

John Nicaretta, who was named man of the year by the Bayonne Chapter of UNICO. He was honored at a black tie dinner dance at the Richfield Regency in Verona on Saturday, March 2.

Saturday's festivities celebrated the many contributions made by Mr. Nicaretta to his family, country, and community. Being 1 of 12 children, family holds a prominent place in the life of Mr. Nicaretta. While attending Bayonne Technical High School, he helped his parents by doing odd jobs before and after class. As a young adult, Mr. Nicaretta worked in the kitchen of Balbo's Riviera Restaurant which was run by his family. On November 12, 1955, our honoree married Helen Dragshchuk. The union produced two children Catherine and John. In 1970, Mr. Nicaretta established Nicaretta Construction Co. with his brother Gino.

Duty to his country has played a significant role for Mr. Nicaretta. He enlisted in the U.S. Army in July 1951 at which time he attended basic infantry training and cooking school at Fort Dix, NJ. The following January Mr. Nicaretta was sent to Korea where he was promoted to mess sergeant for the 151st Combat Engineers Headquarters Co., I Corp Division. Previous experience with his family's restaurant assisted Mr. Nicaretta in preparation of meals for 300 men per day.

Community involvement has been a consistent theme in Mr. Nicaretta's life. Through the construction company, he started with his brother, Mr. Nicaretta contributed to a number of community oriented endeavors. His donation to the "Adopt-A-School Program" of Bayonne helped design two programs at the John Bailey School to promote reading and student recognition. Also benefiting from Mr. Nicaretta's generosity has been Boy Scout Camp Louis and the "Cleaner and Greener Project," which plants trees in Hudson County Park. Among the numerous organizations to which he belongs are the Assumption Catholic War Veterans, Bayonne Chamber of Commerce, Sons of Italy and the Bayonne Sicilian Citizens Club. Mr. Nicaretta is an active member of Our Lady of the Assumption Parish where he volunteers his time and talents.

It is an honor to have such an outstanding and caring individual residing in my district. John Nicaretta is a dedicated community leader. I am certain my colleagues will join me in recognition of this well deserved honor.

### CUBAN ATTACK

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 5, 1996*

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member commends to his colleagues two important editorials which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on February 27 and February 28, 1996.

[From the Omaha World-Herald Feb. 27, 1996]

CUBAN ATTACK IS U.S. BUSINESS; CLINTON TOO QUICK TO CALL IN U.N.

Saturday, Feb. 24, 1996. Two American-based civilian aircraft, belonging to a Cuban exile group called Brothers to the Rescue, are blasted out of the sky by Fidel Castro's warplanes. Four people are missing and presumed dead.

President Clinton's immediate response is to slink off and ask the United Nations to do something. By Sunday evening, the Security Council is meeting in closed session. Cuba asks for more time to give its version of the event. The question of whether the United States would respond unilaterally seemed to be on hold.

Monday, Clinton belatedly came through. He halted charter air travel between Cuba and the mainland, places further restrictions on the movements of Cuban diplomats in the United States and threw his support to pending legislation to tighten U.S. sanctions against the island nation. He also allowed frozen Cuban assets to be used to help the families of the victims.

But even as Clinton acted, the effectiveness of his previous policies toward Castro came under scrutiny. Under Clinton, travel between Cuba and the mainland had become easier. Telephone links were established. U.S. businesses encountered less resistance from their own government in establishing contacts with the Cubans—indeed, when a move originated in Congress to punish them for doing business on the island, Clinton was against it.

When Castro wanted to attend the U.N. anniversary celebration in New York City, the U.S. government did not stop him. Moreover the U.S. government had urged Brothers to the Rescue pilots not to fly into Cuban air space during their flights to spot refugees at sea and notify U.S. authorities—a warning that the Brothers ignored when they dropped leaflets on Cuban cities, urging that Castro be overthrown.

U.S. concessions made no more impression on Fidel Castro than they did on Gerry Adams, apparently. A few days earlier, it was the Irish Republican Army that repaid hopeful concessions with unspeakable violence. Clinton had given the IRA and its Sinn Fein partners a claim to respectability by inviting Adams to be a guest in the White House. The naivete of that approach became clear when the IRA went back to its old practice of planting bombs where dozens of innocent people were likely to be injured.

The intentional destruction of unarmed airplanes was once considered an act of war. As Patrick Buchanan said Sunday, this was murder. U.S. citizens, flying the small planes, were the victims. Clinton was too quick, in our opinion, to turn to the United Nations. This attack endangers the peace of the Caribbean and is accordingly, America's business.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Feb. 28, 1996]

### U.N. RESPONSE TO CUBA TOO TIMID

The Clinton administration unnecessarily humbled itself by going hat in hand to the United Nations after Cuba's air force used missiles to shoot down two American-based, small civilian planes. The incident need not have required a finding by an international body that Cuba was wrong. That was self-evident. It required only an appropriate U.S. response, firm and prompt.

