

District 2: Jessica Monique Lieftring, Andy Rummel.

District 3: Rachel Carlson, Brent M. Frey.

District 4: Kimberly Bogue, Paul Vaughn.

District 5: Beth Rhodes, Jim Champlin.

District 6: Sarah Prange, Tom Nicholson.

District 7: Betsy Ann Villwock, Robert Morris.

District 8: Gillian Robertson, David M. Kuhns.

District 9: Jenny Gogel, Brent D. Williams.

District 10: Corinne Beiersdorfer, Mack Dyer.

1995-96 COUNTY WINNERS

Allen: Angie Mann, Matthew Hallien.
Bartholomew: Gillian Robertson, David M. Kuhns.

Boone: Mary Gibbs, Sean Strawmyer.

Carroll: Brent Frey.

Cass: Rachel Carlson, Matthew Blume.

Clay: Braiden Jackson, Robert Morris.

Dearborn: Corinne Beiersdorfer, Michael Heffelmire.

Decatur: Leah Nahmias, Jesse Abell.

Dellaware: Kindra Harvey, Hans Buckley.

Dubois: Jenny Gogel, Alvin Boeglin.

Elkhart: Andy Rummel.

Fayette: Kate Muggleworth, Leighton Wood.

Franklin: Andrea Meyer.

Fulton: Lyndsey Hazen.

Gibson: John Kiefer.

Greene: Jacob Pirtle.

Hamilton: Tom Nicholson.

Hancock: Sarah Prange.

Howard: Kimberly Bogue.

Huntington: Sara Beaver.

Jackson: Jamie Lambring, Justin Steward.

Jay: Martina Caldwell, Paul Vaughn.

Jefferson: Erin B. Geyman, John Adam Hoffman.

Knox: Betsy Ann Villwock, Drew Hecht.

Kosciusko: Jessica Monique Lieftring, Kurt Kammerer.

Lake: Becky Cochran, Peter Felus.

LaPorte: Amanda Yeakey, Chris Smith.

Madison: Christy McDermit, Billy Kessinger.

Marion: April Grant, Michael O'Keefe.

Marshall: Emely Ryan, Wesley Myers.

Montgomery: Beth Rhodes, Jacob Brown.

Morgan: Jim Champlin.

Newton: Lea Stoller, Justin Pruitt.

Noble: Jillian Bolen, Justin Bradley.

Pike: Jennifer Lloyd.

Porter: Beth Doshan, Bill Bohling.

Posey: Laura DeShields, Brian Clem.

Rush: Marla Lynn Bacon, Jeremy Waits.

St. Joseph: Dawn Nagy, Neil Herceg.

Scott: Jessamine Cutshall.

Spencer: Stacy Kern, Nick Frey.

Starke: Regina Yost, Kenton Altman.

Switzerland: Jessica McCord, Mack Dyer.

Vanderburgh: Lesley Keil, Brent D. Williams.

Wabash: Noelle Myers.

Warrick: Amanda Kaiser, Andy Emmons.

Washington: Mary Pavey, Cameron England.●

COMMENDING ENDANGERED SPECIES NEGOTIATIONS

● Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the past 2½ years Congress has debated the reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act. The issues have been divisive and controversial. The issues have been so volatile that for over a year there was a moratorium on the listing of species, which the proponents argued was necessary to reform a flawed listing process. Obviously, others of us disagreed over the impact of the moratorium and we fought to have it repealed.

Even more telling is the intense polarization that has existed among the many different interests, including large land owners, environmental groups, State and local governments, and public service organizations. For too long the disputing sides in this controversy have devoted more of their energies to furthering that polarization than to finding workable solutions to real problems.

For the past 1½ years, I have indicated to the Environment and Public Works Committee chairman, Senator CHAFEE; the ranking member, Senator BAUCUS; the Drinking Water, Fisheries and Wildlife Subcommittee chairman, Senator KEMPTHORNE, that I want to see the Endangered Species Act reauthorized with necessary reasonable reforms. Clearly as different pieces of legislation were offered in both Chambers of Congress, no progress was made for some time.

However, in a Herculean effort, some organizations representing all of the many different perspectives and interests sat down in a series of meetings and have actually come up with a reform package to the Endangered Species Act. The following were part of the process, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Center for Marine Conservation, the World Wildlife Fund, the Nature Conservancy, the National Realty Committee, and the Western Urban Water Association, and two very significant companies, Georgia Pacific and Plum Creek Co. They were joined from time to time in their discussions by representatives of the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and the Western Governors Association. These groups began their talks about the same time that we in the committee began our bipartisan discussions. I don't know at this point whether all that this private compromise accomplished will be incorporated into legislation; but I do know that their effort, in fact, assisted our process here.

When Members of the Senate of opposite parties start meeting over legislation, we call it responsible compromise. When some of the private interests sat down to work out compromises on the Endangered Species Act, they were isolated and scorned by the right and left. Consequently, these groups have suffered because they tried to assist the larger public good. And isn't the public good exactly why we are here?

Ultimately, the only way to overcome the polarization that has characterized this debate about the Endangered Species Act is to do what these folks have done. They reached across the considerable gulf that separates the environmental and regulated communities in a good faith effort to find common ground.

