the next summit meeting of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. As long as Turkey continues to violate international law and its own commitments to OSCE principles, Turkey should not be considered an appropriate venue for a human rights summit. Such a privilege, Mr. Speaker, should be reserved for participating States that have demonstrated, in word and in deed, steadfast support for Helsinki principles and standards, particularly respect for basic human rights.

[From The Washington Post, Nov. 2, 1997]

BEFORE TURKEY JOINS EUROPE

(By Jim Hoagland)

Friend and ally to Turkey for half a century, the United States today plays a new role: pusher. The drug of choice is unrealistic ambition, fed by Washington to Ankara to keep the Turks cooperative.

The Clinton administration has correctly identified Turkey as the new ''front-line state'' in global conflict. It is the major crossroads of the religious, social and nationalist fractures of new-era politics, and gateway to the oil fields of Central Asia, Iraq and the Persian Gulf. Turkey counts.

But Washington is as weak at remedy as it is strong on diagnosis. In no other region of the post-Cold War world is the imbalance greater between a region's declared importance to U.S. interests and active, sustained U.S. involvement.

Instead the Clinton administration offers diplomatic opium to the Turks, suggesting that the answer to their problems is quick membership in the European Union, and then presses the Europeans to admit the Turks and overlook a few flaws here and there.

There is nothing inherently wrong with the U.S. goal of Turkish membership in the 15-member club of Europe's most affluent nations. A Turkey that fits into Europe economically and socially would be a more stable nation, as U.S. diplomats argue at international conferences and in increasingly acrimonious private exchanges with their European counterparts.

But Washington turns a blind eye to the self-destructive, addictive behavior of the Turkish military that makes EU membership in the near future a pipe dream. Worse: Washington denies its own responsibility for conditions that feed that behavior.

The Turkish military, which dominates the weak coalition government in Ankara, is not interested in harmonizing value added taxes, a perennial hot topic in the EU. The Turkish military expends its energies persecuting dissidents at home—a new wave of arrests of human rights activists was launched last week—and plunging deeper into a nasty civil war in neighboring northern Iraq.

For several weeks Turkish warplanes have been strafing Kurdish guerrillas in Iraq on a near-daily basis. Turkey has moved U.S.-supplied artillery into Iraq to fire on one Kurdish faction, and is dropping napalm on them from U.S.-supplied warplanes, Kurdish spokesmen say.

Turkey's involvement in the Kurdish civil war demolishes the notion that this is a distant, small conflict with no consequence for the United States. The White House pretends otherwise in its misleading reports to Congress and in its anesthetizing public statements playing up the ''success'' of U.S. policy in northern Iraq and Turkey.

The confusion of American purposes and methods is made clear by this officially unacknowledged, bizarre reality: The main targets of Turkey's current attacks inside Iraq are the guerrillas of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, an organization that receives at least $500,000 a month in covert support from the Central Intelligence Agency.

Official American money intended to finance peacekeeping has also been flowing to the PUK's Kurdish opponents, led by Massoud Barzani, who has allied himself with the Baghdad regime of Saddam Hussein.

The Turks are now weary of the vacuum that the United States has let develop in northern Iraq, a U.S. protectorate after the gulf war. They are also understandably upset about the heavy financial sacrifices the long U.S.-led economic blockade on Saddam has imposed on them. Frustrated and confused about U.S. goals, the Turks follow policies that will result in both Kurdish groups reconciling with Saddam, who will resume operational control of the north.

On top of this disastrous scenario, the brutal Turkish campaign pushes further and further away the day when Ankara would be accepted by the European Union. U.S. abdication in northern Iraq, and its self-imposed blindness to the regional consequences of that abdication, undermine its proposed solution for Turkey's problems.

This large, developing Muslim nation already faces nearly insurmountable hurdles in gaining EU membership. Germany, with 2 million Turkish residents and 500,000 Kurds on its soil, is terrified of new waves of immigration. The Europeans are also keenly aware that they are being asked by the Americans to provide more financial support for Turkey so U.S. help can decline.

