attracted to the big city and lose track of where they come from. This''—speaking of our State and her beloved town—''is where I come from. I have roots, a sense of belonging somewhere.''

As much as we are honored that Katharine Hepburn has said she belongs in Connecticut, we are very proud to say that we belong to her and she to us. People around the Old Saybrook section of the State will tell you how thrilled they are to have seen her taking those dips into Long Island Sound, not only in the summer but occasionally in winter, and how grateful they are for the way in which, in her quiet way, she has become involved in the kinds of concerns that local communities have, such as buying a ladder truck for the fire department. She reaches an extraordinary age this Monday and can look back on a remarkable career.

Katharine Hepburn's artistic brilliance, her outlook on life, her spirit, have served as a beacon of light and of truth for people in America and, really, throughout the world. I am delighted to join with my colleague, and I am sure everyone else in our State and everyone here in the Senate, in thanking her for what she has meant to us as an artist, in expanding our own sense of reality, our own horizons, our own appreciation of life. She reaches a substantial age on Monday, but the truth is that Katharine Hepburn, through the miracle of the movies, is ageless and immortal, forever beautiful, forever graceful, forever magnificently intelligent, forever brilliant, forever spirited, forever Katharine Hepburn. Happy 90th birthday.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

HAITI

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like at this point to turn to a topic that I began the discussion about this morning. That is the topic of Haiti.

I said this morning, Mr. President, that the situation in Haiti is at another critical point. President Clinton will meet tomorrow with the President of Haiti, President Preval. In that discussion, what will take place, I think, is very, very important.

I talked earlier today about my recent trip to Haiti, which was the fourth trip that I have taken to Haiti in the last 2 years.

I talked about what I considered to be some of the imperatives, some of the things that absolutely have to take place if this fledgling democracy in Haiti is to survive.

They have to have privatization. They have a schedule now for privatization. It is laid out with a timetable. Everyone who I talked to in Haiti, all Government officials, assured me that they would follow this timetable. But, as I expressed to them, no one, frankly, in this country is going to take that seriously until we actually see privatization take place.

So it is important that, as we approach the date of the first privatization in July, it actually takes place. It is important because that democracy cannot survive just on elections. People have to have hope. People will only have hope if there is food to feed their children and if there is hope and opportunity for their future and the future of their children. That will only occur if some of the state-controlled industries that have really strangled the economy in Haiti for so long can be freed up, if they can be privatized, and if the economy can then begin to grow.

Privatization is also important because by privatizing these industries, that will send a sign to the international community that the leadership in Haiti, from President Preval down, is in fact serious about doing the things to create a market-oriented economy that will in fact allow Haiti's economy to begin to grow.

That is No. 1.

No. 2 is Haiti must make progress in regard to these high-profile political murders. Based on my own investigation when I went to Haiti, I believe they have the capability of doing this. I believe that some of these cases can in fact be solved—the case for example, of Reverend Leroy. I believe that case can be solved. But it can only be solved if there is political leadership. It can only be solved if there is leadership from the top, from President Preval down saying it is a priority that we bring these people who committed this act to justice.

I would like to turn now, Mr. President, to a third area; that is, the agricultural situation in Haiti.

Seventy percent of Haiti's people live in rural areas. That is about 4 million out of a total population of 7 million. Eighty percent, it is estimated, of these rural Haitians farm on hillsides. But Haiti's agriculture clearly is troubled, to say the least. Haiti loses about 36 million metric tons of topsoil every year to erosion. That is enough to cover, they tell me, about 15,000 acres. About half a million people in the northwest part of Haiti are facing today a very serious drought.

Mr. President, 30 years or so ago Haiti produced most of its own food. Today it imports two-thirds of its food. Haiti is having trouble feeding itself, and a number of causes have been assigned to that. I will mention just a few.

The environment in Haiti is certainly fragile. Seventy percent is hillside land. Intensive cropping of 60 percent of the land-surface businesses have been decapitalized—less capital. Effective loss of capital has been magnified by the 1991–1994 embargo. Land plots are sometimes too small. There is a lack of land security under the land tenure system, and, as a result of the country's weak infrastructure, farmers are many times isolated from their markets.

