

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE COMPETITIVE CONSUMER ELECTRONICS AVAILABILITY ACT OF 1995

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Competitive Consumer Electronics Availability Act of 1995. This legislation would require the Federal Communications Commission to take affirmative steps to promote competition in set-top boxes and other new technologies that will give consumers access to the national information infrastructure [NII]. Pursuant to this legislation, Commission regulations will assure that converter boxes, interactive communications devices, and other customer premises equipment be available on a competitive basis from manufacturers, retailers, and other vendors who are not affiliated with the operators of telecommunications systems, as is the case in our telephone system today.

It is fashionable to talk about telecommunications reform in terms of opening interfaces between networks or modes of communication. But the one area that ought to be a priority is the consumer interface—how our constituents will actually be connected to these new networks. So far we have two models—the telephone system, where there is a free and competitive market in making and selling network access devices to consumers; and cable television, where the consumer has enjoyed little choice or selection in devices. The Competitive Consumer Electronics Availability Act seeks to ensure that we follow the competitive market model rather than the monopoly model.

I want to be clear that this legislation does not address the internal operating systems or functions of set-top boxes or other devices. I have no intention of inviting or allowing the Commission to regulate the competitive features of computers. What the legislation does address is simply the question of access—allowing these devices, however they operate or are configured, whether they are separate or built into TV's or personal computers, to connect to the NII. A consumer should be able to choose one the same way he or she chooses other products, by going to the store, comparing the quality, features, and price, and buying or renting the best one.

The legislation does not specify any one means or technology by which the Commission must move from local monopoly to national competition. Finding the best way is what the Commission's public notice and comment process is for. With the aid of the world's most competitive telecommunications and computer industries, and a huge market begging for innovation, the Commission can rely on the private sector to identify the best answers.

I also want to stress that this legislation would not stop a system operator from continuing to offer access devices, so long as the

charges for devices are kept separate from the charges for its system services. The Commission would also be empowered to grant waivers, for a limited time, to system operators who are introducing new services.

In introducing and working for the passage of this legislation, I do not mean to disregard the very reasonable concerns of system operators, such as cable TV companies, to deliver to each consumer only the level of service that has been purchased, and to protect the security of their systems. But this is 1995, not 1965. I cannot accept the notion that to accommodate these concerns it is necessary to convey a monopoly on any consumer electronics devices, any more than previous Congresses and Commissions should have accepted the notion that our telephone system would fall apart if consumers would hook up their own devices.

Mr. Speaker, the American public wants and deserves to play a direct role in forming a national information infrastructure. One need only look at the enormous and growing participation and influence of individuals in the Internet to see this. It would be foolish and shortsighted not to allow consumers to select or own the very devices that will open up so much of the NII to them. Consumers deserve to be able to evaluate and select competing products at retail, side by side. Their freedom to do so is a core strength of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we will have telecommunications reform this year, and I will work to achieve this goal. But we cannot fail to address the most important interface, the consumer interface. I, therefore, ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Competitive Consumer Electronics Availability Act of 1995.

HONORING JESSE SAPOLU

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jesse Sapolu an accomplished individual who has devoted much of his private life to working with the youth of his community. Jesse also is a National Football League all-pro lineman for the 1994-95 world champion San Francisco 49ers football team.

Following his 1979 graduation from Harrington High School in Hawaii, Jesse attended the University of Hawaii where his football career was marked by many outstanding accomplishments both on and off the field. In 1983, Jesse was drafted by the 49ers. Over the past 13 seasons, Jesse has been a consistent performer and contributor to the San Francisco 49ers dominance of professional football. He has been an integral part of the 49ers four Super Bowl victories and for his excellence on the field of play he has been rewarded by his selection as an all-pro center in 1993 and guard in 1994.

Jesse is an ideal role model for the Pacific Islander community. Much of his off-season time is dedicated to working with youth. He is a junior youth leader at the Dominguez Congregational Church and a valuable ally in the antidrug campaign, as an ardent supporter of the just say no to drugs effort.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise to recognize the accomplishments of Jesse Sapolu and I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting him.

A HISTORIC PARTNERSHIP

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues some remarks recently delivered by the Honorable Raymond L. Flynn, the U.S. Ambassador to the Vatican.

