

THE SILICONE BREAST IMPLANT  
RESEARCH AND INFORMATION  
ACT

**HON. GENE GREEN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 25, 1999*

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Commerce Subcommittee on Health, I am committed to ensuring patients have complete and comprehensive access to information before they make a decision about a medical procedure.

To this end, I am proud to re-introduce the Silicone Breast Implant Research and Information Act because I believe it is critical to the advancement of women's health and is the first step towards answering the many questions about the safety and efficacy of silicone breast implants.

By re-introducing this bill today, I along with the 41 original cosponsors, hope to draw attention to an issue that has been either neglected or out right ignored for too long.

It is estimated that as many as 2 million women have received silicone breast implants over the last 30 years. Unfortunately, the information provided to these women before they elected to have silicone breast implants has been both incomplete and even inaccurate.

Moreover, results from past studies have only raised more questions about possible negative effects that ruptured or leaking silicone breast implants may have on breast milk, connective tissue, autoimmune diseases and the accuracy of breast cancer screening tests.

Our legislation ultimately seeks to change this by focusing on three critical points—information, research, and communication.

First, and in my opinion most importantly, this bill will ensure that information sent to women about silicone breast implants contains the most up to date and accurate information available.

Current information packets sent to women do not accurately describe some of the potential risks of silicone breast implants. While recent studies by the Institute of Medicine indicate the rupture rate may be as high as 70 percent, information sent to women suggests the rupture rate is only 1 percent.

Second, this bill encourages the director of the National Institutes of Health to expand existing research projects and clinical trials. Doing so will compliment past and existing studies and will hopefully clear up much of the confusion surrounding the safety and efficacy of silicone breast implants.

Finally, this bill establishes an open line of communication between federal agencies, researchers, the public health community and patient and breast cancer advocates.

Women, especially breast cancer patients, want and deserve full and open access to silicone breast implants. Therefore, it is critical that these products are safe and effective, and that women are provided complete and frequently updated information about the health risks and benefits of silicone breast implants.

While I unequivocally support a women's right to choose to use silicone breast implants, I believe we have a responsibility to support research efforts that will provide the maximum amount of information and understanding about these products.

Recently, I met with a group of women who had silicone breast implants. One of them

shared with me her story about trying to get health insurance after she received her implants. To my dismay, it is standard operating procedures for several health plans to deny health insurance for women with breast implants. And this was a healthy woman! This story only reinforced my belief that silicone breast implants may cause very serious health problems.

The day has come to answer the questions and find out what is causing so many women who have implants to get sick. I hope each of you join me in support of this important legislation.

THE REFORESTATION TAX ACT OF  
1999

**HON. JENNIFER DUNN**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 25, 1999*

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, on March 11 when I introduced the Reforestation Tax Act of 1999, my statement focused on the benefits of this legislation to the forest products sector of our economy. Today, as I add eight more cosponsors to this increasingly popular effort, I would like to focus my remarks on the benefits for non-industrial forest land owners.

America's privately-owned forests make up almost 58% of our nation's total forest lands and are one of our most valuable resources. They provide wildlife habitat, maintain watershed health, and are used for a wide array of recreational activities such as hiking, camping, fishing, and hunting. In addition, they provide the foundation for a multi-billion dollar forest products industry.

To ensure that our wildlife habitat and watershed needs as well as a reliable supply of timber is available for the future, we need to encourage industrial and nonindustrial landowners to invest in enhancing their forest ownership. Investing in forest land is risky. Trees can take anywhere from 25 to 75 years to grow to maturity, depending on the type of tree, regional weather, and soil conditions. The key to success is good management, which is costly. Furthermore, fire, disease, floods, and ice storms—events that are uninsurable—can wipe out acres of trees at any time during the long, risky growing period.

The Reforestation Tax Act of 1999 will remove disincentives for private investment in our forests and help with the cost of maintaining them. By reducing the capital gains paid on timber for individuals and corporations by 3 percent each year the timber is held—up to a maximum reduction of 50 percent—forest landowners will be partially protected from being taxed on inflationary gains. While this provision would not fully compensate for the negative tax impact of inflation, it would provide a significant incentive for those forest land owners who must nurture their investment for a long period of time.

Today, many landowners cease reforestation efforts when they reach the current \$10,000 ceiling on expenses that are eligible for the credit. Removing the cap on expenses eligible for the credit would eliminate a disincentive for private forest land owners to plant more trees. Current law allows this \$10,000 in reforestation expenses to be amortized over a seven year period. My legislation

not only eliminates the monetary cap but also reduces the amortization period to five years. With these changes, the reforestation tax credit and amortization will encourage forest landowners to operate in an ecologically-sound manner that leads to the expansion of investment in this vital natural resource.