Washington needs to acknowledge the damage its vacillating policy on Iraq has caused Turkey and offer financial compensation to Ankara. The deal must include Turkey's ending its human rights abuses at home and the border war on the Kurds, as part of a self-help program to get ready to join Europe.

Friends challenge self-delusion. They do not feed it.

TRIBUTE TO THE LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CORP. FOR POSITIVE EFFORTS MADE IN IMPROVING THEIR ENVIRONMENTAL RECORD

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer congratulations to the Louisiana-Pacific Corp. for turning around its performance in the area of environmental compliance. The Louisiana-Pacific Corp. is one of the Nation's leading building products manufacturers and operates a facility in my district at Olathe, CO. The facility in Olathe manufactures oriented strand boards [OSB] which are high-quality structural panels used in the construction of homes and commercial buildings.

To be fair, this facility has had its share of environmental problems. However, due to an extraordinary effort by the workers in this facility along with a solid commitment from the management of the Louisiana-Pacific Corp., this facility has completed the hard work necessary to meet its environmental compliance responsibilities. This is evidenced by a surprise inspection of this facility by the Environmental Protection Agency which occurred in August 1997. The quotation from the inspection team speaks for itself:

The general housekeeping of the plant was uncommonly good and the plant operations were well organized. Records and Monitoring data were complete, quickly available and easy to understand. Training was thorough, updated regularly and well tracked. Contingency and safety strategies were in place and well understood by managers and staff. Staff knowledge and attention to environmental compliance was good in all categories.

The results of this inspection are a source of pride for all at Louisiana-Pacific and the Olathe OSB plant. The plant was the pilot plant for the roll-out of Louisiana-Pacific's Environmental Management System [EMS], which is now being introduced to all of Louisiana-Pacific's OSB plants and will be introduced to all of Louisiana-Pacific's business units in 1998.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a portion of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies report regarding their inspection of Louisiana-Pacific's Loathe, CO OSB plant and once again say job well done to those at the Louisiana-Pacific Corp.

PRELIMINARY COMPLIANCE AGREEMENT AUDIT OF LOUISIANA PACIFIC CORPORATION—SEPTEMBER 16, 1997

BRIEFING WITH LPC CEO

The Audit Team met with Mr. Mark Suwyn, Chief Executive Officer (CEO), who provided a broad overview of what he has envisioned for LPC's environmental programs and culture changes instituted LPC as a result of the change in management since the Consent Decree and Agreement. The Audit Team viewed a video from series of videos that LPC has prepared for its employees. The video included an address from LPC's CEO to LPC's employees on, among other things, LPC's commitment to environmental laws and regulations. During the Audit Teams meeting with Mr. Suwyn, he also spoke of the Montrose Mill accomplishments in particular and the many changes that have been made at the mill as a result of the Consent Decree.

FACTS AND FINDING FROM INTERVIEWS

The following summarizes the questions asked and responses given by LPC personnel in reference to the Consent Decree and the Preliminary Compliance Agreement.

LPC Structure and Montrose Mill

LPC Structure and Montrose Mill

LPC restructured in 1996 into a geographical alignment and has been changed from Divisions to Regions. The Montrose Mill is no longer in the North Central Division. The North Central Division manager has been recently assigned to Portland Headquarters. He is currently stationed in Idaho. The Montrose Mill is part of the Northwest Region consisting of the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming and Colorado. Mr. Richard Flather is the Regional Business Manager. Each LPC Region has separate positions for a Regional Business Manager, and a Environmental Manager.

LPC uses two organizational structures: one for the Business side and the second for environmental compliance purposes. LPC formed five Environmental Compliance Regions:

Northwest (EPA Regions 8 and 10),

North Central—East (EPA Regions 1 and 5), EPA Region 2 would be included; however, LPS's Environmental Compliance Regional chart does not list any facilities in this Region at the time of this report.

Western (EPA Region 9),

South West (EPA Regions 6 and 7), and

South East (Regions 3 and 4).

