

A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE OF THE
HONORABLE JOHN MORENO**HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1999

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, as a former Member of the California Legislature, it is with particular sadness that I offer this Memorial Tribute to a pioneering colleague, the Honorable John Moreno, late a retired Member of the Assembly, 51st District from 1962–1964.

Assemblyman John Moreno was one of the first Latinos elected to the California Legislature in the 20th Century. A native son of Los Angeles, California, he won election in 1962 from what was then the 51st Assembly District, encompassing parts of East Los Angeles, Santa Fe Springs, Pico Rivera and Montebello. These same communities that I now proudly represent in my 34th Congressional District, were very honorably and well represented by my distinguished predecessor during a time of historic growth and achievement in the State of California.

One of Assemblyman Moreno's major accomplishments in office was winning passage of a bond issue to build Rio Hondo Community College in the 1960's after three earlier bond measures had failed. He also helped the college district avert bankruptcy through legislation that allowed it to prolong a tax override and complete construction of the campus in 1966.

Assemblyman Moreno demonstrated leadership on a host of important legislation including civil rights, aid to the aged and support for farm workers. He served on the state Compensatory Education Commission and co-authored a bill that funded special programs for disadvantaged students, including youths from migrant families and those who were learning English.

John Moreno began his political career as a member of the first City Council of the City of Santa Fe Springs, California. He was a driving force behind city incorporation in 1957 and later served as Mayor. Before entering the Assembly, he taught elementary and high school for 11 years in Pico Rivera, Whittier and Los Angeles. He served in the Navy during the closing months of World War II, then attended the University of Southern California, earning a Bachelors degree in 1951. After leaving the Legislature, he moved to Washington, D.C., where he taught school and opened a home improvement business. He later moved to New York City and ran his business there until retirement in 1992.

The Honorable John Moreno was one of just a few remarkable minority candidates to break through the heavy obstacles of institutional racism during an era when legislative districts were routinely gerrymandered to prevent Mexican-Americans and other minorities from holding elective office. He and his few Latino colleagues paved the way for future generations of Latino elected leaders, including myself, where today the Latino Legislative Caucus in the California Legislature numbers 7 state Senators and sixteen Members of the Assembly, including the past two consecutive Speakers of the Assembly.

John Moreno passed away August 19, 1999 at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York. He was

72 years of age. He is survived by his wife of 18 years, Judith Anderson, four daughters and two sons from a previous marriage, and two sisters.

Mr. Speaker, I join with his many friends and admirers, former constituents and the cities and communities of his Southeast Los Angeles County district in mourning his loss and paying tribute to his many outstanding accomplishments and dedicated service to others.

IN HONOR OF THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE FOREST CITY
PARK CIVIC ASSOCIATION**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the Forest City Park Civic Association of Cleveland, Ohio on its 60th charter anniversary. The Civic Association marked its anniversary with a celebration on August 10, 1999.

The Civic Association dates back to May 11, 1939 when it was first chartered by the state of Ohio as a non-profit, non-political organization. It was the first group in southeast Cleveland to set up a vigorous Neighborhood Improvement Program which served to catalyze similar programs in other communities.

The Forest City Park Civic Association has also pioneered many other activities during its 60 years of existence. They have been involved in a Green Up campaign to plant trees and shrubs throughout the community along with civic participation in pollution control and abatement. Other activities of the Civic Association entail garden tours, picnics and street parties for the community.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the members of the Forest City Park Civic Association on their anniversary and salute them for sixty years of civic service and continuing their dedication to the community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH AN-
NIVERSARY OF ST. HELENA HOS-
PITAL'S FIRST OPEN HEART
SURGERY**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1999

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize St. Helena Hospital as it celebrates its 25th anniversary of the first open heart surgery in the hospital's Cardiac Center. Located in my hometown of St. Helena in the Napa Valley, St. Helena Hospital is one of the country's premier medical facilities. But I don't say that just because this is the hospital where my mother, my father, one of my sons and I were born and where my wife, Janet, worked as a nurse in the Intensive Care Unit.

The St. Helena Hospital has an outstanding cardiac care facility. It began in May of 1974, when Wilfred Tam, M.D. performed the North Bay's first open-heart surgery at St. Helena Hospital. This made St. Helena Hospital one of the first community hospitals to perform the

procedure. The surgery was just one in a series of firsts in the region for the hospital's Cardiac Center, which opened in 1972. Today, St. Helena Hospital's Cardiac surgery team has more than 68 years of combined surgical experience and has performed more than 15,000 open-heart surgeries.

