

As I predicted, she went back five months later. Although I've seen her go in and out of hospitals for as long as I could remember, when I saw her that time I noticed something different. She seemed as though she was sick of cancer and tired of fighting it. A couple more months passed and it looked worse and worse. The most upsetting thing for me to deal with was that I was losing two grandparents, who are two of the most important people in the world to me, to a deadly disease that killed millions each year, CANCER! By that time I didn't want to hear another word about cancer, and I wished and prayed that it could be cured, and quick. But it did exist and there wasn't a cure. It felt like an evil monster that had corrupted my grandparents' bodies. In May of 1998, my beloved grandmother died. I will never forget that day, it was one of the worst days of my life. Inside I was torn up and my heart was shredded to pieces, then I realized that my grandparents wouldn't be able to take part in my life ever again. I remember thinking to myself how I wished they could be alive again just the way it was.

However, as I look back at those thoughts, it was selfish of me to want them to be back in the hospital, dying and suffering from cancer, because that was the way it was, and now I take back those wishes. Also I realized that the memories I had with them in the past have become priceless and those are the memories that I will remember them in the future. I can finally say that I am relieved that my grandparents aren't suffering anymore and they are in a peaceful place. It is now very important for me to think about all people, not just myself, I have to understand that some people aren't as lucky as I am, I am healthy and out-going and I should cherish every moment of life. Things come and go, including health, but you should never lose your happiness and the love for the people who love you.

Mr. Speaker, please join me, our colleagues, Adrienne's family and friends in wishing her continued success in all of her future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF MONTE AHUJA

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Monte Ahuja, a Cleveland entrepreneur and Cleveland State graduate, for his achievements and generous contributions to Cleveland State University. Mr. Ahuja has donated \$1 million and has pledged an additional \$1 million to Cleveland State University, primarily in support of the James J. Nance College of Business Administration.

Born in India, Mr. Ahuja received a bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering from Punjab Engineering College in 1967. He arrived in the U.S. in 1969 and earned a master's degree in mechanical engineering from Ohio State University in 1970. After moving to Cleveland in 1971, and while working full time with a Maple Heights automotive firm, he earned his MBA from Cleveland State's College of Business Administration in 1975. As an assignment for a marketing class, he developed a business plan for an auto transmission supply business. After graduation, Mr. Ahuja turned this plan into his own company—Transtar Industries, Inc. Although the firm began with only two employees and virtually

no capital, today Transtar has nearly 700 employees and is the leader in the transmission products industry with 21 operations in the U.S. and worldwide distribution.

In addition to his generous monetary donations to Cleveland State University, Mr. Ahuja has dedicated his time by serving as a director of the Cleveland State University Foundation, and establishing the Ahuja Endowed Scholarship Fund in Business Administration and Engineering and the Distinguished Scholar in Comparative Indian and Western Philosophy, a cultural endowment initiated by a close friend, Dr. D.C. Bhajji. As chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Ahuja oversaw one of the largest physical expansions in Cleveland State's history. In 1990, he was named one of Cleveland State's top 25 distinguished alumni.

Let us join Cleveland State University as they honor Mr. Ahuja on March 26, 1999, for his contributions to the university.

CLOSER TO EMPIRE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to consider the effect of our current actions in Kosovo, but this time I do not wish to address the folly of war, for attempts to prevent war measures against that nation are now futile. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address a long term concern, a problem larger even than war. I am referring to the folly of empire.

Our involvement in Kosovo and in Iraq, and in Bosnia—when combined with America's role in Korea, and in the Middle East and other places around the world, is now lurching our republic ever closer to empire. Empire is something that all Americans ought to oppose.

I remind those who believe in the Judeo-Christian tradition that opposition to empire is to be found in the warnings found in the book of Ezekiel, warnings against the empowerment of a king. And it is this same principle which is evident in the story of the Tower of Babel, and in that admonition of Christ, which reminds that those things which are of Caesar are not of God.

To pragmatists, agnostics and such, I point to the decline and fall which has historically attended every other empire. The Ottomans and Romans, the Spanish and the British, all who have tried empire have faltered, and at great costs to their own nations.

Mr. Speaker, to liberals I would remind that these interventions, however well-intended they may be, all require the use of forces of occupation, and this is the key step toward colonialism, itself always leading to subjugation and to oppression.

To conservatives, I want to recall the founding of our Republic, our nation's breaking from the yoke of empire in order that we might realize the benefits of liberty and self-determination, and that we might obtain the blessings that flow naturally from limitations on centralized power. Empire reflecting the most perfect means yet devised to concentrate power in the fewest hands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our own nation faces a choice and we may well be at the very precipice. Indeed, to move even one step further down the road to empire may mean that there

will be no turning back short of the eventual decline and fall. Will we act now to restore our Republic?