LPC Installation of Facilities Pollution Equipment

The Montrose Mill installed the Wet Electrostatic Preciptators (WEPS) in 1996 at a

cost of approximately $1.5 million and it is being installed at all newer plants with some of the plants having 3 to 4 WEPS installed. The Regenerative Thermal Oxidizer (RTO) was installed at Montrose in 1996 at a cost of approximately $1.6 million. In total LPC has invested approximately $100 million in RTO's at eighteen (18) plants and RTO's will be installed at all new constructions and current plants under construction at the cost of $3.0 to $3.5 million per setup.

NEW MANAGEMENT EMPHASIZES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM

After Ms. Elizabeth T. Smith was appointed Director, Environmental Affairs in 1993, she and her immediate staff (four positions) trained the Plant Environmental Managers. The Plant Environmental Managers trained the assigned mill personnel. Ms. Smith meets quarterly with the Regional Business Managers and 20 to 30 Production Managers to ensure that the environmental programs are within compliance and meeting both the Consent Decree and the EPA Preliminary Compliance Agreement. Ms. Smith prepares a quarterly report regarding all environmental matters for the CEO and BOD.

Ms. Smith in conjunction with Plant Managers and in special cases with the Vice President, hired the Plant Environmental Managers or assigned a Plant Environmental Manager for each LPC plant/facility as directed in the Consent Decree. Ms. Smith stated that LPC is currently replacing the environmental managers with environmental professionals with three to four years of experience before appointments. There are currently four Regional Environmental Managers who report to Ms. Smith. They are:

Northwest Region—Randy Sandberg
North Central/East Region—Sue Somers
South West and South East Regions—Barb McGiness
Western Region—Dwayne Arino

The Audit Team reviewed the July 1997 Montrose mill monthly report submitted by the plant Environmental Manager, who has dual reporting to Ms. Smith and the Plant Manager. The reports are used as a monitoring tool and if there appears to be an environmental problem, Ms. Smith contacts the Plant Manager and/or Regional Business Manager. If the issues cannot be resolved in a short period of time and it is a major environmental issue, a Corrective Action Plan is put into effect.

To assist the Plant Manager in plant operations, he or she has a staff that consists of an Operations Manager, Supervisor of Production, and the Plant Environmental Manager. However, LPC's Plant Manager is totally responsible for environmental and production functions. The LPC Plant Manager is responsible for coordination and training of environmental and safety of plant personnel. Environmental and Safety functions are part of the LPC Plant Manager's position description.

Ms. Lundquist, VP for Operations, issued the ''Manufacturing—1997 Performance Plan'' that includes a performance evaluation base of 20% for Safety and 15% for Environment to all LPC Plant Managers. The background of the plan states ''Environmental compliance is a *must be* . . .'' and the objective is to support compliance goals and meet expectations of the Corporate Policy on Protection of the Environment and included as part of performance measures. Two important goals for 1997 are the Manufacturing Managers Tracking System for Correcting Environmental Compliance Issues by August 1997 and identifying best available technology for environmental compliance by December 1997.

In addition, in July 1997, LPC issued the LPC Environmental Management Charter, Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for ''Reporting Suspected Violations of Law'' and Environmental Management Responsibilities matrix listing duties and responsibilities regarding area of concerns: policy, reporting, promote compliance, audits, compliance programs, staffing, training, handbook, meeting, records, records retention, permits, operations, spill, upsets and violations, curtailment, inspections, waste minimization/energy use, environmental contracts, budgeting, plant closure, sale/purchase/lease of land, corporate acquisitions/divestitures and Consent Decree for each of the corporate environments consisting of: Corporate Environment, Business Group Environment, Regional Environment, and Plant Environment.

Ms. Smith Explained the (SOP) for Shut Down of Plants/Facilities. Authority extends from the CEO, Director Environmental Affairs, Regional Environmental Managers, Plant Managers, Plant Environmental Manager. Any one of them can close a plant down. She stated however, the most important person who can shut the production down is a production employee if he or she is aware there is a problem. She stated in reality the production employees are the ones who alert management of an environmental problem or potential environmental problems.

