

170 feet above the community. The bottle was originally used as a water tower built by the G.S. Suppiger Bottling Company which produced the Brooks Old Original Catsup. Built in 1949, the bottle holds up to 100,000 gallons of water.

After the bottling plant shut down, the bottle itself fell into disrepair. In 1993 a group of local preservationists began to raise funds with the purpose of refurbishing and preserving the bottle for its 50th anniversary as well as for future generations. More than 6,000 tee-shirts were sold to help raise money and thousands of volunteer hours were devoted to preserving an essential element of my community's heritage.

Now there are hopes that we can get the bottle placed on the National Register of Historic Places and that effort has my wholehearted support.

I commend the Catsup Bottle Preservation Group and Judy DeMoisy who manages Downtown Collinsville for their work in preserving a unique piece of Americana.

LET THEM EAT BEEF

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1999

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member commends to his colleagues an excellent editorial calling for an end to the European Union's irrational and improper beef ban which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald, on May 12, 1999.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, May 12, 1999]

LET THEM EAT BEEF

A showdown between the United States and the European Union over beef exports ought to be unnecessary. The United States has science and the World Trade Organization at its side. European controls on U.S. beef exports have little relationship with provable concerns.

For more than a decade, the European Union has banned the import of beef from animals that have been fed growth hormones. Such hormones are used in raising more than 90 percent of beef cattle in the United States. Their use is an effective way to make cattle grow faster and bigger.

The Food and Drug Administration has determined the substances safe. The World Trade Organization rule in 1997 that the European ban violated international trading agreements. The WTO said the ban was neither supported by science nor justified by any risk assessment. The WTO last year ordered the EU to abandon its policy by May 13, tomorrow.

A trade war looms unless the EU complies. U.S. officials have threatened to retaliate against European products if the ban, which keeps most American beef out of EU countries, is not lifted. Officials said they would impose 100 percent tariffs on more than \$900 million worth of European products, possibly including items such as mineral water, Belgian chocolates and Roquefort cheese. That could effectively price those products out of the U.S. market.

Trade policy-makers at the European Union have kept U.S. officials going around in circles for a decade. The coalition has made superficial changes designed to give the appearance of compliance with the WTO order. That has staved off trade sanctions in

the past. But a free market in U.S. beef has not materialized.

The U.S. cattle industry estimated that growers have lost export sales of about \$500 million annually since 1989, when America began exporting only hormone-free beef to Europe.

American cattle producers have suggested that the real problem is protectionism. European countries want to insulate their beef producers from U.S. competition. There is also the possibility of scientific ignorance—observers have noted a general European hysteria over mad cow disease and genetically engineered foods such as Monsanto soybeans. Too often, fear has been allowed to trump science.

American farmers and ranchers are especially efficient. They have invested in research and technology to keep themselves competitive. If the beef trade barrier is allowed to stand, despite science and the WTO, this nation's ability to sell its agricultural products overseas will become more vulnerable to illegal trade barriers, and its export position could be severely damaged.

The European Union's beef ban is irrational and improper. It risks a trade war that would harm people on both sides of the Atlantic. European consumers should have the chance to decide for themselves the worth and safety of the beef grown by America's farmers and ranchers. They will never get that chance unless their leaders bow to the WTO and lift the beef ban.

1998 SIXTH DISTRICT ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1999

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to share with my colleagues the tremendous work of some diligent young men and women in my district.

Each year, my office—in cooperation with junior and senior high schools in Northern Illinois—sponsors an essay writing contest. The contest's board, chaired by my good friend Vivian Turner, a former principal of Blackhawk Junior High School in Bensenville, Illinois, chooses a topic and judges the entries. Winners of the contest share in more than \$1,000 in scholarship funds.

Today, I have the honor of naming for the RECORD the winners of the 1998 contest.

Last year, Peter Meyer led Mary, Seat of Wisdom School in Park Ridge, Illinois, to a junior high division sweep by winning with an essay titled, "Ban Smoking in Restaurants," a text of which I include in the RECORD. Placing second last year in the junior high division was James Troken, followed in third place by Eva Schiave, both of whom also attended Mary, Seat of Wisdom School.

In the Senior High School Division, the first place award went to Julie Kostuj of Driscoll Catholic High School in Addison for her essay, "Freedom of the Press," a text of which I include in the RECORD. Shahzan Akber of Blenbard North High School in Glen Ellyn took the second place prize, and Nicole Beck of St. Francis High School in Wheaton placed third.

BAN SMOKING IN RESTAURANTS

(By Peter Meyer)

Did you know that most of your taste comes from your sense of smell? If you are in

a restaurant where people are smoking, how can you taste your food? Although you can request a nonsmoking section for your seating, the harmful smoke from the smoking section is still present in the air you are breathing. That air can cause cancer. A law banning smoking in all restaurants in Illinois will make your meal more pleasant while keeping you healthy.

Laws are very important. Laws protect us from harm, help us when in need, and preserve our rights and freedoms as United States citizens. When citizens feel the need for additional protection, laws are passed. Currently there is no law protecting people completely from secondhand smoke in restaurants, yet, secondhand smoke is the third leading cause of preventable death in this country, killing 53,000 nonsmokers in the U.S. each year.

