

DRUG-INDUCED RAPE PREVENTION
AND PUNISHMENT ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1996

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, because I believe that it is critically important that we increase the penalties for possession and trafficking in Rohypnol, I support this legislation even though it does not go far enough.

Rohypnol has been proven dangerous. The drug is odorless, colorless and tasteless and cause sedation and euphoric effects within 15 minutes. The effects are boosted further by alcohol or marijuana. And, most offensively, Rohypnol has become the tool of predators who spike the drinks of unsuspecting young women and then rape them.

Recognizing the dangers posed by Rohypnol, the DEA has begun the administrative process of moving Rohypnol from Schedule IV to Schedule I to put the drug in the same category—and have it carry the same penalties—as other dangerous drugs including LSD and heroin.

In an effort to speed up the process of changing Rohypnol's schedule, last week, the Judiciary Committee voted unanimously to reschedule the drug. Despite that vote, this week, we see a brand new bill on the floor without the rescheduling provision?

Why, you might ask, would anyone oppose rescheduling a dangerous drug with no legitimate purpose in the United States and which has been used to facilitate the rape of numerous young women, including many minors? Why would anyone argue for lenient treatment of a drug that has been banned by the FDA and declared dangerous by the DEA?

Because Hoffman-LaRoche, the pharmaceutical company that manufactures Rohypnol and which sells the drug in 64 foreign countries, has worked very hard to see the rescheduling provision dropped. Hoffman-LaRoche stands to lose \$100 million if Rohypnol is rescheduled because sales in other countries tend to go down when the United States decides a drug is so dangerous that it belongs on Schedule I.

So in today's legislation, Rohypnol remains a Schedule IV drug not because anyone actually believes it is as safe as other Schedule IV drugs like Valium, but because a drug company has successfully lobbied—to the detriment to women and girls across the country—to keep Rohypnol's Schedule IV status.

I sincerely hope that after this bill has passed, we can go back to the Committee process and pass a bill rescheduling Rohypnol so it is treated as seriously as other dangerous drugs.

IN HONOR OF WILLIAM F. ZENGA:
A TRUE TRAILBLAZER FOR THE
DREDGING INDUSTRY IN NEW
JERSEY

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an individual whose distin-

guished service to his community and the labor movement in New Jersey will long be remembered. Mr. William Zenga's efforts will be commemorated on September 28, 1996, when the headquarters of the International Union Operating Engineers is renamed in his honor.

The dedication ceremony of the William F. Zenga Building will be the culmination of a long and notable career. Mr. Zenga's journey to this monumental occasion began upon his graduation from Dickerson High School, Jersey City in 1939 when he became a dredgeman. One year later, he attained the position of operating engineer which he has held continuously, interrupted only by a period of service as a Navy SeeBee during World War II where he earned the rank of chief petty officer.

Mr. Zenga's career in the dredging industry has lasted 56 years. During that time, he has taken up the cause of his fellow dredgemen through his activities with the International Union of Operating Engineers, local 25. Since the inception of local 25, Mr. Zenga has held a number of positions starting as a business agent and executive board member, and progressively moving upward in the labor organization. He has held positions as vice president of the Maritime Port Council of the Delaware Valley and Vicinity, vice president of the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, and trustee of the Maritime Port Council of Greater New York.

Commitment to family and community are paramount to Mr. Zenga. He and his wife, Caroline, make their home in Woodbridge, and are the proud parents of three sons: James, an attorney, William, Jr., an oral surgeon, and Jack, a certified public accountant. Mr. Zenga's interest in having our waterway be free for passage by our Nation's shipping fleet has led to involvement in a number of associations that promote the dredging and maritime industry. He currently serves as a board member of the State of New Jersey Maritime Advisory Council, the New York State Coastal Zone Management Advisory Committee, and a member of the New Jersey Alliance for Action.

It is an honor to recognize the important work of this dedicated individuals. His contributions to the dredging industry are of tremendous importance to many of the residents of my district who depend on an unobstructed coastline to make a living. I am certain my colleagues will rise with me and pay tribute to this trailblazer in the dredging industry.

CONCERNING THE ANNIVERSARY
OF THE 1991 MASSACRE IN EAST
TIMOR

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, as cochairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, I have long been concerned about the deteriorating human rights situation on the Indonesian island of East Timor.

On November 12, 1996, we will mark the fifth anniversary of the brutal massacre of peaceful, unarmed protesters at the Santa Cruz Cemetery in the capital of East Timor. As many as 273 defenseless citizens were killed by the Indonesian military in a ferocious, unprovoked attack.