It is oft repeated that we do not realize the import of our most critical actions at the time that we begin to undertake them. How true, Mr. Speaker, this statement is. Were Mr. Townshend, or the King in England the least contemplative of the true cost which would eventuate as a result of the tea tax or the stamp act?

Now we must ask, is our nation on the verge of empire? Some will say no, because, they say, we do not seek to have direct control over the governments of foreign lands, but how close are we to doing just that? And is it so important whether the dictates of empire come from the head of our government or from the Secretary General of some multilateral entity which we direct?

Today we attempt, directly or indirectly, to dictate to other sovereign nations who they ought and ought not have as leader, which peace accords they should sign, and what form of governments they must enact. How limited is the distinction between our actions today and those of the emperors of history? How limited indeed. In fact, one might suggest that this is a distinction without a substantive difference.

And where now are we willing to commit troops and under what conditions? If we are to stop all violations of human rights, what will we do of Cuba, which recently announced new crackdowns?

And what of communist China? Not only do they steal our secrets, but they violate their own citizens. Who should be more upset, for example, about forced abortion? Is it those who proclaim the inviolable right to life or those who argue for so-called reproductive rights? Even these polar opposites recognize the crimes of the Chinese government in forced abortion. Should we then stop this oppression of millions? Are we committed to lob missiles at this massive nation until it ceases this program?

Will the principle upon which we are now claiming to act lead us to impose our political solutions upon the nations that now contain Tibet, and Kurdistan, and should the sentiment rear, even Quebec and Chechnya?

The most dangerous thing about where we are headed is our lack of historical memory and our disastrous inattention to the effect of the principles upon which we act, for ideas do indeed have consequences, Mr. Speaker, and they pick up a momentum that becomes all their own.

I do believe that we are on the brink, Mr. Speaker, but it is not yet too late. Soon I fear the train, as it is said, will have left the station. We stand on the verge of crossing that line that so firmly distinguishes empire from republic. This occurs not so much by an action or series of actions but by the acceptance of an idea, the idea that we have a right, a duty, an obligation, or a national interest to perfect foreign nations even while we remain less than principled ourselves.

When will we, as a people and as an institution, say "we choose to keep our republic, your designs for empire interest us not in the least." I can only hope it will be soon, for it is my sincerest fear that failing to do so much longer will put us beyond this great divide.

THE SILICONE BREAST IMPLANT
RESEARCH AND INFORMATION
ACT

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Commerce Subcommittee on Health, I am committed to ensuring patients have complete and comprehensive access to information before they make a decision about a medical procedure.

To this end, I am proud to re-introduce the Silicone Breast Implant Research and Information Act because I believe it is critical to the advancement of women's health and is the first step towards answering the many questions about the safety and efficacy of silicone breast implants.

By re-introducing this bill today, I along with the 41 original cosponsors, hope to draw attention to an issue that has been either neglected or out right ignored for too long.

It is estimated that as many as 2 million women have received silicone breast implants over the last 30 years. Unfortunately, the information provided to these women before they elected to have silicone breast implants has been both incomplete and even inaccurate.

Moreover, results from past studies have only raised more questions about possible negative effects that ruptured or leaking silicone breast implants may have on breast milk, connective tissue, autoimmune diseases and the accuracy of breast cancer screening tests.

Our legislation ultimately seeks to change this by focusing on three critical points—information, research, and communication.

First, and in my opinion most importantly, this bill will ensure that information sent to women about silicone breast implants contains the most up to date and accurate information available.

Current information packets sent to women do not accurately describe some of the potential risks of silicone breast implants. While recent studies by the Institute of Medicine indicate the rupture rate may be as high as 70 percent, information sent to women suggests the rupture rate is only 1 percent.

Second, this bill encourages the director of the National Institutes of Health to expand existing research projects and clinical trials. Doing so will compliment past and existing studies and will hopefully clear up much of the confusion surrounding the safety and efficacy of silicone breast implants.

Finally, this bill establishes an open line of communication between federal agencies, researchers, the public health community and patient and breast cancer advocates.

Women, especially breast cancer patients, want and deserve full and open access to silicone breast implants. Therefore, it is critical that these products are safe and effective, and that women are provided complete and frequently updated information about the health risks and benefits of silicone breast implants.

While I unequivocally support a women's right to choose to use silicone breast implants, I believe we have a responsibility to support research efforts that will provide the maximum amount of information and understanding about these products.

