

process. Without ICCVAM, no one would know exactly which office should review a particular test. Moreover, even if one did know the appropriate offices to which a new method should be introduced, there would be no consistent review criteria for validation or regulatory acceptance across the agency. The individual review offices are simply not equipped or staffed to work with a method's sponsor for a process as resource intensive as validation.

Through an exhaustive and comprehensive three year process, ICCVAM has worked with U.S. federal agencies, as well as academia, industry and governments world-wide, to reach consensus on criteria for validation and regulatory acceptance. Due to the vast differences in regulatory requirements between U.S. regulatory agencies, not to mention other governments, the final acceptance and use of an ICCVAM-reviewed method remains the prerogative of each regulatory agency. However, ICCVAM assures that, to the extent feasible, adequate data for the proposed method have been reviewed by external peer review for their validity. ICCVAM provides a vehicle for a new method to be introduced to each agency through scientists responsible for its internal use.

With such intimate involvement of agency experts from within the appropriate scientific field, the method and its potential uses will be well understood by participating agencies. Furthermore, by the time a method has reached recommendation status to the agencies, it will more likely gain regulatory acceptance. Since the ICCVAM process has been endorsed by experts across the U.S. and throughout the world, international harmonization on ICCVAM-reviewed methods will be encouraged. Finally, the incorporation of methods that promote the reduction, refinement, and replacement of whole-animal tests into regulatory decision-making clearly supports the responsible use of animals in product testing.

In summary, from an FDA perspective, the ICCVAM facilitates the scientific review by experts, in both the public and private sectors, to establish the scientific validation of new testing methods that may have application in determining the safety of FDA-regulated products. It should be emphasized, however, that there may be occasions when a sponsor of a particular method would prefer submitting its data on a new method directly to the FDA, or any other agency, and this remains an important option. The ability to employ new technology in the regulatory decision-making process and facilitate the acceptance of new methods for safety testing is clearly enhanced with the added dimension of the ICCVAM process.

I would welcome questions relating to the current activities between ICCVAM and FDA, as well as our vision of this relationship in the future. Again, thank you for the opportunity to discuss this important issue in a public forum.

STATEMENT OF HOLLY E. HAZARD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DORIS DAY ANIMAL LEAGUE

We are proud to join with industry and animal protection organizations in support of the "ICCVAM Authorization Act of 1998."

The bill, sponsored by Representative Tom Lantos, will raise to standing status, an interagency coordinating committee that will review alternative methods for risk assessment and safety substantiation for humans and the environment. ICCVAM will make recommendations to agencies to adopt procedures for implementing these recommendations. The committee will be comprised of representatives from each of the agencies with jurisdiction over products that require or recommend some form of animal

testing. There are over 15 such agencies in the federal government. The committee will also establish a scientific advisory committee that will allow interested outside scientists and other stakeholders to comment on newly-developed alternatives as they become available.

This committee will facilitate the acceptance of the use of alternatives that will significantly decrease the numbers of animals used in toxicity testing, while not only ensuring that the health and safety of Americans and the environment remain at the highest level, but hopefully increasing that level of safety as more technologically-advanced methods of research more closely mimic what may happen in the human body.

The bill is an outgrowth of the former Consumer Products Safe Testing Act. It builds on the mandate given to the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in the NIH Revitalization Act of 1993 to develop criteria for the validation and acceptance of alternative methods. It also consolidates the requirements for an evaluation of alternatives that have interagency implication to one central committee, rather than agency by agency.

We've received many staff calls on how this bill affects medical research. The bill has a specific exemption for research. However, because the government does not regulate industry protocols for medical research, the entire issue is outside the scope of the legislation.

The Doris Day Animal League is working with a number of leaders in industry, and within the animal protection movement, to bring about changes in the uses of animals for toxicity testing. These individuals include: Dr. Martin Stephens and Dr. Andrew Rowan of the Humane Society of the United States; Dr. Dan Bagley of Colgate-Palmolive; Dr. Wallace Hayes and Dr. Louis DiPasquale of Gillette; Dr. Kathy Stitzel of Procter & Gamble; Ms. Adele Douglass of the American Humane Association; and Dr. Peter Theran and Elaine Birkholz of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

One of the significant frustrations of the humane community has been the lack of acceptance by the federal government of technologically-advanced alternatives to animal testing. Many in industry have met with a brick wall when they have attempted to move alternative methods of testing through the government bureaucracy to get their products on the market. The fact is that the easiest thing for any company is to simply maintain the *status quo* and do the animal tests to get on with marketing their products.

The Doris Day Animal League, along with a number of other organizations, successfully lobbied the Department of Transportation for the acceptance of the first federally-approved alternative to animal testing. This was an alternative to the use of rabbits for the testing of highly corrosive chemicals to determine the correct packaging material for transportation. In the animal test, the product would literally eat away the skin of a rabbit while researchers tested how long this took; it could take anywhere from hours to days. While this alternative was accepted at one agency, the company had to petition others for multiple agency acceptance and, as of yet, has been unsuccessful in securing full federal approval for the continued acceptance by the government of this alternative.

