

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A NEW REPRESSIVE POLICE APPARATUS IN RUSSIA?

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, since the demise of the Soviet Union, and the dissolution of its repressive police state, Russian society now faces the challenge of balancing law and order with protection of individual liberties. We are all aware that Russia is experiencing a dramatic rise in crime and a high rate of violence. Unfortunately, the cure envisioned by the Russian Government for this dilemma may be worse than the disease.

According to recent reports, the lower house of the Russian Parliament—the Duma—has voted overwhelmingly in favor of a bill proposed by President Yeltsin that would dramatically expand the powers of the domestic intelligence agency of the Russian Federation, known as the Federal Counterintelligence Service, or FSK. FSK agents would be able to enter homes, government offices and businesses without a search warrant from a court or the prosecutors office, as had been the case previously. The FSK would manage its own jails, and could employ undercover personnel working in other government agencies.

Bear in mind where the FSK stands philosophically these days. I would call attention to a FSK report published on January 10 of this year in the Moscow newspaper *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*. In this report, the FSK accuses various foreign policy research centers, non-governmental organizations, and foundations such as the Soros Foundation and Ford Foundation, of being used by United States secret services to conduct intelligence-gathering and subversive activities on the Russian territory. For instance, the FSK alleges that American specialists have set up a "network of contacts for information on legal sources" in Russia that would become a foundation for clandestine sources should United States-Russian relations worsen. Of course, this analysis came from the folks who reportedly did the planning for the Chechnya operation.

The Russian population is plagued by crime and corruption and, therefore, I can understand how this bill could be widely popular. The bill was approved in the Duma through the democratic process. But, Mr. Speaker, we all know that even democratically passed laws, especially those passed in the heat of the moment, can be seriously flawed. The key principle is protection of the civil liberties of minorities while carrying out the will of the majority. A Russian journalist quoted in the February 28, 1995, *Washington Post* said, "In this country, people don't understand [about civil liberties] until the moment the FSK people come to their flats and knock on their door."

Mr. Speaker, as I noted, crime and corruption are an overwhelming problem in Russia today, and our colleagues in the Russian parliament are faced with the serious task of developing the proper legislation to combat it.

But, as chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, an organization vitally concerned with the principle of rule of law in the OSCE signatory states, I would urge the Federal Assembly and President Yeltsin to deliberate very carefully before giving the domestic security service such expansive powers. In legal terms, these proposed powers may even violate the Russian Constitution. In operational terms, there may soon be little to distinguish the FSK from the KGB of the cold-war era.

TRIBUTE TO EARL THOMAS HUCKLE

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, Earl Thomas Huckle lived his life by a code of "community first." While best known as the former editor and publisher of the *Cadillac Evening News*, the impact of his service to the entire area will be felt for generations.

Earl found and promoted the local chapter of the Kiwanis Club; he served for many years on the chamber of commerce; was a member of the Mercy Hospital Advisory Board and later, chairman; he served as chairman of the Retail Merchant's Association; was on the board of directors of Cadillac's first Community Chest; and was a noted historian with a northern Michigan flavor.

In addition, Earl saw the hope and promise in the children of his community. He worked tirelessly on their behalf. Whether encouraging safe skiing techniques, sponsoring competitions or spending time with his 3 children or 6 grandchildren, Earl Thomas Huckle knew that children are the key to the future.

His work with the *Cadillac Evening News* is legendary. He worked hard with his father to make that newspaper not only the leading source of news in the community, but one of the most productive and responsible newspapers in the State. As its publisher, he revolutionized the printing operation by introducing computer typesetting and offset printing; as its editor, he provided consistent and thoughtful commentary on local and world events.

The citizens of the greater Cadillac area will surely miss the presence of Earl Thomas Huckle. His joy in his family and his contributions to that community will live forever.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

HON. EARL F. HILLIARD

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the Republican forces of Speaker GINGRICH are attempting to justify the block granting of child nutrition program funding by arguing that it actually in-

creases the child nutrition funding nationwide by 4.5 percent.

It seems as though the Republicans will say almost anything to hide that they have cut children's food programs to fund tax breaks for the rich.

The fact is, that Federal funding for our child nutrition and WIC programs, will be slashed by GINGRICH's Republicans by over \$2 billion over 5 years.

While the Republicans slash and cut our children's food programs, they are taking care of their wealthy friends.

In fact, the Ways and Means Committee yesterday reported on the Republican tax break plan for the rich. More than 76 percent of the benefits for the break go to people earning over \$100,000 a year.

Speaker GINGRICH, why is your Republican Party sacrificing our children to make the rich, richer?

TRIBUTE TO CLARION AREA JAYCEES

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a group that has proudly been serving the Clarion community for an outstanding number of years. I am pleased to recognize the Clarion Area Jaycees on this their 30th year of continued service.

In 1965, this organization was founded for the sole purpose of improving the community around them. I am sure these young people were not aware of all the great things they would eventually, and continue to, accomplish. It is no small task for a group to work together closely and be productive for such a long period of time. As one generation of volunteers contributes to the Clarion area, the next generation readies itself for future challenges. Their dedication throughout the 30 years is apparent in every project they take on.

The Jaycees' enormous contributions are not felt by just a few individuals, but by the entire population. The work they do touches every member of the community. The creed of the Jaycees is, "service to humanity is the best work of life." It is obvious to all of us that these are not just words, but a conviction for this group of men and women. As a member of the community that is touched by the Clarion Area Jaycees, I want to thank them for all of their hard work. The mission of the Jaycees is fulfilled with every person they help. So in keeping with that tradition, I have the utmost confidence this organization will continue to render valuable services.

Today marks the Jaycees' celebration of 30 years of service. This event is made even more special by the fact the entire community can join in this special occasion; this accomplishment has certainly benefited us all.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to recognize the Clarion Area Jaycees on this milestone. Once again, I want to thank them for all of their devoted service and my best wishes for continued success.

REPUBLICANS SHOULD SUPPORT
THE COMMUNITY SERVICE
BLOCK GRANT

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think it useful for me to share with my colleagues a brief but very pointed letter from Mark Sullivan, who is the head of the community action agency in the city of Fall River, Citizens, Inc. Mr. Sullivan is one of the outstanding leaders in the fight to improve the quality of life for people in the lower economic brackets, and he has been doing it long enough to have considerable perspective. Thus, he points out that the arguments in favor of the creation of the community action agency, and their subsequent inclusion in a community service block grant, grew from concern that we bypass bureaucracy and provide help directly to the people most in need. Citizens for Citizens is one of the organizations that exemplifies the success of this approach. And because the point Mr. Sullivan makes about the relevance of that experience to much of the rhetoric we are now hearing from my Republican colleagues, I ask that this letter be printed here.