Recognized as a pioneer and a leader in cardiac care, St. Helena Hospital has continued its tradition of high-tech innovation. In 1997, it was the nation's first hospital to purchase the Medtronic Octopus, a device that immobilizes the beating heart during minimally invasive bypass surgery.

Installed in 1993, St. Helena Hospital's digital by-plane cardiovascular catheterization suite was the first of its kind in the United States. Work is scheduled to begin this year to upgrade the hospital's other suite with new, state-of-the-art equipment.

To celebrate its quarter-century of excellence in cardiac care, St. Helena Hospital is hosting a community celebration on September 26, 1999 honoring the physicians and staff who make the Cardiac Center a leader in heart health, and also honoring the "Mended Hearts" for whom they have cared over the years.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we acknowledge and honor the St. Helena Hospital Cardiac Center for its outstanding Cardiac Center and for its tremendous twenty-five year commitment to providing the very best in quality health care.

DRUG INTERDICTION OR DRUG
SMUGGLING?**HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend to you the attached article from earlier this summer written by Mr. Frank Calzon, entitled "Behind Castro: Money laundering, drug smuggling." Mr. Calzon is the executive director of the Center for a Free Cuba in Washington, D.C. and is a tireless fighter for democratic causes. I encourage my colleagues to learn from his insightful article.

BEHIND CASTRO: MONEY LAUNDERING, DRUG
SMUGGLING

State Department and Coast Guard officials last week flew to Havana seeking "to improve U.S.-Cuban cooperation on drug interdiction."

If the Clinton administration would look to history, it would have known that it was a vain mission and would set about probing instead the relationship between Colombia's drug trade and the guerrilla movements over which Fidel Castro exercises inordinate influence.

Havana complains that it lacks resources to combat drug trafficking. But, even if one accepts this at face value, it is unclear how the United States should respond. Should we provide resources to the Cuban Ministry of the Interior—Havana's KGB-Gestapo? Do it while holding in federal custody Cuban spies charged with gathering information about military bases in Florida and linked to the shootdown of the Brothers to the Rescue pilots?

Havana has managed to purchase state-of-the-art radio-jamming equipment and foot the bill for thousands of foreigners to visit

the island and condemn the U.S. embargo. Could it be that inadequate funding for drug interdiction is simply the result of Castro's misguided priorities?

In 1982 a federal grand jury indicted four high-ranking Cuba government officials, including a vice admiral of the Cuban navy and a former Cuban ambassador to Colombia. They were charged with facilitating the smuggling of drugs into the United States.

In 1983 then-President Ronald Reagan said that there was "strong evidence" of drug smuggling by high-level Cuban government officials. And in 1989 Castro executed several Ministry of the Interior officials and Cuba's most decorated army officer, Gen. Arnaldo Ochoa, allegedly involved in the drug trade. Castro did so after years of suggesting that U.S. accusations of drug smuggling were lies "concocted by the CIA." He has never explained how widespread Cuba's involvement with narcotrafficking was then or how a military and national hero such as Ochoa, with no oversight over Cuba's harbors or air-space, could have been involved.

Then there is the mystery of how several hundred million dollars appeared in the coffers of Cuba's National Bank. Castro's American supporters assert that \$800 million is sent by the Cuban-American community every year to relatives. However, given the relatively small number of Cuban-American households who still have relatives in Cuba, it is mathematically impossible for that community to generate such funds. The amount is approximately equivalent to the income Cubans derived in 1997-98 from its main export: sugar. Money laundering and drug smuggling are the logical sources of this mysterious income.

It should be noted that, despite major narcotics charges brought against Ochoa and the other Interior Ministry officers, no accounting was ever presented of what should have been multimillion-dollar payoffs.

Claims of Castro's cooperation with U.S. anti-narcotics efforts are a rerun of the Noriega saga. Panamanian strongman Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega currently is serving a long, federal sentence for his role in the drug trade. He had extensive ties to the Cuban dictator. Evidence was presented at his trial that Castro once mediated a dispute between Noriega and the Medellin drug cartel.

Nevertheless, Gen. Barry R. McCaffrey, the Clinton administration's drug czar, recently said that there is "no conclusive evidence to indicate that the Cuban leadership is currently involved in this criminal activity." The general seems to be unaware of a report released by his own office in March, titled "1998 Annual Assessment of Cocaine Movement." It states: "Noncommercial air movements from Colombia to the Bahamas were most prolific in 1998. Most flights fly either east or west of Jamaica, and subsequently fly over Cuban land mass." It adds that the cocaine flown over Cuban territory is dropped "in or near Cuban territorial waters."

