

Emirates (UAE), and Kuwait have not yet transferred all proceeds from intercepted Iraqi oil to the U.N. escrow account. As I understand it, all States are obligated to transfer such proceeds as soon as possible to the U.N. escrow account, according to Security Council Resolutions 706 and 778. Paragraph 2 of Security Council Resolution 778 states:

"... all States in which there are petroleum products owned by the Government of Iraq, or its State bodies, corporations, or agencies, shall take all feasible steps to purchase or arrange for the sale of such petroleum or petroleum products at fair market value, and thereupon to transfer the proceeds as soon as possible to the escrow account provided for in resolutions 706 (1991) and 712 (1991)."

I would appreciate your clarification as to why Saudi Arabia, the UAE and Kuwait have not transferred all proceeds to the U.N. escrow account.

You further indicate in your response that the U.N. Compensation Commission is "helping to coordinate the receipt of the 30 percent share in sales revenue from the sale of the oil proceeds by Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and the UAE". I do not understand why the U.N. Compensation Commission is coordinating the receipt of a 30 percent amount, when the States are obligated to pay the full 100 percent of revenues to the U.N. escrow account. I would appreciate your clarification of this point as well.

Since my September 8 letter to you, I have received additional information which raises further concerns about this matter. I have been told that Iraqi oil intercepted by the United States and turned over to the Government of Saudi Arabia was sold by that Government in May, 1993 for almost \$350 million, but that only \$40 million of that sum was returned to the U.N. escrow account. I would like to know if this information is accurate and what is United States policy on the appropriate disposition of these funds.

In order to understand the full scope of activities related to the U.N. escrow account, I would appreciate answers to the following questions:

1. Since the inception of the Multinational Interception Force (M.I.F.), what is the total amount and estimated value of intercepted Iraqi oil that has been turned over to each of the Gulf States?

2. To your knowledge, how much of this oil has been sold by the Gulf States, by country, since the inception of the M.I.F.?

3. To your knowledge, how much of the proceeds from the sale of oil has been transferred to the U.N. escrow account, by country, since the inception of the M.I.F.?

4. Have you demarched Gulf States which have not transferred all proceeds to the U.N. escrow account? If so, what has been the response?

The integrity of the sanctions regime depends on cooperation between the M.I.F. and the Gulf States in transferring intercepted oil proceeds to the U.N. escrow account. If these funds are not in fact being transferred to the escrow account, it undermines the entire integrity of the sanctions regime, and calls into question the utility of the complex and costly M.I.F. effort.

I appreciate your consideration of these matters and look forward to your reply.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON  
Ranking Democratic Member.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, DC, March 28, 1996.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: I am writing in response to your letter regarding the disposi-

tion of Iraqi oil intercepted by ships of the Multinational Interception Force (MIF).

The MIF has been a highly successful operation by any standard. Iraq first attempted to export large amounts of oil from its Gulf ports in the fall of 1994 (after these ports were restored to working condition). The MIF intercepted the first and only two tankers which attempted to smuggle Iraqi oil from these ports. Since the interceptions and the penalties imposed on the vessels by the nations to which the vessels were diverted (Kuwait and the U.A.E.), Iraqi efforts to smuggle large cargoes of oil from the southern ports ceased. The MIF is not only responsible for stopping Iraqi exports. It also has successfully prevented the import into Iraq of non-humanitarian goods which smugglers attempted to bring to Iraq disguised as permitted humanitarian cargoes.

Vessels carrying Iraqi oil have been diverted to ports in the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia. Altogether, these smugglers carried approximately 30,000 tons of petroleum products with a value in excess of \$6 million.

The U.A.E. sold approximately 20,000 tons of seized oil and deposited the proceeds in an escrow account in the U.A.E. while awaiting final instructions on disposition from the UN Iraq Sanctions Committee. Kuwait has sold approximately 5300 hundred tons of Iraqi oil and deposited the proceeds (\$615,000) in the UN escrow account. Kuwait continues to hold the proceeds from a larger cargo seized from the tanker "al Mahrousa." The Kuwaiti government is still awaiting payment from the ship's owner, of expenses relating to the diversion. Saudi Arabia has sold approximately 4,000 tons of seized oil and is preparing to transfer the proceeds to the UN escrow account. (States are permitted to deduct expenses related to the disposal of the seized oil from the proceeds of their sale.)

In your letter, you question why the UN Compensation Commission is coordinating receipt of only thirty percent of these proceeds rather than the entire amount. Under U.N. resolutions, all of the proceeds from sale of these oil cargoes (less expenses) are to be deposited to a U.N. escrow account, with the U.N. Compensation Commission entitled to thirty percent of this sum. The remainder goes to fund U.N. operations regarding Iraq (the northern Iraq relief program, the U.N. Special Commission, etc.).

At the time sanctions were imposed against Iraq, there was a substantial amount of Iraqi oil in the Iraq-Saudi Arabia oil pipeline and in storage at the pipeline's outlet at the Saudi port of al-Mu'ajiz. Saudi Arabia subsequently sold this oil. According to Saudi Arabia's interpretation of its obligations under the UN resolutions, it deposited \$40 million from the sale into the UN escrow account. While we have requested the Saudi government to reopen its accounting of this sale with a view to increasing the contribution to UNSCOM, the Saudi position remains that the \$40 million deposit fully satisfied the requirements of the UN resolutions. We will continue to press the Saudis on this important matter.