CITIZENS FOR CITIZENS, INC.,
Fall River, MA, January 31, 1995.

DEAR BARNEY: I just finished watching a 30 year history of the War on Poverty on PBS and the irony of history repeating itself became crystal clear.

The basic concept of all the programs in the War on Poverty was the empowerment of local citizens to make decisions and help design economic programs that affect their lives.

Thirty years later, the new majority in Congress headed by Speaker of the House Gingrich, is talking about designing government so that citizens will be empowered to make economic decisions on the local level for policies that affect their lives.

It seems to be redundant to reinvent the wheel when there is a Community Service Block Grant which serves all of the purposes and meets all of the criteria as established by the new leadership; albeit, it deals with low-income people who need the economic empowerment the most.

I believe that Speaker Gingrich, with his background as a historian has a knowledge and appreciation of these programs for economic empowerment.

I welcome him as a spokesman for the need to extend and expand the Community Action Agency through increased funding for the Community Services Block Grant, and wish you would thank him for his generous forthcoming support.

COMMITTEE FUNDING
RESOLUTION

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman THOMAS for his hard work and diligence in bringing the committee funding resolution to the floor today. This bill represents the new Republican Congress commitment to downsizing and accountability.

On the very first day of the 104th Congress Republicans voted to cut our own committee staffs by one-third. We proved to the American people that we are serious about keeping our commitment to giving them the smaller, more effective Government they voted for.

This bill before us today shows the American people that we are keeping our promise. Chairman THOMAS has introduced a funding request that reflects the change we voted for just a few short months ago. It represents the largest decrease in committee funding ever.

Spending the taxpayers' money wisely is important. Chairman THOMAS' bill not only downsizes Congress but introduces a new level of accountability. Changing the way committees pay for staff and supplies forces them to justify every penny they spend.

Congress must now publicly authorize all committee spending every 2 years and fund all staff salaries out of a single account. For the first time, committees will have to account for all of their operating expenses. Congress will no longer hide long distance phone call charges or paper costs in extraneous accounts. The American people will see just how we spend their money.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of Appropriations I am responsible for funding congressional operations. Mr. THOMAS' bill offers guidelines to my subcommittee—guidelines which I am proud to accept.

He and I both share a commitment to the American people who work hard for the tax dollars they have to send to Washington. The least we can do is spend those dollars wisely.

TERM LIMITS

HON. JAY DICKEY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been a supporter of term limits since my initial election to the House in 1992, and I continue to support term limits today. Due to provisions added to House Joint Resolution 2 during the February 28, 1995, House Judiciary Committee markup, I can no longer support this bill.

In its current form, House Joint Resolution 2 preempts State term limit laws, like amendment No. 73, passed by the voters of my home State of Arkansas. The amended bill also removes the lifetime cap for service in the House. Specifically, it would allow a Member to serve six terms, sit out one term, then serve six terms more. That is not real term limits.

LEGAL REFORM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, March 15, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

LEGAL REFORM

The House last week approved three bills that would effect wide-ranging legal reforms in civil lawsuits. The measures respond to a public perception that the legal system has become burdened with excessive costs and long delays and that the growing number of lawsuits, particularly frivolous suits, are swamping the courts. These bills seek to curb lawsuit abuse which weakens the economy, eliminates jobs, and injures our global competitiveness.

I supported two of the three bills, albeit with some reservations. The civil justice system needs reform—and these bills are a first step in the reform process—but the bills considered in the House were poorly drafted and hastily considered and they overreach. My greatest concern is that their impact would be to tilt the courts in favor of large companies at the expense of individual plaintiffs. My expectation is these problems will be addressed during Senate consideration.

PRODUCT LIABILITY REFORM

This measure, which I supported, would for the first time create a uniform product liability law (covering state and federal actions) in three areas: punitive damages; joint and several liability; and fault-based liability for product sellers. First, the bill caps non-economic and punitive damages for all civil lawsuits. Punitive damages are awarded to punish negligence, rather than to compensate a victim, and non-economic damages are for things such as pain and suffering. Non-economic damages would be capped at \$250,000, and punitive damages would be capped at three times the claimant's award for monetary losses (such as lost wages and medical bills) or \$250,000—whichever is greater. Second, the bill restricts "joint and several liability" by allowing non-economic damages only up to the level of a defendant's responsibility. In other words, someone who is only 20% responsible would pay only 20% of the non-economic damages. Third, the bill prohibits product liability suits for injuries caused by products that are more than 15 years old, unless the product is expressly guaranteed for a longer period, or if the product causes a chronic illness that does not appear for more than 15 years (such as asbestos).

It is probably necessary to narrow the risk of manufacturers' and sellers' liability in certain cases involving defective products. Juries are sometimes confused and sometimes come in with awards that are neither reasonable nor justified by the evidence. In many cases, judges routinely reduce those jury awards drastically, but perhaps not in all cases. The restrictions on joint and several liability also make sense. The important link is between behavior and responsibility, and the bill limits a defendant's liability to the share of damages caused by his own actions.

Capping punitive damages, however, has to be approached with great care. This bill represents a federal encroachment on well established state authority and responsibility. Furthermore, high punitive damages serve to keep a manufacturer on his toes.

SECURITIES LITIGATION REFORM

This bill, which I supported, would limit so-called "strike" lawsuits—class action lawsuits filed by stockholders against companies or stockbrokers for having misrepresented the company's economic position when the class of stockholders decided to buy the stock. Further, the bill limits security fraud suits by individual stockholders for similar claims of misrepresentation.

The problem of frivolous class action lawsuits against a company as soon as its stock drops is a real one. Because their stock prices are so volatile, high technology companies are especially vulnerable. Even so, we do not want to weaken the deterrent to financial fraud. To this end, the House, with my support, approved amendments to promote public disclosure of stock information; narrow exceptions to defendant liability; and define the responsibilities of accountants in reporting cases of fraud to federal regulators.

CIVIL LITIGATION REFORM

This bill, would make several significant changes in the federal civil justice system. First, it would require losing parties in federal civil cases to pay the attorneys' fees of the winning party under certain circumstances. Second, the bill would restrict the admission of scientific evidence in federal court. Third, the measure would make sanctions against lawyers who file frivolous lawsuits mandatory, rather than leaving the decision to the judge.

I opposed the bill primarily because of its "loser pays" provisions. A key principle of the American system is accessible justice and I do not want to pass laws which prohibit or deter an individual from a meritorious vet risky lawsuit for fear that the penalty would be financial ruin. Everybody wants to curb frivolous lawsuits—and I supported an amendment that would give a defendant the opportunity to seek dismissal of a frivolous suit.