Recently, I met with a group of women who had silicone breast implants. One of them

shared with me her story about trying to get health insurance after she received her implants. To my dismay, it is standard operating procedures for several health plans to deny health insurance for women with breast implants. And this was a healthy woman! This story only reinforced my belief that silicone breast implants may cause very serious health problems.

The day has come to answer the questions and find out what is causing so many women who have implants to get sick. I hope each of you join me in support of this important legislation.

THE REFORESTATION TAX ACT OF
1999

HON. JENNIFER DUNN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, on March 11 when I introduced the Reforestation Tax Act of 1999, my statement focused on the benefits of this legislation to the forest products sector of our economy. Today, as I add eight more cosponsors to this increasingly popular effort, I would like to focus my remarks on the benefits for non-industrial forest land owners.

America's privately-owned forests make up almost 58% of our nation's total forest lands and are one of our most valuable resources. They provide wildlife habitat, maintain watershed health, and are used for a wide array of recreational activities such as hiking, camping, fishing, and hunting. In addition, they provide the foundation for a multi-billion dollar forest products industry.

To ensure that our wildlife habitat and watershed needs as well as a reliable supply of timber is available for the future, we need to encourage industrial and nonindustrial landowners to invest in enhancing their forest ownership. Investing in forest land is risky. Trees can take anywhere from 25 to 75 years to grow to maturity, depending on the type of tree, regional weather, and soil conditions. The key to success is good management, which is costly. Furthermore, fire, disease, floods, and ice storms—events that are uninsurable—can wipe out acres of trees at any time during the long, risky growing period.

The Reforestation Tax Act of 1999 will remove disincentives for private investment in our forests and help with the cost of maintaining them. By reducing the capital gains paid on timber for individuals and corporations by 3 percent each year the timber is held—up to a maximum reduction of 50 percent—forest landowners will be partially protected from being taxed on inflationary gains. While this provision would not fully compensate for the negative tax impact of inflation, it would provide a significant incentive for those forest land owners who must nurture their investment for a long period of time.

Today, many landowners cease reforestation efforts when they reach the current \$10,000 ceiling on expenses that are eligible for the credit. Removing the cap on expenses eligible for the credit would eliminate a disincentive for private forest land owners to plant more trees. Current law allows this \$10,000 in reforestation expenses to be amortized over a seven year period. My legislation

not only eliminates the monetary cap but also reduces the amortization period to five years. With these changes, the reforestation tax credit and amortization will encourage forest landowners to operate in an ecologically-sound manner that leads to the expansion of investment in this vital natural resource.

By removing these current law disincentives to sustainable forestry for both our industrial and non-industrial forest land owners, we will increase reforestation and enhance sound environmental management on private land. We believe this will benefit Americans across the country, not just forest land owners.

I am grateful for the broad support the Reforestation Tax Act of 1999 has gained since its introduction, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to make this bill a reality.

JUSTICE FOR ATOMIC VETERANS
ACT—H.R. 1286

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Congresswoman BERKLEY, I am today introducing H.R. 1286 the Justice for Atomic Veterans Act. This important legislation provides a presumption of service-connection for certain radiation-related illnesses suffered by veterans who were exposed during military service to ionizing radiation. These veterans include those who participated in atmospheric testing of a nuclear device, who participated in the occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki between August 6, 1945 and July 1, 1946 and who were interned as prisoners of war in Japan during World War II and were therefore exposed to ionizing radiation.

During their military service, these veterans put their lives and health at risk. They were, in most cases, sworn to secrecy concerning the nature of their work. They were not provided with adequate protection from radiation. The amount of radiation to which they were exposed was not measured. Albert "Smokey" Parrish, a veteran who served at the Nevada test site wrote "We, the Atomic veterans feel like an innocent man in prison for life, and no one will listen to the facts of the case."

Under present law, veterans who engaged in radiation risk activities during military service are entitled to a presumption of service-connection for some illnesses, but for other illnesses veterans must prove causation by "dose reconstruction estimates" which many reputable scientists have found fatally flawed. Because of the recognized problems inherent in dose reconstruction, last year, the Department of Veterans Affairs Deputy Under Secretary for Health, Dr. Kenneth Kizer, wrote that he personally recommended strong support as a "matter of equity and fairness" for legislation similar to the Justice for Atomic Veterans Act which was then proposed by Senator WELLSTONE.

It is not the fault of veterans that accurate records of their exposure to ionizing radiation were not kept and maintained. In fact, many veterans have been not been able to obtain their medical records relating to their exposure during military service despite their best efforts. Records have been lost and records of