from the United States and other Western countries when they declared their republics independent earlier this year. Otherwise one would have expected sympathy for democratic movements seeking independence from a Communist-dominated central government.

The tragedy that has overtaken Yugoslavia is the direct result of the ambitions of the Serbian Communist leader, Slobodan Milosevic. Over the last four years he has schemed to impose Serbian domination—and his own—on federal Yugoslavia. When he could, he brutally suppressed opponents, such as the Albanian majority in Serbia's province of Kosovo.

The Milosevic grab for power aroused in other republics opposition that was both ethnic and democratic—anti-Communist—in character. When Croatia declared its independence on June 25, Mr. Milosevic responded with war. His instrument is the federal army whose officers are mostly Serbs.

In the attacks since June 25 the federal army has captured about a third of Croatia's territory. It has used planes to bomb Croatian villages and cities, as well as shells and mortars and infantry attacks.

The attacks on Dubrovnik best illustrate the nature of Mr. Milosevic's war; its punitive nature. Dubrovnik is at the southern

end of a thin strip of Croatia running down the Adriatic coast. It does not block the way to anything, and it is hard to see what military value it has as a target. It seems, in fact, to have been targeted for psychological and cultural reasons.

Dubrovnik is a Renaissance port, beautifully preserved, a gem not only of Croatia but of all Europe. The United Nations has declared it a cultural landmark. Right now bombs are falling on the city every day. For nearly a month the federal blockade has cut off regular supplies of food, water and electricity.

The European Community has tried to act diplomatically, appointing Lord Carrington as its crisis representative. He has brokered cease-fire after cease-fire, but Mr. Milosevic pays no attention to them. Lord Carrington, despite his great abilities, is reduced to depicting the attack on Dubrovnik as a "criminal act."

It is a criminal act; but nobody does anything serious about the criminal, Mr. Milosevic. It is true, and understandable, that the United States and its friends are ordinarily reluctant to assist the ethnic breakup of other countries. But we are well past that point now.

There is no Yugoslavia anymore. There are republics as independent in their feelings as Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. There is an attempt to impose on them by force either Serbian domination or a Greater Serbia enlarged with territory seized from its neighbors. And that use of force may have wide reverberations.

"The danger that is coming from Yugoslavia may be deeper and longer than the international community has realized." President Vaclav Havel of Czechoslovakia said that during his visit to Washington two weeks ago. It is time to listen, and to act.

THE ONLY THREE EXCEPTIONS

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will be considering the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriation bill once again. And once again, I am confronted with a frustrating dilemma related to the subject of abortion and abortion funding.

It has been my long-held belief that abortions should be permitted only in the case of a threat to the mother's life, rape, or incest. Unfortunately, in the case of this bill, the conference committee has given us no opportunity to vote to make these exceptions. This is in spite of the fact that the Senate bill provided for these exceptions.

This is a very difficult issue for all of us. There is no other issue that is more personal or emotional than this one. A majority of the American people believe that abortion should be prohibited or restricted. And many believe that abortion should be permitted only when the life of the mother is threatened or in the case of rape or incest. This according to a survey done by the Wirthlin Group released June 19, 1991.

As a result, I urge my colleagues to recognize the importance of this issue and help bring about these three exceptions.

HERBICIDE RESISTANT PLANTS

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to prohibit Federal funds from being spent on herbicide-resistant plant research. Joining me as cosponsors are Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. OLVER. Let me be clear: this legislation is not anti-biotechnology or anti-research. I firmly believe that biotechnology will help American agriculture reach even new heights in the ability to supply food to our citizens and others around the world. Herbicide-resistant plants may even play a role in reaching that goal. This legislation simply states that research which will benefit private corporations should be funded by those who stand to benefit from it.

Once licensed, the market for these kinds of plants is estimated to be over \$300 million in the United States alone. Worldwide, the market potential is enormous. Sensing such market potential, private multi-national chemical companies are already spending millions to develop such products. There is no need for taxpayer dollars to be spent on this private sector race.

It's difficult to know how much USDA currently spends on this research, but our best guess is that until now, between \$8 to 10 million have been spent on this subject. This amount is likely to grow, however, unless we make our research priorities clear. Herbicides, like any pest control measure, have an important role in American agriculture. However, we also need to protect our ground water resources, and we need to develop more sustainable methods of production. Chemical-intensive farming is not always the most economical or ecologically viable approach.

Instead of Federal dollars being spent on herbicide-resistant plants, we need to spend more to help our producers find the best way to maximize profits in environmentally sound ways.

Identical legislation has been introduced today in the Senate by Mr. LEAHY, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and Mr. GORE, who is a leader on biotechnology issues. I look forward to working with those Members, as well as with my House colleagues, to help foster beneficial biotechnology research, and stop the needless Federal subsidy of research designed to benefit private companies which have sufficient resources to undertake the expense and risk on their own.

TURN THAT DOWN!

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, say what? Excuse me? Could you say that again?

We all know the routine. We ask someone a question and then repeat it, and repeat it, and repeat it.

Is communication no longer possible? Are Americans speaking in a multitude of incomprehensible dialects? Of course not. The problem is not what we're saying—the problem is that we are no longer hearing. Americans are going deaf at an alarming rate and at a younger age.

The cause is not pesticides or the state of our ozone layer. The cause is actually quite simple—the decline in our hearing is directly proportional to the noise we are exposed to.

That jackhammer at the construction site that cause your jawbone to jitter isn't just a temporary inconvenience, it can cause lasting damage to your hearing. Similarly, those incessant noises we tolerate around the house—the whizz of a food blender, the din of an electric can opener, the whirl of a dishwasher—can be physically harmful to one's hearing. For instance, a garbage disposal hits 80 decibels and a lawn mower 90 decibels. Sustained exposure to noise at this level can damage your hearing.

Few of us, though, are exposed to these noises for any length of time, but many of us are exposed at great length to a source of noise that poses a significant risk—the personal headset stereo.

Since Sony introduced the first Walkman in the 1970's, Americans have been in love with personal headset stereos. About 22 million units were sold in this country last year. Clearly, they are enjoyable to wear for such things as jogging, riding the subway to work, or cleaning around the house. But the enjoyment we gain lets us too easily forget the danger of these devices. Personal headset stereos can emit 115 decibels, a sound almost as loud as a thunderclap.