The bill, in contrast, would place average Americans at a disadvantage in disputes with large corporations, for whom the risk of paying opposing attorneys is simply the cost of doing business. A middle-income plaintiff could be forced to accept a small settlement unless he or she is willing to assume the risk of being financially ruined by the payment of the fees of the other side's attorneys, who may be expensive corporate lawyers.

CONCLUSION

In general, I think the entire legal reform package deserves a searching examination in the Senate. I have been impressed throughout the debate that the House has focused on a tide of anecdotes purporting to show the American legal system as out of control, swamped with frivolous product liability and personal damage suits. I am less sure that the evidence supports the lesson of those anecdotes.

The balance that must be struck is to protect the people's right to sue while at the same time reducing frivolous and expensive lawsuits. That is not an easy balance to strike and the details reaching that balance become very complicated. My hope is that the Senate will improve upon the House-passed bills. I am inclined to think that they are simply too raw to be enacted in their present form.

IN HONOR OF THE GIRL FRIENDS, INC.

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the fine record of one of the oldest civic/social organizations of African-American women in these United States—the Girl Friends, Inc. Founded in 1972, its primary focus was to promote friendship and to foster goodwill. Under the legal guidance of the Honorable Thurgood Marshall, the organization was incorporated in 1938.

The Girl Friends, Inc. is a national organization comprised of 1,250 socially and professionally prominent women, including national political figures, Federal judges, medical doctors, college presidents, accountants, lawyers, and teachers.

Presently, there are 40 chapters located in major American cities, representing leaders and spheres of influence with an ongoing commitment to contribute to civic activities that enhance the quality of community life.

The organization has given major financial assistance to community organizations, including the United Negro College Fund, the NAACP legal defense fund, the children's defense fund, and the NAACP.

Through its local chapters, it gives annually to local groups such as the heart fund, the sickle cell fund, the Cancer Research Foundation, the Boys and Girls Club of America, and local theatre groups for children.

I would like to congratulate the national president of the Girl Friends, Inc., Mrs. Virginia Scott Speller of Houston, TX, for giving leadership during these days of extending a helping hand to those in our communities who are in need, especially students who want to complete a college education and senior citizens who need care and attention.

I also salute the more than 1,200 members who take time from their professional duties to give of themselves to help make our country a responsive and caring Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the national officers and all of the 40 chapters of the Girl Friends, Inc. for their 68 years of service to these United States.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF BOBBY CAPÓ

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 16, the New York Office of the Puerto Rico Federal Affairs Administration will unveil a pictorial stamp cancellation to honor a giant of romantic music and borinquen patriotism, Bobby Capó. I rise to pay tribute to the memory of this extraordinary and beloved individual.

Felix Manuel Rodríguez "Bobby" Capó was born in Coamo, Puerto Rico in 1922. Having moved to New York as a young man in the 1930s, Bobby Capó encountered for the first time a land of cold winters and often chilly

race relations. He set about very early in life to overcome these features with the warmth of his music and personality.

In the course of his 68 years Bobby Capó composed over 2,000 songs and released more than 50 record albums. But these figures do not do justice to the influence of this superb artist. Possessing a lyrical tenor, perfect pitch and supreme grace, Bobby Capó was a dynamic showman whose tours and television appearances in New York, Puerto Rico and the rest of the United States and Latin America were vital to the popularization of the romantic style. His great ballads "Piel Canela," "Juguete" and "Sin Fe," sung by hundreds of artists around the world, are timeless classics that will forever convey the mystery of romantic love.

Mr. Speaker, as the first Puerto Rican to direct his own television shows and appear in Mexican films, Bobby Capó was a theatrical phenomenon as well. But he was much more than an entertainer. A man for all seasons, in his later years he became increasingly involved in public affairs. He served as Director of the New York Office of the Puerto Rico Federal Affairs Administration, he founded and was the first president of the Puerto Rico Guild of Artists, and in numerous capacities promoted a better understanding of Puerto Rican and Hispanic culture. Moreover, in many personal acts of advocacy and political action he proved himself a dedicated and energetic defender of the less fortunate in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I was extremely privileged to have known Bobby Capó, to have had him as an inspiration and a mentor. His romanticism, his devotion to the island of his birth, and his sheer love of life are elements of his spirit which have struck a deep chord with me and with many thousands of others. I remain a devoted fan of his enduring music and memory, both of which will live on forever in the hearts of his admirers. I ask my colleagues to join me in appreciation of the life and legacy of this wonderful man.

LED ASTRAY BY THE POVERTY "EXPERTS"

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Williams, a professor of economics at George Mason University, has formulated a decorous and forthright theory which reveals the malignant problems caused by American dependence on the welfare state.

Since the 1960's, Federal welfare policies have only resulted in a debilitating reliance by American citizens on a Federal Government not created to function in this area. Unfortunately, this institution—the welfare state—has become a permanent and detrimental fixture in our society.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article written by Mr. Williams entitled, "Led astray by the poverty 'experts'." May we all learn from his insights and wisdom as the 104th Congress embarks on the reformation of the outdated welfare policies plaguing our Nation.

LED ASTRAY BY THE POVERTY 'EXPERTS'

(By Walter Williams)

Much of what's wrong in our country is the result of heeding the words of "experts" and "intellectuals," whose advice defies every notion of common sense.

Take skyrocketing black illegitimacy. But first, let's put it into perspective. In 1940, black illegitimacy was 19 percent. Today, it's 68 percent and estimated to be 75 percent by the year 2000. As early as the 1870s, up to 80 percent of black kids lived in two-parent families. Between 1905 and 1925, 85 percent of Harlem youngsters lived in two-parent families. Today, fewer than 40 percent of black kids live in two-parent families. The black family could survive slavery and Jim Crowism but not the welfare state.

During the '60s, now-Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan wrote a report concluding, "At the heart of the deterioration of the fabric of Negro family." At that time, black illegitimacy was 30 percent. Liberals attacked the report. Civil rights leader Bayard Rustin said, "What may be a disease to the white middle class may be a healthy adaptation of the Negro lower class." Floyd McKissick, director of COPE, echoed that sentiment, saying, "Just because Moynihan believes in middle-class values doesn't mean they are the best for everyone in America."

Those sentiments were supported by many, including supposed intellectuals. Andrew Cherlin, a Johns Hopkins professor and sociologist, argued it had yet to be shown that the "absence of a father was directly responsible for any of the supposed deficiencies of broken homes." Mr. cherlin concluded that the real issue "is not the lack of male presence but the lack of male income." In other words, fathers can be replaced by a monthly welfare check. That's a stupid idea, but we bought it.

