

Urban League will hold its Second Annual Equal Opportunity Awards Dinner at the Long Branch Ocean Place Hilton. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Monmouth County Urban League, and its new president Dr. Webster Tremell, for the excellent work that the league has done in lending a helping hand to those in our community who need it most—and to give my strongest encouragement for their future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, the mission of the Urban League as a nonprofit community-based social service and civil rights organization is to assist African-Americans and other minorities and low-income families and individuals to achieve social and economic equality. The league, whose national headquarters is in New York City, has 114 affiliates across the nation. Working through social work, economics, and the law, the league seeks to secure equal opportunities in all sectors. While seeking to improve the quality of life for racial minorities, the league is also devoted to the goal of building bridges between the races.

The league was founded in 1910 in response to the needs of southern blacks who migrated to New York seeking enhanced economic opportunities, only to be confronted with unemployment, scarce health care, and overcrowded housing. The league was created through the merger of several organizations dedicated to assisting these new arrivals and combatting the racism of that era. In the years since, the league has expanded into a nationwide organization, and many distinguished leaders have presided over the league in the years since, including, Whitney Young, Vernon Jordan, and the current president and chief executive officer, John E. Jacob.

The Monmouth County League has sought to bring together a broad cross-section of public and private sector leaders representing the corporate, banking, legal, government, and educational communities. Among the major goals of the Monmouth chapter of the league are programs to assist unemployed and underemployed people to become self-sufficient through job readiness counseling, job development, job bank and referral services, and entrepreneurial advocacy. The league also works to address the housing needs of the community, through the development of affordable housing and counseling to assist families and individuals who may qualify for various forms of rental or home ownership assistance programs. The league also works in developing leadership through the support of young adults and professionals serving in mentorship and tutorial programs. Efforts also focus on health education and prevention programs.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to pay tribute to the work of the Monmouth County Urban League, and to wish for its continued success in the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF LORIN AND
ANN WASHER

HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, recently a couple from my district, Lorin and Ann Washer, needed to cancel a long-awaited trip to the Nation's Capital due to health reasons. It would have been a special trip for them, as

50 years ago this month they met in Washington on a blind date. That night, April 12, 1945, was the day President Roosevelt died. Ann and Lorin had to change their plans to dine out and instead ate at the home of a friend. Obviously the location of their meal was unimportant, as their courtship began in earnest shortly thereafter, and they were married in October 1946.

Mr. Speaker, although Ann and Lorin cannot come to Washington to celebrate the April 12 anniversary of their first meeting. I am pleased to honor them for a relationship that has endured 50 years. It is increasingly rare in our society that a couple exhibits the qualities of loyalty and love demonstrated by the Washers, and I am pleased to draw attention to this outstanding couple as the reminiscence about not only their courtship, but so many years of married life. Couples like the Washers have much to teach and much to remember, and deserve our congratulations on this unique day in their lives.

CLINTON RELISHES HIS UNNECESSARY INVASION

HON. CHRISTOPHER COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, the occasion of President Clinton's visit to Haiti is occasion to reflect on the ill wisdom of his policy there. It is "his" policy because, as he did with Mexico, he bypassed the Congress. The following article by Sir Eldon Griffiths is a sobering analysis of the Clinton Haiti policy.

CLINTON RELISHES HIS UNNECESSARY INVASION

By the time you read this, U.S. troops in Haiti will be pulling out in favor of a U.S.-led, U.S.-munitioned, and largely U.S.-financed U.N. army. President Clinton is in this tiny speck of an island, ready to pass the baton—I almost said the buck!—to U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, whose thankless task now becomes to hold the ring in Haiti while the smallest, poorest country in the Western Hemisphere struggles to construct a "viable democracy."