In his statement, the Ambassador reflects on the United States moral obligation to help end suffering of our fellow men. I agree that this ethical consideration, to help where we can, and lead by example, should be the cornerstone of our Nation's foreign policy. As my colleagues are no doubt aware, the Holy See has demonstrated great leadership in the fight for freedom from all types of oppression. I commend his speech, "the United States and the Holy See: A Historic Partnership" to my colleagues' attention.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE HOLY SEE: A HISTORIC PARTNERSHIP . . . FROM THE POTOMAC TO THE TIBER

Delivering humanitarian assistance to the Third World: the Necessity to act

The United States and the Vatican are developing an important partnership, one based on common interest, cooperation and coordination. This partnership has the capability to become a prominent feature of the post cold-war world where the ability to achieve results in the international arena may be based as much on moral concerns as on military and economic alliances.

Many are not aware of the relationship between the U.S. and the Vatican, so let me review some of the highlights of our productive relationship over the past 11 years of official diplomatic relations. First I would like to discuss a crucial issue for U.S. foreign policy: the moral commitment we have as a nation to help those most in need.

We hear outrageous statements in Congress about the trillions of dollars of foreign aid being tossed down Third World ratholes. There is a major debate in Washington today about whether to cut the foreign aid that goes to feed the hungry and clothe the naked in some of the poorest places in the world. What many Americans do not realize is that we spend less than one half of one percent of the federal budget on foreign aid and even less on the part of foreign aid that goes toward humanitarian assistance. That is not too much. If anything, it's too little.

Foreign aid to help poor and developing countries is not only morally correct but makes sound U.S. policy. A small amount of

• 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.

money goes a long way and can mean the difference between life and death. American interests are better served when countries and regions are stable. The U.S. throughout its history has often been isolationist when it has come to getting involved in the world's problems. But if we don't, we will be dealing with famine, disease and possible military intervention later on. I don't need to remind you of the problems the U.S. has encountered in its temporary, fitful withdrawals from the world community throughout its history.

Like it or not, there is a moral dimension to foreign policy. Children dying of malnutrition and disease are moral concerns of the U.S. We can't and shouldn't ignore this.

When President Clinton nominated me to be the U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See two years ago, the President told me he wanted me to work closely with the Catholic Church on issues of social and economic justice. As part of this role, I have traveled widely to visit some of the most desperate places on earth both to highlight the problems in as well as consult with Catholic charities and other humanitarian aid organizations on how well aid was being delivered to these areas. Over the past many months, I have been to India, Sudan, Haiti, Somalia, Kenya, Uganda, Croatia, Sarajevo, Burundi, and Rwanda and have seen for myself humanitarian crises occurring in these countries. I have also seen, though, the fine work of the Catholic and other charities in the places I have visited, including that of Catholic Relief Services, Caritas, Doctors Without Borders, and many other groups across the religious and social spectrum.

The world's media are interested in these places for a few weeks or months. But then a new story comes along and the continuing crisis becomes yesterday's news. The television cameras leave and people still starve. We need a way to keep the world's attention focused on these troubled places, but we also need to read about the great successes that are achieved by these humanitarian organizations or donor fatigue will set in. To read the paper these days is to read of failures—in Somalia, Rwanda, Sudan. It's partly true but does not touch on the successes: the work of aid organizations to keep people alive.

The African example: The forgotten continent

Involvement by the U.S. in Africa during the past two years has in the public's eye, centered largely on Somalia. There has been a lot of talk recently in the press and among politicians about the "failure of our mission in Somalia." I was in Somalia while operation "Restore Hope" was underway and saw what it made possible for relief workers of many nations to do under the protection of U.S. and UN troops. The peace they brought to Baidoa had dramatic humanitarian consequences. Baidoa as called the "City of death", where thousands had died of starvation and hundreds of thousands more were expected to die in the near future. You remember the pictures on CNN during December 1992. And Baidoa was not unique. The famine caused by the ravages of the warlords prevented crops from being planted and food being distributed. Without operation "Restore Hope" millions would have died.

A lot of people are saying that it is the responsibility of Somalis to put their own country in order, and that no peace can be imposed from outside. I agree completely. Nor do I think it constructive to discuss how we might have conducted "Restore Hope" differently.