LPC has developed an Environmental Affairs Team ''Center of Expertise'' for managers to contact with problems or questions. In addition, LPC installed an internal ''Intra-net and Environmental Internal WEB Page'' for LPC employees to utilize for information.

A training course was developed regarding Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) that explains what PCBs' are, health hazards, regulations, management responsibility, and how LPC will handle monitoring, engineering, emergencies, transportation and disposal of PCBs'.

In addition, LPC developed ''Doing Something About It . . . '' for an August 14, 1997 training class at New Waverly Complex scheduled for reopening something in 1999 or 2000. It appears to be a very detailed course with a major array of environmental issues and compliance requirements in both English and Spanish.

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES (SOP) AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CHANGES

There was an in-depth discussion in this area. The following focuses on the major areas discussed. LPC has made major advances in SOP's for internal operations. They are currently in the process of updating their formal evaluation system of performance of Plant Managers to be rated on Production, Environmental, Health and Safety on an equal basis. LPC has developed an Environmental Management System (EMS) for mill operations. The Montrose mill served as the pilot and cutting down the time to respond to problems has been contributed to the EMS process

Performance Plans, Handbooks, and SOP's

The Audit Team reviewed the 1997 Environmental Affairs Performance Plan, the Manager's Environmental Handbook, and various LPC SOP's.

The Audit Team reviewed the 1997 Environmental Affairs Performance Plan dated August 13, 1997, which illustrated the status of programs and projects: as complete, in progress, or initiated. In addition, the plan contained additional projects and efforts for 1997.

The Audit Team reviewed the Manager's Environmental Handbook, which was very detailed and covered the entire array of environmental acts and programs. This handbook has been distributed to each Plant Manager.

The Audit Team reviewed LPC's Audit Privileged & Confidential SOP policy written in 1993 and is still the current SOP. Ms. Smith stated that the LPC internal audit process, which proved to be a valuable tool, was a major factor in her efforts to get changes made through the CEO.

The newly issued SOP for Environmental Audit Corrective Action Process effective April 25, 1997, was reviewed and this SOP explained the basic processes as: Root Cause Analysis, Corrective Action, Monthly Review of Issue Status, Monthly Report to CEO and Issue Corrected. To bring the environmental issue to ''Closure'', the Legal Department, the Department of Environmental Affairs and the Plant Manager must review and agree on the status of the issue and agree on closure. Then, the Legal Department will issue a final report to Senior Management, Director of Environmental Affairs, the Product Line General Manager and the Plant Manager stating that the issue(s) has been resolved. Follow-up audits or inspections by regional or corporate environmental personnel may occur to confirm that an appropriate correction has been satisfactorily completed.

Interviews were held with Mr. Don Smith, Audit Manager, and Mr. Bill Hossman, Environmental Assessment Coordinator. Mr. Smith stated that LPC uses a standard audit program and does special audits for the legal department and gave risk assessments as an example for special audits. Environmental Audits started in 1993 for specific risk assessments and has been expanded from specific risk to include financial and operations. The LPC audit team gives a two weeks notice and has an entrance and exit meeting with the plant manager. The Legal Department makes an evaluation of the audit report. LPC has 10 to 15 plants plus acquisitions that need audits. They have completed 70% of their audits with a target of finishing remaining audits by end of 1998. As a rule of thumb, each plant is audited every three years. The LPC auditor viewed closed plants as a significant risk and cite the PCB problems at closed plants as an example. Mr. Smith responded to the question, ''Were there common environmental problems at plants that led to changes to SOP's?''. He stated, ''Yes.''

REQUIRED PUBLISHED LETTERS AND/OR MANUALS:

LPC Code of Conduct

LPC issued the Code of Conduct instituted by the new CEO in April 1996 and distributed it to all employees by mail in April 1996. LPC, in addition, printed a Spanish version of the LPC Code of Conduct. Prior to that date there was no official LPC Code of Conduct publication.

