

testing for a new protease inhibitor and deserves the full support of Congress.

S. 2021, legislation I introduced with my colleague Senator BOXER, would eliminate the tariff for several chemical compounds which are required for the manufacture of an AIDS drug, nelfinavir mesylate, which has produced promising test results.

PROTEASE INHIBITORS

Nelfinavir is one of a new class of AIDS drugs called protease inhibitors. These drugs are designed to block an enzyme, called protease, that appears to play a crucial role in the replication of HIV.

During the 11th International Conference on AIDS in Vancouver, British Columbia, researchers released evidence that protease inhibitor drugs, when taken in combination with existing therapies, can reduce levels of the AIDS-causing virus in blood to levels so low that the virus is undetectable by even the most sensitive tests. AIDS researchers at the conference describe this new drug therapy as a major and unprecedented step in combating AIDS, one that may represent a treatment approach that may delay the onset of AIDS, extend patients' lives, and transform AIDS into a long-term, manageable disease.

Mr. President, HIV/AIDS is a critical public health issue, requiring the Nation's full attention. In America today, AIDS is the leading cause of death for young Americans between the ages of 25 and 44.

In my State of California, 1 out of every 200 Californians is HIV positive, while one of every 25 is HIV positive in my home of San Francisco.

More than 220,700 American men, women and children died of AIDS by the end of 1993. While the number of deaths trails other urgent health priorities such as cancer or heart disease, AIDS is nearly equally debilitating to the Nation when measured by the years of potential and productive life lost due to the disease.

AIDS is a paramount public health concern and every effort should be made to ensure that drugs are made available as swiftly and at as low a cost as possible. We simply cannot delay or waste time in providing drugs, treatments or materials needed to fight this disease. This tariff legislation represents a modest, but important, step.

ZERO TARIFF FOR PHARMACEUTICALS

Under the 1994 GATT agreement, most pharmaceutical products are entitled to enter the country without a tariff. However, the zero tariff does not apply to many new pharmaceutical products or their chemical ingredients. As a result, the chemicals needed to make nelfinavir mesylate, an AIDS protease inhibitor currently undergoing research testing, but not yet a recognized pharmaceutical product under GATT, would be ineligible for the pharmaceutical zero tariff.

During negotiations with World Trade Organization nations to imple-

ment the pharmaceutical zero tariff, the administration successfully added the chemical compounds needed to manufacture the AIDS drug. As a result, the tariff will drop to zero on April 1, 1997.

Nelfinavir is on the Food and Drug Administration's fast-track approval process for AIDS drugs. Commercial production of the drug will begin well before April 1, in order that the drug can be immediately available to AIDS patients upon FDA approval. Although currently imported duty-free for use in clinical research trials, the imported chemicals will soon be used for commercial production. During the period of commercial production prior to April 1, the chemical compounds will face a 12 percent tariff, which will only add to the cost and delay the drug's production and distribution to individuals in need.

Fifteen days after enactment, this bill will eliminate the tariff for two of the essential and unique chemical inputs, as well as for the active ingredient nelfinavir, acid chloride, chloroalcohol and AG 1346, until April 1, 1997. On April 1, the tariff drops to zero under the WTO pharmaceutical agreement. Without this legislation, the manufacturer would face a 12 percent tariff for its chemicals, which are not available in the United States, as the drug proceeds into production. This tariff reduction will allow for the acceleration of drug production, providing more timely relief for the public.

The Congressional Budget Office reviewed S. 2021, concluding the legislation will have only a de minimis impact on tariff revenue. However, for AIDS patients, their families and those at risk, the impact may be profound. Congress should take this opportunity to reduce tariffs for these AIDS chemicals.

As a matter of public policy, we should do everything we can to develop AIDS drugs and treatments. Without this legislation to remove the tariff, we will be tolerating needless hurdles and delay, rather than expediting needed relief. Patients and their families do not have time to wait for the next round of drugs to be approved and added to the zero-tariff list, which is scheduled for review in 1999. By importing the chemical compounds without a tariff, we can accelerate the drug development process.

Ambassador Barshefsky and others in the Administration deserve tremendous credit for extending a zero tariff for these chemical components through international negotiations. I am pleased to support Chairman ROTH and Senator MOYNIHAN, the Finance Committee bill. I also wish to thank California Representatives BILL THOMAS, ROBERT MATSUI and BRIAN BILBRAY for their bipartisan efforts to build support on the House. The legislation represents an encouraging step forward.●

DAVIS-BACON REFORM IN THE 105TH CONGRESS

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, throughout the 104th session, Congress and the American people sought new ways to enhance the training, health care, and retirement security of the Nation's workforce. Statistics tell us that our economy is healthy, stronger than it has been for years, yet, our sense of personal economic security has been shaken. News articles of corporate downsizing and consolidations have disturbed the confidence in the American economy.