When Mr. Moynihan completed his report, according to Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, attempts were made to repress its release. Professors Lee Rainwater and Williams Yancey suggested "it would have been well to reduce the discussion of illegitimacy because of the inflammatory nature of the issue with its inevitable overtones of immorality."

According to William Bennett, writing in the American Enterprise (January-February 1995), "More than 70 percent of black children will have been supported by Aid to Families with Dependent Children payments at one point or another during childhood." He adds, "The most serious problems afflicting our society today are manifestly moral, behavioral and spiritual, and therefore remarkably resistant to government cures." That recognition is thankfully slowly dawning upon us after years of listening to experts and their destructive nonsense.

But the experts are doing their level best to keep us befuddled. They continue to preach nonsense like the proposition that crime and other forms of antisocial behavior are caused by poverty. The truth of the matter is the causal direction may be the other way around: Poverty is caused by crime and antisocial behavior. After all, poverty is the likely result when a person does not respect the rights and property of others and ignores the values of hard work, sacrifice and deferment of gratification.

Congress has put welfare reform high on its agenda. In seeking advice on what to do, they should summarily disqualify all the experts whose advice we've listened to in the past that has resulted in today's calamity. If I had it my way, there'd be a blanket exclusion of anyone from any government agency dealing with poverty and anyone who has received a government grant to do research on poverty.

DEMOLAY MONTH

HON. STEVE LARGENT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, March is DeMolay Month, when the Order of DeMolay—an international Masonic-related, fraternal, civic service organization for young men 13 to 21—celebrates its 76th anniversary. DeMolay is a youth development organization based on seven virtues needed in today's society—filial love; reverence for sacred things, such as God; courtesy; comradeship; fidelity; moral and physical cleanness; and patriotism. DeMolay promotes scholarship and provides a full package of leadership, athletic, social, and civic service activities to interest today's young men.

This year Delta Chapter, located in Jenks, OK and 1 of 4 DeMolay chapters in my congressional district, celebrates its 60th anniversary. For the first time in its history, Delta Chapter was recently named 1994 Oklahoma DeMolay Association Chapter of the Year. Last year, the chapter sponsored two recycling drives and a severe weather seminar for the Jenks community and held civic service and charitable projects for the Tulsa and Jenks Community Food Banks, Scottish Rite Childhood Language Clinics, Tulsa Area Book Bank, Big Brothers and Big Sisters of Green County, and the Oklahoma Masonic Home for the Aged.

Several prominent scientists, educators, business leaders, astronauts—and several former or current members of Congress—were active DeMolays in their youth. Distinguished political commentator and Tulsa-native Paul Harvey is a former member of Delta Chapter.

At a time when teenage drug use and gangs command the attention of the media, and teenage violence has reached near-epidemic levels, it is refreshing to recognize the leadership and good citizenship demonstrated by members of the Order of DeMolay.

THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF COMMUNICATIONS DEREGULATION

HON. TOM DELAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, Government regulations impose a tremendous burden on our Nation's economy. Excessive regulations result in higher prices for American consumers and fewer jobs for American workers. One of the primary goals of the Contract With America is to reduce onerous Government regulations and break down unnecessary barriers to competition. In that regard, I was especially interested to learn of a new study released by the independent Wharton Econometrics Forecasting Associates [WEFA] Group. Their study documents the positive impact that would result from greater competition in the U.S. communications industry. They conclude that full, immediate, and simultaneous competition in all communications markets would result in more jobs, lower prices, and a stronger economy. I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the results of the WEFA study as we continue to

more forward with our efforts to deregulate our Nation's economy.

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF DEREGULATING THE U.S. COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRIES—HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS

OVERVIEW

The 104th Congress is in the process of reforming the nation's outdated communications laws. A fundamental concern in this process involves when and to what extent cable TV, long distance and local telecommunications markets should be opened to competition. Opinions range from opening all markets immediately to creating lengthy approval processes for competitive entry.

A study released by renowned independent economic forecasting firm, The WEFA Group, quantifies the impact that various policy options will have on diverse economic indicators, including job-creation, economic growth, technological innovation, consumer savings and the balance of trade. Specifically, the WEFA study compares three approaches:

Immediate, full competition—removal of legal and regulatory barriers to market entry; change from traditional rate-of-return regulation to price-cap regulation for any noncompetitive service; complete deregulation of competitive services; and, all markets open simultaneously on January 1, 1996.

Competition phased in over two to three years—local competition occurs a year ahead of long distance competition, with full competition by 1998.

Competition phased in over four to five years—local competition occurs a year ahead of long distance competition, with full competition by 2000.

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

I. Immediate competition means new jobs, economic growth, consumer savings

Full, immediate and simultaneous competition in all communications markets will result in more jobs, lower prices and a stronger economy than any other option. The study finds that immediate and full competition in the telecommunications industry will achieve:

New jobs

3.4 million additional U.S. jobs would be created over the next ten years as a result of full, immediate competition in all communications markets. These jobs would be spread across all states and all major industry groups, including: 498,000 new jobs in manufacturing; 423,000 new construction jobs; 923,000 new jobs in wholesale and retail trade; 1.4 million new jobs in the service sector.

Economic growth

Once competition is brought fully and immediately to the communications industry, the benefits of lower prices, enhanced services and newer technology will boost economic activity throughout the economy. Specifically, within ten years, America would experience: \$298 billion increase in annual Real Gross Domestic Product; \$162 billion increase in annual Real Personal Consumption; \$14 billion improvement in annual balance of trade; \$140 billion improvement in the annual national budget deficit; an average increase of \$850 in the per year disposable income of each U.S. household.

Consumer savings

American consumers would receive substantial benefits from immediate competition in all communications markets. The study concluded that competition, which will bring greater network efficiencies, including bandwidth expansion and increased use of digital services, will result in a 23% decrease in telecommunications prices over

the next ten years. A large portion of this is due to a 35% decline in long-distance toll rates over the first five years of deregulation. Specifically, immediate competition would:

Save consumers nearly \$550 billion over the next ten years from lower telecommunications rates, including: \$333 billion in consumer savings from lower long distance rates; \$107 billion in consumer savings from lower cellular rates; \$78 billion in consumer savings from lower cable TV rates; \$32 billion in consumer savings from lower local rates.

II. Delayed competition means fewer jobs, slower economy, higher rates

In addition to the immediate competition model, the study forecasts the economic effect of two other models, assuming that it takes three and five years, respectively, to achieve full competition—including removal of entry barriers, change from rate-of-return regulation to price-cap regulation from rate-of-return regulation for noncompetitive services, and deregulation of competitive services.

