

prosecutors, police, entertainers, media executives, researchers, and treatment and prevention specialists from across America to examine solutions and keep us moving forward with proven strategies. The Vice President, General Barry McCaffrey, and I met with the participants in a series of roundtable discussions, discussing how to strengthen the efforts of families, the media, communities, schools, businesses, and government to reduce drug use and violence. Participants left with new energy and new ideas, determined to return home and begin implementing the solutions and strategies discussed that day.

This conference took place at an important juncture in America's ongoing fight against drug abuse. In the last few years our nation has made significant progress against drug use and related crime. The number of Americans who use cocaine has been reduced by 30 percent since 1992. The amount of money Americans spend on illicit drugs has declined from an estimated \$64 billion five years ago to about \$49 billion in 1993—a 23 percent drop. We are finally gaining ground against overall crime: drug-related murders are down 12 percent since 1989; robberies are down 10 percent since 1991.

At the same time, we have dealt serious blows to the international criminal networks that import drugs into America. Many powerful drug lords, including leaders of Colombia's notorious Cali cartel, have been arrested. A multinational air interdiction program has disrupted the principal air route for smugglers between Peru and Colombia. The close cooperation between the United States, Peru, and other governments in the region has disrupted the cocaine economy in several areas. Our efforts have decreased overall cocaine production and have made coca planting less attractive to the farmers who initiate the cocaine production process. And I have taken the serious step of cutting off all non-humanitarian aid to certain drug producing and trafficking nations that have not cooperated with the United States in narcotics control. Further, I have ordered that we vote against their requests for loans from the World Bank and other multilateral development banks. This clearly underscores the unwavering commitment of the United States to stand against drug production and trafficking.

Here at home, we have achieved major successes in arresting, prosecuting, and dismantling criminal drug networks. In Miami, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Program, through its operational task forces, successfully concluded a major operation that resulted in the indictments of 252 individuals for drug trafficking and other drug-related crimes. Operations conducted by the Drug Enforcement Administration's Mobile Enforcement Teams program (MET), a highly successful federal tool for assisting local law enforcement, have resulted in more

than 1,500 arrests of violent and predatory drug criminals in more than 50 communities across the nation.

But as the White House Leadership Conference on Youth, Drug Use, and Violence showed, now is the time to press forward. We must not let up for a moment in our efforts against drug abuse, and drug abuse by young people, particularly.

There are many reasons why young people do continue to use drugs. Chief among these are ignorance of the facts about addiction and the potency of drugs, and complacency about the danger of drugs. Unfortunately, all too often we see signs of complacency about the dangers of drug use: diminished attention to the drug problem by the national media; the glamorization and legitimization of drug use in the entertainment industry; the coddling of professional athletes who are habitual drug-users; avoidance of the issue by parents and other adults; calls for drug-legalization; and the marketing of products to young people that legitimize and elevate the use of alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drugs.

All Americans must accept responsibility to teach young people that drugs are illegal and they are deadly. They may land you in jail; they may cost you your life. We must renew our commitment to the drug prevention strategies that deter first-time drug use and stop the progression from alcohol and tobacco use to marijuana and harder drugs.

The National Drug Control Strategy is designed to prevent a new drug use epidemic through an aggressive and comprehensive full-court press that harnesses the energies of committed individuals from every sector of our society. As I said in the State of the Union, we must step up our attack against criminal youth gangs that deal in illicit drugs. We will improve the effectiveness of our cooperative efforts among U.S. defense and law enforcement agencies, as well as with other nations, to disrupt the flow of drugs coming into the country. We will seek to expand the availability and improve the quality of drug treatment. And we will continue to oppose resolutely calls for the legalization of illicit drugs. We will increase efforts to prevent drug use by all Americans, particularly young people.

The tragedy of drug abuse and drug-related crime affects us all. The National Drug Control Strategy requires commitment and resources from many individuals and organizations, and from all levels of government. For the strategy to succeed, each of us must do our part.

