

threat of not breaking even, they request a postal rate increase.

The USPS borrows money from the U.S. Federal Reserve at the most favorable rates—CMRA's have to borrow money at market rates.

The USPS has a statutory monopoly on the delivery of first class mail, the revenue of which can be used to subsidize other services.

Perhaps the biggest advantage of all is its size. If the Postal Service was a private business, it would be ranked as the 12th largest business in the Nation, and 33d largest in the world.

Is it right that the Postal Service should enter into competition with small businesses with all of these inherent advantages? Would the Congress stand by and allow Ford to maintain a monopoly, while letting them use their profits to compete against small businesses on a different front? Would the Congress let Exxon compete with small businesses if it had limited sovereign immunity and was represented by the Department of Justice? The answer is a resounding no.

Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service has a job to do—deliver the mail and sell postage. That is what it was designed to do by the Founding Fathers. These core services are what the Postal Service is good at, and what it should continue to do. Offering ancillary services only detracts from their core mission.

My bill, the Postal Service Core Business Act, specifically prohibits the USPS from getting into the CMRA business. It addresses the question of what is the proper role for the Postal Service in areas where private industries already provide the service. That role is to stay out of private businesses way and let the marketplace work.

My bill is remarkably simple. The Postal Service is prohibited from competing with private industry, like the CMRA's, unless the Postal Service was offering the service nationwide as of January 1, 1994. The purpose of the bill is to draw a clear line as to what the USPS can and cannot do.

Such a line is necessary. I am familiar with reports of postal executives stating that they need to get into retail businesses to protect the Postal Service. That is simply not true. This is an agency which made \$1.5 billion last year and has stated that it expects to make in excess \$500 million this year. This is not a suffering agency.

Furthermore, the USPS is an agency which does not seem to understand its mission. Representatives of the Postal Service have lauded the organization as the country's largest retail distribution system with 50,000-plus outlets, and announced their intention to increase its retail revenue by \$1 to \$1.5 billion in the next few years. This is wrong. All of those outlets were built with taxpayer money and stamp revenue. The U.S. Government and the taxpayer built this system, but not to be a competitor with the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, this is a vital bill. I again voice my strong support for the Postal Service, I want to help it remain strong and vital. Competing in industries which the private sector has created is not the way to meet their goal. My bill would redirect the Postal Service to its core mission: Mail delivery and stamp sales. That's why I call the bill the Postal Service Core Business Act of 1996. American corporations have learned that to be successful, they must concentrate on their core business. The Postal Service needs to understand this too.

Congress has the ultimate authority over the Postal Service. The House Postal Service Subcommittee, chaired by my friend and colleague, JOHN MCHUGH, is beginning to craft postal reform legislation. I hope that the subcommittee will give my bill serious consideration. This issue needs to be addressed. A vital Postal Service is critical to our Nation's future, but Congress must not stand by and let a giant Government agency destroy a whole industry of small private businesses. It is interesting to note that all of these CMRA's stores are independently owned and operated. There is not one franchise organization which runs stores as a corporation. This makes the industry very unique, and has directly contributed to their profitability.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a single congressional district without at least one of these CMRA stores within its borders. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in this legislation, which will most assuredly effect a small business within their hometown. This bill is pro-Postal Service and pro-competition. Every American has the right to the American Dream. These small business owners look to us to insure that their dream is not taken from them.

COMMUNICATIONS PRIVACY AND CONSUMER EMPOWERMENT ACT

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1996

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the "Communications Privacy and Consumer Empowerment Act. The issue of privacy in the information age and in particular, children's privacy protection, is quite timely as the Nation becomes ever more linked by communications networks, such as the Internet. It is important that we tackle these issues now before we travel down the information superhighway too far and realize perhaps we've made a wrong turn.

Thomas Mann once said, "A great truth is a truth whose opposite is also a great truth."

The great truth of the Information Age is that the wire—and I use the term "wire" as shorthand for any telecommunications infrastructure such as phone, cable, computer, or wireless networks—the wondrous wire that brings new services to homes, businesses, and schools will have a certain Dickensian quality to it: It will be the best of wires and the worst of wires.

It can uplift society as well as debase it. It can allow people to telecommute to work and obtain distance learning classes. New digital technologies and other innovations allow corporations to become more efficient workers more productive, and businesses to conduct commerce almost effortlessly in digital dollars.

This same technology however, will avail corporate America of the opportunity to track the clickstream of a citizen of the Net, to sneak corporate hands into a personal information cookie jar and use this database to compile sophisticated, highly personal consumer profiles of people's hobbies, buying habits, financial information, health information, who they contact or converse with, when and for how long. In short, that wondrous wire may also allow digital desperadoes to roam

the electronic frontier unchecked by any high technology sheriff or adherence to any code of electronic ethics.