Whether we are able to incorporate all of the substance that they arrived at is still uncertain, but I do know that it is true compromise and a respectable effort at finding consensus. This process these organizations have engaged in

will be immensely helpful to Senator CHAFEE, myself, and others who are searching for good, creative ideas on this highly charged issue.

So, I have committed myself to a sincere examination of their work in light of the negotiations we are conducting in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I hope that their good faith effort may be a model for dialog and communication to build the consensus necessary to build even stronger support for an effective endangered species conservation effort.●

DOROTHY RABINOWITZ

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, on Saturday morning last, Nat Hentoff devoted his ever-insightful column to a tribute to Dorothy Rabinowitz. Much deserved; beautifully accomplished. I ask that Mr. Hentoff's column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1996]

SHE LISTENED TO THE CHILDREN—AND HAD SOME DOUBTS

(By Nat Hentoff)

I.F. Stone, one of my mentors in this business, used to tell young reporters: "If you intend to use the First Amendment to change the world, forget it. If you're lucky, you may be able, over time, to make small, incremental changes."

Once in a while, however, a journalists does make a big difference, even rescuing innocent people from prison—and changing the way many other journalists cover a particular kind of story.

For much of the past 10 years, Dorothy Rabinowitz has been rigorously investigating cases of preschool teachers and others around the country who have been convicted of sexual child abuse. She first became involved in the New Jersey sentencing of Kelly Michaels to 47 years in prison on 115 counts of bizarrely molesting 20 children from the ages of 3 to 5. (One child testified that Michaels had turned her into a mouse. Others said the teacher made them eat a "cake" of her feces.)

The press at the time found the testimony of the accusers entirely convincing, and a Pulitzer Prize winner, Anna Quindlen, then a columnist for the New York Times, urged her readers to "believe the children."

Rabinowitz interviewed everyone she was able to reach, including the furious parents of the allegedly abused children. She also obtained transcripts of the state's "investigators" who questioned the children until the kids gave the required answers.

I also had those transcripts. The manipulation and intimidation of the children was so obvious that if the trail had not been about sexual violations of kids, the charges would have been dismissed. The prosecution did not introduce a single piece of physical evidence to support the charges and the children's stories.

After five years in prison, Michaels was released because lawyers who had read Dorothy Rabinowitz's investigative pieces volunteered to prove her innocence. By then, most of the press had come to the belated conclusion that somehow an injustice had been done, but there were no apologies.

Rabinowitz had joined the Wall Street Journal by then, writing commentary. But an inveterate reporter, she bases her commentaries on research that comes from legwork.

Although she writes on other issues, Rabinowitz continues to confront prosecutors and juries who have convicted defendants accused by children—coached by therapists and law enforcement “specialists” in sexual abuse. As Alan Kors, a history professor at the University of Pennsylvania, notes: “What Rabinowitz has disclosed to full public scrutiny and understanding is sadly reminiscent of Europe’s witch-craze—a jurisprudence of leading questions, socio-pathology, disregard of evidence and logic, and careerism joined to fanaticism.”

In the Massachusetts Amiraaults’ case, Rabinowitz’s persistent stories finally led to the release from prison of two of the three defendants. She has not given up on the third. In the *Boston Globe*, critic at large Ed Siegel emphasizes that Rabinowitz was “the first journalist to provide in-depth reporting on the case” and “her series had a ripple effect.” And Malcolm Gladwell noted in *The Post* that “the Amiraaults’ case became a national cause celebre because of doubts about the veracity of the children’s testimony against them.” Those doubts came largely from stories in the *Wall Street Journal*.

A movie could be made about Dorothy Rabinowitz, journeying alone, to the city of Wenatchee in the state of Washington, where many have been charged and imprisoned on the testimony of children in a nightmarish setting that resembled a fusion of the TV series “Picket Fences” and a Stephen King novel.

A local television reporter, Tom Grant, told me he had to fight to get air time to report the story, which he nonetheless did with much courage in a town that had aspects of 17th-century Salem, Mass. This year, Grant received a George Polk Award for local television reporting.

He says, however, that Wenatchee became a national concern because of Dorothy Rabinowitz. “Six months after I started on the story,” he said to me, “Dorothy came and everything exploded. Then the other media came.”

Rabinowitz was a finalist for a Pulitzer Prize in commentary this year, but was not considered worthy. Some members of the ultimate Pulitzer Board had been told—as one of them assured Tucker Carlson of the *Standard*—that she had had no effect on the local situations she wrote about. So much for accuracy of reporting on high.

In 1965, when the august Pulitzer board overruled a music jury award to Duke Ellington, he said: “Fate doesn’t want me to be too famous too young.” Ellington easily survived the ignorance of the Pulitzer Board. And Dorothy Rabinowitz also knows she is worth a lot more than one of its prizes.●

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

DR. PHILIP M. BLATT

● Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, few of us are ever called upon by our genes to bear a burden comparable to that which is borne by those in lifelong contention with the condition known as hemophilia. Even fewer of us, I believe, whatever physical burdens we may be obliged to bear, ever encounter a physician such as my friend and neighbor in Delaware, Dr. Philip M. Blatt, a hematologist who treats many patients suffering from hemophilia.