Environmental Handbook

Mr. Harry Merlo, CEO transmitted by mail in January 1994 to all employees a copy of the LPC ''Environmental Handbook for Employees''. The letter in addition enclosed a copy of the ''Corporate Policy on Protection of the Environment'' adopted by the BOD in July, 1993.

Manager Environmental Handbook

LPC issued under CEO Harry Merlo the original ''Manager Environmental Handbook'' on February 24, 1995. A revised version dated May 1997 was distributed to managers in May 1997. The latest revision contains four (4) training modules as follows: Management Overview, Waste, Water, and Air.

In addition, the handbook includes a Questionnaire to assist in the goal of identifying environmental issues that will be addressed in the next 5 years by recommending that Plant Managers utilize the development of Corrective Action Plans as the ''Way to Go''.

TRIBUTE TO NOTED MASSILLON BASEBALL AND FOOTBALL COACH

HON. RALPH REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a special person, Carl Frederick (Ducky) Schroeder who died on November 1, 1997 after a brief illness. He was born on March 25, 1905 in Canal Fulton to Elizabeth nee Ruehling and Frederick Schroeder. He lived in the Massillon area most of his life. It was said that as a young boy, he spent much of his time swimming in the Ohio Canal and the Tuscarawas River, and that he used to ''walk like a duck on land'' hence the nickname ''Ducky.''

Ducky began his athletic career in Canal Fulton and Massillon where he was a standout in baseball and football. Upon graduation, Ducky played football at Kings College in Tennessee but subsequently transferred to Wittenberg University where he was a standout pitcher for three years. He also was a football star and still holds the record for most carries in one game—44 times for 176 yards while also playing linebacker on defense. After graduation Ducky went on to obtain a Masters Degree in Physical Education from Ohio State University.

Starting in 1930 Ducky embarked on a long illustrious career of public service as a teacher and coach. For example, up until he began his career at Washington High School, Ducky was head football and basketball coach at the Ohio Military Institute, Newcomerstown, Logan, and Salem High School and was Athletic Director for both the Springfield YMCA and High School.

On the collegiate and military level Ducky was assistant football and basketball coach at Mount Union College and was head football and basketball coach at Wittenberg University. For the WWII war effort, Ducky trained more than 700 Air Force cadets who later went on to become pilots.

However, it was his career in public service at Massillon for which he will be most remembered. In 1948, Ducky returned to Massillon High School where he taught and coached until his retirement in 1971. As head coach of the baseball team, he took the team to the state finals in 1955 and the state semifinals in 1960. During his 23 years as assistant football coach, the Tigers won 13 state championships and it was Ducky's job to supervise the winter conditioning program. He also coached several professional baseball and football players.

Ducky selflessly gave of his free time to promote sports. He was on the Big 33 Committee which led to five Ohio-Pennsylvania all star games. He was Secretary/Treasurer of the Ohio High School Football Coaches Association and was inducted into the Ohio High School Coaches Hall of Fame. Ducky was a past president of the Professional Football Hall of Fame Club in Canton. He also served as sales representative for the Rae Crowther Blocking Sled Company. In recognition for all his service to Massillon Athletics, he had one of the best high school baseball facilities dedicated to him—The Carl ''Ducky'' Schroeder Field.

In 1935, a group of athletics at Newcomerstown High School wrote Ducky upon his leaving that school. Their letter reads as follows: Dear Coach: On behalf of the colored boys of Newcomerstown High School, permit me to bid you a fond adieu. We regretfully say that you must leave us, because we consider you equal to or better than any coach who had been or shall be here. We admire you for showing no discrimination whatsoever, and we hope your future career of coaching will be onward and upward. Though our conduct at times was not commendable, we feel that your instructions were for the best. Though we have nothing to offer you as a remembrance of us, we hope you will sometimes think of us. The colored boys of NHS bid you farewell. Signed Matthew Scott, Booker Russell, Sidney Jones, Buster Cohen, Ed McCall, ''Fat'' Jones, Killie Sterns, Osie Dansby.