Please feel free to write us in the future if we may be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

BARBARA LARKIN,  
Acting Assistant Secretary,  
Legislative Affairs.

## EFFECTS OF ALCOHOL

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1996

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association recently reported findings of a survey that should shake our complacency about alcohol problems among young people in this country. That survey dramatizes the extent of heavy, dangerous drinking by persons ages 18 to 30 years.

Some of these findings paint a disturbing picture of alcohol abuse among young adults: 15 percent said they drink six or more drinks a night, and nearly one in five is a frequent binge drinker—with males consuming five or more drinks and females four or more—and 7 percent say they drink this much every time they drink. As a result of these findings, the AMA has put us on notice that the most significant drug problem affecting young people is alcohol. Alcohol is the most widely used and abused drug by young and old alike.

Despite alcohol's crippling effect on young people, beer, wine, and liquor marketers position their products as if they are harmless, essential ingredients of a healthy, active lifestyle. Young people deserve a more responsible, balanced message about a drug that destroys so many young lives and careers.

For that reason, I rise today to salute John Soriano, a high school senior scholar-athlete from North Caldwell, NJ, for his contribution to balancing the messages that young people get about alcohol. John is the winner of a national writing contest, cosponsored by *Scholastic Choices Magazine* and Center for Science in the Public Interest. That contest asked teenagers to "Talk Back to Alcohol Advertisers." His poem "JoAnn," poignantly describes the disbelief, pain, and loss following a drinking-related car crash.

John Soriano's poem provides a message that most beer ads bury beneath endearing, animated animals or in their hype about how the brew will make you a man, help you win a girl, or make you a success in life. John's winning entry sends a message to advertisers that kids' lives are constantly threatened by alcohol, that the sanitized ads are misleading, and that more of the real story needs to be told.

We cannot continue to ignore how the promotion of drinking to young people—on television, on campus, in youth-oriented magazines, on billboards and transit signs, at rock concerts and sporting events, almost everywhere—helps disrupt futures and destroys young lives and robs our Nation of too many of its most important resources. We need to go beyond passing laws that criminalize young people for illegal possession of alcohol; we need to do more than support school-based education that has little chance of competing with over \$1 billion of alcohol advertising that offers tantalizing personal rewards for drinking. We need to follow John Soriano's lead, and begin to "talk back to alcohol advertisers."

JOANN

Young and immune and I knew what was best.

I knew that I wouldn't end up like the rest. JoAnn knew it too and she stayed by my side,

Through the times that we laughed and the times that we cried,  
 Social Distortion—we wouldn't give in,  
 This was never a battle that we couldn't win,  
 Future was bright, both of us knew,  
 We could handle it all, we thought this was true,  
 But a night and a dream that never would end  
 We decided to spend it with a drink and a friend,  
 A few bottles went by, to us it was fun,  
 We left for her home at a quarter to one.  
 Five years have gone by and I still feel the wheel,  
 But now I live on in a chair made of steel,  
 Thousands of times the pain has amassed,  
 When I think of my life and opportunities past,  
 I still see JoAnn about once a week,  
 And I usually end up in tears at her feet,  
 She talks to me softly but I don't hear a sound,  
 And the tears of my conscience fall hard to the ground,  
 As I lie on the grass moving up with my hands,  
 We talk about futures, our loves, and our plans,  
 I stay there and cry and talk for an hour,  
 When I'm ready to leave, I leave her a flower.  
 My soul is still trapped in the bottles that passed,  
 And the sorrow I carry is certain to last,  
 JoAnn says' she loves me and that should make me brave,  
 But I lose it each week when I visit her grave,  
 And the drinks and the dream and the one fateful night,  
 I love you JoAnn, I'm sorry; Goodnight.

A TRIBUTE TO ANGELA DENISE DILLARD

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 29, 1996*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to Dr. Angela Denise Dillard, assistant professor of history and Afro-American and African studies at the University of Minnesota. A native of Detroit, Dr. Dillard recently received her Ph.D. in American culture from the University of Michigan. I take particular pride in offering this tribute because Dr. Dillard's family and mine long have been active in the struggle for justice, jobs, and opportunity. Dr. Dillard's mother, Marilyn Dillard, and my father, the late John Conyers, Sr., were among the earliest members of the Trade Union Leadership Council, an organization formed in the 1950's to combat racism in management and unions. Marilyn Dillard served as secretary of TULC. Dr. Dillard's father, Paul Dillard, is a probation officer with the State of Michigan.

In the 1960's the Dillard household was a gathering place for activities. The heated political and social discussions there left a lasting impression on Dr. Dillard and on her older brother, the Rev. Paul Anthony Dillard, Jr., who worked in my Detroit office as a congressional aide in the 1980's. The Rev. Dillard's premature death last year at the age of 36 ended an outstanding career as an advocate for the disadvantaged and the oppressed. At the time of his death, he was dean of the Imani Temple Cathedral in Washington, DC.