By removing these current law disincentives to sustainable forestry for both our industrial and non-industrial forest land owners, we will increase reforestation and enhance sound environmental management on private land. We believe this will benefit Americans across the country, not just forest land owners.

I am grateful for the broad support the Reforestation Tax Act of 1999 has gained since its introduction, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to make this bill a reality.

JUSTICE FOR ATOMIC VETERANS  
ACT—H.R. 1286

**HON. LANE EVANS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 25, 1999*

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Congresswoman BERKLEY, I am today introducing H.R. 1286 the Justice for Atomic Veterans Act. This important legislation provides a presumption of service-connection for certain radiation-related illnesses suffered by veterans who were exposed during military service to ionizing radiation. These veterans include those who participated in atmospheric testing of a nuclear device, who participated in the occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki between August 6, 1945 and July 1, 1946 and who were interned as prisoners of war in Japan during World War II and were therefore exposed to ionizing radiation.

During their military service, these veterans put their lives and health at risk. They were, in most cases, sworn to secrecy concerning the nature of their work. They were not provided with adequate protection from radiation. The amount of radiation to which they were exposed was not measured. Albert "Smokey" Parrish, a veteran who served at the Nevada test site wrote "We, the Atomic veterans feel like an innocent man in prison for life, and no one will listen to the facts of the case."

Under present law, veterans who engaged in radiation risk activities during military service are entitled to a presumption of service-connection for some illnesses, but for other illnesses veterans must prove causation by "dose reconstruction estimates" which many reputable scientists have found fatally flawed. Because of the recognized problems inherent in dose reconstruction, last year, the Department of Veterans Affairs Deputy Under Secretary for Health, Dr. Kenneth Kizer, wrote that he personally recommended strong support as a "matter of equity and fairness" for legislation similar to the Justice for Atomic Veterans Act which was then proposed by Senator WELLSTONE.

It is not the fault of veterans that accurate records of their exposure to ionizing radiation were not kept and maintained. In fact, many veterans have been not been able to obtain their medical records relating to their exposure during military service despite their best efforts. Records have been lost and records of

radiation-related activities were classified and not made available to the veterans seeking compensation.

According to Dr. Kizer, "the scientific methodology that is the basis for adjudicating radiation exposure cases may be sound, the problem is that the exposure cannot be reliably determined for many individuals, and it never will be able to be determined in my judgment. Thus, no matter how good the method is, if the input is not valid then the determination will be suspect."

Our atomic veterans were put in harm's way in the service of our government. However, our government failed to collect the data and provide the follow-up that would enable our atomic veterans to effectively pursue claims for the harm which resulted.

Further, Congresswoman BERKLEY and I agree with the statement in the 1995 final report of the Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments: "When the nation exposes servicemen and women to hazardous substances, there is an obligation to keep appropriate records of both the exposures and the long-term medical outcomes."

Our Nation failed to keep records on the exposures experienced by our atomic veterans. Veterans should not suffer for that neglect. Let us right the injustices visited on our atomic veterans since the days of World War II. Congress should enact a presumption of service-connection for illnesses which are likely to be due to radiation risk activity. Our veterans deserve this simple act of justice.

#### PROTECTION OF AMERICAN WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS FROM MUSCULOSKELETAL DISORDERS

### HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 25, 1999*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recommend that OSHA be enabled to continue its work on protecting American workers and employees by preventing Musculoskeletal injuries and other injuries at the workplace of America. An update of OSHA guidelines (which have been extensively and voluntarily used by employers for the last 10 years) is timely.

American employers currently spend \$15–20 billion/year on disability and absenteeism due to work-related musculoskeletal disorders, not considering the legal costs of law suits filed by employees. The total cost to the American society is about \$60 billion/year due to medical costs and lost productivity of injured employees.

The ergonomics of work is a well-studied field by scientists in academia and NIOSH and the conclusions from that research point that most musculoskeletal disorders caused by the unsound ergonomic practices could be avoided if guidelines by OSHA were implemented at the workplace, thus protecting workers from unnecessary suffering and saving money for employers. While the regulations by OSHA may be improved and made more efficient, flexible and responsive to the needs of a particular employer, OSHA's capability to protect American workers and employers should be maintained.

I believe that the costs of efficient OSHA regulations for protecting workers from musculoskeletal injuries are minuscule in comparison with the cost of maintaining the status quo and continuity of costly musculoskeletal injuries in the workplace.