I wish the United Nations better luck than its hapless multinational forces experienced after the United States handed over Somalia. Let's also acknowledge that six months—and several billion dollars—after Jimmy Carter brokered his deal and Bill Clinton sent in an air-sea armada with more firepower than all the armies of Latin America combined. Port au Prince is probably less dangerous than it was under the rule of Raoul Cedras and his thugs. With the U.S. embargo lifted, some, though by no means all, of Haiti's services and small firms are back in business. Most of those Haitian boat people intercepted by the U.S. Coast Guard as they tried to get to Florida are being repatriated, many forcibly, from the unsanitary camps that shame America in Cuba and Panama.

Last Tuesday's high-noon murder of a prominent Haitian lawyer who had criticized President Aristide is, however, a reminder that Port au Prince still is riven by dangerous elements, but thanks to the U.S. Marines (and a growing Haitian police force), the situation in the capital has improved to a point where it's less frightening to walk in the streets at night than it is in, let's say, Washington, D.C.

Clinton has every reason to praise the U.S. forces. They did what he told them to do.

But his claim that his Haiti was a "triumph" is none the less as spurious as it is self-deceiving. This version of events may sit well with those Haitians who've done well from Aristide's return; it may also carry the day with the liberal press and what's left of the Black Caucus in Congress. But history, I predict, will judge Clinton's Haitian adventure less generously. More likely it will be seen as an unnecessary, grotesque mismatch of U.S. power to U.S. interests.

Is that too harsh a verdict? If you think so, just ask three questions:

Did Haiti under Cedras (or any other ruler) pose a threat to U.S. security? It didn't. It couldn't. It doesn't. Haiti has no military airfields, no naval ports, no missiles sites like those in Cuba that enemies of America might use. Militarily, Clinton's invasion was a classic case of using a billion dollar hammer to crack a 20-cent nut.

Was Haiti crucial to the economic interests of the United States? No, it wasn't. It isn't. It couldn't be. Haiti has no oil, no minerals, no products of any kind the United States needs to earn its living. Trade with Haiti is so insignificant that when the United States imposed a total embargo, few Americans even noticed, outside a few travel agents in Miami.

Were the lives of American citizens at risk in Haiti? No, they weren't. Despite all the efforts of the State Department, not one example was found of Americans suffering oppression or wrongful imprisonment in Haiti. Lacking these or any other reasons of U.S. national interest, President Clinton based his case for invading Haiti on the need to impose—or restore—democracy. But why in Port au Prince, but not—as Ronald Reagan sought to do in the face of Clinton's criticism at the time—in Salvador or Panama or Nicaragua?

Okay, Cedras was a rightwing brute, just as Aristide is a leftwing demagogue. But if Cedras was grinding down the Haitian people to a level that justified U.S. intervention, why didn't Washington first try to overthrow him with the CIA (as it did in Guatemala and Cuba)? And how come, when Jimmy Carter went to Haiti with Colin Powell and Sam Nunn, Carter claimed the U.S. embargo was "shameful" and called Cedras "an honorable man" with whom the United States could do business?

When the full story comes to be told, Haiti, I suspect, will turn out to have been the Unnecessary Invasion. The United States got sucked into it in large part because candidate Clinton publicly broke with George Bush's policy of sending back the Haitian boat people, with the result that hundreds of thousands set off for Florida, creating a problem that Clinton in office found he couldn't handle. Clinton was then humiliated when he sent in the *USS Harlan County* supply ship with a bunch of officials on board who turned tail at the first whiff of grape-shot from Cedras's goons on the dock. And so it came to pass that stopping the flow of refugees (that Clinton himself had invited), and putting Aristide back in Cedras's place, became the leitmotifs of U.S. foreign policy.

Never mind Cuba, where the dictatorship was harsher and the outflow of migrants larger. Forget Rwanda, where millions died, or Angola and all the rest. Haiti was a case of presidential pique and strategic misjudgment, of liberal idealism, and Florida's Democratic politics getting in the way of any objective long-term assessments of U.S. diplomatic priorities and America's true national interests.