Under a much harsher economic umbrella, Congress, 64 years ago, intent on sustaining a construction industry already ravaged by the economic instability of the Great Depression, reasoned that the destructive practices of the Southern contractors would be best resolved by requiring that Federal contracted labor be paid the locally prevailing wage, thereby halting the tendency of Government contractors to drive down workers' wages in order to win lucrative projects. Thus, I believe today, more than ever, we need the Davis-Bacon Act to enhance the training, health care, and retirement security of the Nation's work force. The dividends of the Davis-Bacon Act are pervasive: a ready pool of trained and highly skilled construction workers, decreased construction accidents and the injuries and fatalities that are caused thereby, and the contributions to local, State, and Federal tax revenues that can only be made by working men and women.

As Governor of Oregon, I signed that State's little Davis-Bacon Act into law 37 years ago, and I have supported the intelligent use of the prevailing wage standard in Government contracts since.

Mr. President, Davis-Bacon has been debated year after year, and I do agree with opponents of Davis-Bacon that it needs revision. I emphasize that we need reform of Davis-Bacon and not repeal, as my colleagues agreed on May 22 of this year when 99 Senators voted in support of Davis-Bacon reform and not repeal. As my colleagues well know, it has been my objective during the 104th Congress to enact several long overdue changes to the 65-year-old Davis-Bacon Act, which enforces a prevailing wage standard on Federal construction projects. In the final hours of the 104th Congress, I ask the Members of the 105th Congress to reflect on the progress that was made under my Davis-Bacon reform bill, S. 1183. For example, 7 Republican cosponsors and 19 Democrats cosponsoring S. 1183 for a total of 26 cosponsors serves as a simple illustration of the progress that was made under the 104th Congress toward Davis-Bacon reform and not repeal.

Mr. President, I ask those who adamantly support Davis-Bacon repeal to harken to the cry of Davis-Bacon reform. The Davis-Bacon Act as it now stands, indeed deserves some of the

criticism that has been levied against it by some of my distinguished colleagues. Nevertheless, its purpose of protecting the jobs of our Nation's construction workers must persuade us to reform, rather than repeal, the act. I ask my colleagues who support repeal, do we continue to live under a Davis-Bacon law, which we agree needs reform, or continue on under current law which will not be repealed now or in the foreseeable future. The logical answer is to support and vote for sensible reform, as in my bill S. 1183. The Davis-Bacon reform bill which I sponsored is supported by the building trades unions and several coalitions of contractors groups whose 21,000 members across the Nation perform major construction projects covered by Davis-Bacon.

I urge my colleagues who will remain in this great body and the new Members who will arrive in the Senate and House in January to continue this bipartisan, management-labor compromise for it provides us with a rare window of opportunity to pass the reforms that Davis-Bacon urgently requires. Such broad-based support for Davis-Bacon reform was and is extraordinary on Capitol Hill and I hope that it can be recreated in the next Congress. ●

DR. CHRISTINA JEFFREY

● Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I have been contacted by my constituent, Dr. Christina Jeffrey of Kennesaw, GA, who was formerly the historian for the other body.

Dr. Jeffrey has asked that I place in the RECORD materials which would help correct unfounded media reports about her professional reputation. I am pleased to do this for Dr. Jeffrey because I have long noted the fact that the media is sometimes quick to report the negative, but slow to report corrections.

I know of Dr. Jeffrey from her service as a volunteer with other academicians on my nonpolitical advisory board which selects young men and women to serve as interns in my Senate offices. Based on what I know regarding her reputation among her colleagues who know her best, Dr. Jeffrey is a person of integrity with a genuine interest in public service as well as higher education.

It is sad that in this city, both elected officials and staff are often subjected to accusations and actions that go far beyond the bounds of fair play. I hope the following material helps clarify the facts involving Dr. Jeffrey's professional reputation.

The material follows:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, March 22, 1989.

Hon. RICHARD SHELBY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SHELBY: Your letter to Secretary Cavazos concerning Dr. Christina Price has been forwarded to me for reply.

Dr. Price's concern is understandable. She was generous in acting as a reviewer for the

National Diffusion Network (NDN) on the application for funding of a curriculum entitled "Facing History and Ourselves." Denial of that funding application has created an extended controversy, and disclosure of her comments in the media has created a great deal of misunderstanding about both the program and Dr. Price's own views.

I believe Dr. Price was acting in good faith, and was delivering honest opinions, when she reviewed "Facing History." She argues that here comments were written in a kind of academic shorthand, not for public consumption, and that in no way did she intend to convey an attitude of racism or anti-Semitism. We accept her contention. And to the extent that any Department of Education official has characterized Dr. Price herself as racist or anti-Semitic, we do indeed apologize.