And a reach of 115 decibels is not unique. The headsets sold last year had an average rating of 100 decibels. Any noise above 85 decibels—roughly the sound of a passing subway—can accelerate hearing loss. Even 2 hours of exposure to 100 decibels can be dangerous; with each 5 decibel increase, the "safe time" is cut in half. And different noise sources with the same decibel level cause similar damage. The 100 decibel rattle of a jackhammer is no different than a personal headset stereo at 100 decibels.

The Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families held a hearing this summer to examine the danger of personal headset stereos. Audiologists, an otolaryngologist, a musician, and other witnesses all testified that the danger from loud noise exposure is real and lasting.

In response to the overwhelming evidence presented at the hearing, I have decided that noise abatement is critical and must once again be placed at the forefront of public policy. Today, PATRICIA SCHROEDER, the chairwoman of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, joins me in introducing legislation to restore funding to the Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Noise Abatement and Control.

Prior to 1982, the EPA Office of Noise Abatement and Control was responsible for coordinating Federal research and activities in noise control, authorizing the establishment of noise emissions standards for products distributed in commerce, and providing information to the public regarding the noise emission and

noise reduction characteristics of such products. However, the EPA Office of Noise Abatement and Control has had no funding since 1982. It has a mission, it is statutorily responsible for noise activities, yet it has no funding.

Clearly, the EPA Office of Noise Abatement and Control should be refunded and reinvigorated. The problem of noise induced hearing loss from headphones is just one example of many where this Government has a direct interest in protecting the hearing of consumers and no program with which to do so.

And let me assure my colleagues of one thing: Noise is not disappearing. In fact, our brilliant scientists and engineers are developing more and better amplification devices each year. Our children may be captivated by the latest music craze captured by this technology but the incredible volume can leave its scar. Our children don't realize that only a short time down the road, they'll be the next "Say what?" victims.

When we think of the dangers children face each day—drugs, violence, accidents—it seems odd to add noise to this ever-growing list. Yet, noise induced hearing loss is the most common affliction for Americans. Some 28 million Americans have hearing loss and about 10 million Americans have hearing loss attributable to environmental causes. A growing percentage in this category are children. It's time to reopen the EPA Office of Noise Abatement and Control. The problem of noise is still with us and growing. The goals and mission of the EPA Office of Noise Abatement and Control are still important. Let's not be indifferent to this problem any longer.

As for noise induced hearing loss from headphones, the message is loud and clear: Turn down the volume and protect your hearing.

**MRS. ZELLA HILL CELEBRATES
90TH BIRTHDAY**

HON. ROBERT W. DAVIS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to recognize Mrs. Zella Hill as she celebrates her 90th birthday on November 9. Mrs. Hill has traced her family tree back to the early 1800's when the Hills were one of the first families to settle in Michigan's upper peninsula. She proudly refers to her grandchildren as sixth generation Michiganders.

Mrs. Hill recently challenged her relatives and friends to join her on the 34th annual Mackinaw Bridge walk held each Labor Day. She also participated in a recent reunion of 350 family members in Pickford, MI.

On this occasion, I would like to congratulate Mrs. Hill on her 90th birthday. Her zest for life and enthusiasm are an inspiration to us all.

NOVEMBER 4, 1991: WILLIAM
MCKINLEY NICHOLAS' 95TH
BIRTHDAY

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, 95 years ago, as the bells were ringing in Niles, OH to celebrate the election of native son William McKinley as the 25th President of the United States, a young woman in that city was giving birth to a son, and in honor of the moment he was named William McKinley Nicholas.

After school he attended business college, and at age 21 he married a young woman he met there named Helen. They lived in Warren, OH for decades, raised a family, and were active in various community organizations. Helen passed away in 1976, but William has had the good fortune and health to be celebrating his 95th birthday today.

In many ways William's life has not been exceptional. He and his family did the same things and experienced the same highs and lows that many other Americans have known over the past near century. They worked hard, celebrated family events, helped others when they were needed, and adjusted to the advent of cars, airplanes, rockets, modern appliances, and computers as well as the depression and several wars.

But in one way his life has been very special. He, along with his wife, set an example of how to be good people for their children, and then their children's children, and then their children's children's children, and now for even a fourth generation of children, as well as for the many people that have been fortunate enough to know them over the years. Celebrating William's birthday and his life is also a celebration of the best things about our country and all it's people.

In addition to his three sons and two daughters, 17 grandchildren, and 25 great grandchildren, William now has three great great grandchildren. I join with his family and friends in thanking him for the example he has set, and in wishing him many many happy returns.

TRIBUTE TO BILLY CARMICHAEL

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, November 10, I am looking forward to taking part in a ceremony in my hometown of Dillon, SC, dedicating our fire station and unveiling a portrait in memory of a legend in that town—Billy Carmichael.

I would probably be underestimating Billy's contributions to Dillon by calling him a legend, though. He personified Dillon. Growing up, I couldn't imagine how this town would survive without Billy at the helm. He was elected mayor of Dillon in 1963 and held that office until his death last September. As a matter of fact, town lore has it that Billy served as mayor longer than anyone else has served any city in this country.

As mayor, Billy was involved in every facet of life in Dillon. Aside from the expected contributions that a responsible public servant would make to his community, Billy made his job as mayor his life—from his involvement in local restoration projects to philanthropic activities to economic development initiatives. Throughout his many years of public service, he was personally involved in the lives of the people in the community—their problems were his problems—and he made it his first priority to make certain that everyone was taken care of.

I hate to believe that the day of public servants like Billy Carmichael may be a thing of the past, but I think generations to come will be hard pressed to find a public servant who would give so unselfishly for so many years to make his community a better place to live.

Throughout my childhood and growing up years, Billy gave me insight and inspiration along my road to public service. I grew up admiring and respecting this man who so ably led my hometown for 17 years. He and his wife, Virginia, were two of my first supporters when I threw my hat in the ring to run for public office more than 10 years ago. Their support meant the world to me then, and his encouragement and wisdom guide me still today.

On Sunday, we will be celebrating the dedication of our town fire station in Billy's memory. Celebrating an event such as this is a very joyous occasion, but this is doubly gratifying because we are saluting someone as well as something. This dedication to this fine man is our way of saying thanks to Billy for a job well done. From now on, every time any of us walk by that building, we'll think fondly of this generous and giving man to whom it is dedicated.

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK PENNONI

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, it is with admiration and respect that I rise today to pay tribute to Chuck Pennoni. Chuck has been named president of the American Society of Civil Engineers [ASCE].