This bill is desperately needed to push this issue forward significantly in this country, and because of this country's stature in this area, throughout the world. We believe that many companies are standing ready to invest the resources that they need to develop

alternatives. And now regulators have taken the first step. Many in the federal bureaucracy are extremely comfortable with old methodologies that have established protocols and a history of success from a regulatory perspective. Congress needs to push these agencies to look ahead, not behind, in terms of the most efficient, effective and humane scientific judgment that should be expected from the agencies called upon to protect the consumers of this country.

I urge your strong support of the ICCVAM Authorization Act and invite questions for the League or for our industry supporters.

THE SECURITY SITUATION IN MEXICO

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 5, 1998

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times front page story yesterday about the threats to American law enforcement agents involved in fighting drugs along and across the border with Mexico should be a cause for alarm for all of us.

It strains credibility that the Administration again this past March "fully certified" Mexico as cooperating with us in the battle against illicit drugs. The recent stories on the deteriorating security situation along the border from drug related violence and threats against our law enforcement agents make it clear—the Mexican authorities are just not doing enough.

I have long argued that the safety and security of our law enforcement agents who every day risk their lives for us and our communities, should be of paramount concern in our bilateral relationship in the fight against drugs. These latest accounts of threats and inadequate resolution of the issue of the security of our law enforcement agents underscores that we have a long way to go.

[From the Washington Times, Thurs., June 4, 1998]

U.S. AGENTS WARNED OF MEXICAN RETALIATION

By Jamie Dettmer

The U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration has pulled its agents out of Tijuana, and the Justice Department is warning American lawmen on both sides of the 2,000-mile-long Mexican border to protect themselves more than ever.

The new threat they face isn't violence from narcotics traffickers, but hostility from their law enforcement counterparts in the Mexican federal judicial police.

Working relations between American and Mexican lawmen seldom have been smooth—distrust on both sides all too often undermines cooperation in the fight against drug smuggling and illegal immigration.

But as a result of a recent U.S. undercover money-laundering sting that nabbed several Mexican bankers, the bad blood has roiled to a pitch not seen since the murder 13 years ago of a DEA agent in Mexico, U.S. law-enforcement sources say.

According to a report by Insight magazine, a sister publication of The Washington Times, an urgent warning was sent Tuesday to all U.S. law-enforcement agencies with officers working along the border or in Mexico to stay alert "retaliation" from the Mexican police as a consequence of the sting, known as Operation Casablanca.

High-level DEA sources say they can't rule out physical assaults on U.S. lawmen operating in Mexico or visiting on official business.

The Mexican police are aggrieved by U.S. investigators luring Mexican bankers to America for arrest and are infuriated that American lawmen worked undercover on Mexican territory without the Mexican government's approval. U.S. authorities say they didn't want to tip off the subjects of their probe.

As a precaution, the DEA has withdrawn all agents from a joint U.S.-Mexico task force in Tijuana, the home city of the Arellano Felix brothers, who control Mexico's second-largest drug cartel. The retreat will disrupt investigations and jeopardize special operations against the traffickers, say DEA and U.S. Customs sources.

"We are basically facing a breakdown on the border," says a senior California-based DEA agent. "We have right now some big operations going on against the Arellano Felixes—last week we intercepted \$4 million of their cash—and against a Tijuana family who control amphetamine smuggling. Those ops are endangered now."

The alert was issued when the El Paso Intelligence Center, the federal law-enforcement intelligence clearing house, noticed an abrupt rise in reports from various federal agents of hostility from their Mexican counterparts. The federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) later verified the danger.

The official warning sent by the Justice Department to the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service cautions, "The Mexican Federal Judicial Police may seek retaliation against U.S. law-enforcement" because of Casablanca.

The warning goes on to say, "Reliable information received by the Los Angeles [ATF office] also indicates that Mexican law enforcement intends to seek revenge . . . by ensuring that any American law enforcement officer caught committing any sort of infraction will be given 'No Slack,' and they will be prosecuted to the fullest extent possible under Mexican law."

INS intelligence also suggests that bitterness over Operation Casablanca may not be limited to the Mexican police. "Feelings of injustice may manifest itself into the Mexican military as well."

An INS spokesman refused to confirm or deny the authenticity of the memo.

Frustrated U.S. lawmen point to the hostility of their Mexican counterparts as proof that DEA and Customs Service agents should be allowed to carry their sidearms when traveling south of the border on official business. Mexican authorities won't allow it, and the U.S. and Mexican governments have been locked in a fierce behind-the-scenes diplomatic dispute over the issue for more than a year.

The Mexicans have refused to budge. President Clinton's antidrug chief, Gen. Barry McCaffrey, recently sided with the Mexicans on the issue, infuriating Rep. Benjamin A. Gilman, New York Republican and chairman of the House International Relations Committee, by suggesting that U.S. lawmen should be satisfied with Mexican police protection.

In May, Mr. Gilman slammed Gen. McCaffrey, arguing that DEA agents couldn't entrust their lives to their Mexican counterparts because drug cartels are growing more violent and there is "proven massive corruption among Mexican law enforcement agencies."