A three-year delay in full competition would result in the creation of 1.5 million fewer jobs than would immediate deregulation over the next five years. A five-year delay would mean 1.9 million fewer jobs over the next five years.

A three-year delay in deregulation would result in \$137 billion less in real GDP, and a five year delay would mean \$171 billion less in real GDP over the next ten years.

III. The long-distance market is currently not competitive

Contrary to industry arguments, there is no real competition in the long distance industry today. The long distance companies have not lowered their rates, despite steep declines in local access charges, the most significant cost of providing service. In fact, the big three long distance companies have raised rates in an oligopolistic fashion six times in the past three years (see chart 1). In a truly competitive industry prices do not go up when costs go down.

This lack of real competition in the long distance industry may be the biggest barrier to entry facing competitors in the local market.

(1) State regulators fear that opening local and short-haul long distance would result in drastic losses in the access charge subsidies that help pay for universal service in residential and rural areas.

(2) Full and immediate competition, which includes lifting the long-distance restriction, would mitigate the losses of these access charges. As a result of full competition, local rates would decrease 1% per year over the next ten years.

IV. Regulatory reform is necessary

The study concludes that telecommunications companies must be free of pricing regulations that discourage investment in new network services if the full benefits of competition are to be realized. Specifically, the study finds:

Rate-of-return regulation, designed to constrain earnings under the "natural monopolies" of the past, only slows the rate of network investment and the introduction of new technologies in today's environment of competition and technological convergence.

Price regulation allows incumbent carriers to re-price existing services and to introduce new services in response to competition, while still holding prices below that which might occur in the absence of regulation. In competitive markets, competition and not artificial regulatory distinctions should determine pricing.

V. Delayed competition inhibits new services, creates "economic welfare loss"

A significant benefit of the Immediate Regulatory Relief model is that lower rates, better service and increased investment all would accelerate the affordable delivery of advanced services like health care, education, telecommuting and more.

On the other hand, the study finds that delaying competition in communications will also delay the deployment of new, advanced services. Each delay in the deployment of these new services, results in a significant cost to American's economy and society as a whole—a cost quantified as "economic welfare loss."

The economic welfare loss of new services delayed as a result of current barriers to competition amounts to more than \$110 billion per year of delay. This economic welfare loss includes, among other items: \$40 billion per year in residential medical and education services; \$20.4 billion per year in residential advanced information services; \$28.8 billion per year in residential and business video conferencing; \$10.3 billion per year in expanded residential entertainment programming.

Full competition in communications markets would result in a gain of between \$750 and \$1,000 in consumer welfare per year, per U.S. household, as a result of new services deployed.

Methodology

Through years of research, The WEFA Group has developed a set of forecasting models that provide the framework for developing consistent and accurate views of the impact of various market and policy developments on specific industries and the U.S. economy. In July 1993, the WEFA Group completed a study titled *The Economic Impact of Eliminating the Line-of-Business Restrictions on the Bell Companies*. That study showed that full competition would result in millions of new jobs, significant benefits for the American economy, accelerated innovation and infrastructure investment lower telecommunications rates and encourage the development of enhanced information services. The result would be substantial consumer savings and the creation of millions of new jobs.

This study uses an updated methodology to examine the costs already incurred by delaying regulatory reform and evaluate the costs of further delays in deregulation.

It takes a well-defined set of assumptions and adjustments gained from research and analysis of the telecommunications industry and imposes them on the WEFA models. It forecasts the effects not only on the telecommunications industry but on the industries that buy from and supply to the telecommunications industry, and reviews how the supply and demand on both sides impacts industry prices.

Each study model assumes the eventual onset of full competition, including: (1) the removal of Federal and state regulatory barriers to competition; (2) the replacement of "cost plus" rate-of-return regulation with a streamlined form of price regulation for non-competitive services; and (3) complete deregulation of competitive service offerings.

The models differ in two significant respects: one, the timing of full competition; and, two, the sequencing—while the Immediate Regulatory Relief scenario represents simultaneous entry into all markets, the three and five year delay scenarios open the local market to competition before the long-distance market.

THE PRESSLER AMENDMENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, next month Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto comes to Washington and will be conferring with Members in several meetings on the Hill.

Bilateral relations between the United States and Pakistan since 1990 have been dominated by the Pressler amendment, which stipulates that no United States assistance shall be furnished to Pakistan, and no military equipment or technology shall be sold or transferred to Pakistan, until the President on an annual basis certifies that Pakistan does not possess a nuclear explosive device.

In an effort to inform Members prior to Prime Minister Bhutto's visit to the Hill about this legislation and its impact on United States-Pakistani relations, I ask permission to include in the *Record* testimony I submitted a few days ago to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE PRESSLER AMENDMENT STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE LEE H. HAMILTON, SUBMITTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS, SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate you for calling this hearing on a most timely subject. Four weeks from today, Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto will be visiting Capitol Hill. Holding this hearing today on what has become the defining element in the bilateral U.S.-Pakistani relationship serves an important purpose by forcing us to examine the current status of, and prospects for, that relationship.

Let me add that I deeply appreciate the courtesy you have afforded me by inviting me to submit testimony as part of the official record of this hearing.

I also wish to take a moment to pay tribute to the two American diplomats who were killed yesterday in Karachi. The tragic deaths of Mr. Durell and Ms. Vanlandingham, as well as the wounding of Mr. McCloy, should serve to remind us that courageous American men and women place their lives on the line daily on behalf of the United States. I am sure that you join me in saluting their dedication and sacrifice, and calling upon the Pakistani government to spare no effort to bring their killers to justice.

Mr. Chairman, you have called this hearing to discuss our nonproliferation policies in South Asia. There are few issues of greater importance to U.S. security. The previous director of the Central Intelligence Agency identified the Indian Subcontinent as the most likely place in the world for the outbreak of a nuclear conflict—a catastrophe that would affect the United States as well as more than one billion people in South Asia.

Moreover, a failure to stop the spread of nuclear weapons in South Asia will also limit our ability to keep such weapons out of the hands of Iran, Iraq, North Korea, and other would-be nuclear powers. A world with fifteen or twenty nuclear weapons states is a world we don't wish to contemplate. So the importance of your hearing today—coming as it does only weeks before the international community is to convene in New York to determine the fate of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty—cannot be overestimated.

Mr. Chairman, my argument today can be summarized in a few brief propositions: Pakistan is a country the United States cannot and should not ignore. The Pressler amendment has undermined our bilateral relations with Pakistan. As a nonproliferation tool, the Pressler amendment has outlived its usefulness, and is now counterproductive. It is time to modify this amendment, or even to lift it altogether.

