

She pursued "users" in recovery who would share their secrets with her. She talked to her patient, unfailing mother about her struggle.

My office staff knew Terry had a problem that frequently took precedence over all else in my life. Especially in the years since I left the U.S. Senate in 1981, Terry has never been far from my consciousness and concern. In the 1960s and early '70s, the Vietnam War and the excesses of the Cold War became such obsessions with me that I ran for the Presidency in 1972 to offer a different course. But Terry became my obsession in the 1980s and '90s. Only another parent with an alcoholic or otherwise chemically addicted child can begin to comprehend the endless concern and anxiety, anger and resentment, excited hopes and disappointments, exhausting and sometimes frightening experiences that go with loving and caring for an alcoholic offspring.

Two years ago, while having lunch with Michael Deaver, a long-time aide to former President Reagan, I mentioned my deep concern over Terry's drinking problem. He arranged for her to go through one of the finest treatment programs in the nation—Father Martin's Ashley rehabilitation center in Havre de Grace, Md. After six weeks of a seemingly successful recovery, Terry was urged to live for the next six months in the protective environment of a halfway house. Terry, however, was desperate to return to Madison to be near her daughters, so she rejected this advice. Eleanor agreed to go with her to Madison and stay until Terry could get settled. With her usual patience and love, Eleanor remained with Terry for two weeks. On the day of her departure, Terry started drinking again. Eleanor returned home—her heart broken one more time.

A few months later, we persuaded Terry to enter a program at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. She cooperated with all aspects of the agenda, and so did Eleanor and I, which involved counseling and group-discussion sessions with family members of other patients. We were highly encouraged by Terry's seeming success.

On the morning of the completion of the program, I happily brought Terry home. She asked if she could use the car for a few minutes to pick up a prescription at a drugstore nearby. Three hours later, I was called by a friendly bartender who told me that Terry had collapsed from drinking. It pains me even now to recall the sad and bitter disappointment, the personal regret and doubt about my own judgment that followed.

One of the things I learned from experiences like this was to separate my feelings toward the alcoholic whom I loved from the alcoholism which I hated. Some of her friends would tell me that there were two Terry's—the sober one whom they cared about and the intoxicated one whom they could not stand. I understand this well-meaning sentiment, which I sometimes held. But it is wrong. There was never more than one Terry—a Terry who usually brought joy to her friends but at other times transferred to others her own suffering. If a member of the family were suffering from cancer or AIDS, we would not say that we love them when they are healthy but despise them when they are ill. So it should be with alcoholism, a frequently fatal disease. The same disease that hurts the alcoholic's family and friends hurts and demoralizes the alcoholic vastly more.

I developed an exchange with Terry that seemed to work for both of us. "Who is ahead today—you or the demon?" I would ask. She loved that way of posing the problem. It's okay to love your family member or friend and despise the demon that attacks him or her.

What parents discover is that they are powerless to overcome the addiction that's destroying their precious creation. A friend of Terry's, from one of America's most celebrated families, says she saved his life by persuading him to go forward with alcohol treatment. He sent us a eloquent letter in which he wrote: "Senator, not all the Senators of all the Congresses could legislate a person sober. And Mrs. McGovern, no amount of love expressed by good mothers like you can birth sobriety."

You can assist, advise, agonize, pay and pray, but you cannot deliver sobriety. And in many cases, neither can the victim, no matter how hard she or he tries.

However, another thing I learned is that you must never abandon hope. Never give up on the alcoholic, and don't let him or her give up. If you have a spiritual faith or wish to develop one, use the power of prayer. Share that hope and faith with the victim. Terry died at age 45. She probably would have died at 18 or 30 or 40 had it not been for her faith and the faith of others.

I believe that alcoholism and other chemical dependencies constitute America's No. 1 social problem. Every year, victory eludes 100,000 Americans like Teresa, who die of alcoholism. Countless others suffer from the loss of employment, the neglect of their families the breakup of marriages, a sense of shame and defeat—all of this, plus constant danger and distress.

We must support the good treatment centers and urge public officials to support adequate funding for alcoholism research and rehabilitation. Unfortunately, funds recently have been cut back. The price of this "economy" includes more suffering and death from alcohol and other drugs, more loss of productivity, and more disorder and crime. For every dollar saved in cuts, we will spend several times that much in future costs—some of which are immeasurable.

IF SOMEONE YOU LOVE IS AN ALCOHOLIC:

More than 15 million Americans drink too much, according to some experts. Alcoholism has no known cure, but the National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence (NCADD) says the disease can be stopped. In fact, there are more than 1.5 million Americans in recovery. Here are some of the council's recommendations when dealing with an alcoholic:

1. Recognize that alcoholism is a disease and not a moral failure or lack of willpower.
2. Learn as much as you can about the disease. Many libraries have sections on alcoholism, addiction and related subjects.
3. Don't become an "enabler." An enabler is a person close to the alcoholic who supports or "enables" the drinking by pretending that there isn't a problem (denial), or by protecting or lying for the alcoholic.
4. Avoid "home treatments." Don't try to solve a loved one's drinking problem by preaching, complaining, acting like a martyr or reasoning with the drinker. An alcoholic needs help from experts, such as Alcoholics Anonymous.
5. Get help for yourself. One of the hallmarks of the illness is that it affects everyone close to the alcoholic. Many treatment programs provide help for those affected by another person's drinking.

REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 450), to ensure economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes:

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the bill H.R. 450. While I support the intentions of the bill, I feel that a regulatory freeze is not only a clumsy but also a dangerous way to achieve the important goal of regulatory reform.

The most frustrating aspect of this legislative session is that day after day, we must face the growing reality of the increasing irrelevance of the House of Representatives. While this body has become the center of American jingoism and bumper sticker solutions, it is quickly moving off the radar screen of policy relevance. A brief glance at the bill H.R. 450 tells us why this is happening.

The stated goal of H.R. 450 is a good one to ensure the economy and efficiency of the Federal Government. This has been one of the most vehemently pursued goals of the Clinton Administration. With a firm commitment to reinventing government, the Administration has doggedly pursued the goal of regulatory reform. They have put an end to the explosion of senseless regulations that occurred under the Republican administrations of Ronald Reagan and George Bush. In short, the stated goal of this bill is already being pursued systematically, intelligently, and relentlessly under President Clinton. The simple fact is that the goals of H.R. 450 are being achieved already. The only reason that the majority party feels compelled to take up the regulatory struggle is because they know it is a good chance to take the wind out of the sails of the Clinton administration. It is a bill entirely motivated by politics.

But the problems of this bill don't end with its redundancy. H.R. 450 is also bad policy. In order to achieve the stated goal of government economy and efficiency, the bill proposes a moratorium on regulations that is retroactive through November of last year. Freezing regulations is not an intelligent way to streamline government. This is an excellent example of the extremism of the Republican party in this House.

Freezing all Federal regulations will potentially expose the people of America to countless dangers. The EPA has indicated that standards to reduce the presence of lead and dioxins in the air will be put on hold, as will efforts to remove dangerous disinfectant byproducts and microbiological contaminants in water. Further, the development of safe alternatives to ozone depleting chemicals will be put on hold. The Department of Labor will not be able to finish outlining the regulations that will guide the implementation of the Family Medical Leave Act. The Department of Agriculture will not be able to prevent the importation of animals and animal products infected with bovine spongiform encephalopathy, or

work to prevent the spread of lethal avian influenza in chickens. The Department of Transportation notes that H.R. 450 would stop regulations designed to make commuter planes meet the safety requirements of larger carriers, and to prevent natural gas pipeline explosions. These are just a few examples of the manner in which the moratorium could pose a direct threat to the health, safety and economic well-being of the American people.

Republicans are correct when they assert that Americans and American businesses are fed up with senseless regulations. But they are horribly off the mark when they propose that freezing all regulations is the solution to this problem. The exemptions that they have offered for regulations protecting health, safety, and property are vague at best, and give the latter inexplicable ascendancy over the first two. There is no guarantee that important regulations will be allowed enactment under H.R. 450. I cannot support such carelessly crafted legislation, and I am surprised at those who can.

The practice of performing delicate policy operations with a meat axe has characterized the actions of the House from the beginning of the session, and it is eroding the credibility of this body. Even as we rush to pass bills that are poorly crafted, the Senate is carefully weighing the implications of each piece of legislation. This is not a question of partisan politics. The Republicans have a majority in the Senate as well. And yet there, they recognize the great importance of designing legislation that not only sounds good, but that works as well. We should do the same. H.R. 450 is another example of an important issue that has been drastically oversimplified. Freezing reforms is not the answer to the regulatory explosion, and it is a proposal that places American lives at risk. Therefore, I will not support this legislation.

I do not believe that the 435 Members of this body ought to be consigned to irrelevance in the policy sphere. But unless the Republican Party stops focusing on the laminated card in the Speaker's breast pocket, and starts concentrating on the difficult, deliberative, and complex task of framing policy and instituting reform, we are doomed to 50 more days of meaningless endeavors. I fear that the words of Macbeth will be a fitting epitaph for the Republican Contract, which thus far has frequently proven to be a document "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

TRIBUTE TO JUSTIN AARON
HARRIS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respectful tribute to a young man from my district who has made the ultimate sacrifice, giving his life in service to our country in a foreign land. Justin Aaron Harris, a Marine Sergeant, was tragically killed last week when his helicopter went down at sea after hitting a ship off the coast of Mogadishu. He died on February 19, 1995, leaving a wife, Chantay, and a young son, Justin, Jr., his parents, Peggy and Joe, a sister, Julie Morrison, brothers, Joe, Jeffrey, Jerry, and Javan Harris and

scores of relatives and friends who mourn the loss of a promise-filled life cut short. We offer them our hearts in empathy as they face this deep tragedy. We hope that his vision for America and his devotion and belief in service to our nation and oppressed people around the world will make this cross a little easier to bear. We pray the memories his family and friends shared in his too-brief life will sustain them all. Justin knows as we all know, the price of freedom is not free. He laid down his life in service to us.