We need a law banning smoking completely in all restaurants in Illinois. The current Illinois law bans smoking in public places except in designated smoking areas. It says a smoking area should be designed to minimize the intrusion of smoke into areas where smoking is not permitted. Nonsmoking sections do not eliminate nonsmokers' exposure to secondhand smoke, the smoke does not remain in the smoking section. Secondhand smoke has been proven to be a serious health risk. Even the Illinois General Assembly finds that tobacco smoke is annoying, harmful, and dangerous to human beings and a hazard to public health.

Secondhand smoke is a mixture of the smoke given off by a cigarette, pipe, or cigar, and the smoke exhaled from the lungs of smokers. The Environmental Protection Agency has classified secondhand smoke a Group A Carcinogen—a substance known to cause cancer in humans. There is no safe level of exposure for Group A toxins. Nicotine is not the only toxin nonsmokers are exposed to in secondhand smoke. Smoke from the burning end of a cigarette contains over 4,000 chemicals and forty carcinogens including: formaldehyde, cyanide, arsenic, carbon monoxide, methane, and benzene.

Smoke-filled rooms can have up to six times the air pollution as a busy highway. Second-hand smoke does not quickly clear from a room. It takes about two weeks for nicotine to clear from the air in a room where smoking has occurred. In addition to being a carcinogen, second-hand smoke causes irritation of the eye, nose, and throat. Passive smoking can also irritate the lungs leading to coughing, excess phlegm, chest discomfort, and reduced lung function especially in children. Secondhand smoke may effect the cardiovascular system, and some studies have linked exposure to secondhand smoke with the onset of chest pain.

When smoking is banned in restaurants, customers will not be exposed to secondhand smoke. They will be able to eat without suffering from the irritation of smoke, increasing their ability to enjoy their meal. Developing children will have healthier lungs. Restaurants will no longer have to pay to operate expensive ventilation systems and will be able to seat more people by not having to maintain separate sections. People who find smoke offensive will not be doomed to eat in the fast-food restaurants that have banned smoking. Smoke-free restaurants may discourage people from starting or continuing to smoke.

Smoking is already banned in most public buildings. Current laws allowing a smoking section in restaurants do not prevent exposure to secondhand smoke. People are involuntarily exposed to smoke which is a carcinogen and a health hazard. Banning smoking in restaurants will continue the effort to improve public health and reduce health costs. Food in restaurants will taste better and eating will be more enjoyable.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

(By Julie Kostri)

Although, according to the United States Constitution, everyone in America has the right of free speech, I believe that in some ways the press abuses its right to free speech. The writers of the Constitution intended everyone to have a right to voice their opinions without being prosecuted by the law. Today, however, the press does more than just profess their views. Publicists often tell lies and proclaim them as facts. As a strong influence in the lives of every American, the media can easily sway public sentiment and ruin the reputation of celebrities.

The media has a right to report facts. It is also acceptable to broadcast opinions as long as it is made clear that what is printed or said is one's own views and not a proven fact. The press has the right to address social grievances, but publicists must be informed on the issues. It would cause much confusion in the public if a distinction was not made between truths and personal views. The population would never know what to believe, and there would be chaos. The media has crossed the line when it uses misleading propaganda or defames a celebrity. In one's own home, around close family and friends, it is acceptable to state whatever one wants. However, there is a difference between sharing your views with a group of friends and printing your opinions in a newspaper or broadcasting them on national television. Publicists should use prudence and common sense when determining what is acceptable to be read or hear by millions. The media often does not realize its great power and the trust that Americans have in the media. It is detrimental to use this power without discretion. Celebrities especially can have an injured reputation and be discriminated against by something the media declared about them.

It is very difficult for the government to prevent abuses by the press without violating a constitutional right. The government has passed laws outlawing libel, but libel is very hard to prove in court. The press can find a loophole in just about everything that they print. The First Amendment basically gives the media the right to say anything and assemble whenever it wants.

The press morally has an obligation to print the truth, but the media more often than not cares more about sales than ethics. As long as the American population continues to read these stories in the newspaper or listen to them on the news, the problem will not stop. The general public has the liberty to buy what it wants. People should not purchase newspapers and magazines in which there are articles in poor taste. The media tailors to the public. The population should not be controlled by the media. The people of this nation have a right to call for higher standards of workmanship.

Individuals have a right to privacy that the media should not invade. According to the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, every citizen has the "right to life, liberty, and property." People's individual rights are often violated by the media. Journalists are many times guilty of harassment. They cannot take "no" for an answer. Some of the most tenacious journalists will go to great lengths to get a story. Reporters will trespass on private property and harass people until they get what they want.

I do not believe that celebrities are less entitled to privacy than the general public. Every American is equal in the eyes of the law. Celebrities do not have any less rights than the common resident. However, celebrities do usually tolerate the media better than the commoner because celebrities have an image to worry about. Celebrities know

that if they are rude to the press, the media could easily destroy them.