Allow me to amplify each of these propositions in turn.

I. PAKISTAN IS A COUNTRY THE UNITED STATES CANNOT AND SHOULD NOT IGNORE

U.S. National Interests: Why is it in the national interest of the United States to maintain decent relations with Pakistan?

There is, first of all, the matter of sheer numbers. Pakistan is the 7th largest nation in the world. It is the world's second largest Moslem nation. Size alone compels the United States to pay attention to Pakistan.

Second, considerations of global and regional security make cooperation with Islamabad important for the United States. Pakistan occupies a strategic location on the map. It is situated near major countries—China, Russia, Iran, India—and neighbors the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, and central Asia. Its army is the world's eighth largest. Even in a post-cold war world, the United States should not ignore these geopolitical and geostrategic considerations.

In addition, the United States has an important interest in working to prevent the outbreak of a South Asian war that could spiral into a nuclear conflict. We can best promote regional peace and stability if we have good relations with Pakistan as well as India.

Third, Pakistan has been an active supporter of United Nations peacekeeping activities. Its 7,000 troops in Somalia comprised the largest international component in that difficult operation. Islamabad contributed more than one thousand troops to the U.N. operation in Cambodia. It currently has 3,000 soldiers in Bosnia. In fact, Pakistan has provided more troops for U.N. peacekeeping efforts around the world than any other country—including our own.

Fourth, this and previous administrations have identified missile and nuclear nonproliferation as a primary component of U.S. security. As one of the world's few nuclear weapons-capable states not a party to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT], Pakistan is crucial to the success of our global nonproliferation efforts. Similarly, it is in our national interest to prevent the deployment of the ballistic missiles both India and Pakistan are developing.

The fifth reason we should not ignore Pakistan relates to our desire to combat international terrorism and drug trafficking. Yesterday's tragic events in Karachi have once more brought home to us the grave threat posed by terrorism. The value of Pakistani cooperation in the fight against terrorism was vividly demonstrated last month when Prime Minister Bhutto, in the face of certain domestic opposition, moved swiftly to extradite to the United States the individual alleged to be the mastermind behind the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center.

On the narcotics front, Pakistan is a conduit for opium and heroin grown in Afghanistan, the second largest opium producer in the world. If the deadly flow of Afghan drugs is to be stanchied, we must have Pakistani cooperation. And while we have not been fully satisfied with the steps Pakistan has taken in the counter-narcotics area in recent years, just last week President Clinton stated that the government of Pakistan has laid the foundation for significant progress during the current year in the fight against illicit drugs.

Sixth, the United States has a clear-cut interest in encouraging democracy, pluralism, secularism, and a respect for human rights in Pakistan. Pakistan can be a model of a democratic, secular Islamic state, a partner in the effort to combat the spread of religious and ideological extremism. The administration believes that Pakistan has used its moderating influence with other Islamic countries. We should seek to buttress that influence.

Finally, economic and trade considerations call for friendly relations with Pakistan. Admittedly these U.S. interests are not as important in a statistical sense as in some other countries. Nonetheless, we have an interest in promoting continued economic reform, deregulation, and trade liberalization in Pakistan.

U.S.-Pakistani differences: Let me hasten to add, Mr. Chairman, that none of this suggests that we see eye to eye with Pakistan on all important issues. We don't. We would like to see Islamabad join the NPT, but it refuses to do so. We wish Pakistan would cease all military support for the Kashmiri insurgents. We want more vigorous law enforcement against the druglords. We are concerned about the uneven respect given human rights in Pakistan. We are sometimes dismayed by what passes for democratic politics in Pakistan.

But most fundamentally, we believe that Pakistan, by choosing to embark upon a nuclear weapons program, has broken its pledge to us in a way that directly challenges U.S. national interests.

The substantial levels of U.S. assistance provided to Pakistan throughout the 1980s were part of an explicit bargain: we would furnish Pakistan with financial and military aid, in return for which Islamabad would forgo the nuclear weapons option. Pakistan violated that bargain. The subsequent deterioration in our bilateral relations flows directly from that action. Until Pakistan redresses that breach of faith, ties between our two countries will never recapture the warmth and sense of common purpose they possessed a decade ago.

In the sense, it is neither prudent nor possible to "let bygones be bygones." But at the same time, insofar as it advances American purposes, we should try to build on the shared interests I have set forth above in order to promote U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives.

II. THE PRESSLER AMENDMENT HAS UNDERMINED OUR BILATERAL RELATIONS WITH PAKISTAN

After a close and productive relationship throughout the 1980s, bilateral ties between Washington and Islamabad plummeted after President Bush proved unable in 1990 to certify, under the Pressler amendment, that Pakistan does not possess a nuclear explosive device.

In the four-and-a-half years since then, the Pressler amendment has been by far the most important element shaping the bilateral relationship. By banning aid and most military sales and transfers, the amendment has sharply limited the possibility of a U.S.-Pakistani collaborative relationship.

In some respects, it is surprising that U.S.-Pakistani relations have remained as good as they have since 1990. Islamabad continues to attach great importance to its relationship with Washington. There exists in Pakistan, especially at the official level, a deep reservoir of good will toward the United States.

Nonetheless, there is no denying that the Pressler amendment has had a corrosive impact on bilateral ties. Moreover, so long as Pressler remains the law of the land, relations are unlikely to improve. Secretary Perry's trip to Pakistan in January, for all

the warm sentiments it evoked, did not break the fundamental impasse between Washington and Islamabad.

The F-16 Problem: During Prime Minister Bhutto's visit to Washington next month, the single most important item on her agenda will be the F-16s Pakistan bought, but which have not been directed because of Pressler amendment restrictions. If Ms. Bhutto fails to persuade the United States to release the F-16s, she will at a minimum ask for the return of the \$658 million Pakistan has paid for these warplanes.

I am worried about the creation of excessive expectations for the prime minister's visit. Pakistan is unlikely to get the F-16s. More than that, serious problems stand in the way of returning the full \$658 million. This money has already been paid to the manufacturer. The U.S. government does not have the ability to give the money back, even if it were so inclined.

We face the distinct possibility, therefore, that someone who has been a good friend to the United States, the head of government of an important country with longstanding ties to the United States, is about to come to Washington for what many of her countrymen may see as a diplomatic fiasco.

And all this, ironically, because of legislation that, when adopted in 1985, was designed as a Pakistan-friendly amendment. The members of this subcommittee will recall that when Sen. Pressler first offered his amendment, he envisioned it as a means of heading off far more punitive legislation.