It is this issue of hijacking personal information that we are concerned about and we are obviously concerned when kids are the target.

The issue of child and adult privacy in an electronic environment, must find its ultimate solution in a carefully conceived and crafted combination of technology, industry action, government oversight or regulation.

Without question, the issues posed by advances in digital communications technology are tremendously complex. Again, how best to protect kids is a complex issue. How to put teeth into privacy protections is also important to figure out. What may have worked for privacy protection or parental empowerment in the phone or cable or TV industry may not adequately serve as a model when these technologies converge. Therefore I believe we must pursue other alternatives.

We must recognize that children's privacy is a subset of a parent's privacy rights. The bill I am introducing today is premised on the belief that regardless of the technology that consumers use, their privacy rights and expectations remain a constant. Whether they are using a phone, a TV clicker, a satellite dish, or a modem, every consumer should enjoy a Privacy Bill of Rights for the Information Age. These core rights are embodied in a proposal I have advocated for many years and I call it "Knowledge, Notice and No."

In short, consumers and parents should get the following three basic rights:

First, knowledge that information is being collected about them. This is very important because digital technologies increasingly allow people to electronically glean personal information about users surreptitiously. I would note here that many Internet browsers, for example, use "cookies"—a technology that can identify and tag an online user—unbeknownst to the user—and keep track of what Web sites a person visits.

Second, adequate and conspicuous notice that any personal information collected is intended by the recipient for reuse or sale.

Third, and, the right of a consumer to say "no" and to curtail or prohibit such reuse or sale of their personal information.

The National Telecommunications and Information Administration [NTIA] has been actively studying how to safeguard telecommunications-related personal information. "Privacy and the NII," an analysis completed by NTIA in October of 1995, documented a number of areas where personal privacy protections varied depending upon which network carrier provided a telecommunications service. For example, the Cable Act requires cable operators to notify subscribers at the time of subscription of the operator's information practices and generally prohibits an operator from disclosure of personal data. Such protections, however do not extend to video services offered by DBS providers or wireless cable operators. Under the legislation I am introducing today, the FCC will be tasked with harmonizing the privacy protections across board so that strong, tough privacy policies exist regardless of the technology that a consumer uses to obtain a service.

The bill is structured in a way that will first ascertain whether there are technological tools that can empower consumers and parents.

The bill also requests the agencies to determine if there are industry standards and practices that embody this electronic Privacy Bill of Rights. Where technological tools don't exist, or where a particular industry refuses to embrace this code of electronic ethics in a way that solves the problem, then the Government is obliged to step in and reinforce protection of privacy rights.

I implore the industry to act swiftly because the current situation is utterly unsustainable. The same libertarian quality that has stimulated such rapid growth of the Internet gravely threatens to cripple its promise. It is chaotic, free, and open, but has spawned an exponential increase in commercial voyeurism that is tearing privacy rights asunder. While Jack Kerouac would have a fine time joyriding from site to site on the World Wide Web, I believe that many, many citizens of the Net would be particularly troubled to find that their personal data—their usage of the World Wide Web itself—can be and is being tracked. At risk is consumer confidence in the medium. When consumer confidence plummets so will economic activity on the Internet.

My legislation will establish "Knowledge, Notice, and No" as the goal and will require Government action where the technology or the industry fail to adequately protect consumers and kids.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS HOLDS HEARINGS ON CHURCH BURNINGS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1996

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker. Today the Congressional Black Caucus [CBC] held hearings on the rash of church burnings occurring across the Nation. The list of panelists included government officials, civil rights leaders, religious leaders, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the Anti-Defamation League. Each made a significant contribution to the dialog on increasing the Federal response to the church burnings. However, one of the most poignant and thought-provoking statements was submitted by the youngest member of the Caucus, Hon. JESSE L. JACKSON, JR.

I commend Congressman JACKSON's remarks to my colleagues with hopes that his words will be as enlightening to Members as they were to those in attendance at today's hearing.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JESSE L.
JACKSON, JR.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend you for calling these hearings. They are necessary. They are important. They are informative and help to educate and arouse the American people and elected officials to corrective action.

I want to commend the Justice Department, and especially Deval Patrick, the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, for his tireless and ceaseless efforts at investigating these crimes against God and humanity.

The Congress deserves some credit for passing a stronger law on Tuesday that gives the Department of Justice greater leverage in prosecuting those who engage in the desecration or destruction of property belonging to religious institutions.

I want to thank President Bill Clinton for his forthright leadership in going to South Carolina and seeing first hand the crisis and meeting with the victims whose church has been destroyed. That is a necessary and effective use of the bully pulpit of the presidency.