Mr. Pennoni presently serves as the founder, president, and chairman of the board of Pennoni Associates, Inc., a 25-year-old Philadelphia-based firm specializing in multidisciplinary consulting engineering.

Chuck Pennoni is a graduate of Drexel University in Philadelphia, PA, with a B.S. and an M.S. in civil engineering. He frequently lectures at the University of Pennsylvania, as well as Swarthmore, Villanova, and Drexel Universities. Chuck also taught structural design and strength of materials at Temple University.

Throughout his career, Mr. Pennoni has had an immense amount of involvement with the ASCE and has served them well. He has been the recipient of numerous awards within his field.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and the other Members of the House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Mr. Chuck Pennoni on his many accomplishments in the engineering community.

TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT BEDER
CLIFTON

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Sgt. Beder Clifton who retired from the Sacramento City Police Department on October 26, 1991, after over 30 years of service to the community.

Sergeant Clifton represents the finest traditions of law enforcement and the Sacramento Police Department. His service to the community and to his department is reflected in a career that saw Sergeant Clifton become dean of narcotics enforcement officers in Sacramento County. He was a teacher not only to the officers who served under him, but to all members of law enforcement of the community as well as the prosecutors that worked with him. He was a leader in establishing joint agency task forces to attack the drug problems in Sacramento. Throughout his career, Sergeant Clifton was instrumental in developing many programs that contributed to the efficiency of both his own department and to that of the many allied agencies. Without question, an officer with Sergeant Clifton's skill and leadership will be missed in the Sacramento Police Department.

It is in view of this service that I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Sergeant Clifton.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION
TO PROMOTE OBSERVANCE OF
HUMAN RIGHTS STANDARDS IN
FORMER SOVIET REPUBLICS

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a resolution today, on behalf of fellow House Members of the Helsinki Commission, which seeks to promote observance of CSCE human rights standards in former Soviet Republics. The Helsinki Final Act and other documents of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE], including the Moscow CDH document, have established recognized standards for the protection and promotion of human rights, democracy, and rule of law.

The dramatic events following the failed Soviet coup highlight the growing importance of these Republics. It is essential to ensure that the human rights and fundamental freedoms of those living in the Republics are protected, particularly during this period of rapid change. Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldova, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan have declared independence; and Russia and Kazakhstan have declared sovereignty. The peoples of these Republics have made clear their strong desire to determine their own future. It is apparent that many of these Republics are taking steps to promote and protect the rights of

individuals on their territory, however, human rights abuses have been reported in a number of Republics.

The resolution we are introducing today expresses the sense of Congress that the leaders of each of these Republics should accept and implement all CSCE commitments on human rights and humanitarian cooperation, including provisions regarding monitoring activities.

The resolution urges the parliamentary leaders of each of the Republics to consider the establishment, within their respective parliaments, of appropriate mechanisms for the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. It also requests that the President keep the Congress informed of the status of human rights in each of the Republics.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential to stress the importance of human rights and rule of law to the peoples of these Republics as they seek to assert their independence and sovereignty. The Helsinki process provides excellent standards for the protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms. My hope is that the leaders of each of these Republics will accept and implement these commitments, including respect for the rights of members of national minorities.

CAMPAIGN REFORM: THE PROPER
APPROACH TO BETTER GOVERNMENT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, all across the country, Americans are embracing the growing movement to impose term limits on our Nation's elected Federal legislators. Support for term limits is a clear expression of citizens' frustration with a Congress they see as unresponsive to their concerns and so solidly entrenched that reelection is all but assured. Congress has no one to blame for this but itself, because it continues to adhere to a system of financing campaigns which is skewed to perpetuate incumbency. The voters' outrage has led them to search for a solution. They have found term limits.

Term limits are an undemocratic proposition, and if adopted would do far more harm than good. The central problem with our Government is a faulty election process, not that Members of Congress can serve their community for as many years as the voters want. Fixing what ails Congress should be about bridging the gap that currently exists between the people and their representatives, not about mandating plenty of turnover. Getting rid of big money in elections and giving average citizens a more direct voice in Federal elections will insure a level of turnover determined by the voters and based on the legislator's performance in office, rather than his or her fundraising ability.

One formula that is all too prevalent in today's politics is one that says "dollars equal votes." This axiom can be seen in the staggering amounts of money spent in recent Fed-

eral campaigns. In 1976, for example, the average cost for a candidate winning a House seat was \$87,000; and for a Senate seat, \$609,000. By 1986, the figures were \$350,000 and \$3,099,554 respectively. And the numbers continue to rise.

To raise these vast sums of money, most candidates are forced to adopt a grueling, year-round fundraising schedule; constantly seeking money as they continue to serve the public. This financial environment allows wealthy individuals and special-interest groups to command much of the time and attention of politicians. Meanwhile, average citizens, unwilling or unable to contribute large amounts, feel their interests are being crowded out or not represented. Campaign finance reform would help reverse that trend, and make candidates more responsible to the majority of their constituents, not a bunch of special interests.

The complexity of current campaign finance regulations demands a comprehensive plan for reform. We must restore the public's trust in its representatives, by curtailing or stopping certain abusive practices, like member PAC's and soft money transfers, and establishing a more even playing field between challenger and incumbent candidates.

A fundamental step in restoring public confidence in Congress is to make incumbent Members and their challengers more reliant on funds raised from small donations rather than large individual or PAC contributions. Establishing voluntary spending limits for election cycles, as well as placing limits on the amount and type of contributions accepted, will substantially increase the financial influence small contributors have with relation to that of PAC's and large contributors. We must establish a system in which candidates will be more reliant, and therefore more beholden to, small individual contributions rather than large, special-interest funding. I do not favor an absolute ban on PAC or large individual contributions. I do strongly believe that we must lower the amount each person or PAC can contribute, and limit the total amount candidates can accept from each category. Charles Keating-type ethical questions too often arise when large contributions are involved. Such scandals have significantly eroded the public's confidence in their elected representatives, and have to be addressed by reform legislation.

We must also limit the dollars candidates can accept from their State and national parties. Known as soft money, these funds get poured into candidates' coffers through loopholes in the current laws. Legislation that limits the acceptance from citizens, and yet fails to address parties' soft money abuses, would do little in the way of actual reform. In fact, a large percentage of the donations collected for presidential races are subsequently funneled by national campaign committees into chosen congressional elections. The campaign finance regulations covering these transfers must be amended to insure that people's donations are used for the purpose the contributor intended.