The moral question we need to face, and face squarely, is "Was Operation Restore Hope the right thing to do? On one hand, we have a 26-month operation that cost the UN

over \$1.7 billion and the lives of 132 peacekeepers, some American but most Pakistani. On the other hand, we have to consider what might have been the consequences of our non-action: possibly a million or more people dead of starvation. Can and should the U.S.—the only superpower with the wherewithal to stop a famine in Somalia—risk U.S. lives and resources to stop widespread death? We chose not to do so in Rwanda. We have chosen not to do so in Liberia and Sierra Leone.

It comes down to a moral question: what is the greater good? I think that America—the only super power—has the duty to act, and I think it is in our interest to do so. We are not truly ourselves unless we act to save innocent lives.

There's still a crisis in Africa . . .

Starvation is again looming over the African continent. Recent reports indicate that the coming famine could be worse than those experienced over the past few years, when aid donors often—because of ignorance of what was happening—responded too late to the crises. The international humanitarian group CARE estimates that almost 30 million people are at risk in the Horn of Africa alone. Many organizations are working now to battle "compassion fatigue" among the rich donor countries. One way we should be able to fight this is through coordination between the U.S. government, private charities, and the Catholic Church. We need to keep the response to a possible African famine focused and organized and convince the international community of this critical effort.

As one who has visited most of the countries in Africa which are faced with famine, I want to sound a strong warning bell to the international community that chaos, devastation, and death are at their door. Will it be on our conscience?

U.S.-Vatican partnership

At this point, you might fairly ask, what is the U.S. Ambassador to the Vatican doing speaking out on these things? Part of the answer is that humanitarian issues have always been in the forefront of my work throughout my public life. I'll never forget my parents, a dockworker and a cleaning lady, response when I asked them why they put money in the Church poor box every week despite our modest means, "we're not as poor as some people," they said, "we have our health and a roof over our heads." We all need to remember that there are many people, particularly in the Third World, that are desperate for the basic necessities to live and we cannot abandon them. My position at the Vatican and my instructions from President Clinton to focus on humanitarian issues during my tenure here have led to a natural partnership with the Vatican on developing better ways to deliver aid. From my unique position as the U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See I have looked around me to see what contribution this Embassy could make to helping those in the most distressed places in the world. By combining the resources of the world's remaining superpower—the U.S.—with the force of the world's moral superpower—the Holy See—we will be able to contribute to getting aid to where it is needed most because of the complementary resources of the U.S. government, the Catholic Church, and their respective aid organizations. The goal is not original, but the way to achieve it is. The U.S. and the Catholic Church, through its various charities, already coordinate on an informal level in many humanitarian assistance projects. This initiative does not exclude anyone or any group. In fact, Administration officials will reach out to many private charities over the next few months to solicit their ideas and

support. My charge from the President, however, is to pursue cooperation with the Catholic Church because of my position at the Holy See, which is why I limit my discussion here to that topic.

I have already discussed the conscientious efforts of U.S. humanitarian assistance missions to deliver needed food, medicine and supplies around the world. But I have also seen the problems with aid deliveries on my visits to the Third World. For example, on my Presidential mission to India in October, 1993, to lead the U.S. relief effort following the devastating earthquakes there, I observed a disturbing problem with the organization of the aid delivery: no one brought emergency housing provisions or some key medical supplies for children. International donors sent food and water purification systems, but not one of the most basic necessities for the newly homeless Indians, temporary shelters. This illustrated to me two problems: first, while there was obviously coordination of aid delivery country-by-country, there was not adequate coordination on the international level to make sure that the needed supplies were sent and the needed coordination took place. Second, many of the resources for getting information about what was needed at an early stage were not used, meaning the people on the ground were having a hard time telling international donors what would be most useful. The UN does a lot of coordination, as do international charities and individual countries, but I wondered as I left India if it could not be done better.

The initiative takes shape

One way to work on the better coordination of aid—and to make sure that aid gets to the people who need it most at the least cost—is through a partnership between the U.S. and Catholic and other charities. The Holy See, which has often been called the "world's listening post," can help supply useful data in our efforts to respond more effectively to international disasters.