Given Castro's sensitivity concerning unidentified aircraft flying over Cuba, as evidenced by the Brothers to the Rescue shootdown, it is inexplicable that not one drug-smuggling airplane has ever been shot down over the island.

There are those who believe that the Cuban leopard has changed his spots. Maybe. But the consequences of taking Castro at his word can be tragic. The impact of the drug epidemic on America's youth is far too important to allow the facts linking Castro to the drug trade to be swept under the rug.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 417) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes:

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Shays-Meehan Campaign Finance Reform Act and urge my colleagues to vote against all "poison pill" amendments that will be offered today. I am proud to cosponsor this bipartisan legislation, which represents the best, real opportunity to reform our broken campaign finance system.

The issue of campaign finance reform cuts to the essence of democracy. Our unique American political system will not survive without the participation of the average American citizen. Unfortunately, more and more Americans are dropping out—with each election, fewer Americans are voting. They are doing so because they no longer believe that their vote matters. As they see more and more money pouring into campaigns, they believe that their voice is being drowned out by wealthy special interests.

Despite the cynicism of the American public, Congress has failed to enact significant campaign finance reform legislation since 1974. In that year, in the wake of the Watergate Scandal, Congress imposed tough spending limits on direct, "hard money" contributions to candidates. Unfortunately, no one at that time foresaw how two loopholes in the law would lead to a gross corruption of our political system.

The first loophole is "soft" money—the unregulated and unlimited contributions to the political parties from corporations, labor unions, or wealthy individuals. "Soft" money allows wealthy special interests to skirt around "hard" money limits and dump unlimited sums of money into a campaign.

During the 1996 election cycle, approximately 30 percent of all large federal contributions came in the form of soft money to political parties. Both parties raised soft money at a 75 percent higher rate than four years ago. For the 2000 elections, it is estimated that soft money spending will exceed \$500 million—more than double the total for the 1996 elections.

Soft money is used to finance the second loophole in campaign finance law: sham issue advertisements. This loophole allows special interests to spend huge sums of money on campaign ads advocating either the defeat or election of a candidate. As long as these ads do not use the magic words "vote for" or "vote against" they are deemed "issue advocacy" under current law and therefore not subject to campaign spending limits or disclosure requirements.

During the 1996 elections, the television and radio airwaves were flooded with these sham issue ads—many of which were negative attack ads. Americans who see or here these ads have no idea who pays for them because

no disclosure is required. They drown out the voice of the average American citizen, and even sometimes of the candidates themselves. Without reform, we can certainly expect a huge increase in these sham issue ads.

The Shays-Meehan bill begins to restore public confidence in our electoral system by closing these two egregious loopholes. The bill bans all contributions of soft money to federal campaigns. Specifically, it bans national party committees from soliciting, receiving, directing or spending soft money. The bill also prohibits state and local parties from spending soft money on federal election activity.

In an effort to ban campaign advertisements that masquerade as "issue advocacy," Shays-Meehan tightens the definition of "express advocacy" communications. Under the bill, any ad that is clearly designed to influence an election is deemed "express advocacy" and must therefore abide by federal contribution and expenditure limits and disclosure requirements. Shays-Meehan includes well crafted language that specifically exempts legitimate voter guides from the definition of "express advocacy."

The Shays-Meehan bill would not prevent public organizations from running advertisements, but it would ensure that ads clearly designed to influence an election are regulated under federal law. We have laws clearly designed to regulate and disclose campaign donations and expenditures, and no one should be allowed to evade them. Shays-Meehan would ensure that everyone involved in influencing elections plays by the same rules.

Opponents have argued that the Shays-Meehan bill undermines the First Amendment right of free speech. However, the Supreme Court has ruled that Congress has a broad ability to protect the political process from corruption and the appearance of corruption. It has upheld as constitutional the ability to limit contributions by individuals and political committees to candidates. The Supreme Court has also clearly permitted Congress to distinguish between issue advocacy on the one hand, and electioneering or "express advocacy" on the other.

The Meehan-Shays proposal will not cure our campaign finance system of all its evils—and I certainly support more far reaching restrictions on campaign contributions and expenditures. However, the bill will take a modest but significant first step toward restoring integrity in our political system. It will limit the influence of wealthy special interests and help to restore the voice of average American citizens in our political process. In short, enactment of this legislation is essential to the survival of American democracy.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON H.R. 2756, "FAIR COMPETITION IN TAX-EXEMPT FINANCING ACT OF 1999"

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1999

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in August I introduced H.R. 2756, the "Fair Competition in Tax-Exempt Financing Act of 1999", which has been referred to the Ways and Means Committee. As a general proposition I believe