Reform should also end the practice of representatives contributing money from their own PAC's or campaign funds to those of their colleagues. Money people have donated to help elect one candidate can now be put towards the election of others, usually without the

knowledge, or consent, of the contributor. Member-to-Member donations are also being increasingly used to influence the internal power struggles that go on within the House and Senate. Such uses of campaign donations must be stopped. One way to help do so is to establish a method for funding candidates that does not imply a favor or an attempt to influence that candidate. Such a method is public financing.

Public finance, in the form of matching funds, is a vitally important way to take politicians out of the deep pockets of special interests and wealthy individuals. A controversial method of reform, public financing is critical for getting the candidates' focus back on the common people who make up the body of our democratic system. Equally important is the establishment of a method for funding such a financing system. The costs of public financing must not be paid for with tax increases or tacked onto the national deficit. A voluntary, or participation-based, system will provide the needed revenues without further burdening the American taxpayer.

Tying public financing to overall spending caps will encourage candidates to adhere to the limits and place them on equal financial footing with their opponent. Public funding, used to encourage acceptance of small, in-district donations, will turn the candidates' attention back to the people he or she hopes to represent. This will lead to a more issue-oriented debate among candidates and give voters a better idea of where the candidates stand. An enhanced public debate will contribute to a more informed and interested electorate.

The goal of campaign finance reform is public involvement in the process of government. Changes are desperately needed to regain the confidence of the voters. We need a comprehensive reform bill that combines spending limits with reductions in special interest contributions, yet creates incentives for public financing and encourages small individual donations. We need to address the abuses and inequities present in our system, and do so in a fair and nonpartisan way. Campaign reform can wait no longer. The American people have made it clear that they want substantive changes, not empty promises. Because Congress is in the unique position of making the laws that governs its actions, Congress has a chance to accomplish true reform and the opportunity to regain the trust of the American voter. This is an opportunity that Congress cannot afford to miss.

HISTORY'S TIDE TURNING
TOWARD A UNIFIED CHINA

HON. RICHARD RAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a thoughtful piece by Robert Akerman that appeared in the Atlanta Journal on Wednesday, October 9, 1991:

Tomorrow will be "Double Ten"—the tenth day of the tenth month, the anniversary of

the founding of the Republic of China. This 80th anniversary comes as we are at a turning of the tide of history.

The emergence of a new China—a unified, democratic and prosperous China—is becoming a real possibility. This was the vision of Dr. Sun Yat-sen when he established the republic; it is the vision that has been kept alive on the land of Taiwan for more than 40 years since the communists completed the conquest of the mainland. It no longer seems to be just a vision for the distant future.

Beginning with the tearing down of the Berlin wall and culminating in the collapse of communist control in the Soviet Union, things have been happening in Europe which have had a deep emotional impact on people of my age, people who were politically conscious when the Cold War began. These are things we had hoped for, and planned for in the sense of supporting policies aimed at defeating communism without having to fight World War Three. I was not sure that victories such as these would happen during my lifetime, but they have come.

But there is also Asia. I was one of those for whom events in China almost a half century ago were as traumatic as those in Europe. The Marxist-Leninist Maoist ideology which was confronted in Asia was basically the same as the totalitarianism which threatened Europe, and even more cruel in its practical application. The communist regime systematically slaughtered its opponents, yet many Westerners were able to ignore the evil of the regime, until it cracked down on university students while Western television cameras were around.

Having studied other cultures enough to teach world history in my days as a college professor, I understood the long perspective that representatives of the Republic of China on Taiwan were taking when they held to the doctrine that one day China would be unified again, and it was their mission to preserve an alternative model for the future. The Chinese tend to take the long view of history: after all, as a people they have the world's longest history. But many Americans scoffed at the idea that tiny Taiwan, even though it has become an economic powerhouse, could even "regain the mainland." It was so "isolated," so "out of step with history."

Because of recent events, now we in America know that even though it may take a long time for the tide of history to turn, it can move fast when it does turn. Germany was reunited in much less time than we expected, and now we have seen the collapse of Soviet communism. The dream of a reunited China now begins to seem less of a dream, and the Republic of China on Taiwan now appears to be very much in step with history.

FIFTY YEARS OF CARING FOR THE
DISABLED BY THE EASTER SEAL
SOCIETY OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call the attention of my colleagues to a very special anniversary. This year, the Easter Seal Society of San Mateo will celebrate 50 years of providing unselfish service to those who need it most. On the occasion of their Golden Jubilee, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to this valued care provider.

The Easter Seal Society of San Mateo County was founded in the Crippled Children's Society of San Mateo County in January 1941. In 1957, the nationwide organization adopted the familiar Easter lily as its national fundraising logo and included "East Seal" in its name. But whatever its name, for the last 50 years the Easter Seal Society of San Mateo has provided the highest level of caring for the most unfortunate among us.

This renowned organization has helped and motivated thousands of local residents to regain personal pride and confidence as they rebound from serious adversity as a result of affliction and accidental injury. In the end, the people touched by this caring group become more self-sufficient members of the community.

The physical and vocational rehabilitation of disabled children and adults by the Easter Seal Society of San Mateo County is provided at two large facilities operated by the organization in Burlingame—a fully equipped, 17,000-square-foot, out-patient rehabilitation center for children and adults; and a 13,000-square-foot work center that provides vocational, educational, and social programs for disabled adults.

In the last decade, the number of individuals helped at these two facilities has tripled. Nearly 7,000 disabled people were either served directly or referred to other care providers in 1989-90. These cases involved such disorders as communication, orthopedic, neurological and neuromuscular, social and pathological, learning and developmental, and such general disorders as heart and circulatory, and accidental injuries.

The Easter Seal Society of San Mateo has evolved locally from its humble beginning in 1941 into one of the largest nonprofit physical and vocational rehabilitative service organizations in San Mateo County due in large part to generous community support. During fiscal 1989-90, that citizen concern was translated into more than \$1.5 million in revenues used for program services—a 75 percent increase over the \$859,000 program expenditures of 10 years ago.

But clearly the most important people in the local organization's family of friends are the many thousands of courageous disabled citizens who have turned to the Eastern Seal Society of San Mateo County for help in regaining confidence and self-esteem by overcoming physical and emotional hardships.