A veteran DEA agent says he hasn't encountered such hostility from Mexican police since the fallout from the murder of DEA agent Enrique Camarena by narcotics traffickers in 1985. Some U.S. sources believe Mr. Camarena was killed with the collusion of corrupt Mexican officials and police officers.

Mexican law enforcement officials reacted very badly later when undercover DEA agents snatched a doctor in Mexico who had been involved in torturing Mr. Camarena before his murder.

HONORING KAVANAUGH'S FURNITURE FOR THEIR 125 YEARS OF BUSINESS

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 5, 1998

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to have the opportunity to acknowledge and honor Kavanaugh Furniture of Springfield, Massachusetts for its 125th year of business.

In 1873, Mr. Dennis Nelen opened his establishment as a "wholesaler and retailer in elegant furniture, hair and husk mattresses" and before 1900 he partnered with Mr. William Kavanaugh. Today, Kavanaugh's is the largest furniture store in Western Massachusetts and has three sister stores with a fourth on the way. It is Springfield's oldest family owned business still in existence and one of the oldest operating furniture stores in the entire United States.

In an era where retailers often sacrifice quality service for quantity sold, Kavanaugh's has remained a testament to the beauty of the family business. In their establishment, quality service is a trait passed down through the generations. Mr. Jack Nelen, who became Kavanaugh's president in 1965 and is the grandson of the original founder, began making deliveries for the store when he was just a teenager. The success of a family business can be measured, in part, by the duration of its existence. Kavanaugh Furniture has survived and flourished through two world wars, the Great Depression, and several other fluctuations in the economy. They were also able to last during the recession of the early 90s even though furniture was considered a luxury by many. Perhaps more impressive has been Kavanaugh's ability to survive the local "big chain" competition, while located in an area not supported by mega-mall traffic. In this regard, the Nelen family business can be considered a huge success and a strong example for other family businesses.

Only 1 out of 30,000 retail stores makes it to be 100 years old, and Kavanaugh's has now reached its 125th year in the business. Not only has Kavanaugh's created lasting personal success for its owners and employees, it has been an enormous asset to the community and neighborhood as well. Its list of civil activities and commitments includes being a catalyst for and taking part in fund raisers for The Children's Miracle Network, Shriners' Hospital, the Red Cross, and the United Way. Kavanaugh's once even held a free picnic for over 2,500 city kids.

The Kavanaugh Furniture store is an anchor for the community. It has taken care of its customers and has been rewarded with 125 years of business. I wish the Nelen family and all of the folks at Kavanaugh's success in continuing a great tradition of excellent service to their customers and the community at large as they embark on the 21st century and another 125 years.

INTRODUCTION OF H.J. RES. 120: DISAPPROVING THE EXTENSION OF THE PRESIDENT'S WAIVER OF JACKSON-VANIK CRITERIA FOR VIETNAM

HON. DANA ROHRBACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 5, 1998

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a Joint Resolution, co-sponsored by my good friends, BEN GILMAN, Chairman of the International Relations Committee and CHRIS SMITH, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights, in partnership with Senator BOB SMITH and Senator JESSE HELMS, to require Vietnam to provide freedom of emigration for its people, under the provisions of the U.S. Trade Act of 1974, before tax dollars from American citizens are used to insure or otherwise further trade with the communist regime in Vietnam.

Vietnam remains among the world's last Marxist-Leninist governments, where corrupt cronyism and an absence of credible courts have driven away foreign investors. The freedoms of speech, religion and assembly are denied to average citizens, as well as the freedom of emigration. As a result, Vietnam's economy is lagging, investor disenchantment is growing and, despite continued arrest and persecution of dissidents and religious leaders, protest movements have taken root in northern and southern provinces. It is both unconscionable and unsound for President Clinton to issue waivers in order to permit U.S. financing guarantees and credits to investors through the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and Export-Import Bank.

In addition to H.J. Res. 120, I have also introduced H.R. 3158 to prevent the President from granting waivers for Ex-Im and OPIC credits and financing guarantees in the absence of true democratic reform, release of all political prisoners, humane working conditions, as well as the Jackson-Vanik emigration criteria.

A critical lesson we should learn from the economic collapse of the so-called "Asian Tigers" such as Indonesia, South Korea and Thailand is that the U.S. Government should not put tax dollars at risk to subsidize unsound private business deals with corrupt regimes. The Heritage Foundation's *1998 Index of Economic Freedom* ranks Vietnam among the six worst economic environments in the world. It would be appalling to make American taxpayers guarantee private business investments before real democratic political reform is in place. We should stand with the people of Vietnam who crave for freedom, and abide firmly by America's principles and laws to require the despotic regime in Hanoi to respect international standards of human rights and labor before giving the Vietnamese regime the benefit of our taxpayer-backed institutions.

IN HONOR OF THE NEW JERSEY NETWORK'S IMAGES/IMAGENES

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 5, 1998

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor New Jersey Network's Images/