On Wednesday, May 15, Dr. Blatt will be honored by the Delaware Valley Chapter of the National Hemophilia Foundation, not merely for applying

his medical skills to helping his patients survive, but especially for the warm, human, caring manner in which he does so.

Hemophilia, which affects the ability of the blood to coagulate and thus can make even a minor injury into a major threat from the uncontrollable loss of blood, tends, in a sense, to isolate its victims. They know that they must manage their lives with an uncommon degree of caution and avoidance. They know that what might be a negligible scratch for someone else can, in their case, become a life-threatening wound. And because of the fragility of their blood, they must often undergo constant treatment—and that necessity, in the years before the effect of the AIDS virus was known, placed many of them innocently at risk to that deadly disease.

It would be very easy, Mr. President, for any victims of hemophilia to suffer as much from the psychic as from the physical effects of their condition—to perceive themselves as put upon through no fault of their own, to think of themselves as the outcast victims of a genetic condition totally beyond their control—but not so easy if they are Philip Blatt’s patients.

Dr. Blatt knows that his hemophilia patients suffer from a condition that has an almost all-consuming effect on their lives, but goes to great lengths to make sure it does not consume their spirits. He knows that their hemophilia makes them relative rarities among the general run of people, but he never forgets that they are—first, foremost, and always—people, with the same general inheritance of strengths and deficiencies we all share, with the same rights and responsibilities, with the same dreams and aspirations.

Philip Blatt is not a doctor who simply treats his patients’ frailties, but a physician in the classic tradition who treats them as whole persons, and who cares not only about saving their lives but also about helping them keep their lives whole and rewarding. He practices medicine in its finest sense, and it is that quality, Mr. President, for which the Delaware Chapter of the National Hemophilia Society will honor him this week, as I do today here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.●

THE BATTLE OF ADWA

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, recently I was catching up on my reading and I read in a bulletin published by the Embassy of Ethiopia the speech of President Negasso Gidada on the 100th anniversary of the battle of Adwa.

Frankly I had never heard of the battle of Adwa before reading this speech but because of its insight into this historic event as well as insights into Ethiopia I ask to have it printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

Ethiopia and its neighbor Eritrea, who divided into two countries peacefully after years of struggle, are both making progress.

It is good to see the progress that Ethiopia is making and I congratulate President Negasso Gidada and the people of Ethiopia on their steps forward.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY DR. NEGASSO GIDADA ON THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE BATTLE OF ADWA

[The following are selected excerpts from the speech of President Negasso Gidada on March 2, 1996, in Addis Ababa]

Dear Peoples of Ethiopia, Invited Guests and Friends of Our Country:

At the outset, I wish on behalf of all the peoples of Ethiopia, to express my heartfelt joy as we celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Victory of Adwa, an event that is accorded a special place of honor in our long history of struggle to safeguard our independence.

A hundred years have passed since the victory of the battle of Adwa, a victory which is a source of pride not only to us Ethiopians, but to those peoples of Africa and other continents who suffered under colonial rule. Today, all over our country we are celebrating with great joy the one hundredth anniversary of the victory achieved at Adwa by our heroic fathers who, with their fervent patriotism, halted the invasion designed to subjugate us under the colonial yoke forced upon our African brothers at the end of the last century.

This victory achieved by our heroic fathers over Italian colonialists at Adwa, the centenary of which we celebrate with great color today, had special significance not only for Ethiopia but for the anti-colonial struggle of all the African peoples.

It is to be recalled that it was in the last quarter of the previous century that the rich European countries decided to divide up Africa among themselves to satisfy their demand for raw materials and markets. Following their decision, European powers invaded all parts of Africa. They deployed highly organized armies equipped with modern arms with the objective of subjugating under direct colonial rule the African countries, most of which were relatively at low levels of development. Africa and her peoples sank into the darkness of colonialism.

The colonial powers keen to exploit the wealth and labor that Africa provided them, sought to insure that no country remained free in Africa and began planning to bring Ethiopia under their control. After having labored to weaken our country earlier through various smaller acts of aggression, they eventually launched an all out invasion in 1896. The invading force deployed by Italian colonialists was, however, dealt a crushing blow by our gallant forebears on March 2, 1896 at Adwa. Ethiopia and her peoples were saved from falling under colonial rule. The colonialists suffered great humiliation.

The historic victory scored at Adwa, coming at a time when our continent was suffering from foreign domination, had the strong effect of marking a new chapter in the anti-colonial struggle of the African peoples. The victory of Adwa provided a great example for our African brothers to rekindle their struggle to regain their freedom with new vigor and hope. The victory of Adwa contributed greatly to the intensification of the struggle of black peoples all over the world for their right to live in dignity and equality. Adwa provided a vivid example not only for Africa but for peoples the world over suffering under colonialism and racism to revitalize their struggle.

It is because of these features signaling light at the end of the dark tunnel of colonialism to the peoples of Africa that we say that the victory of Adwa, beyond being a war between Italian invaders and Ethiopia, had a special meaning and dimension for Africa.