The Indonesian security forces who were responsible for this brutal act of terror are still operating with impunity throughout East Timor. This impunity is illustrated by the legal aftermath of the massacre. Those military personnel who were responsible for the massacre received a slap on the wrist; the strongest punishment was house arrest. Compare this with the harsh punishment meted out to those who were convicted of organizing peaceful protests. They received sentences ranging from 9 years to life in prison. They are still in prison as we speak.

The Dili massacre is one of the most egregious, but by no means the only, example of severe repression in East Timor. Arbitrary arrests, militarization of the island, and training and arming young East Timorese loyal to the Indonesian Government are all on the rise.

It is unconscionable that we are considering transfer of high-technology military equipment to a country whose military is responsible for such a reprehensible act against its own people. I hope that Members will consider the consequences for the people of East Timor when we turn a blind eye to horrible acts such as this.

TRIBUTE TO TONY BEILENSEN

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our retiring colleague, TONY BEILENSEN of California. Congressman BEILENSEN is one of the most constructive and productive Members of this body. While his diligence has earned his colleagues' respect in a variety of substantive areas, his lifelong legislative passion has been in habitat protection, especially for the endangered African elephant, and the Asian tiger and rhinoceros.

As I noted at a recent Resources Committee hearing on elephants, tigers, and rhinos, Jonathan Swift wrote, in 1793, "Geographers mapping Africa over uninhabitable downs placed elephants for want of towns." For better or worse, Europeans saw fit soon to rectify what they viewed as a shortage of towns with the colonization of the African Continent. And along with that colonization came big game hunters and a booming global trade in elephant ivory.

Two hundred and fifty years after Swift penned that little poem, American consumers were indirectly responsible for the deaths of thousands of elephants each year, and the millions of elephants that had once stood on maps in the place of African towns were reduced to fewer than 700,000.

This magnificent species was facing the possibility of extinction in the wild if the slaughter were not stopped. Fortunately, we were able to respond to the pending crisis and diminish, if not completely halt, the uncontrolled killing of African elephants for their dubious honor of emerging from the evolutionary process bearing a resource more precious than gold.

Although habitat protection and the pressures of industrialization continue to pose a threat to African elephant populations, this species appears to be on the rebound, thanks in part to our colleague from California.

I understand that elephants, like the whales found off the coast of Massachusetts, are able to communicate over long distances by making deep rumbling sounds that humans cannot hear. If we could hear them, I am sure the elephants would be thanking Mr. BEILENSEN for his extraordinary work on their behalf.

I wish we could be as optimistic about the future of the other species these laws are designed to protect. Due to the continuing demand for rhino horns and tiger bones in traditional Asian medicines, and the deplorable illegal trade in tiger skins, these extraordinary creatures may be gone from the face of the Earth by the time the Democrats regain control of this Congress. There is some hope, however, for both the rhinos and tigers and the Democrats.

The battle to save these species from extinction is far from over, but at least the battle is joined. We must continue to do all we can through international cooperation and environmental education to ensure that rhinos, tigers, and elephants still exist for future generations.

We all know that extinction, like politics, is forever. It is a very special privilege to recognize TONY, whose loss will be immense to this institution and to the country, to say nothing of the heffalumps.

INTRODUCTION OF COMPREHENSIVE WOMEN'S PENSIONS PROTECTION ACT

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, we are here this morning to announce the introduction of the comprehensive women's pension bill of 1996.

While Republicans spent the 104th Congress trying to deny working American families \$40 billion of their hard earned pension money by allowing employers to raid pension plans, Democrats beat back these attempts and worked to ensure that working Americans, particularly women, get the benefits to which they are entitled.

For instance, President Clinton recently signed into law legislation I have championed since 1986 which reduces the vesting period—the period you must work before become entitled to a pension—from 10 to 5 years for multiemployer plans. The moment President Clinton put his signature on the bill, 1 million Americans became entitled to a pension. But there is much more work to be done, particularly for the women of America.

For instance, less than one-third of all women retirees over age 55 receive pension benefits compared to 55 percent of male retirees. Yet the typical American woman who retires can expect to live approximately 19 years. Sadly, over one-third of elderly women living alone live below the poverty line and three-fifths live within 150 percent of the poverty line. Women's pension benefits depend on several factors including: participation in the work force, lifetime earnings relative to those of current or former husbands, and marital history.