Ducky is survived by his wife of 63 years, Gertrude, his sister Helen Ellis, and numerous nieces and nephews, great nieces and nephews, and great great nieces and nephews. He was a longstanding member of St. John's Lutheran Church of Canal Fulton.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CREATE THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, the ''Sound Science for the Environment Act,'' along with Mr. ABERCROMBIE, that would create a National Institute for the Environment (NIE). The sole mission of the NIE will be to improve the scientific basis for environmental decision-making.

The United States spends more than $150 billion a year on pollution control and environmental clean up. Yet, less than 2 percent of that amount is spent on the background science to fully understand these problems before we legislate and regulate them. As we have seen on countless issues from clean air standards to endangered species habitat, from global warming to nonpoint source pollution, the credibility and impartiality of the science underlying our decisions is a topic of heated debate. However, very little has been done to provide unbiased science or to link it with policy-making. This legislation is an effort to put some substance behind the calls for ''sound science''.

Our legislation envisions the creation of the NIE within the National Science Foundation, a significant difference from similar bills I have supported in past Congresses. Operating as part of the NSF will provide the National Institute for the Environment with opportunities to function more effectively, and will accord it a position of stature within the scientific community.

Mr. Speaker, the NIE's sole purpose will be to come up with the best available science on a particular subject. That science will be used by us, the nation's lawmakers, who have been entrusted by our constituents to make the soundest environmental decisions, in their trust and their children's trust. We therefore must ensure that we do base our decisions on sound science. No politics, no interest group pressure, no lobbying. . . .just straightforward sound science by the country's best scientists. Importantly, this information will not be compiled by regulators, as the NIE is entirely a non-regulatory body. The NIE will support original scientific research, in addition to data assessment.

The NIE signifies a new approach to environmental science by integrating knowledge assessment, research, and educational training. The NIE will be created by consolidating some environmental science programs and redirecting funds from programs that are not a high priority and not cost-effective. To minimize cost and bureaucracy, the NIE will not operate laboratories and research facilities, but will competitively award peer-reviewed grants to the best scientists in academia, the private sector, government.

With the Federal Government's current fiscal constraints, Congress needs to implement cost-effective, integrated environmental science that underpins our environmental policies. The question is not whether the federal government will play a role in environmental science, but rather, the accuracy of that role. Thus the need for the NIE. Once we have the best environmental science and information at our fingertips, we can begin to make more informed environmental decisions based on the most accurate, reliable and unbiased science. The dividend returned on this investment will be long-term and will establish a true legacy to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, we all share the common goal to inject credible, peer-reviewed science into environmental legislation and regulations. This legislation will serve to accomplish that goal. I encourage all my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this bipartisan legislation.

Please include for the RECORD this line-by-line summary of our bill, the ''Sound Science for the Environment Act.''

OUTLINE OF THE SOUND SCIENCE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT ACT TO ESTABLISH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

This outline describes legislation to create a National Institute for the Environment (NIE), with the mission to improve the scientific basis for decision-making on environmental issues, & for other purposes.

Section 1. Short title: the ''Sound Science for the Environment Act.''

Section 2. Findings: The Congress finds the following:

A healthy environment is essential to an enhanced quality of life, a competitive economy, & national security.

The United States lacks an effective mechanism for providing & communicating a comprehensive, objective & credible scientific understanding of environmental issues in a timely manner to policy-makers & the public.

An appropriate understanding of the diverse scientific issues that underlie the environmental problems facing the United States is essential to finding environmentally & economically sound solutions to these problems.

To be useful, this understanding requires the integration of ongoing assessments of the state of scientific knowledge with credible problem-focused research, the communication of scientific information, & the appropriate education & training of environmental scientists, engineers, & other professionals.

These scientific activities are best carried out through a neutral, institution without regulatory responsibilities, where the public & private organizations and individuals can establish a shared understanding of the state