The local organization's ultimate gratification in serving these patients—indeed the gratification of the entire Easter Seal organization nationwide—is seeing the disabled grasp their future and bravely learn to live life to the fullest.

Mr. Speaker, the Easter Seal Society of San Mateo County is proud of its heritage as "The Easter Seal People" and I am proud to recognize this invaluable organization on the occasion of their 50th anniversary. I am confident that the next half century of service will be provided at an even higher level than in the past. I commend and thank all of those who have made the East Seal Society of San Mateo County what it is today.

TRIBUTE TO ANGELO
TSAKOPOULOS

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that Angelo Tsakopoulos, the nationally known developer and philanthropist from Sacramento, CA, will be honored at the 16th annual United Hellenic American Congress [UHAC] Banquet in Chicago, IL, on Saturday, November 9, 1991.

Mr. Tsakopoulos is the founder and president of AKT Development Corp., one of the largest development firms in Sacramento, CA, controlling or developing more than 25,000 acres in the Sacramento metropolitan area.

An emigrant from Greece 40 years ago, Mr. Tsakopoulos has earned tremendous respect throughout his 30 years in business in Sacramento. He is well recognized as a long-time philanthropist and benefactor of the arts. He has made lasting contributions to both the cultural and the educational communities by donating land for schools, art galleries, museums, hospitals and senior citizens' facilities. Examples of his humanitarian efforts including funding for a new wing at the Crocker Art Museum in Sacramento, as well as sponsoring numerous performances of the symphony, ballet, and theatre.

In 1990 Mr. Tsakopoulos was the recipient of the Sacramento Excellence Award. In May 1991, the McGeorge School of Law awarded Mr. Tsakopoulos an honorary doctor of laws degree, citing his work as a "community leader, entrepreneur, and philanthropist."

Mr. Tsakopoulos' is a devout member of the Greek Orthodox Church and a true believer in the values of Hellenism. His commitment to education was the impetus for establishing the Kazantzakis Chair for Modern Greek studies at San Francisco State University. In addition, Mr. Tsakopoulos has funded chairs at the University of California at Berkeley, the University of California at Davis, and Dartmouth College. More recently, he directed the creation of the S.B. Vryonis Center in California for the Study of Hellenism, an academic research center.

With his continued promotion of the just causes of Hellenism in Cyprus, the Aegean, and at the Patriarchate, Mr. Tsakopoulos has become one of the most respected leaders of the Greek-American community. Through his extensive business development and philanthropic efforts, Mr. Tsakopoulos has emerged as one of the most admired, respected, and loved members of the Sacramento community.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues join me in saluting Angelo Tsakopoulos. I am proud to call him a friend and honored to have this opportunity to pay tribute to such a generous and outstanding person.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF WIC SUPPLEMENTAL BENEFITS ACT OF 1991
EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to reauthorize a program that provides coupons to recipients of the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC], for the purchase of fresh fruits and vegetables.

WIC was established in 1972 under the Child Nutrition Act. Since that time it has provided supplemental food and nutrition education to low-income pregnant and nursing mothers, and infants and children up to age 5. The benefits and cost effectiveness of this program are well documented and highly praised.

Since 1988, 10 States running demonstration programs have provided additional benefits to WIC recipients in the form of coupons for fresh fruits and vegetables purchased at farmers' markets. The program has served a valuable purpose by giving a nutritionally at-risk population access to fresh fruits and vegetables. This initial introduction to such foods is an important step in establishing healthy eating patterns.

The bill reauthorizes the program for an additional 4 years.

MR. E. RAYMOND BENWAY RECOGNIZED AS VETERAN OF THE YEAR

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. E. Raymond Benway of Newport, RI. Raymond Benway is the recipient of this year's Veteran of the Year Award presented by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Newport Lodge No. 104.

The Newport Chapter of the Order of Elks has been a part of the Newport community since 1888. The chapter is involved in many charitable activities. Most notably their charitable contributions go to benefit veterans, children, handicapped, and the sick and aged. Each year the Newport Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks presents the Veteran of the Year Award to a local veteran who has led a long and distinguished career of service to the United States of America.

Raymond Benway's military career began nearly 40 years ago and included almost 30 years of active service. On January 3, 1942, Raymond Benway entered the naval training station in Newport, RI. His first assignment was aboard the *U.S.S. Kearney*. That assignment soon ended after the *U.S.S. Kearney* was torpedoed in the North Atlantic in March 1942. Raymond Benway was then reassigned to the *U.S.S. Birmingham* and engaged in many combat missions in the Pacific, including Marianas, Leyte Gulf, Marshall Islands, New

Guinea, and Bougainville, in the Solomon Islands. After 6 years of naval service Raymond Benway was honorably discharged and highly decorated.

During Raymond Benway's distinguished naval career he was awarded many decorations. He was awarded the World War II Victory Medal, National Defense Service Medal with a star, Europe Africa Middle East Campaign with two stars, Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal with two bronze stars and one silver star, and the American Defense Philippines Liberation Medal.

Raymond Benway's military career did not end with the U.S. Navy. In 1950 Raymond Benway enlisted in the U.S. Coast Guard. He served aboard the Coast Guard Cutters *Casco*, *Heather*, and *Venturous*. In 1966 Raymond Benway served on a patrol boat based in DaNang, Vietnam. He served in Vietnam for 1 year. In 1973 Raymond Benway retired from the Coast Guard.

Once again Raymond Benway came away highly decorated from the service. He received the Coast Guard Good Conduct Medal with a silver star, the Vietnam National Service Medal with two stars, and the Republic of Vietnam Service Medal with device.

After retiring from military service Raymond Benway became involved in many veterans organizations. He is a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, post 4487, in Middletown, RI, and the Fleet Reserve Association, branch 19, of Newport, RI. Chief Benway was the exalted ruler of the Newport Lodge of Elks in 1967-68. Additionally he is the chairman of the Flag Day committee, chairman of the memorial Sunday committee, and member of the veterans committee.

E. Raymond Benway has led a truly distinguished career both in and out of active military duty. He served his country well during times of war and peace. After giving so much to his country, he continues to contribute to his community. It is people like him who have made the United States a great country. I take great pleasure in congratulating E. Raymond Benway as the recipient of the Newport Lodge of Elks Veteran of the Year Award. I extend my best wishes to him for a successful future.

