

the House floor. It is my hope that we shall soon see this bill signed into law.

### THE STERLING FOREST

HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce, along with my colleagues RICHARD POMBO and FRANK LUCAS, the Federal Lands Prioritization Act of 1995. This legislation will sell idle public lands deemed pointless for Federal ownership and will use the proceeds to purchase Sterling Forest; therefore ending the funding deadlock that has existed in Congress with regard to Sterling Forest.

With the help of Representatives POMBO and LUCAS, I now introduce a bill that, not only saves Sterling Forest, but also specifies a funding source for its acquisition. Last week I heard of Representative FRANK LUCAS' desire to sell public lands in Oklahoma and approached Representative POMBO of the House Resources Committee to propose that Sterling Forest be the beneficiary of funds from those Federal lands being reverted to private ownership.

Together, we were able to propose a bill that makes the Federal land acquisition process more fiscally responsible, and sets a precedent that the Federal Government reprioritize its land holding policies and streamline its inventory to better target budget resources and meet environmental goals.

As a Passaic County Freeholder, I understood early on the need to take action to protect Sterling Forest. In fact, during my service on the Passaic County Board of Freeholders, the board was the first entity to secure part of Sterling Forest in 1993—purchasing 2,000 acres. I have since been looking forward to the day that the reserve would have complete Federal protection. Selling dead-weight public lands to buy Sterling Forest is a fiscally responsible solution to a decade-old stalemate.

Located in southern New York and bordering northern New Jersey, Sterling Forest, in its current undeveloped State, is important to the residents of both States for a variety of reasons.

Sterling Forest is a 17,500-acre water and recreational reserve that area residents and public officials have repeatedly requested the Federal Government protect. Stalls in the actual purchase have been attributed to budget-cutting times and the concern about adding more public land to the already bloated Federal Government inventory.

As a recreational area for New York and New Jersey, Sterling Forest offers a haven for families and individuals interested in leaving behind stresses of everyday life. The picturesque beauty of this natural sanctuary provides a wide variety of outdoor activities for the enjoyment of everyone. Sterling Forest even serves as a connections to the Northeast with the Appalachian trail winding its way through the forest's rough terrain.

Most importantly, however, Sterling Forest is a watershed for most of northern New Jersey and the surrounding area. It provides nearly 2 million New Jersey residents with clean and safe drinking water.

Proposed development and urbanization of this area will destroy a great bounty of natural resources to the entire Northeast. Furthermore, if the land is developed, the water that flows from Sterling Forest could become polluted. The only viable solution at that point would be to build a water treatment center at the cost of \$150 million to New Jersey taxpayers. Not only would this cost the taxpayers revenue they just don't have, but it is, at best, a second-rate solution. Truthfully, Mr. Speaker, there is just no comparison between treated water and water from a natural watershed such as Sterling Forest.

Sterling Forest is an issue of national significance, involving one of Government's most essential functions: the preservation of a vital, life-sustaining resource—water. As stated before, Sterling Forest provides clean water for 2 million Americans in New Jersey alone—a fact that transcends any suggestion of parochial interests.

For this reason, an alliance of governmental agencies and public interest groups have joined together in the fight to save this vital resource. This legislation sets up a management and fiscal partnership between all levels of Government. In fact, purchasing this land is just a one-time expense. The Department of the Interior will not be burdened by the costs of managing and maintaining the forest, for this will be done jointly by New York and New Jersey. A partnership such as this of local, State, and Federal Government is positive for all involved and should serve as a model for future land acquisition. It is our responsibility to protect Sterling Forest and assure an ample water supply for generations to come.

It is important to note that there is a bipartisan consensus to save Sterling Forest. Senator BILL BRADLEY of New Jersey has already sponsored a bill in the U.S. Senate, Gov. Christine Todd Whitman of New Jersey signed the appropriation and authorization of \$10 million toward the project, and Gov. George Pataki of New York approved the 1995–96 budget including \$18 million for land conservation. Many members in the New Jersey delegation have been active in the collective pursuit of this achievement, and I commend them for all they have done.

The States and the Federal Government have been working to preserve this vital resource to insure that Sterling Forest is around to meet both the recreation and environment needs of the area. It is time that we realize our goals.

No matter how you look at this project, saving the forest yields no negative repercussions. The preservation of a vital source of water to one of the most populated areas of the country is not simply a laudable aspiration, but rather a necessary undertaking. Furthermore, the residents are opposed to development; the local governments are opposed to development; and the taxpayers are opposed to development.