There has been a long-term trend toward greater labor market participation by women. In 1940, only 28 percent of all women worked

and less than 15 percent of married women worked. By 1993, almost 60 percent of all women worked and married women were slightly more likely than other women to be working. The growth of women in the work force is even more pronounced for women in their prime earning years—ages 25 to 54. The labor force participation rate for these women increased from 42 percent in 1960 to 75 percent in 1993. For married women in this age bracket labor force participation increased from 35 percent in 1960 to 72 percent in 1993.

Not only are more women working, they are staying in the work force longer. For instance, 19 percent of married women with children under age 6 worked in 1960; by 1993, 60 percent of these women were in the work force. Similarly, 39 percent of married women with children between the ages of 6 and 17 were in the work force in 1960 and by 1993, fully 75 percent of these women were in the work force.

Women's median year-round, full-time covered earnings were a relatively constant 60 percent of men's earnings until about 1980. Since that time, women's earnings have risen to roughly 70 percent of men's. This increase will, in time, increase pension benefits for women although this change will be slow because benefits are based on average earnings over a lifetime.

A woman's marital status at retirement is also a critical factor in determining benefits. The Social Security Administration projects that the proportion of women aged 65 to 69 who are married will remain relatively constant over the next 25 years, and that the proportion who are divorced will more than double over this period. There are tremendous inequities in the law with respect to the pension of a widow or divorced spouse. For instance, only about 54 percent of married private pension plan recipients have selected a joint and survivor option, which, in the event of their death, will continue to provide benefits to their spouse.

The face of women in America today has changed; it's time our pension laws recognize those changes. The bill before us today does just that. A number of us have been active in this area. We have been successful in getting small pieces enacted. And today, we pledge to work together in the next Congress to update our pension laws for the women of America.

SOUND ADVICE ON UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, as we consider our future trade relations with China, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention to an excellent speech on the issue by former Secretary of Commerce Barbara Hackman Franklin.

Secretary Franklin not only has long experience in United States trade policy, but she also has particular expertise in United States-Chinese relations. That is why the Heritage Foundation asked her to make a special address on this subject.

In her remarks, Ms. Franklin emphasized that our relationship with China has come to a critical point. She urged us to consider the

long term implications of our annual fight over MFN. Further, Ms. Franklin described the significant changes occurring in China and the impact of trade investment on those changes.

As Ms. Franklin pointed out, China is rapidly becoming a global economic power, making it crucial that the United States have a consistent, long-range strategy for stable, constructive relations.

Barbara Franklin has made a major contribution to a better understanding of our relationship with China as well as the implications of MFN for our national interest. I am including a summary of her speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I urge my colleagues to read it carefully.

SUMMARY OF REMARKS GIVEN BY THE HONORABLE BARBARA HACKMAN FRANKLIN—“CHINA: FRIEND OR ENEMY?”

(Prepared by the staff of the Committee on International Relations)

The bilateral relationship between the U.S. and China is one of the most important in the world today. We have come to a critical point, where a better understanding between the two countries has become crucial for a stable and predictable relationship for the future.

Change in China is occurring at a tremendous rate and the result of China's transition can affect the U.S. for many reasons. China has the largest population and standing army in the world. It also is strategically positioned in the center of Asia and is a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, giving China the power to veto decisions in the U.N.

China's growing economic clout is significant for the U.S. as well. Currently, China is rated as the third largest economy in the world, behind Japan and the U.S., and predictions of China's future economic growth show that within the next 15 years it has the potential of becoming the world's largest economy. This has become important for the U.S. because China is the largest market in the world for aircraft, telephones, construction equipment, agriculture products, and increasingly for consumer goods. We can see that China is a market for many of the products sold by the U.S. and, more importantly, the figures show that the demand in China continues to grow rapidly.

At the same time, we cannot ignore the vital concerns many people have brought up about the problems with human rights abuses, nuclear proliferation, and protection of intellectual property rights in China. Our increasing trade deficit has also caused a great deal of anxiety in the U.S., along with the question of both Taiwan and Hong Kong and the intentions of China's military. Many goals are being set by the central government and provinces, ranging from expanding education to strengthening China's agriculture to meeting the basic needs of the Chinese people, to help alleviate the problems and issues that China faces.

Threatening to deny MFN status should not be used as a means of addressing these concerns. Congress should renew MFN for China. Denying MFN status to China or attaching unrelated conditions does not make any sense for many reasons. The economic consequences would be profound, as denial of MFN would hinder trade and increase tariffs and costs for U.S. companies doing business in China. A negative message to the Asia-Pacific region would also result, where there is already concern about whether the U.S. is going to withdraw. Denying MFN would also harm the economies of Taiwan and Hong Kong and, as previously stated, would not correct or erase any of the concerns we have with China. Furthermore, the time has come