Although the press is given freedom of speech in the Constitution, I believe that the rights of the individual precede the rights of the press. When personal rights are being violated by the media, then the government has to intervene. The American population should demand that more laws be passed to protect them from the injustices of the media. The press can be regulated by the government without violating a Constitutional right. Just as written in the Second Amendment to the Constitution, every individual has a right to bear arms. However, for the protection of the majority of people, the government has limited the kinds of arms that civilians can own, and it is illegal to carry a concealed weapon. With limits, United States citizens are still allowed to bear arms. There is no reason why the government cannot regulate the freedom of speech of the press without taking their Constitutional liberties away.

CRISIS IN KOSOVO (ITEM NO. 4)
REMARKS BY TONY ELGINDY DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH & TRADING, PACIFIC EQUITY INVESTIGATIONS

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 1999, I joined with Representative CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY and Representative MICHAEL E. CAPUANO to host the second in a series of Congressional Teach-In sessions on the Crisis in Kosovo. If a peaceful resolution to this conflict is to be found in the coming weeks, it is essential that we cultivate a consciousness of peace and actively search for creative solutions. We must construct a foundation for peace through negotiation, mediation, and diplomacy.

Part of the dynamic of peace is a willingness to engage in meaningful dialogue, to listen to one another openly and to share our views in a constructive manner. I hope that these Teach-In sessions will contribute to this process by providing a forum for Members of Congress and the public to explore alternatives to the bombing and options for a peaceful resolution. We will hear from a variety of speakers on different sides of the Kosovo situation. I will be introducing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD transcripts of their remarks and essays that shed light on the many dimensions of the crisis.

This presentation is by Tony Elgindy, Director of Research & Trading for Pacific Equity Investigations. Mr. Elgindy is not a professional aid worker. He is a dedicated and committed individual who has adopted a personal role in helping his fellow human beings who have been brutalized by this ongoing tragedy. Mr. Elgindy shares his observations and experiences with us, speaking in graphic and moving detail. He was instrumental in bringing 30 refugees out of the Kosovo area to the United States, the first group of refugees to arrive in our country. Among these displaced families were Sefkije Ferataj and her 2 year old daughter, Besarta. Both of them appeared at this second Congressional Teach-In. Following his presentation in a May 1, 1999, article from

the Chicago Tribune that describes what the Ferataj family encountered when they reached Chicago. These documents give a very real, human face to the Crisis in Kosovo.

PRESENTATION BY TONY ELGINDY TO CONGRESSIONAL TEACH-IN ON KOSOVO

I'd like to first apologize, having just gotten here in the States from Macedonia. I don't have prior prepared remarks. I would like to thank everyone for having this opportunity to share what I've seen, and to assist me in trying to define some sort of forward momentum here.

Upon my arrival in Skopje, Macedonia which is approximately 23 km. south of the border, I saw my first camps. We went to the border, saw Serb activity on the border, and talked to refugees.

It's difficult to know from my standpoint exactly where to start. I don't know if it's with the random torture, the beatings, the sadistic mutilation of women, their unsafe enslavement, the taking of eyes of women and children, the cutting off of ears, the burning alive of males, castration of young boys, I just don't know where to start. What's happening in Kosovo is a tragedy beyond anything you could ever watch on TV. There is no way for any of us to sit here today and understand what they are feeling, what they are seeing, or what they've endured. You cannot smell it here, you cannot hear it here. The Serbs are systematically burning evidence, destroying all traces of the atrocities, pulverizing ashes. There were flashes in the sky at night when we were trying to sleep from the NATO bombing. All of the relief workers that I met would be there during the day and leave there in the evening, leaving the camps to the Macedonian police. The crying and the grief intensified at night. And I don't know how anyone could tolerate it.

This is a Holocaust, undoubtedly. Holocaust Number Two. I'm not a politician; I'm a trader. I work on Wall Street, been doing it for 11 years. I deal with numbers. I've been fortunate enough to be able to help various relief organizations in the United States with money donations, connections, support, one of which is the Mother Teresa Foundation in Skopje. So I can't sit here and tell you what the results will be and what it will be like if we didn't bomb, or we stopped military action or we sent in ground troops or we never sent in ground troops. All I can testify is what I saw in my two weeks at the border of Kosovo.

Right now in America our markets are at an all-time high. We are swimming in money. The Internet, Dow Jones, and NASDAQ markets capture our focus, our imagination. And—I say this without trying to offend anyone—our greed has blinded us to what's happening elsewhere. And it became apparent to me that somewhere down the line their lives don't meet our standards for valuable commodities to protect. We are remote control-happy. We click through our channels one after another, and we all say yes, that's terrible and we go on to the next channel and we find a sitcom that we can sit down and watch for the rest of the evening. These people don't have that luxury. They cannot turn it off. They cannot switch channels.

Of the 30 refugees [he is helping to evacuate to the U.S.], six of them are family members—two close family members and four distant family members—of another U.S. citizen who accompanied me on the trip to find her family. The other 24 have no connections here in the U.S. It's a very difficult ordeal to obtain their visas, since the U.S. Embassy when we arrived wasn't allowing any refugees to come. And I used whatever