We ask the Congress to be a bipartisan partner and provide the resources we need at the federal level to get the job done. I challenge state and local governments to focus on drug abuse as a top priority. We ask the media and the advertising and entertainment industries to work with us to educate our youth, and all Americans, about the

dangers of drug use. Finally, we invite every American—every parent, every teacher, every law enforcement officer, every faith leader, every young person, and every community leader—to join our national campaign to save our youth.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 29, 1996.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

NIKE IS A WORLD-CLASS AMERICAN COMPANY AND A GOOD CORPORATE CITIZEN IN OREGON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, just prior to the April recess, my colleague from Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, took to the House floor and criticized the operations of Nike, an important Oregon-based company headquartered in my district. I fundamentally disagree with her assessment of Nike and rise today to set the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD straight. Simply stated, the company that my colleague from Ohio portrayed in her statement is not the company that I have been working with for the last 3½ years and which has been headquartered in my district for the last quarter century. In my view, Nike is a world-class American company, providing good American jobs, and has been and continues to be a good corporate citizen in Oregon.

I find it most unfortunate that the Congresswoman, nor her staff, nor anyone from the jobs and fair trade caucus, took the time to check with Nike, to understand their side of the story before the statement was given, neither did they check with me. So in the name of fairness, let's look at the allegations and then the facts, one by one, to get to the bottom of what this company is really about.

First, it is alleged that Nike has downsized its work force and shut down all of its U.S. production. The fact is that currently, Nike directly employs over 5,500 employees in the United States, 3,500 of whom are based in Oregon. This makes Nike one of Oregon's leading private sector employers. The majority of these U.S. jobs are professional, technical, design, or managerial positions—highly skilled jobs that command high wages. It is interesting to note that on average, Nike employees in Oregon make over \$45,000 per year. That compares very favorably with the average Oregon private sector income of roughly \$25,000 per year.

The remainder of Nike's U.S. jobs include customer service, distribution, sales, retail and yes, manufacturing. With a U.S. production force of nearly

1,800 people, Nike is the largest provider of American manufacturing jobs among all athletic footwear companies. This includes Nike's air sole factory in Beaverton, OR, where 800 Oregonians are employed making the air cushioning units which are incorporated into most of Nike's footwear products. In addition, it is important to recognize that Nike sources nearly 70 percent of the apparel it sells in the United States within the United States, which translates into thousands of additional U.S. jobs. In total, Nike and its U.S. subsidiaries and subcontractors manufacture hundreds of millions of dollars worth of shoes, apparel, accessories, and printed products in the United States.

And despite what was alleged, Nike hasn't downsized its work force and moved production overseas. Nike has always produced its athletic footwear in Asia, because that is where the athletic footwear industry—including the expertise, efficiency, and innovation—has always been located. It is true that in the late 1970's, in an effort to build a U.S. athletic footwear manufacturing base, Nike opened two factories in Maine and New Hampshire, but that effort proved unsuccessful for a variety of reasons. But what is important to note is that when those two factories were running, they employed 825 people—including those in research and development. Today, as mentioned earlier, Nike and its subsidiaries employ nearly 1,800 Americans in direct manufacturing—so in fact Nike has greatly increased not downsized its U.S. manufacturing work force.

Second, with regard to allegations about the exploitation of workers at Nike factories overseas, it is important to note initially that like nearly every other athletic footwear and apparel company, Nike doesn't own the factories producing Nike goods. Rather, Nike contracts with privately owned facilities. But in every factory where Nike sources product, Nike is guided by its code of conduct and Nike binds all its business partners to the code's principles with a signed memorandum of understanding [MOU]. Together, these documents require all factories in which Nike does business to:

First, certify compliance with all applicable local government regulations regarding minimum wage; overtime, child labor laws; provisions for pregnancy, menstrual leave; provisions for vacations and holidays and mandatory retirement benefits; second, certify compliance with all applicable local government regulations regarding occupational health and safety; third, certify compliance with all applicable local laws providing health insurance, life insurance, and workers compensation; fourth, certify that it and its suppliers and contractors do not use any form of forced labor—prison or otherwise; fifth, certify compliance with all applicable local environmental regulations, and adhere to Nike's own broader environmental practices, including the prohibition on the use of

chlorofluorocarbons [CFC's], the release of which could contribute to the depletion of the Earth's ozone layer; sixth, certify that it does not discriminate in hiring, salary, benefits, advancement, termination, or retirement on the basis of gender, race, religion, age, sexual orientation or ethnic origin; and seventh, agree to maintain on file such documentation as may be needed to demonstrate compliance with the certification in the MOU, and further agrees to make the documents available for Nike's inspection upon request.