However, it is also true that some of Dr. Price's review comments were ambiguously phrased, and that portions lifted out of context and reprinted in the media could lead an objective reader to conclude that she favored presenting the Nazi or KKK point of view in the interests of "balance or objectivity." While the best education about any historical issue requires an understanding of the motivations of all parties, the teaching of the Holocaust demands clear delineation between good and evil. To the extent that outside observers believed Dr. Price to be advocating a morally neutral approach to the teaching of the Holocaust—and to the extent that they further believed this represented the position of the Department of Education—it is not surprising that they would raise strenuous objections.

It should also be noted that under the Freedom of Information Act, the Department of Education was required to release a list of reviewers, and the evaluations of the projects submitted by them, without identifying which reviewers made which comments. We complied with FOIA requirements in supplying this information. Dr. Price was informed of this policy in a letter from Dr. Shirley Curry, director of the Recognition Division, on November 19, 1986. It read in part: "Your review of applications for grants becomes part of the official government record and will be a determining factor in choosing who will be funded. If requested, applicants will be given copies of the reviewers' comments. However, the names of the reviewers will be removed from the review instruments before being sent out."

The most difficult aspect of this episode is that I am sure Dr. Price feels as strongly about appropriate teaching of the Holocaust as we do (and for that matter, as strongly as those who created the "Facing History" curriculum). She did what was asked in good faith. Unfortunately, what she wrote left room for misinterpretation.

In the event that this controversy continues, you may rest assured that I will do everything possible to ensure that no further confusion arises, and that no one in this Department casts aspersions on the character of Dr. Price.

Thank you for your interest in this matter. Since you wrote on behalf of Dr. Price, we trust you will be providing her with a copy of this response.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA HINES,
Assistant Secretary.

CATHOLIC LEAGUE,
New York, NY, September 26, 1996.

Hon. SAM NUNN,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR NUNN: As president of the nation's largest Catholic civil rights organization, I am delighted to write a letter of support for Dr. Christina Jeffrey. Dr. Jeffrey,

as the public knows, was terminated as House historian on the grounds that she promoted the inclusion of the Nazi perspective in Holocaust curriculum.

What the public does not generally know is that Dr. Jeffrey is a determined anti-Nazi scholar whose reputation has been unfairly maligned by uninformed ideologues. It was a disgrace that she was terminated in the first place, and it is doubly disgraceful that her reputation remains unfairly tarnished. That is why I am appealing to you to clear her name by submitting this letter, and others like it, into the Congressional Record.

I have spent most of my life as a college professor, and, having taught Political Sociology, I know that it is important for students to understand the mind-set of those who sponsor genocide. Yes, in the hands of a Nazi sympathizer, such a pedagogical approach could be misused to engender empathy for terrorists. The same is true of virtually any topic of an incendiary nature. But when taught by someone with the impeccable moral credentials of a Dr. Jeffrey, such an orientation can yield very positive results, both scholarly and morally. After all, if the goal is to stop another Holocaust from ever happening again, it is critical that everyone know the psychology and social soil in which genocidal ambitions flourish.

Dr. Jeffrey represents the very best of her Catholic training: she wants to help craft a world where injustice does not prevail. It is a travesty that injustice has been visited upon her, even if those who perpetrated it remain sadly ignorant of her character, intentions and effects.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. DONOHUE,
President.

GEORGIA CONFERENCE, AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS,

Carrollton, GA, October 24, 1995.

Re Christina Jeffrey.

To: Whom it May Concern.

From: Don Wagner.

The national office of the American Association of University Professors, in response to a request from the Georgia Conference-AAUP, wrote to Secretary of Education Richard Riley to protest the treatment which Dr. Christina Jeffrey received from the Department of Education, i.e., the release of her name without her knowledge or permission in conjunction with a grant review she did for the Department in 1986. This treatment led ultimately to her being fired as House historian by House Speaker Newt Gingrich. The peer review process is designated to be confidential and the Department, when it breaches that promised confidentiality, damages the whole system, and can, as we saw in Dr. Jeffrey's case, unfairly harm the individuals involved. The Department of Education responded to our inquiry positively and shares our concerns about confidentiality and Dr. Jeffrey's case.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS,

Princeton, NJ, October 31, 1995.

The National Association of Scholars is pleased to endorse the public vindication of Professor Christina Jeffrey, to whom we extend every good wish for the rehabilitation of her career. Now that a fair reading of the evidence has finally been rendered, no one could possibly doubt her complete professional integrity and basic human decency. Clearly, she is no Nazi sympathizer or crank racist, and it is regrettable that her reputation has had to endure such calumny.

It is just as clear, however, that this entire incident should never have occurred. When in 1986 Professor Jeffrey was invited by the US Department of Education to evaluate