On December 2, 1994, President Clinton wrote to Pope John Paul II, offering a closer collaboration between the U.S. government and the Vatican to better alleviate the "human suffering in a world with too many man-made and natural disasters." In his letter to the Holy Father, the President designated me as his direct representative on this initiative with the Vatican. The Pope welcomed the initiative in his written response to the President and named Cardinal Roger Etchegaray, president of the pontifical council Cor Unum (which coordinates the humanitarian assistance of the Vatican and Catholic charities around the world) as his point man on the issue.

I met with Cardinal Etchegaray at the end of January. I presented him with a proposal from Brian Atwood, the Director of the U.S. Agency for International Development (U.S. AID) to share with the Vatican situation reports on U.S. assistance missions and reports from its recently-created Famine Early Warning System. U.S. AID also offered to review jointly with the Vatican our various emergency responses, with a view to improving future reactions to emergencies.

Cardinal Etchegaray welcomed our proposals to share information and coordinate the delivery of assistance around the world. He told me that Catholic charities, because of their extensive network of workers in the world's trouble spots, would be able to share the information with the U.S. government. The Cardinal emphasized the Pope's deep interest in humanitarian concerns and pointed to two institutes the Pope supports to promote sustainable development in Latin America and sub-Saharan Africa. He offered

these as two constructive points of immediate cooperation between the U.S. and the Catholic Church.

I have also met regularly with Archbishop Giovanni Cheli, Andre Nguyen Van Chau (International Catholic Migration Commission), Kenneth Hackett (Catholic Relief Services), and with representatives of other respected emergency relief organizations to pursue further avenues of cooperation between the U.S. and the Catholic Church. In March, I spent two hours with Mr. Hackett discussing the best way to anticipate political and natural disasters so that aid can be delivered early. The fine work of CRS should be a model for what we can accomplish on a larger scale, with more donors involved in coordinating humanitarian assistance.

The U.S. has financial resources and logistical support to offer Catholic charities. These charities, which receive direction from the Vatican, are often an early warning system of their own, with key insights into where crises will occur and how to prevent them in the first place.

The Moral imperative to act

Charity begins at home, as the popular saying goes. We are left—after all the discussion and analysis in Congress, on the OP-ED pages, on the Sunday talk shows—with something that is often forgotten: we have a moral imperative to act to save people who are starving and dying. We as a nation have always done this. To say that it should not be part of foreign policy is to deny much of what we are as a people and country. There is no moral distinction to be made between someone starving in New York and someone starving in Sudan or Rwanda. We should attempt to help both.

It is time to cut through the rhetoric and say it clearly: we should be spending a portion of the federal budget—it's only one half of one percent at present, which does not seem to me to be too high—to help those less fortunate than ourselves. It makes good moral, as well as foreign policy, sense.

That said, there are always ways to provide aid more efficiently. By working together, the U.S. and the Holy See can contribute to the more effective utilization of resources to help those in need. In Pope John Paul II and President Clinton, we have a natural partnership in the concern for the poor, disadvantaged, and forgotten. Let's build on that partnership to achieve concrete results. As I have said before, the U.S.-Vatican relationship seems to be one made in heaven; but it's nice also to see fruits of our labor together here on earth.

CHARLES GATI ON A TROUBLED
RUSSIA

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to take note of an excellent op-ed in the Washington Post of March 17 by my good friend and highly respected foreign policy analyst, Charles Gati. As we reevaluate our relationship with Boris Yeltsin and a rapidly changing Russia, Charles Gati provides an invaluable perspective on the internal disintegration of Russian society and its effect on Yeltsin's ability to govern. While not making excuses for the mistakes Yeltsin has made, we must understand that, as Charles has put it, "Yeltsin's about-face [on reform] is a symptom, not the cause, of Russia's plight." I commend Charles for his incisive and thoughtful

analysis and urge my colleagues to read this excellent piece:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 17, 1995]

WEIMAR RUSSIA

(By Charles Gati)

In his astute analysis of Russia's predicament [op-ed, Feb. 22], Peter Reddaway convincingly shows that President Boris Yeltsin has all but abandoned the course of reform he began in 1991.

The point that needs to be added is that Yeltsin's about-face is a symptom, not the cause, of Russia's plight. As the transition from one-party rule and the command economy to today's chaotic conditions has benefited few and alienated many, public support for reform has yielded to pressure for retrenchment.