Dr. Dillard recalls that the conversations she heard as a child whetted her curiosity and

shaped her professional life. "I developed an early interest in the history of ideas, and how ideas influence political and social life, culture and race relations... people's day-to-day existence," she says. "My family and my family's friends talked about these issues constantly. Years later I started to remember all the old stories I had heard, and I decided, 'Wow, that would make a wonderful project.'"

Her doctoral dissertation, "From the Reverend Charles A. Hill to the Reverend Albert B. Cleage, Jr.: Patterns of Change and Continuity in the Patterns of Civil Rights Mobilization in Detroit, 1935-1967," was a result of those discussions. The late Reverend Hill of Hartford Avenue Baptist Church was a community activist who formed broad-based religious and ethnic coalitions to bring about social change. The Reverend Cleage, of the Shrine of the Black Madonna, eventually discarded integrationist tendencies and turned to black nationalism and black theology in the 1960's.

Dr. Dillard argues that Detroit underwent "two major phases in its civil rights mobilizations, sustained by two distinct communities of protest. The first phase (and community) was generated by migration, depression, and the logic of industrial unionism; the second was generated by the rise of the southern civil rights movement and by the social and economic environment of post-World War II Detroit." Dr. Dillard's study emphasizes the tension, discontinuities, false starts, and realignments among those constituting and often reconstituting the city's civil rights-oriented left.

A graduate of Immaculata High School, Dr. Dillard received her B.A. in 1988 from Michigan State University's James Madison College where she majored in justice, morality and constitutional democracy. In 1991, she received her M.A. in political science from the New School for Social Research; the next year she received an M.A. in American culture from the University of Michigan. In 1995, she received her Ph.D. in American culture from the University of Michigan.

Dr. Dillard became an assistant professor at the University of Minnesota in September 1995. She taught African-American Political Thought in 1994 at James Madison College and she taught Tradition and Resistance: National Narratives and American Values, in 1993 at the University of Michigan. In 1991, she taught Political Implications of the "Harlem Years," 1920-1935, at the New School for Social Research's Eugene Lang College.

Numerous organizations have recognized her outstanding ability by awarding her a variety of grants and fellowships. In 1996, the University of Minnesota awarded her the McKnight Summer Research Fellowship. In 1994-95, she received the Committee on Institutional Cooperation Dissertation Fellowship, and in 1994 the University of Michigan nominated her for the National endowment for the Humanities Dissertation Fellowship.

In addition to her dissertation, her papers and presentations include "Rumblings on the right: Black Conservative Thought and the Lincoln Review," which was delivered at the Graduate Student Conference held at the University of Michigan's Center for African and African-American Studies in February 1994, and "Sports, Race and African-American Autobiography," which was delivered at the Midwest Modern Language Association in November

1993. Her Master's thesis at the New School for Social Research was "The Negro Problem and the Problem with 'Negro': Name Changes in the Black/African-American Community."

Through her scholarship and her teaching, Dr. Angela Denise Dillard keeps alive her family tradition of activism by focusing attention on the gallant struggles African-Americans have made for jobs, justice, and opportunity.

UNION SALTS

HON. HARRIS W. FAWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 29, 1996*

Mr. Fawell. Mr. Speaker, in two separate hearings last year, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities heard from witnesses who shared their experiences with the union organizing tactic known as "salting." Their testimony included stories about union organizers and agents who sought or gained employment with a non-union employer when, in fact, they had little if any intention of truly working for that company. In many cases, the organizers and agents were there simply to disrupt the employer's workplace or to increase the cost of doing business by forcing the employer to defend itself against frivolous charges filed with the National Labor Relations Board [NLRB]. For most of these companies—many of which were smaller businesses—the economic harm inflicted by the union's "salting" campaigns was devastating.

Equally troubling, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that union "salts" are often brazen in their efforts to inflict economic harm on non-union employers. Indeed, most union "salts" make clear when they apply for a job that their loyalties lie elsewhere and that they have little interest in working to promote the interests of the company.

Obviously, one might ask why any employer would hire an individual that he knows is there to hurt his company. The complicated answer to this question, Mr. Speaker, lies in broad interpretations of who is covered by provisions of the National Labor Relations Act [NLRA] that prohibit employers from discriminating against employees because of their union interests or activities. These interpretations have had the practical effect of presenting employers with a Hobson's choice: either hire the union "salt" who is sure to disrupt your workplace or file frivolous charges resulting in costly litigation; or, deny the "salt" employment and risk being sued for discrimination under the NLRA. Either way the employer is faced with a hiring decision that may threaten the very survival of his or her business.

To remedy this situation, I am pleased today to introduce the Truth in Employment Act of 1996. This legislation would amend section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act to make clear that an employer is not required to hire any person who seeks a job in order to promote interests unrelated to those of the employer. If enacted, the bill will help restore the balance of rights that "salting" upsets and that is fundamental to our system of collective bargaining.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is in no way intended to infringe upon any rights or protections otherwise accorded