The USAID has instituted two programs to address these programs. The Agriculturally Sustainable Systems for Environmental Transformation, or ASSET, as it is called, is a $45 million program to improve hillside farming to help poor urban neighborhoods, improve water supply and waste management, and strengthen the Haitian Government's agricultural food security and environmental policy.

Mr. President, the Program for the Recovery of the Economy in Transition, or PRET, is an $8 million program aimed at strengthening the Haitian private sector's role in national economic and business policymaking, providing innovative sources of credit, and helping key industries export the domestic market potential.

Mr. President, under ASSET's coffee project, USAID has helped over 20,000 coffee farmers produce a premium coffee that is now marketed under the trademark of ''Haitian Blue.'' Since 1990, farmers have exported almost 200,000 pounds of this coffee. USAID has implemented a program of tree planting to reverse the impact of almost 30 million trees being cut each year. USAID plans to expand the ASSET program to assist the Haitian Government in establishing an agricultural data collection system, disseminate technology, and provide environmental management.

There is currently not a single—this is amazing—not a single source of information on agricultural production in Haiti, no central collection of this data, even though agricultural production affects the lives of approximately 70 percent of the people who live in Haiti.

The USAID Agribusiness Loan Guarantee Fund provides incentives for financial institutions to extend credit to midsized agribusinesses. By financing these businesses such lending institutions also help small farmers from whom the middlemen buy their goods. In the first 18 months of its operation, the fund had resulted in 1,300 permanent jobs and 10,000 seasonal jobs.

While our program has shown some success, I think it is important to point out to my colleagues in the Senate that United States assistance in the agricultural area still only reaches approximately 1 out of 7 Haitian farmers. Clearly the goal of our policy is and always must be self-sufficiency for Haiti.

The outlines of the bipartisan United States policy toward Haiti I think are clear. The United States should help Haiti become self-sufficient in food. We should help them build a system of law and order. After all, United States law enforcement is the best in the world and the Haitians can benefit greatly from our expertise. We should help the Haitians attract the kind of private investment that is the cornerstone of long-term economic growth.

I cannot stress enough that our good intentions cannot succeed, will not succeed in and of themselves. No matter how much we want to help Haiti, there is a limit to what we can do.

There is a limit to what we will do. Ultimately, the democracy that is slowly growing in Haiti can only be preserved by Haitians themselves. Haiti has to have the will, Haiti has to have the perseverance to carry through with the real reforms that we have talked about today. And that is what I believe President Clinton must underscore in the conversation that he will have tomorrow with Haitian President Preval. Our message to President Preval and to the Haitian people must be very simply this: We can help you, we will help you, but the destiny of your country really lies in your own hands.

CHARLES D. ''CHUCK'' SHIPLEY

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, this afternoon I honor the memory of a truly great figure in the history of Ohio, Charles D. ''Chuck'' Shipley, who died on April 5 of this year at the young age of 54.

Chuck Shipley leaves Ohio a better place than he found it. Chuck dedicated his whole life to public service, to improving the lives of his fellow Ohioans. He first spent 16 years in the Ohio State Highway Patrol. Chuck was later director of the Ohio Department of Public Safety and served under Gov. George Voinovich in that position from 1991 to 1997. He served as the director of the department of public safety for the entire 4 years that I served as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Ohio. While he served in that capacity, he was in charge of several agencies including the highway patrol, and he was in charge in general of highway safety for the 11 million people who live in our great State.

Chuck and I both had experiences in law enforcement that dramatically shaped our attitudes toward highway safety. I had been a local county prosecutor and in that capacity I dealt with the shattered lives of families who had lost loved ones who had been killed in auto fatalities, sometimes by drunk drivers.

When I was in the State senate, a little 7-year-old boy in my home county, a little boy by the name of Justin Beason was struck and killed by a driver who had been driving and drinking. Little Justin was killed as he was getting off his school bus. In response to this tragedy, with the help of Mothers Against Drunk Drivers, we succeeded in 1983 in writing a tough new drunk driving law in the State of Ohio.

While I was working on safety issues as a prosecutor and as a State senator, Chuck Shipley was on the front lines as a highway patrolman. He saw much more often than I ever did the devastation that is brought by highway fatalities. It was Chuck who was often the one to notify the parents of a child who had been killed in a highway accident.