Three sites totalling 56,000 acres will be put up for sale to the private sector: Optima "Lake"—the failed flood control project, which now consists of a 17,000-foot earthen dam and a dry lake bed (13,500 acres), Black Kettle National Grasslands (30,710 acres), and Rita Blanca National Grasslands (13,576 acres). Both Black Kettle and Rita Blanca are odd-lot Federal tracts. These proceeds will be earmarked for the purchase of the Washita National Battlefield and Sterling Forest.

Please support this budget-friendly preservation of land that actually needs the Federal Government protection. Support the Federal Lands Prioritization Act of 1995.

### EXTENDING AU PAIR PROGRAMS, H.R. 2767

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to extend the authorization for a program important to many American families. This measure renews the authority for the Au Pair program that expired on September 30. This bipartisan measure includes as original sponsors the ranking Democrat on the International Relations Committee, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Hamilton, the chairman of the International Operations and Human Rights Subcommittee, Mr. Smith of New Jersey the gentlelady from Maryland, Mrs. Morella, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Moran, the gentleman from California Mr. Baker, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Wolf, and the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Davis.

This measure will: Extend the authority for the program for 2 years; open it up to world wide participation; lift the limitation on the number of organizations that may participate and manage an au pair program; and, require the U.S. Information Agency to report on the compliance of the au pair organizations with recently adopted regulations.

Many families rely on the au pair program for their child care and particularly welcome the opportunity to broaden their children's experience by having someone from another country live with them for a year. The lapse in the program has caused untold inconvenience to many families turning their child care plans upside down. It is time to fix this problem.

Accordingly, I am pleased to be able to introduce this bipartisan bill and will seek rapid consideration by both Houses of Congress.

I request that the entire text of H.R. 2767 be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

H.R. 2767

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AU PAIR PROGRAMS.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 8 of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-454) is repealed.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR AU PAIR PROGRAMS.—The Director of the United States Information Agency is authorized to continue to administer an au pair program, operating on a world-wide basis, through fiscal year 1997.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 1996, the Director of the United States Information Agency shall submit a report regarding the continued extension of au pair programs to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives. This report shall specifically detail the compliance of all au pair organizations with regulations governing au pair programs as published on February 15, 1995.

AMERICA'S FORGOTTEN ATOMIC  
HEROES

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 13, 1995*

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to talk about forgotten heroes. As we contemplate sending United States troops to Bosnia, we would be well-served to remember the fates of those men and women known as Atomic Veterans. Most Americans, and maybe many of us here in Congress, are not aware that there exists today a group of veterans who were exposed to ionizing radiation while in the U.S. military in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in the nuclear and thermonuclear tests in the Pacific, and the Nevada nuclear tests. Some were directly exposed, some were exposed by cleaning up contaminated sites, ships, or aircraft. Some, sadly, lost their lives. And, in the 50 years since nuclear testing began, many of our Atomic Veterans have fallen ill from exposure and, today, probably more than half of them are dead.

Our Government has recognized more than 40 cancers and conditions that are caused by exposure to ionizing radiation, but only the 13 named in PL100-321 and 2 in PL102-578 are deemed presumptive. Many of the Atomic Veterans don't think these laws go far enough. They tell me that the law we passed in 1984, PL93-542, under which most radiation claims are adjudicated, do not go far enough. They say, in fact, that we have a double standard. The Marshall Islands Nuclear Claims Tribunal Act of 1987, as amended, gives compensation to Marshall Islanders, presumptively, for cancers and conditions that are denied to U.S. servicemen. These veterans are exposed at the same time and places as the Marshall Islanders. Does that sound fair to you?

The President's Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments issued their final report of over 900 pages on October 3, 1995. President Clinton apologized on behalf of the United States for the human experiments performed on both civilians and the military. The report brought some long-overdue recognition by the executive branch of Government. Today, I would like to ask Congress to recognize the Atomic Veterans, throughout the country, for their valor and service. I know many of my colleagues join me in thanking them for their sacrifice, and I know many of you will join me in working with the Veterans Administration to equalize the standards for those veterans with radioactive cancers and diseases.

## UNICEF: 49 YEARS AND COUNTING

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 14, 1995*

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for those of us lucky enough to grow up in an environment free of civil war and famine, it can be difficult to imagine the hardships that confront millions of children every day in places like Bosnia and Rwanda. At least 40 conflicts are currently raging throughout the world, and as a result, approximately 1.5 mil-

lion children have been killed, more than 4 million disabled, 5 million forced into refugee camps, and 12 million rendered homeless.

The United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF], a special program of the United Nations established on December 11, 1946, is dedicated to the health and welfare of children, who represent the future of our world. UNICEF's annual report on the State of the World's Children, released this week, highlights its success in combating disease, hunger, and death among the world's children.