And Nike's code of conduct and MOU with its factories are strongly enforced. Not only does Nike have Americans in every factory where it does business to ensure that the code and MOU are being strictly adhered to, but Nike conducts independent audits also to evaluate overall compliance with the code and MOU. When a problem is discovered, Nike is quick to respond to address and remedy the problem to ensure that all workers employed in factories making Nike products are safe and treated fairly. So far, the relationship between Nike and the factories is working well. For instance, in a recent audit of an Indonesian footwear factory, 90 percent of the workers surveyed said they liked the factory's work, environment and wages.

In response to the allegation that workers making Nike shoes are paid slave wages and are mostly poverty-stricken women and hungry girls, the fact of the matter is that in the six Asian countries where Nike currently sources footwear, workers are paid an average twice the minimum wage mandated by the respective Government. And wages are only part of the equation. Compensation in factories where Nike does business often also includes subsidies for housing, transportation, food and health care, bonuses for attendance and performance, and a variety of paid days off for holidays and personal leave.

But perhaps the allegations that Nike threatens to tear up our communities with their relentless marketing and causing children to kill one another for shoes are the most outrageous and unfair of all. To say that kids are killing kids just for a pair of \$150 shoes completely ignores what is really going on within our cities and with our youth, and unfairly and naively places blame where it doesn't belong.

Why didn't the Congresswoman from Ohio's floor statement mention all the things Nike was doing to rebuild our inner cities and assist our kids? Why didn't she mention that Nike actively operates a multimillion-dollar P.L.A.Y. program—which stands for Participate in the Lives of America's Youth—a program to promote sports and fitness within our inner cities. Why didn't she note that Nike has contributed hundreds of millions of dollars directly to a wide variety of charities and nonprofit organizations—the goals

of which include promoting sports and fitness, improving the environment, supporting the arts and humanities, preventing and controlling disease and other illnesses, eradicating poverty and hopelessness, and many programs promoting minority and youth initiatives.

When my own daughter, Amende Briggs, suggested that Nike institute an art program in schools, the company enthusiastically supported the idea. Nike has hired a full time director of the Art Outreach project, which is currently operating in a number of schools in Oregon and other States. Nike pays employees to teach art in schools.

Just in Oregon alone, over the last 2 years Nike has directly contributed nearly \$2 million to a broad assortment of programs. To start, beginning in 1984, Nike has continually donated 10 percent of its profits—up to \$50,000 a year—from sales in its employee store to assist economic development in the primarily minority, low-income northeast Portland community. Programs benefiting from Nike gifts include the Portland Urban League, Northeast Community Development Corp., Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs, Oregon Council for Hispanic Advancement, and others. In addition, Nike provided \$250,000 to finish renovating northeast-Portland based Dishman Community Center, nearly \$250,000 to open Portland House of Umoja—a residential facility for gang-affected youth—and just recently, using its environmentally acclaimed reuse-a-shoe program throughout the Portland metropolitan area. In addition, Nike annually contributes hundreds of thousands of dollars per year in establishing innercity sports leagues such as a low-income golf program for girls, several soccer programs, and direct grants to numerous Oregon agencies to help establish and maintain kids sports and recreation programs throughout the State.

Furthermore, Nike and its employees contribute support to a broad range of Oregon's civic, cultural, educational, and environmental, organizations, including the Oregon Shakespeare Festival—Ashland, the Oregon Bach Festival—Eugene, Art Quake—Portland, the Sunriver Nature Center—Sunriver, the Nature Conservancy and numerous other programs.

All told, if one combines all of Nike's Oregon tax payments, charitable contributions and direct support of other Oregon businesses, Nike directly contributed over \$270 million to Oregon's economy last year.

Finally, I can't help but respond to the question raised by the Congresswoman from Ohio when she pondered whether Phil Knight, Nike's Chairman and CEO has a conscience. Not only is Knight directly and personally responsible for all of the positive things Nike has done in Oregon, the United States and the world for that matter, Knight is one of the few remaining executives of Fortune 500 companies that remain

at the helm of the companies they personally started—and that is critically important in these days of corporate mergers and hostile takeovers. Knight, a University of Oregon track runner, started the company with his track coach in 1964, and sold shoes out of the back of their cars. Now Nike is the world's largest sports and fitness company, and Knight is one of the most influential figures in the world of sports. The company started in Oregon and remains in Oregon because Knight is committed to remain in the State. Any person who visits Nike's corporate headquarters in Beaverton, any person who sees the amount of economic development and employment Nike adds to the State, any person who understands Nike's global operations knows that Phil Knight has a conscience.