LAW SCHOOL PROFESSORS AND
DEANS PROTECT HABEAS CORPUS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 5, 1991

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge and thank a group of over 340 law school deans and professors who worked tremendously hard to successfully protect our Bill of Rights. They joined with scores of other legal scholars who wrote separately. With their help, we were able to defeat the administration's "full and fair adjudication" habeas corpus amendment—the Hyde amendment—to the crime bill, H.R. 3371. I thought that you would be interested in seeing their letter, along with the impressive list of law school deans and professors. I hope that you will join me in applauding their efforts.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF LAW,
Boston, MA, September 20, 1991.

Hon. JACK BROOKS,
Hon. DON EDWARDS,
Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
Hon. HENRY HYDE.

DEAR MESSRS. BROOKS, EDWARDS, FISH AND HYDE: When the House takes up anti-crime measures this fall, the Bush Administration will propose the adoption of habeas corpus reform legislation similar to that which the Senate adopted this summer. The Administration's plan, formally introduced in the House as Title II of H.R. 1400, would largely eliminate the federal courts' ability to enforce the Bill of Rights by issuing the writ of habeas corpus. Habeas corpus plays a vital role in the machinery of American justice. Any attempt to strip the federal courts of this critical basis of judicial authority should be rejected.

The federal courts' general power to issue the writ of habeas corpus has existed since the original Judiciary Act of 1789; their authority to entertain petitions from applicants complaining of state custody reaches back to 1867. The statutory framework has been modified over the years in order to streamline the processing of cases and to accommodate legitimate state interests. Only a decade ago, special rules of procedure were promulgated to govern habeas corpus proceedings. Pursuant to those rules, habeas corpus is now an important part of the machinery for federal enforcement of the Bill of Rights. Through habeas corpus, Americans receive their due—a fair opportunity to litigate federal claims in a federal forum.

The state courts, too, are charged to enforce federal standards, and we have no doubt that they do so to the best of their ability. Still, all courts make mistakes. Fifty state courts, moreover, inevitably generate conflicting judgments. The Supreme Court is unable to review all state court determinations of federal issues for error or to reconcile conflicting decisions from so many jurisdictions. Accordingly, the Justices must rely upon the lower federal courts as surrogates. Within the current scheme, the Supreme Court maintains accuracy and uniformity in the treatment of Bill of Rights questions by reviewing decisions from the twelve federal circuits.

The Bush Administration proposals to alter this well-established framework include provisions that would bar federal habeas corpus relief with respect to any claim that was "fully and fairly adjudicated" in state court. These are terms of art in the law of federal courts. If they are written into the statutes governing habeas corpus, they will largely abolish the federal courts' current and longstanding authority to enforce the Bill of Rights in this context. For all the reasons just recited, the House should reject this program—just as it has rejected similar programs in the past.

Other proposals for streamlining corpus procedures, particularly in death penalty cases, can and should be considered and evaluated on their own merits. It is essential, however, that the "full and fair adjudication" standard be avoided—in order that there be a habeas corpus jurisdiction left to reform.

In addition, your attention is drawn to a series of recent Supreme Court decisions that, taken literally, promise to do by judicial decision what the President proposes to do by legislation. In *Teague v. Lane* and subsequent cases, the Court has largely barred the federal courts from considering constitu-

tional claims resting on "new rules" of law, established after petitioners' sentences are approved on direct review. If *Teague* and its progeny had only to do with the retroactive effect of genuine changes in the law, they would not excite great controversy in the academic community. The Court's definition of a "new rule," however, is so broad as to capture not only claims that depend on genuine changes in the law, but also claims that seek the application of settled principles to different fact patterns. If habeas corpus is to be preserved as the vital remedy it is, the definition of a "new rule" within the meaning of the *Teague* line of cases must be changed legislatively. In the Senate, both Senator Biden's original bill and Senator Graham's proposed amendment contained such a provision. In the House, Mr. Edwards' bill contains similar language. A provision redefining "new rules" is essential in any habeas corpus reform legislation adopted by the House this year.

I am authorized to say that the law professors whose names appear below join me in this letter and these recommendations. Our institutional affiliations are given for identification only.

Very truly yours,

LARRY W. YACKLE,
Professor of Law.

American University Washington College of Law:

Professor M. Hager.
Professor Sheldon Krantz.
Professor Jennifer P. Lyman.
Professor Jamin Ben Raskin.
Professor Ira P. Robbins.
Professor Ann C. Shueek.
Professor Joan Chalmers Williams.
Professor Richard J. Wilson.
Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law:
Professor Barry C. Schreck.
Professor Lawrence A. Vogelstein.
Boston University School of Law:
Professor Kathryn Abrams.
Professor Jack Michael Beermann.
Professor Jamie Boyle.
Professor Stanley Z. Fisher.
Professor Prina Lahav.
Professor Murray Tracey Maclin.
Professor Aviam Soifer.
California State University:
Professor J. Bronson.
California Western School of Law:
Professor Floralynn Einesman.
Case Western Reserve University Law School:
Professor Lewis R. Katz.
Professor Juliet P. Kostriksky.
Catholic University of America School of Law:

Professor Fred Warren Bennett.
Columbia University School of Law:
Professor Vivian O. Berger.
Professor Harold S.H. Edgar.
Professor Stephen J. Ellmann.
Professor Walter Gellhorn.
Professor Philip Genty.
Professor R. Kent Greenawalt.
Professor Jack Greenberg.
Professor James Steven Leibman.
Professor Albert J. Rosenthal.
Professor Telford Taylor.
Cornell Law School:
Professor Gregory S. Alexander.
Professor Theodore Eisenberg.
Professor John A. Filiciano.
Professor Sheri L. Johnson.
Professor Steven H. Shiffrin.
Creighton University School of Law:
Professor G. Michael Fenner.
Dickinson School of Law:

Professor Gary Schott Gildin.
Duke University School of Law:
Professor Katharine T. Bartlett.
Professor Sara Sun Beale.
Professor Paul D. Carrington.
Professor James Coleman.
Professor James D. Cox.
Professor Walter E. Dellinger III.
Professor Carolyn McAllister.
Professor Thomas B. Metzloff.
Professor Madeline H. Morris.
Professor Robert P. Mosteller.
Professor Christopher H. Schroeder.
Florida State University College of Law.
Professor Margaret A. Baldwin.
Professor Lawrence C. George.
Professor Steven G. Gay.
Professor Steven Mark Goldstein.
Professor Robert Heath Kennedy.
Professor John W. Larson.
Professor Jarrett C. Oeltjen.
Professor Nat S. Stern.
George Washington University National Law Center:

Professor Jerome A. Barron.
Professor Mary M. Cheh.
Professor C. Thomas Dienes.
Professor Ira C. Lupu.
Georgetown University Law Center:
Professor William W. Greenhalgh.
Adjunct Professor Cynthia W. Lobo.
Professor Mark V. Tushnet.
Georgia State University College of Law:
Professor Kathryn R. Urbonya.
Golden Gate University School of Law:
Professor Allan Brotsky.
Professor Robert K. Calhoun, Jr.
Professor Morton P. Cohen.
Professor Michael D. DeVito.
Professor Deene Goodlaw.
Professor Joan W. Howarth.
Professor Susan Kuper.
Professor Judith Grant McKelvey.
Professor Leslie A. Minkus.
Professor David Oppenheimer.
Professor Wendy Roudner.
Professor Susan Rutberg.
Professor Bernard L. Segal.
Professor Mary Pat Treuthart.
Gonzaga University School of Law:
Professor George Critchlow.
Harvard University Law School:
Professor Elizabeth Bartholet.
Professor Derrick A. Bell, Jr.
Professor Cynthia Farina.
(Visiting Professor)
Professor Richard Fallon.
Professor Roger Fisher.
Professor Gerald Frug.
Professor Morton Horwitz.
Professor Andrew Kaufman.
Professor David Kennedy.
Professor Duncan Kennedy.
Professor Sanford Levinson.
(Visiting Professor)
Professor Louis Loss.
Professor Daniel Meltzer.
Professor David L. Shapiro.
Professor Gary Singens.
Professor Henry Steiner.
Dr. Alan Stone.
Professor Donald Trautman.
Professor Lloyd L. Weinreb.
Professor Bernard Wolfman.
Hofstra University School of Law:
Professor Douglas L. Colbert.
Indiana University at Bloomington School of Law:
Professor Craig M. Bradley.
Professor Daniel O. Conkle.
Professor Joseph L. Hoffman.
Associate Dean Lauren K. Robel.
Professor Thomas F. Schornhorst.
Professor Earl Singleton.

Professor Jeffrey Evans Stake.
 Professor J. Alexander Tanford.
 Indiana University at Indianapolis School
 of Law:
 Professor Helen Garfield.
 Professor W. William Hodes.
 Dean Norman Lefstein.
 Professor William E. Marsh.
 John Marshall Law School:
 Professor Melvin B. Lewis.
 Lewis and Clark Northwestern School of
 Law:
 Professor Arthur B. LaFrance.
 Memphis State University Cecil C. Hum-
 phreys School of Law:
 Professor William Michael Roberts.
 New York University School of Law:
 Professor Steven Gillers.
 Professor Martin Guggenheim.
 Professor Randy Hertz.
 Professor Lewis Kornhauser.
 Professor Holly Maguigan.
 Professor Lawrence Gene Sager.
 Professor Steven Zeidman.
 Nova University Shepard Broad Law Cen-
 ter:
 Professor Steven J. Wisotsky.
 North Carolina Central University School
 of Law:
 Professor Warren D. Bracy.
 Professor Adrienne M. Fox.
 Professor Irving L. Joyner.
 Professor Thomas M. Ringer.
 Northern Illinois University College of
 Law:
 Professor Kathleen H. Patchel.
 Professor Lawrence Schlam.
 Professor Joel H. Swift.
 Ohio State University College of Law:
 Professor Lawrence Herman.
 Rutgers—The State University of New Jer-
 sey S.I. Newhouse Center for Law and Jus-
 tice:
 Professor John Leubsdorf.
 Saint Cloud State University:
 Professor G. Kittel.
 Santa Clara University School of Law:
 Professor George J. Alexander.
 Professor Howard C. Anawalt.
 Professor Richard P. Berg.
 Professor Dean Mary B. Emery.
 Professor Monica Evans.
 Professor Russell W. Galloway, Jr.
 Professor Aidan R. Gough.
 Professor Phillip Joseph Jimenez.
 Professor Jeffrey Kroeber.
 Professor Kenneth A. Manaster.
 Adjunct Professor Gerald Z. Marer.
 Professor Jeffrey G. Miller.
 Professor Nancy A. Millich.
 Professor Robert W. Peterson.
 Professor John E. Rummel.
 Professor Margaret Mary Russell.
 Professor Eric W. Wright.
 Director Laurie B. Zimet.
 Stanford Law School:
 Professor Barbara Allen Babcock.
 Professor Charles Richard Calleros.
 Professor Charles Richard Campbell.
 Professor Janet M. Cooper.
 Professor Henry T. Greely.
 Professor Thomas C. Grey.
 Professor Gerald Gunther.
 Professor Charles R. Lawrence.
 Professor Margaret Jane Radin.
 Professor Deborah L. Rhode.
 Professor William H. Simon.
 Professor Kim Taylor.
 Professor Robert Weisberg.
 Suffolk University Law School:
 Professor Eric D. Blumenson.
 Thomas M. Cooley Law School:
 Professor Doream M. Koenig.
 Tulane University School of Law:

Professor Elizabeth W. Cole.
 University of Akron C. Blake McDowell
 Law Center:
 Professor Richard L. Aynes.
 Professor J. Dean Carro.
 Professor Dana F. Castle.
 Professor Richard C. Cohen.
 Professor Malina Coleman.
 Professor Richard L. Grant.
 Professor Ann Woodley Harbottle.
 Professor Wilson Ray Huhn.
 Dean Isaac C. Hunt, Jr.
 Professor Donald M. Jenkins.
 Professor Charles E. Kirkwood.
 Professor Margery Malkin Koosed.
 Professor Constance L. Leistiko.
 Professor Anne S. McFarland.
 Professor Marla L. Mitchell.
 Professor Tawia Modibo Ocran.
 Professor Carol A. Olson.
 Professor Kyle Passmore.
 Professor Elizabeth A. Reilly.
 Professor William Douglas Rich.
 Professor John Patrick Sahl.
 Professor John F. Seiberling.
 University of Alabama School of Law:
 Professor Williams L. Andreen.
 Professor Bryan Keith Fair.
 Professor Tony A. Freyer.
 Professor Timothy Hoff.
 Professor Jerome Allan Hoffman.
 Professor Wythe Holt.
 Professor Michelle D. Monse.
 Professor Martha I. Morgan.
 Professor Karl S. Okamoto.
 Professor Norman P. Stein.
 University of Arkansas at Fayetteville
 Leflar Law Center:
 Professor Morton Gitelman.
 Professor Donald P. Judges.
 Professor Ann Killenbeck.
 Professor Rohert Todd Laurence.
 Professor John J. Watkins.
 Professor Albert M. Witte.
 University of Arkansas at Little Rock
 School of Law:
 Dean Howard B. Eisenberg.
 University of California at Los Angeles
 School of Law:
 Professor Peter Arenella.
 Professor Julian N. Eule.
 Professor William E. Forbath.
 Professor Robert Garcia.
 Professor/Associate Dean Carol E. Gold-
 berg-Ambrose.
 Professor Robert David Goldstein.
 Professor Kenneth L. Karst.
 Professor Jonathan D. Varat.
 University of Chicago School of Law:
 Professor Albert W. Alschuler.
 University of Connecticut School of Law:
 Professor Hugh C. Macgill.
 University of Georgia:
 Professor Milner S. Ball.
 Professor Paul M. Kurtz.
 Professor Ellen S. Podger.
 University of Houston Law Center:
 Professor Mary Anne Bobinsky.
 Professor Seth J. Chandler.
 Professor David R. Dow.
 Professor Dennis P. Duffy.
 Professor Sandra Guerra.
 Professor Peter Linzer.
 Professor Laura Ellen Oren.
 Professor Jordan J. Paust.
 Professor Karl R. Rabago.
 Professor Irene Merker Rosenberg.
 Professor Yale L. Rosenberg.
 Professor Robert P. Schuwert.
 Professor Stephen Thomas Zamora.
 University of Idaho College of Law:
 Professor Elizabeth Barker Brandt.
 Professor Neil Edward Franklin.
 Professor Kenneth Stuart Gallant.

Professor Dale D. Goble.
 Professor Maureen Laflin.
 Professor Monique C. Lillard.
 Professor James S. Macdonald.
 Professor John A. Miller.
 Professor Myron A. Schreck.
 Dean Sheldon A. Vincenti.
 University of Kansas School of Law:
 Professor Robert C. Casad.
 Professor Kimberley A. Dayton.
 Professor David J. Gottlieb.
 Professor Philip C. Kissam.
 Professor Richard E. Levy.
 Professor Keith G. Meyer.
 Professor Reginald Lee Robinson.
 Professor Thomas G. Stacey.
 University of Kentucky:
 Professor Roberta M. Harding.
 University of Missouri-Kansas City School
 of Law:
 Professor David Actenberg.
 Professor Julie M. Cheslik.
 Professor Corinne Cooper.
 Professor Barbara A. Glesner.
 Professor Nancy Levit.
 Professor Joan Mahoney.
 Professor Robert Popper.
 Professor Ellen Yankiver Suni.
 University of Oklahoma Law Center:
 Professor Keith Neville Bystrom.
 Professor Randall Coyne.
 Professor Rodney J. Uphoff.
 Professor Shirley A. Wiegand.
 University of Pennsylvania Law School:
 Professor C. Edwin Baker.
 Professor Seth F. Kreimer.
 Professor Howard Lesnick.
 Professor Gerald L. Neuman.
 Professor David Rudovsky.
 Professor Susan P. Sturm.
 Professor Clyde W. Summers.
 University of Pittsburgh School of Law:
 Professor John M. Burkoff.
 Professor Welsh S. White.
 University of San Diego School of Law:
 Professor Kevin L. Cole.
 University of San Francisco School of Law:
 Professor Jeffrey S. Brand.
 Professor Adrienne Davis.
 Professor John Denvir.
 Professor Dolores A. Donovan.
 Professor Trina Grillo.
 Professor Sharon A. Meadows.
 Associate Dean Suzanne E. Mounts.
 Professor Steven F. Shatz.
 University of South Carolina School of
 Law:
 Professor W. Lewis Burke, Jr.
 Professor Randall Meads Chastain.
 Professor Vance L. Cowden.
 Professor James F. Flanagan.
 Professor Patrick James Flynn.
 Professor F. Patrick Hubbard.
 Professor Herbert Alan Johnson.
 Professor David K. Linnan.
 Professor Walter A. Reise, Jr.
 Professor O'Neal Smalls.
 Professor Jon P. Thames.
 Professor Eldon D. Wedlock, Jr.
 University of South Dakota:
 Professor Mary Christine Hutton.
 University of Southern California Law
 Center:
 Professor Scott Altman.
 Professor Michael J. Brennan.
 Professor Lee W. Campbell.
 Professor Edwin Chemerinsky.
 Professor Dennis Edward Curtis.
 Professor Dean Karen Lash.
 Professor Daniel Ortiz (Visiting Professor).
 Professor Noel Ragsdale.
 Professor Judith Resnik.
 Professor Matthew L. Spitzer.
 Professor Nomi M. Stolzenberg.

Professor Charles D. Weisselberg.
 Professor Charles H. Whitebread.
 University of Texas School of Law:
 Professor Michael J. Churgin.
 Professor Edward F. Sherman.
 Professor Jordan M. Steiker.
 Professor Michael E. Tigar.
 University of Utah College of Law:
 Professor John J. Flynn.
 Professor Kate Leahy.
 Professor William J. Lockhart.
 Professor John Martinez.
 Professor Robert W. Swenson.
 Professor Debora L. Threedy.
 University of Wisconsin Law School:

Professor Frank J. Remington.
 Valparaiso University School of Law:
 Professor Bruce G. Berner.
 Professor Ivan E. Bodensteiner.
 Professor Laura Gaston Dooley.
 Professor Rosalie Berger Levinson.
 Professor David E. Vandercyoy.
 Vanderbilt University School of Law:
 Professor Robert Belton.
 Professor Barry Friedman.
 Professor Susan L. Kay.
 Widener University—Delaware Campus:
 Professor Phyllis Tatik Bookspan.
 Professor Francis J. Catania, Jr.
 Professor John Fulton Hart.

Professor J. Patrick Kelly.
 Widners University—Harrisburg Campus:
 Professor Alan L. Adelstein.
 Professor Raymond E. Gallagher.
 Professor Charles Geyh.
 Professor Mary Kate Kearney.
 Professor James May
 Professor Harry L. Witte.
 Yale Law School:
 Professor Akhil Reed Amar.
 Professor John L. Pottenger, Jr.
 Professor Stephen Wizner.