Chuck told me about that experience, and as he told me about it I could see it had left an unbelievable impression on him. He told me it was the toughest thing he ever had to do in his life, and tragically he had to do that more than once. That kind of experience, as Chuck told me, leaves a deep impression on a person. It certainly left an impact on Chuck.

Chuck Shipley became a committed, dedicated fighter in the cause of highway safety. When I was Lieutenant Governor and he was director of the public safety department, I was, frankly, very grateful time and time again for the passion that Chuck brought to his work. It was contagious. His energy and enthusiasm helped him change attitudes. It helped him win converts who had worked to make Ohio safer.

Chuck and I spent a great deal of time together traveling the State, many times on holidays because that is when you always try to put the emphasis on highway safety—Memorial Day, Labor Day, or some other holiday. We spent a lot of time talking and a lot of time traveling the State to promote antidrunk-driver campaigns or designated-driver campaigns and just overall highway safety. Chuck helped us implement, among other things, administrative license suspensions, to help crack down on drunk drivers, and he took many, many other actions in his official capacity to save lives in Ohio. He was a worker, a hard worker in a good cause, and Chuck got results. I can truly say something about Chuck Shipley that any of us would be incredibly proud to have said about ourselves: There are people alive today who would not be alive but for Chuck Shipley.

I join all Ohioans in being grateful for the life he dedicated to our State but even more I am grateful for our friendship. He was a wonderful human being, a person who would not get upset even in the most difficult circumstance. I do not ever recall, all the hours I spent with Chuck, him ever getting upset. He always had a smile. He was always calm. He always went about his business. I am very proud to have known Chuck Shipley, and I want to express my condolences to Chuck's family, express to all of them my greatest sympathy for the loss of Chuck, to his wife Jana, their children David and Carli, and their family. Their loss is great, and so is Ohio's.

BETTER PHARMACEUTICALS FOR CHILDREN ACT

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I turn at this point to a matter that was brought up a little while ago by my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Senator CHRIS DODD. He spoke very eloquently about the piece of legislation that he and I are introducing, a piece of legislation that we believe will dramatically improve health care available to America's children.

We as a nation need to do a better job making sure our children get the pharmaceuticals that are appropriate for them. This is a matter I have been concerned about for some time, and it is a matter that as the father of eight children is near and dear to my heart.

We are introducing the Better Pharmaceuticals for Children Act. This legislation will provide an incentive in the form of 6 months of market exclusivity to encourage pharmaceutical companies to conduct the necessary clinical trials for FDA approval of their products for children. These studies would take away the guesswork that too many physicians and parents go through in trying to treat their sick children. These studies would do away with this guesswork by giving an incentive to the drug companies, by giving them a 6-months extension on their patent exclusivity so as to give them the incentive to do the trials and do the studies that would give parents and give physicians better information.

This is not a new product. Let me give several examples to show my colleagues what the problem is. The first example goes back to 1960. There was a drug called chloramphenicol that was approved for use in adults to control bacterial infections. This drug was widely used with adults and it was successful, but when it was used on children the results were devastating. It shut down their liver. Many children got sick and, tragically, a number of them died. This came to be known as the gray baby syndrome.

Let me give another example of the problem that our bill attempts to address. There was a little 4-year old leukemia patient named Stewart Baxter who had to scream through a spinal tap, had to go through immense pain because the doctors were advised they could not give him an anesthetic. The anesthetic was thought to be harmful to young patients. However, later they found that was not true. A few weeks later he was allowed to undergo the same procedure—this time, however, under the anesthetic. Better information earlier would have prevented that child's agony and would have made it possible for the parents not to have had to undergo that trauma as well in watching their child go through that pain.

Let me give you another example. Dr. Ralph Kaufman, representing the American Academy of Pediatrics, testified in the House of Representatives about a 1-month-old infant that he treated. He was treating it for a life-threatening infection, the kind of infection that was resistant to all available antibiotics except one. That one antibiotic was not labeled for children. They had not done the testing. And it certainly was not labeled for a 1-month-old infant. But Dr. Kaufman took the chance, combining his knowledge with the physiology of the 1-month-old child with how the instructions said the antibiotic should be used for adults. In this case Dr. Kaufman said the gamble paid off. But sometimes the outcome is not so favorable. Physicians have to gamble, due to a lack of information. Sometimes physicians do not take the chance and they lose the availability of a very useful drug. Other times they do take the