#### HONORING JACK STARK UPON HIS RETIREMENT

### HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 25, 1999*

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, Jack Stark, the President of Claremont McKenna College, after nearly three decades of outstanding leadership, is retiring in July of this year. He will be succeeded by Pamela Brooks Gann, currently Dean of Duke University School of Law.

For thirty years, the world of higher education has been roiled by change. The free speech movement of the 1960's, the first challenge to campus authority, was succeeded by demands for black and other ethnic studies, by the anti-war movement, by sit-ins and violent demonstrations against ROTC. Then came contests over affirmative action in admission and faculty hiring, the challenge to courses in Western Civilization, "Gay Rights," and the passions aroused by "political correctness." Throughout this turmoil, Claremont McKenna College, unlike so many other academic institutions, has held firmly to its founding mission—and it has prospered mightily.

Jack Stark kept CMC on course through these stressful years, built its endowment, raised admission standards, and recruited distinguished faculty. If this were the sum of Jack Stark's achievement, we would honor him as one of the nation's great academic leaders. It is not only as a conservator, however, but also as an educational innovator that he deserves our attention.

Jack Stark built on the campus of CMC—a small, private, undergraduate liberal arts college—nine research institutes, each different in its scholarly focus, but each contributing to the education of CMC's one thousand students.

The first to be founded was The Henry Salvatori Center for the Study of Individual Freedom in the Modern World. The Salvatori Center supports the study of the conditions essential to the preservation of liberty, and under its directors, Ward Elliott, Ralph Rossum and Charles Kesler, has contributed vigorously to intellectual debate.

The Rose Institute of State and Local Government, which was founded 25 years ago this April, specializes in survey research, fiscal analysis, and database development. The Institute authors studies of political and demographic trends, and its student team is trained in many aspects of computer-aided research. Its Board Chairman, Al Lunsford, refers to it as an "unmatched resource of data and analysis in its geographical area of focus," and under its long-time director, Dr. Alan Heslop, the Institute has built a formidable reputation.

The third to be founded was The Institute of Decision Science, which provides practical experience in economic and mathematical mod-

eling, decision-making, and risk analysis for industry, government and the professions. It sponsors research and presents conferences on topics in decision science. IDS and its director, Janet Myhre, are frequently consulted by government agencies and major industrial corporations.

Next to be founded was The Lowe Institute of Political Economy. Initially under the direction of Dr. Craig Stubblebine, now headed by Dr. Sven Arndt, the Lowe Institute supports the study of major issues in economic policy. Recent work has focused on the North American Free Trade Agreement, APEC and on trade and regulatory policies.

The Keck Center for International and Strategic Studies was founded to support the study of critical issues in world affairs by sponsoring lectures, fellowships, visiting scholars, conferences, publications, and student internships. Its director, Dr. C. J. Lee, is an expert on Asia and has led the center in studies on Korean affairs.

The Family of Benjamin Z. Gould Center of Humanistic Studies, originally headed by Dr. Ricardo Quinones, now by Dr. Jay Martin, is dedicated to understanding vital issues of the modern world in light of the perennial values provided by literature, philosophy, and religion. Towards this end, it sponsors publications, visiting speakers, student and faculty research, and organized lecture series.

The Roberts Environmental Center uses an interdisciplinary approach encompassing biology, chemistry, economics, and political science to analyze environmental problems and to evaluate policy alternatives. Under its founding director, the late Robert Felmeth, and now under Dr. Emil Morhardt, it conducts field research, trains students in the use of analytical software and sponsors the Environment, Economics, and Politics major.

The Kravis Leadership Institute provides for the academic study of leadership and sponsors speakers, mentoring, internships, and the Leadership Studies Sequence. Its director, Dr. Ronald Riggio, has been one of the pioneers of leadership studies in psychology.

Most recent is the newly formed Berger Institute on Work, Family, and Children—the ninth of the institutes to be fathered by Jack Stark.

At their best, these nine CMC research institutes provide students and faculty with opportunities to engage together in the investigation of key public policy issues. Students get close, hands-on experience of the challenges—the chores as well as the joys—of scholarship. Typically, their work is not for academic credit: the students are paid, and as their responsibilities increase so does their remuneration.

Research on important subjects, produced by small faculty-student teams, funded by outside grants and contracts, is achieving a solid reputation for CMC's institutes. CMC students are making important extra-curricular gains by working with faculty specialists in methodologies they are sure to encounter in their later careers and on the important subjects that face our society. Every one of those CMC students owes Jack Stark a debt of gratitude. The world of higher education, too, would be wise to note this pioneering achievement at Claremont McKenna College.