As it turned out, the U.N. response was minimal and perfunctory. The United States had requested a formal resolution, condemning the assault. Instead, it received a "presidential statement," which required no vote and which deplored rather than condemned. To their credit, the drafters of the statement mentioned that international covenants ban the use of weapons against civilian aircraft.

But any outrage was muted. Diplomats said there was no support for punitive action against Cuba.

Madeleine Albright, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, called attention to the heinousness of the Cuban barbarism

when she played a tape in which the Cuban pilots expressed joy about their success and made crude remarks about their victims.

At one point, one of the fighter pilots radioed that the target was in sight and that it was a small plane. Ground control acknowledged that it was a "small plane." The pilot identified the plane as a Cessna 337. An order came back: "Authorized to destroy."

Ms. Albright said she was "struck by the joy of these pilots as they committed cold-blooded murder." Her fellow Security Council members, however, showed little outrage.

This should be a lesson to the administration. There may be times when the United Nations serves a purpose. But certainly there are other times—and this was one—when the United States has better things to do than solicit an expression of support from the United Nations.

### THE IMPACT OF FAMILY PLANNING CUTS

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 5, 1996*

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my dismay and disappointment with recent legislation that devastates international family planning programs.

Although this is not an abortion issue, we have opted to treat it like one. People on both ends of the abortion issue spectrum have argued that they want to strengthen the family, yet the impact of these funding cuts will result in millions of couples losing contraceptive services, millions of unwanted pregnancies, and inevitably millions of abortions. In addition, this funding cut will stymie maternal and infant health programs, as well as education about sexually transmitted diseases/HIV, around the world as agencies shuffle what little appropriations they have.

This is not the way to promote the family. The Washington Post published a Judy Mann column February 2 which addresses these devastating cuts. I submit for the consideration of my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1996]

EXTRACTING THEIR POUND OF FLESH

(By Judy Mann)

Congressional opponents of family planning scored a major victory last week by passing legislation that will strangle U.S. support for international contraceptive services.

Led by House Republicans and backed by the Christian Coalition and other right-wing groups that oppose abortion, these efforts ironically will lead to an additional 200,000 illegal and unsafe abortions, according to Nils Daulaire, deputy assistant administrator for policy and child health policy adviser at the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Damage to family-planning programs will be far more extensive than it appeared from early news reports about the temporary budget agreement. The legislation will decrease by 35 percent the amount of money available to spend on international family-planning programs—that is, it will cut the budget by nearly \$200 million. USAID will not be permitted to spend any of its appropriation for family planning until July 1, nine months after the start of the fiscal year, which, in Daulaire's words, will cause a "tremendous disruption in services." It is the only international assistance program

that is restricted in this way. After July 1, spending cannot exceed 6.7 percent per month of the total appropriated, which means that only a small amount of the whole will actually be spent before Oct. 1, with a new fiscal year begins.

Daulaire projects that as many as 5,000 more women will die over the next year as a result of unsafe abortions and mistimed pregnancies, and that roughly 500,000 additional births will result, putting further stress on child-survival programs that are strained already. Further, he says, the piecemealing restrictions imposed by Congress will increase administrative costs by four to five times, costing U.S. taxpayers \$750,000 to \$1 million more.

Most of the campaign against family planning has been carried out in the guise of preventing U.S. foreign aid funds from paying for abortions, although that practice has been banned since 1973. This current fight began last year when House Republicans voted for a measure sponsored by Rep. Christopher H. Smith (R-N.J.) that would have prevented any foreign nongovernmental organization from receiving any U.S. family-planning money if it attempted to provide information about abortion or lobby its own government to change regulations regarding abortion. The Senate refused to go along with the Smith language, the White House said it would veto any bill with this language, and a stalemate on the whole foreign aid package ensued.

Pressure to get a foreign operations appropriation bill mounted steadily after Oct. 1, when checks to Israel and Egypt weren't delivered, foreign aid missions weren't getting their funding, their contractors weren't being paid and population programs weren't being funded at all, according to Victoria Markell, vice president of Population Action International, a nonprofit, research-based advocacy organization that receives no federal funding.

The Smith language was cut out of the final bill last Thursday in the face of growing public outrage over the prospect of yet another government shutdown. "The ideologues had to come up with some formulation that will restrict population-planning spending as much as they could," Markell says. Neither the Senate nor the White House wanted the blame for another government shutdown.

"It's such an attack on women and children," Markell says. "How in the world can you pretend to care about child survival when we know that women and mothers are going to die without access to family planning?" She cites a World Health Organization statistic that 90 percent of children in developing countries who lose their mothers in delivery will die by their first birthday. "We know that if women have fewer children, the children they have live longer and are healthier and everyone benefits."

"One of the key priorities of our family-planning program is to reduce abortions worldwide," Daulaire says. Yet, when it became clear that the Smith language gutting family-planning services would not pass, "they decided that the way to extract a cost was by severely restricting AID's ability to provide family-planning services around the world. They understood very clearly that this language would mean not just a 35 percent reduction in funding but was really much harsher."