III. THE PRESSLER AMENDMENT HAS OUTLIVED ITS USEFULNESS

Speaking to a New York audience recently, Secretary Perry called the Pressler amendment "a blunt instrument" that has undercut our influence in Pakistan and hindered our efforts to avert a nuclear arms race in South Asia.

I concur. It has reduced our voice in a large, militarily-significant, moderate Islamic country. It has led to an increase in Chinese, and possibly Iranian, influence in Pakistan. It has hampered our ability to achieve other important U.S. objectives in the region, such as strengthening democracy and human rights, fighting illicit narcotics, and promoting economic development.

Even in the area of nonproliferation, the Pressler amendment has become counterproductive. It has given India no incentive to engage in meaningful negotiations on nonproliferation, since New Delhi prefers a status quo that punishes only Pakistan. It has, by reducing Pakistan's conventional strength, given arguments to those in Pakistan who wish to pursue the nuclear option more vigorously. It even threatens to drive Pakistan into an unholy nuclear partnership with Iran, Iraq, or other would-be proliferations—though to date, fortunately, there is no evidence that Pakistan has succumbed to this temptation.

Let me remind this subcommittee that the Pressler amendment was never intended to be triggered. Its proponents hoped that by drawing a clear line, they would give Pakistan an incentive to avoid crossing that line. Once those hopes were dashed and the amendment was invoked, it lost its usefulness. In the four-plus years since then, our once flourishing partnership with Pakistan has deteriorated, while nuclear tensions on the Subcontinent, and the possibility of a nuclear catastrophe, remain unabated.

IV. IT'S TIME TO MODIFY THE PRESSLER AMENDMENT

I suppose it is no surprise that my own preferences would be to repeal this legislation altogether. But, Mr. Chairman, I can

count votes, and I understand that this does not appear to be the position held by a majority of my colleagues.

As the next best thing, then, I think your Committee should ask the administration to take another look at what the Pressler amendment requires—to see if there are opportunities for useful modification.

This is not a radical suggestion. Indeed, both this and the previous administration have already begun to do this. So has the Congress. For instance:

In each of the past three years, the foreign operations bill has contained a provision allowing the U.S. government to spend monies for assistance programs in Pakistan operated by non-governmental organizations. Last year, for the first time, USAID provided nearly \$10 million for child survival and female literacy programs in Pakistan.

Under the terms of the Pressler amendment, Pakistan is not permitted to receive International Military Education and Training [IMET]. But in January, Secretary Perry agreed in principle that Islamabad could purchase professional military education [PME] courses, so long as the transfer of technology was not involved.

What I am proposing now is that the administration, in close consultation with the Congress, push this process forward. Certain desirable steps will require legislative action, but there are also steps the administration, after consultation with Congress, should take on its own. For instance:

(1) Pakistan should be made eligible for Overseas Private Investment Corporation [OPIC] insurance programs. OPIC is not an aid donating agency. Its purpose is to promote U.S. business interests in overseas markets. By withholding OPIC eligibility, we only penalize our own business community. OPIC, moreover, has the added virtue of being self-financing.

(2) The Administration should waive the storage fees charged to Pakistan for holding its F-16s—fees that amount to \$50,000 per plane per year. We are refusing to release the airplanes, as the Pressler amendment requires, and then we insist that Pakistan pay us for holding them. This doesn't pass the common sense test.

(3) The Administration should move forward with Secretary Perry's suggestion that Pakistan be allowed to purchase PME courses. In this way, we will strengthen military-to-military ties, at a time when the Pakistani military, which for much of the country's history had been a threat to democracy, may now be the ultimate guarantor of Pakistani democracy. (The army's role during the year-long political crisis of 1993, for instance, has been viewed by many observers as positive.)

(4) We should provide visa enforcement training for Pakistani customs employees. Here again, this is a common sense move.

Slowing down illegal immigration to the United States is in our interest.

(5) We should be offering flight safety training to Pakistani air controllers. Since this would be of direct value to U.S. travelers, it is difficult to see why anyone should object.

(6) I would like to see the provisions contained in recent foreign operations bills maintained or even expanded, in order to permit limited economic assistance for social programs—population planning, for instance, or primary education, or rural clinics. While any assistance made available in this fashion would be modest in amount, it would send the message that the United States has not turned its back on a friend.

(7) Finally, I believe that fairness and good policy require that we return some of the military items that the Pakistani military sent here for repair or other work prior to the invocation of the Pressler amendment, and which we have kept because of the Pressler legislation.

Conclusion: None of these steps in and of themselves will turn the U.S.-Pakistani relationship around. But they would have a symbolic importance out of all proportion to their actual significance. They would say to the Pakistanis that we still value their friendship, that we care about this relationship. And they would help contribute to the success of Prime Minister Bhutto's visit.

I would urge the Administration to consult closely with the Congress before taking any of these steps. I am pleased to note that considerable consultation already has taken place. I would now encourage the Executive to come forward with specific recommendations, and I would encourage my colleagues in the Legislative branch to give such recommendations serious consideration.

From the standpoint of advancing U.S. policy objectives in South Asia, as well as promoting our global nonproliferation goals, we should accept the fact that the Pressler amendment, however well intended, has outlived its usefulness. The administration and the Congress should acknowledge this reality, and move to place our South Asia policy on a sounder footing.

The first step should be to lift some of the restrictions imposed by the Pressler amendment. I urge the members of this distinguished subcommittee to take the lead in this enterprise.

BLACK PRESS WEEK

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the invaluable contributions of the African-American press. From the founding of the Freedom's Journal, to the pioneering work of Ebony founder John Johnson, to the contributions of the National Newspaper Publishers Association [NNPA], the African-American press has been in the forefront of news coverage and a force for social change. It is fitting that we honor these and other leaders during National Black Press Week.

This year, Ebony magazine is celebrating its 50th anniversary. Its founder and publisher, Mr. John Johnson, was recently awarded the prestigious Communication Award from the Center for Communication for this pioneering efforts on behalf of African-Americans. His work and values are embodied in Ebony, a premier American magazine known for its excellence.

Mr. Johnson's work has helped pave the way for many African Americans in journalism. Within my own congressional district, there are newspapermen of great distinction: Mr. William Hales, editor and publisher of the Hartford Inquirer; Mr. Edgar Johnson, editor of the West Indian American; and Mr. John Allen, editor-in-chief of the North End Agent. Each one has distinguished himself and his paper by informing the community about relevant issues and pressing for social change. They have increased public awareness on issues of importance to the African-American and West Indian-American community.