I know that Nike is proud of being an American company and proud of its successful operations and employment in the United States and around the world. I also can tell you that most Oregonians, and most Americans for that matter, are also proud of Nike. To call this company or Mr. Knight a corporate vulture is unfair and uncalled for. I would hope my friend from Ohio would review her criticism and reconsider her opinions of this important American company.

FDA DOES NOT SERVE PUBLIC BY DENYING TREATMENT OF LAST RESORT PURSUED BY TERMINALLY ILL PATIENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have heard from our constituents regarding the plight of cancer patients under the care of Dr. Stanislaw Burzynski of Houston, TX. My office has received many letters and phone calls concerning this matter, which is why I am on the floor today. Recently, the House Committee on Commerce, of which I am a sitting member, held a compelling hearing into the difficulty patients have in getting his experimental Antineoplaston therapy due to the FDA. Whatever the FDA's concerns are, the problem remains they are denying patents with life-threatening diseases access to this therapy. Many only have a few months to a year to live and this treatment is essentially their last hope.

Following those Commerce hearings, the FDA met with members of the committee and assurances were given that Dr. Burzynski's patients and those seeking his treatment would be accommodated. Unfortunately, his patients on clinical trials are on hold and dozens of terminally ill cancer patients who want his lifesaving therapy cannot get it. For whatever reasons the FDA claims to defend this situation, they fail to recognize that people's lives and rights are being trampled in this process. I do not see how the FDA is serving

the public when, by its actions it prevents a child with a brain tumor or a young woman with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, from getting a treatment these individuals and their families have been informed about and have freely chosen to pursue. In essence, the FDA is telling someone battling a disease like cancer that they cannot have a potential life-saving treatment. For many of these patients, this treatment is their last resort after being told to get their affairs in order and essentially wait to die.

Legislation has been introduced with wide bipartisan support by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon, to address this problem, called the Access to Medical Treatment Act (H.R. 2019). It has 40 Members in the House cosponsoring this legislation and has both Senate Minority Leader DASCHLE along with Senate Majority Leader DOLE and a dozen Senate cosponsors on a similar bill in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker. I just want to say that as we continue down the path toward FDA reform, let us be mindful of patients with life-threatening diseases who are grasping at their last hopes to continue to live.

GASOLINE PRICE INCREASES OUTRAGEOUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, and I know the Speaker is well knowledgeable about this, to speak about the sudden and outrageous increases in prices of gasoline that consumers in California and across the Nation have had to face.

As you know, gasoline prices in California have gone up 40, 50, 60 cents a gallon. They threaten to go even further, and there seems to be no market reason why this has occurred. There is no emergency, there is no situation that would seem to have caused this drastic escalation in prices.

Consumers are outraged, I am outraged. My colleagues from California and I have joined together to ask for an investigation of this situation by the Attorney General to see whether any monopoly or other practices have been involved.

At the same time that these increases have occurred, the major oil companies have reported 40-, 50-, 60-percent increases in their profits from the previous year. So it is clear that this rise in price in gasoline is tied directly to the rise in profits of our major oil companies.

Now, the Speaker of the House visited California over the weekend and announced that he would ask the Congress to repeal the recently added gasoline tax of 4 cents or so a gallon. I welcome the Speaker's attention to the problems of consumers in California, but I think he has deliberately taken our eye off the ball to focus on an ex-

traneous issue. The issue is the 50-, 60-cents-a-gallon increase, the issue is the 40-, 50-, 60-percent profit margins that have recently occurred by the oil companies. The issue is not the 4-cent-a-gallon Federal gas tax.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Speaker helps us to solve our problems in California by helping us focus in on the issues and not take our eye off the issues to support some special interest friends of his and his party. So I look forward to working with the Speaker to look into this outrageous increase in gasoline prices, to find the real reason for it, and to try to bring the consumer some relief from this outrageous price increase.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. FURSE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BALLENGER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes each day, on April 30 and May 1.

Ms. PRYCE, for 5 minutes each day, on April 30 and May 1.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. FARR of California.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 30, 1996, at 12:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2545. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1994 describing the activities and accomplishments of programs for persons with developmental disabilities and their families, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6006(c); to the Committee on Commerce.

2546. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Manufacturing