What is clear from this exercise is that the conservative Christian bloc of House Republicans is targeting international contraceptive and family-planning services, not just abortion services. And the people who will suffer are women and children in the poorest parts of the world. Is that the Christian way?

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES A. WALTON,  
SR.

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1996

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following obituary appeared in the Indianapolis Star on February 20, 1996. It should have been delayed for at least 30 more years.

Charlie Walton was one of God's noblemen—undoubtedly still is now that he is in the arms of the Almighty for eternity.

Obituaries tend to be rather sterile. Just the facts. Here is another fact, Charlie Walton was one of the brightest and gentlest people who ever lived. His death leaves an enormously lonesome place in Indianapolis.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Feb. 20, 1996]

CHARLES WALTON SR., ATTORNEY, EX-CENTER TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE

Charles A. Walton Sr., 59, an Indianapolis attorney and former Center Township trustee, died Feb. 19.

Services will be at 1 p.m. Feb. 22 in Stuart Mortuary Chapel, with calling from 11 a.m.

Burial: Crown Hill Cemetery.

He was elected interim trustee in 1986 by Democratic precinct committeemen to fill the unexpired term of the late Benjamin Osborne. Mr. Walton, a controversial figure, subsequently was denied the nomination for a four-year term by party officials despite support from the precinct committeemen.

He was an attorney 36 years with several firms, including Walton and Pratt, which he helped start in 1992 with a daughter, a son and son-in-law.

Mr. Walton was elected to the Indiana General Assembly in 1964. He was also a former deputy prosecuting attorney for Marion County and an Indianapolis city attorney.

He was an unsuccessful candidate for mayor of Indianapolis in 1987.

He was a member of Metropolitan Baptist Church; National, American, Indiana, Indianapolis and Marion County bar associations; and a life member of the NAACP.

He was a graduate of Morehouse College and Indiana University School of Law, Indianapolis. Memorial contributions may be made to the Indianapolis Morehouse College Alumni Association Scholarship Fund, in care of Walton and Pratt law firm.

Survivors: wife Joan Blackshear Walton; children Charles A. Jr., John C. Walton, Mia-Lon Washington, Tanya Walton Pratt; sisters Adell Van Buren, Johnnie Marie Cliff; four grandchildren.

INTRODUCTION OF SAFE: THE SECURITY AND FREEDOM THROUGH ENCRYPTION ACT

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1996

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce the Security and Freedom Through Encryption Act. The SAFE Act. Twenty-seven of my colleagues in the House join me as cosponsors of this important legislation. We join Senators LEAHY and BURNS in this bipartisan initiative which is intended to send the administration two loud and clear messages:

Our antiquated export restrictions are out of step with today's technology and must be brought into the information age; and

And American citizens and businesses will not tolerate big brother holding the keys to their private and proprietary information.

American consumers are demanding information security and are getting it. Without security features, the innovative content, electronic commerce, and enhanced communications capabilities necessary to make the development of the GII—global information infrastructure—a success simply will not occur. Current law allows Americans to utilize any level of encryption that innovative minds can develop, but the administration wants to change that. They want to use export controls as a back door approach to controlling the use of encryption here at home.

The administration has proposed allowing the export of products with strong security features but only if key escrow is built in. If this does not work, administration officials have said they will seek legislation forcing Americans to use only encryption to which the Government has access. We are here to tell the administration not to bother. We reject that solution as a big Government answer to a Big Government problem. It completely ignores consumer privacy and security.

While we recognize the concerns of law enforcement officials who want to preserve surveillance capabilities, the technology genie is clearly out of the bottle. The administrations' "64-bit key escrow" policy ignores the realities of today's marketplace and the technology which abounds. Criminals and terrorists are not always stupid, they are going to use the highest security to communicate and conspire that is technologically available. Terrorists will not buy American just because of it's PC.

There are currently over 500 foreign products and programs with strong encryption capabilities available in the world marketplace. These are products that U.S. companies can not even export. Some of them are here on display. These products are being produced and sold by foreign companies and can be downloaded on the Internet and used anywhere in the world.

An economic study released in December by the Department of Commerce demonstrates that failure to address these export controls by the year 2000—4 years from now—will cost the U.S. economy \$60 billion and 200,000 jobs. The administration's proposed policy would be yet another blow to the U.S. computer industry. It is time we gave our companies the ability to compete rather than giving foreign competitors the advantage.

Therefore, our bill will do four things:

Continue to ensure that all Americans have the right to choose any security system to protect their confidential information.

Prohibit big brother from mandating a back door into people's computer systems.

Make it unlawful to use encryption in the commission of a crime or to willfully coverup a crime.

Allow the U.S. computer industry to export generally available software and hardware if a product with comparable security is commercially available from foreign suppliers.

U.S. software companies, world leaders in cutting edge technology, must have the freedom to develop products with strong security features which meet computer user demands and privacy concerns in the United States and abroad. Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan effort that I urge of all my colleagues to join and support.