My district is richer for the contributions of these men and their papers. Today, their work is made possible in part by the legacy of the Nation's first African-American newspaper, the Freedom's Journal. Mr. John Brown Russwurm and Mr. Samuel E. Cornish founded this paper to honor the ideals of the rights and liberties guaranteed in the Constitution, and out of their appreciation for the rich diversity of African-American culture. Their first steps helped pave the way for the many men and women who followed in their footsteps. And they enriched the lives of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the NNPA on its 168th anniversary and also to thank all the journalists who carry on the traditions that make Black Press Week a distinguished celebration.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 16, 1995, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 17

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on the Department of the Interior and the Department of Defense consultations concerning conservation of endangered species at Ft. Bragg, North Carolina.

SD-406

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to reform the Federal regulatory process.

SD-226

MARCH 20

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider S. Con. Res. 6, to express the sense of the Senate concerning compliance by the Government of Mexico regarding certain loans, S. 384, to require a report on U.S. support for Mexico during its debt crisis, S. Con. Res. 3, relating to Taiwan and the United States, S. Con. Res. 4, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the North-South Korea Agreed Framework, S. Con. Res. 9, expressing the sense of the Congress regarding a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China on Taiwan to the U.S., Treaty Doc. 103-25, with respect to restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons, and pending nominations.

SD-419

Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the impact in Indian Country of proposed rescissions of fiscal year 1995 Indian program funds and of proposals to consolidate or block grant Federal programs funds to the several states.

SR-485

MARCH 21

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings on the nomination of Daniel Robert Glickman, of Kansas, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

SD-C50

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on telecommunications policy reform issues, focusing on cable rates, broadcast, and foreign ownership.

SR-253

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the impact of regulatory reform proposals on environmental and other laws within the jurisdiction of the committee.

SD-406

Special on Aging

To hold hearings to examine the scope of health care fraud.

SH-216

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Production and Regulation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 92, to provide for the reconstitution of outstanding repayment obligations of the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration for the appropriated capital investments in the Federal Columbia River Power System.

SD-366

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on S. 5, to clarify the war powers of Congress and the President in the post-Cold War period, and H.R. 7, to revitalize the national security of the United States.

SD-419

Governmental Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation to reform the Federal regulatory process.

SD-342

Labor and Human Resources

Aging Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Older Americans Act, focusing on Title III.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To continue hearings on S. 5, to clarify the war powers of Congress and the President in the post-Cold War period, and H.R. 7, to revitalize the national security of the United States.

SD-419

MARCH 22

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

SD-192

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings to review a report prepared for the committee on the clean-up of Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.

SD-138

Judiciary

To hold hearings on an analysis of Federal assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 441, to authorize funds for certain programs under the

Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act.

SR-485

MARCH 23

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SR-253

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on direct lending practices.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, and the National Passenger Railroad Corporation (Amtrak).

SD-192

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and the United States Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

SD-192

Armed Services

Personnel Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on the Department of Defense medical program and related health care issues.

SR-222

Environment and Public Works

Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to approve the National Highway System and transportation issues related to clean air conformity requirements.

SD-406

3:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-138

MARCH 24

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-138

MARCH 27

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Executive Office of the President, and the General Services Administration.

SD-138

MARCH 28
 9:30 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Defense Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Army programs. SD-138

Appropriations
 Interior Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior. SD-116

Governmental Affairs
 Oversight of Government Management and The District of Columbia Subcommittee
 To hold oversight hearings to examine initiatives to reduce the cost of Pentagon travel processing. SD-342

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Foreign Operations Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on Africa humanitarian and refugee issues. SD-192

view the legislative recommendations of AMVETS, American Ex-Prisoners of War, Vietnam Veterans of America, Blinded Veterans Association, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart. 345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Transportation Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation. SD-192

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
 To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the science programs of the National Science Foundation and activities of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (Executive Office of the President). SR-253

Environment and Public Works
 Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed legislation to approve the National Highway System and other related transportation requirements. SD-406

tional Aeronautics and Space Administration. SD-192

Energy and Natural Resources
 Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
 To hold oversight hearings on the U.S. Forest Service land management planning process. SD-366

Rules and Administration
 To resume hearings to examine the future of the Smithsonian Institution. SR-301

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, Economic Research Service, and the National Agricultural Statistics Service, all of the Department of Agriculture. SD-138

Appropriations
 Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Bureau of Prisons, both of the Department of Justice. S-146, Capitol

MARCH 29
 9:30 a.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-366

Special on Aging
 To hold hearings to examine ways that individuals and families can better plan and pay for their long term care needs. SD-628

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, all of the Department of Agriculture. SD-138

Appropriations
 Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts, and the Judicial Conference. S-146, Capitol

10:30 a.m.
 Indian Affairs
 Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SR-485

MARCH 31
 9:30 a.m.
 Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
 To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on agricultural credit. SR-332

Appropriations
 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Court of Veteran's Appeals, and Veterans Affairs Service Organizations. SD-138

APRIL 3
 2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Personnel Management. SD-138

APRIL 4
 9:30 a.m.
 Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
 To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on market effects of Federal farm policy. SR-332

Appropriations
 Interior Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. SD-138

2:30 p.m.
 Indian Affairs
 To hold oversight hearings on welfare reform in Indian Country. SR-485

APRIL 6
 9:30 a.m.
 Appropriations
 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency. SD-138

10:00 a.m.
 Environment and Public Works
 Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed legislation to approve the National Highway System, issues related to the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, and the innovative financing of transportation facilities. SD-406

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget. SD-116

MARCH 30
 9:30 a.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 506, to reform Federal mining laws. SD-366

Rules and Administration
 To hold hearings to examine the future of the Smithsonian Institution. SR-301

Veterans' Affairs
 To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to re-

APRIL 5
 9:30 a.m.
 Appropriations
 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Na-

APRIL 26
 9:30 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Interior Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for energy conservation. SD-116

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Food

and Consumer Service, Department of Agriculture.		est Service of the Department of Agriculture.		MAY 5
	SD-138		SD-138	
Appropriations				9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee				Appropriations
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Legal Services Corporation.				VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
	S-146, Capitol			To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for Environmental Protection Agency science programs.
11:00 a.m.				SD-138
Appropriations				
Interior Subcommittee				MAY 11
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for fossil energy, clean coal technology, Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and the Naval Petroleum Reserve.				
	SD-116			10:00 a.m.
				Appropriations
				Interior Subcommittee
				To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.
				SD-116
	APRIL 27			
10:00 a.m.				1:00 p.m.
Appropriations				Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee				Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation.				To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.
	SD-192			SD-116
	MAY 2			MAY 17
9:30 a.m.				9:30 a.m.
Appropriations				Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee				Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the For-				To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of the Interior.
				SD-192