A poem was read at his memorial service, held in his hometown of Toledo, Ohio on February 25, 1995. The author apparently unknown, it symbolizes Justin's and his family's faith and offers a meaning to his passing, helping all to understand and to gain strength:

I'M FREE

Don't grieve for me, for now I'm free
I'm following the path God laid for me.
I took his hand when I heard Him call
I turned my back, and left it all.
I could not stay another day
To laugh, or love, or work, or play
Tasks left undone must stay that way
I found that place at the close of the day.
If my parting has left a void,
Then fill it with remembered joy.
A friendship shared, a laugh, a kiss
Oh yes, these things I too will miss.
Be not burdened with times of sorrow
I wish you sunshine of tomorrow.
My life's been full, I savored much
Good friends, good times, a loved one's touch.

Perhaps my time seemed all too brief.
Don't lengthen it now with undue grief.
Lift up your heart and share with me . . .
God wanted me now
He set me Free!

Justin Aaron Harris, age 23; always remembered, always honored, always loved.

SUSTAINABLE CONSUMPTIVE USE
OF MARINE RESOURCES

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has had an enviable and successful record, both domestically and internationally, of fostering sound conservation and scientific management of wildlife and marine resources. Through statutes, regulation and international treaties, the United States has traditionally taken a leadership role in demanding science-based information and data upon which to shape policy and programs for the conservation of plants, animals, and fish. An integral part of wildlife and resource management is the concept of consumptive use of such renewable resources under proper and professional management.

In the February issue of the American Spectator there is a most thought provoking article by David Andrew Price regarding the issue of whaling by coastal and island nations. With the exception of a small science-based harvest of whales by natives in Alaska, the United States is no longer a consumer or producer of whale products. For other nations, however, whale products have been a traditional source of food for thousands of years. The serious question is whether or not such traditional harvests should be blocked when limited taking in

no manner would have an adverse impact on populations stocks. Further, ignoring science in the management of one species of wildlife based upon a response to a protectionist philosophy sets a dangerous precedent. Wildlife and marine resources cannot afford to be managed on the basis of some subjective ethic that ignores science and appropriate management.

I commend Mr. Price's article to my colleagues on a most important issue of sustainable use of renewable marine resources and the role of the United States in that policy.

[From the American Spectator, February 1995]

SAVE THE WHALERS

(By David Andrew Price)

One morning last January, Arvid Enghaugen, a resident of the Norwegian coastal town of Gressvik, found his whaling boat sitting unusually deep in the water. When he climbed aboard to investigate, he found that the ship was in fact sinking; someone had opened its sea cock and padlocked the engine-room door. After breaking the lock, Enghaugen discovered that the engine was underwater. He also found a calling card from the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, a small, California-based environmentalist group that specializes in direct actions against whalers. Counting Enghaugen's boat, Sea Shepherd has sunk or damaged eleven Norwegian, Icelandic, Spanish, and Portuguese vessels since 1979.

The boat was repaired in time for the 1994 whaling season, but Enghaugen's problems weren't over. On July 1, while he was looking for whales off the Danish coast, live Greenpeace protesters boarded the ship from an inflatable dinghy and tried to take its harpoon cannon. Enghaugen's crew tossed one protester into the sea, and the rest then jumped overboard; the protesters were picked up by the dinghy and returned to the Greenpeace mother ship.

A week later, after Enghaugen's boat shot a harpoon into a whale, a team from another Greenpeace vessel cut the harpoon line to free the wounded animal. A group again tried to board the whaler, and the crew again threw them off. Enghaugen cut a hole in one of the Greenpeace dinghies with a whale flensing knife. For the next two weeks, Enghaugen and crew were dogged by Greenpeace ships and helicopters.

Although the activities failed to stop Enghaugen's hunt, their public relations war in America has been a different story. Over the past twenty years, the save-the-whales movement has been so successful in shaping public sentiment about the whaling industry that the U.S. and other nations have adopted a worldwide moratorium on whaling. Part of the credit must go to the animals themselves, which are more charismatic on television than Kurds, Bosnians, or Rwandans, who have engendered far less international protection. The movement owes most of its success, however, to the gullibility of Hollywood and the press in passing along bogus claims from whaling's opponents.

The mainstay of the case against whaling—that it threatens an endangered species—is characteristic of the misinformation. It is true that European nations and the United States killed enormous numbers of whales during commercial whaling's heyday in the nineteenth century, but to say that "whales" are endangered is no more meaningful than to say that "birds" are endangered; there are more than seventy species of whales, and their numbers vary dramatically. Some are endangered, some are not. The blue whale, the gray whale, and the