In Moscow, members of the small biznis class can afford to rent a dacha for more than \$5,000 a month, eat out at a fashionable Swiss restaurant where the main course costs \$40, and pay \$3.25 for a slice of Viennese torte. By contrast, the vast majority of the Russian people, who earn less than \$100 a month if employed, are worse off than they were under communism.

The nostalgia they feel for an improved version of the bad old days of order, however oppressive, and the welfare state, however meager, is as understandable as it is unfortunate. They walk by Moscow's elegant storefronts that display expensive Western-made goods priced in dollars, not in rubles, wondering what has happened to their lives and to their country. They look for scapegoats at home and abroad.

Showing disturbing similarities to Weimar Germany of the 1920s, Russia is a humiliated country in search of direction without a compass. It is smaller than it has been in three centuries. Both the outer empire in Central and Eastern Europe and the inner empire that was the Soviet Union are gone, and Moscow must now use force to keep even Russia itself together. As its pitiful (and shameful) performance in Chechnya has shown, the military has been reduced to a ragtag army, with presumably unusable nuclear weapons. Four thousand five hundred rubles—worth more than \$4,500 only a few years ago—are now gladly exchanged for one dollar. For its very sustenance, Russia is at the mercy of the International Monetary Fund, which can palliate but surely cannot cure the country's economic ills.

Worse yet, Russia is deprived of pride and self-respect. There was a time, during World War II, when the whole world admired the Soviet military for its extraordinary boldness and bravery. There was a time, in the 1950s, when several ex-colonies of Asia sought to emulate the Soviet model of rapid industrialization and when Soviet science moved ahead of the United States in space research. There was a time, from the 1920s through the 1970s, when many—too many—Western intellectuals and others believed that Soviet-style communism was the wave of the future. And there was a time when then-Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko claimed that no significant issue in world politics could be settled without Moscow's concurrence.

To appreciate the present mood of letdown and frustration, imagine that our currency became all but worthless; that our stores identified some of their wares in the Cyrillic rather than the Roman alphabet, showing prices in rubles; that our political and economic life were guided by made-in-Moscow standards; and that our leaders were lectured by patronizing foreign commissars about the need to stay the course in order to join their "progressive," which is to say the communist, world.

In the final analysis, the condition of Weimar Russia is alarming because it is at once

a weak democracy and a weak police state, pluralistic and yet intolerant, pro-American in its promise but anti-American in its resentments. The public—its pride deflated and its economic needs unmet—craves order at home and respect abroad. The authoritarian temptation is pervasive, and so is the urge to be—and to be seen—as strong once again.

The West may defer the day of reckoning, but it cannot obviate the Russians' eventual need to compensate for the humiliation that is their present fate.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
PALLADIUM-TIMES

HON. JOHN M. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Palladium-Times, the community newspaper of Oswego County, NY, on its 150th anniversary as a daily.

The newspaper traces its history to 1819, when the Oswego Palladium began as a weekly newspaper, and to 1845, when the Oswego Daily Advertiser began daily publication. Its other predecessor, the Oswego Times, interrupted its publication when its owners went off to fight the Civil War.

As chance would have it, the Oswego Palladium and Oswego Times ended up on the same street in this city on the shores of Lake Ontario. However, when it became apparent that neither paper could thrive while competing in the marketplace, the two newspapers joined forces, and the Palladium-Times was created.

Mr. Speaker, few endeavors are more significant to an informed community than local journalism. Freedom of the press is a vital part of our heritage, reflecting the strong belief that only when people have access to the facts and a discussion of the issues are they able to participate fully in the democratic process.

History has shown that an independent and responsible press is essential to a free society, and the Oswego Palladium-Times, by demonstrating these qualities, has earned the trust and loyalty of its readers throughout its 150 years of service. The men and women of the Palladium-Times can take great pride in this accomplishment. I join the people of Oswego County, NY, in wishing the newspaper many more years of success in this enterprise so important to our democracy.

THE INTRODUCTION OF PRIVATE
LEGISLATION FOR THE RELIEF
OF NGUYEN QUY AN AND
NGUYEN NGOC KIM QUY

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to finally resolve the bureaucratic nightmare in which a brave hero of the Vietnam war, Maj. An Nguyen, has found himself.

Major An is a decorated veteran of the South Vietnamese Air Force, decorated by the