So when the president returns to Washington, let's hope he lays aside his mantle of Liberator—or is it Conqueror?—of Haiti.

Time has come to return to the real world of global issues. Clinton's relations with Father Aristide may just be hunky-dory, but with most of the other leaders of Europe and Asia, they are as frosty as at any time I can remember.

Perhaps John Major of Britain, who arrives in Washington this weekend, will point this out.

(Sir Eldon is president of the Orange County World Affairs Council, a former member of the British House of Commons, and director of the Center for International Business at Chapman University.)

INTRODUCTION OF THE CHLORINE ZERO DISCHARGE ACT OF 1995

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to introduce the Chlorine Zero Discharge Act of 1995. This legislation, which has already been cosponsored by nearly 30 Members of the House, is identical to H.R. 2898 which I introduced in August 1993. That legislation, although not enacted by the 103d Congress, garnered nearly 60 bipartisan cosponsors.

The Chlorine Zero Discharge Act will, if enacted, result in the elimination within 5 years of the use of chlorine and chlorinated compounds as bleaching agents in the production of pulp and paper. Specifically, the bill would amend the Clean Water Act to require a reduction to absolute zero of the discharge or release into water of any organochlorine compounds, byproducts, or metabolites formed as a result of the use of chlorine or any other chlorinated oxidizing agents in the pulp and paper manufacturing process.

The use of chlorine and chlorine compounds in the pulp and paper industry is the second largest use of chlorine in the United States and Canada. Chlorine and its compounds are used as bleaching agents to remove residual lignins from wood pulp to make the resulting paper white.

The use of chlorine as a bleaching agent in the production of pulp and paper results in the release of an estimated 1,000 organochlorines in the wastewater of pulp and paper mills. The average pulp mill in America releases 35 tons of toxic organochlorines each day. However, only 3 of the 1,000 organochlorines released are currently regulated by the EPA: dioxin, furan, and chloroform. Only the State of Oregon regulates organochlorines as a class of pollutants.

Although dioxin is produced as a byproduct of pulp and paper bleaching in only very small amounts, scientific studies by the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] and independent scientists have shown that even in minute amounts, organochlorines such as dioxin are persistent and bioaccumulative. This means that they remain in the environment for years and buildup over time reaching levels that have been linked to cancers and development and behavioral disorders in humans and death in animal and plant life. For example, although DDT was banned in the 1970's, trace amounts now linked to animal deaths still persist in the environment more than 20 years after its last known use in this country.

In its recent reassessment of dioxin—ordered by then-EPA Administrator William Reilly in 1991—the EPA determined that even in the smallest amounts, this most toxic of all chemicals has significant health and environmental effects including severe reproductive, immunological, behavioral, and developmental difficulties in humans and animals which have been exposed to it. In fact, the EPA has identified dioxin as the most potent carcinogen ever evaluated by the Agency.

A 1990 EPA analysis revealed that as many as 1 in 10 subsistence and sports fishing individuals could get cancer by eating fish contaminated by releases from certain pulp and paper mills. Additional studies have found that pulp and paper mill workers tend to have higher rates of particular forms of cancer, such as soft-tissue sarcomas and respiratory cancers, than the population as a whole. A 1988 EPA survey of 104 U.S. pulp and paper mills found bleached pulp from nearly every mill to contain the most dangerous forms of dioxins and furans.

A 1992 report issued by the International Joint Commission on the Great Lakes Basin [IJC] concluded that “the use of chlorine and its compounds should be avoided in the manufacturing process.” A 1994 report from the same organization reported that “mounting evidence continues to reinforce concerns about the effect of persistent toxic substances” including reproductive, metabolic, neurological and behavioral abnormalities, suppression of the immune system and increasing levels of breast and other cancers.

Former IJC and Indiana Republican Party Chair Gordon Durnil has been even more forceful, warning “the heart of our message is that the integrity of the human species will be increasingly compromised unless we act decisively to bring the growing problem of persistent toxic substances under control. We are convinced that the dangers posed to humans will increase with each passing generation.”