UNICEF's immunization, sanitation, and nutrition programs have helped reduce child mortality rates by 50 percent in the last 30 years. Every year, UNICEF provides oral vaccines and other medicines that save the lives of 3 million children. In 1994, UNICEF's close cooperation with various international food programs helped feed 57 million hungry people.

Given the tight budgetary constraints presently facing the United States, we need to use our limited resources wisely. I believe that our interests include UNICEF programs benefitting millions of children in developing nations. I am pleased that this year's Foreign Aid appropriations bill would create the Child and Disease Program's Fund, to include such programs as AIDS prevention, nutrition, polio eradication, an infectious disease surveillance system, and funding for blind children.

One of the central principles behind the creation of UNICEF is that action taken today to prevent disease and malnutrition will save us money in future years. An example is the fight to eradicate polio. Although there have been no reported cases of polio in the Western hemisphere or in Europe for 3 years, experts estimate that funding for immunizations must continue for another 5 years to ensure that the disease is eliminated. Failure to contribute to this effort could lead to a resurgence of polio, and a drastic increase in the cost of combating the spread of disease.

UNICEF will celebrate its 50th anniversary in 1996. We should honor the successes of the last 50 years, but we must also prepare for the next 50 years. As we work for a better world for our children, UNICEF's programs are worthy of our continued support.

AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSO-  
CIATION ENDORSES MEDICAL  
USE OF MARIJUANA

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 14, 1995*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced legislation which would allow physicians to prescribe marijuana when in their judgment it is medically appropriate to do so. I first became a supporter of this legislation more than a decade ago, when it was introduced by our late colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut Mr. McKinney. I was recently advised of a resolution passed by The American Public Health Association which supports the concept embodied in the legislation I have introduced and I ask that this resolution be printed here.

ACCESS TO THERAPEUTIC MARIJUANA/  
CANNABIS

The American Public Health Association: Being aware that cannabis/marijuana has been used medicinally for centuries and that

cannabis products were widely prescribed by physicians in the United States until 1937; and

Being aware that "marijuana" prohibition began with the Marijuana Tax Act of 1937 under false claims despite disagreeing testimony from the AMA's representative; and

Being further aware that the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 completely prohibited all medicinal use of marijuana by placing it in the most restrictive category of Schedule I, whereby drugs must meet three criteria for placement in this category: 1) have no therapeutic value, 2) are not safe for medical use, and 3) have a high abuse potential; and

Being cognizant that the Drug Enforcement Administration's own administrative law judge ruled in 1988 that marijuana must be removed from Schedule I and made available for physicians to prescribe; and

Knowing that 36 states have passed legislation recognizing marijuana's therapeutic value; and

Also knowing that the only available access to legal marijuana which was through the Food and Drug Administration's Investigational New Drug Program has been closed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services since 1991; and

Understanding that while synthetic Tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) is available in pill form, it is only one of approximately 60 cannabinoids which may have medicinal value individually or in some combination; and

Understanding that marijuana has an extremely wide acute margin of safety for use under medical supervision and cannot cause lethal reactions; and

Understanding that marijuana has been reported to be effective in: a) reducing intraocular pressure in glaucoma; b) reducing nausea and vomiting associated with chemotherapy; c) stimulating the appetite for patients living with AIDS (acquired immunodeficiency syndrome) and suffering from the wasting syndrome; d) controlling spasticity associated with spinal cord injury and multiple sclerosis; e) decreasing the suffering from chronic pain; and f) controlling seizures associated with seizure disorders; and

Understanding that marijuana seems to work differently than may conventional medications for the above problems, making it a possible option for persons resistant to the conventional medications; and

Being concerned that desperate patients and their families are choosing to break the law to obtain this medicine when conventional medicines or treatments have not been effective for them or are too toxic; and

Realizing that this places ill persons at risk for criminal charges and at risk for obtaining contaminated medicine because of the lack of quality control; and

Realizing that thousands of patients not helped by conventional medications and treatments, may find relief from their suffering with the use of marijuana if their primary care providers were able to prescribe this medicine; and

Concluding that cannabis/marijuana was wrongfully placed in Schedule I of the Controlled Substances depriving patients of its therapeutic potential.

Recognizing the APHA adopted a resolution (7014) on Marijuana and the Law which urged federal and state drugs laws to exclude marijuana from classification as a narcotic drug; and

Concluding that greater harm is caused by the legal consequences of its prohibition than possible risks of medicinal use; therefore

1. Encourages research of the therapeutic properties of various cannabinoids and combinations of cannabinoids; and