The American Public Health Association [APHA], a nationwide membership association of over 30,000 health professionals, passed a resolution in October 1993 “calling for measurable and progressive reduction toward the elimination of the use of chlorine-based bleaches in the paper and pulp industry and of ozone-depleting chlorinated organic chemicals.” In February 1994, APHA endorsed the Chlorine Zero Discharge Act.

Despite repeated claims to the contrary, alternatives to the use of chlorine and chlorinated compounds do exist. Totally chlorine-free [TCF] alternatives such as hydrogen peroxide and ozone are in use today in mills around the world, especially in Europe. Unfortunately, although these alternatives are increasingly relied upon by our competitors in Sweden, France, Portugal, Spain, Denmark, and Germany, American industry has steadfastly refused to adapt to the changing market conditions affecting the worldwide paper market. Only one mill in North America, the Louisiana-Pacific pulp mill in Samoa, CA, has made the switch to TCF production.

Such intransigence in the face of changing world-wide market demands for white paper that does not destroy the environment and threaten human health could spell disaster for the American pulp and paper industry. Failure to begin to make the switch now to TCF production processes could mean that our industry, and the thousands of jobs that go with it, will be unprepared to meet the challenges of

the future. The increased production and use of chlorine-free paper by our European competitors—now approaching 20 percent of the market in some European countries—is decreasing the American share of the world paper market and could seriously threaten the American market in the future as American consumers begin to demand chlorine-free paper.

The links between the use of chlorinated compounds in a wide variety of applications from pesticide use to pulp and paper bleaching and cancers and other health effects have received widespread media coverage since I first introduced this bill in 1993. In the past 18 months, stories have appeared in Time, Newsweek, National Journal, Scientific American, The New York Times, The Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, USA Today, the Atlanta Constitution, the Portland Press Herald and countless other newspapers from coast to coast. CNN has aired several reports on the use of chlorine in the pulp and paper industry and ABC News' Prime Time Live is currently planning a similar story for airing in the near future. The public is clearly getting the message. Now it is time for American industry to pay attention to the public outcry for paper production processes that do not harm the environment or threaten public health.

By eliminating the use of chlorine and chlorinated compounds in the pulp and paper bleaching process, the Chlorine Zero Discharge Act provides a responsible, effective solution to the environmental and economic degradation of chlorine use in the pulp and paper industry. Federal intervention to ensure that the use of these unnecessary, dangerous chemicals is eliminated is necessary to protect the public from potential life-threatening health and environmental impacts.

I am pleased to introduce this bill today along with the support of my colleagues JERROLD NADLER, NEIL ABERCROMBIE, GARY ACKERMAN, HOWARD BERMAN, DAVID BONIOR, GEORGE BROWN, ANNA ESHOO, LANE EVANS, ENI FALEOMAVAEGA, SAM FARR, BOB FILNER, MAURICE HINCHEY, MATTHEW MARTINEZ, JIM McDERMOTT, CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, FRANK PALLONE, NANCY PELOSI, CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELO, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, MARTIN SABO, PATRICIA SCHROEDER, JOSE SERRANO, ESTEBAN TORRES, NYDIA VELASQUEZ, BRUCE VENTO, HENRY WAXMAN, LYNN WOOLSEY, and SIDNEY YATES.

I urge the my other colleagues to join me in supporting this important health and environmental protection legislation.

The full text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Chlorine Zero Discharge Act of 1995”.

SEC. 2. ZERO DISCHARGE OF TOXIC PERSISTENT AND BIOACCUMULATIVE SUBSTANCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) substances that persist and/or bioaccumulate in the environment, build to higher and higher concentration over time, reaching their greatest levels in the tissues of species high on the food chain, including humans;

(2) toxic substances that persist and/or bioaccumulate in the environment are biologically active in infinitesimal quantities,