What has happened? Over 63 African American churches have been burned over the past five years. Other churches, with African American members, have been burned. There has been a pattern. The firebombed churches have almost all been very small rural churches located in isolated areas.

Why is this happening? Is it a legal conspiracy? The jury is still out—and the investigation is still on—with regard to a legal conspiracy.

Is it a cultural conspiracy? And what is meant when someone says that? Let me try to explain. I am from Chicago and a big Chicago Bulls fan. When Michael Jordan shoots a 3-point shot, Chicago fans jump in excitement because Michael Jordan just made a basket. But guess what? Michael Jordan fans in Los Angeles, Dallas, Miami and all around the country jump up too—a kind of cultural conspiracy, if you will—because, in basketball terms, Michael Jordan represents the common denominator through which all of his fans relate.

What's the parallel to church burnings? When we talk about cultural conspiracies with respect to church burnings, we are talking about some politicians, some radio and television talk-show hosts, and other hate mongers around the country fanning the flames of economic insecurity and race hatred, fanning the fears of racial animosity with anti-affirmative action, anti-majority-minority, anti-immigration propaganda from the very top of our nation, creating a kind of racial cultural conspiracy.

In 1964, in reaction to Brown v. Board of Education decision in 1954 and the resulting civil rights movement, Barry Goldwater, a Republican, ran his presidential campaign talking about States' rights. It was a way of saying that States had a way around the equal protection clause of the Constitution of the United States.

In 1968, in response to the 1967 and 1968 riots and the anti-Vietnam mass protests, Richard Nixon, a Republican, ran his campaign on a law and order theme.

In 1972, George Wallace, a Democrat, ran his campaign in reaction to attempts to desegregate the schools, on an anti-busing platform.

In 1976, even Jimmy Carter, also a Democrat, gave a speech in Indiana talking about ethnic purity.

In 1980 and 1984, Ronald Reagan talked about welfare queens; and in 1988 it was George Bush who used Willie Horton.

Even our current President, in 1992, used Sister Souljah in his bid to become the President of the United States.

This year we heard Pat Buchanan, a presidential candidate, equate "We Shall Overcome" with whistling "Dixie." He said those who sing "We Shall Overcome" and those who whistle "Dixie" are both involved in freedom movements.

Well, if whistling "Dixie," protecting the Confederacy, and "We Shall Overcome," fighting for equal protection under the law, can be equated, it suggests that either we are all missing the boat or that something is taking place within our nation that has not been healed (even) since the Civil War.

The Republicans took control of Congress in 1994, and, Tom Wicker reports in his new book, *Tragic Failure*, "on January 23, 1995 . . . in the ornate hearing room of the House Rules Committee, the victorious Republicans removed a portrait of former Representative Claude Pepper of Florida, a re-

nowned white liberal Democrat. That was understandable, but the new Republican committee chairman, Gerald Solomon of New York, had order the Pepper portrait replaced by that of another Democrat, the late Howard Smith of Virginia, a last-ditch segregationist and in his many years as Rules Committee chairman one of the most powerful opponents of the civil rights legislation of the sixties."

All of the above were seeding the clouds of racism; all were using race to manipulate voters; all were engaged in a cultural conspiracy to exploit the racial fears and insecurities of the American people. Such words and actions help to set a national climate that appeals, not to the best in us, but to the worst in us. And that climate rubs the sticks, strikes the spark, and fans the winds, that eventually bring us the burning down of Black churches.

Even this year, expect affirmative action to be the centerpiece of another political strategy to manipulate the American people onto a so-called race issue—which really isn't a race issue, since white women have been the biggest beneficiaries of affirmative action. But it will divert attention away from issues of substance. We need jobs and a full employment economy. We need a single-payer national health care system. We need affordable housing for all of our people. We need an educational system that prepares our young people to work in the 21st century. We need our national infrastructure rebuilt—our roads, sewers, bridges, airports, seaports and rails. We need our cities rebuilt. We need family farmers restored to their land. We need our environment cleaned up.

That is what we need, but what we will likely get is diversion—affirmative action, California Civil Rights Initiative, proposition 187-type issues scapegoating immigrants and more.

That is why this hearing is so important. This hearing helps to clarify what is really going on. It helps to identify what politicians are really doing. It helps to educate the American people so they can insulate themselves from such diversion and, hopefully, demand more of those running for public office in 1996.

So I want to thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for your insight and wisdom in calling for this hearing. And thank you for inviting me to participate.

TRIBUTE TO JUAN C. TENORIO

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1996

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, back home in Guam this month, the architectural/engineering firm of Juan C. Tenorio Associates, Inc., is celebrating its 25th anniversary. It is a significant milestone for a company president, Mr. Juan C. Tenorio, a fellow Chamorro who believed in himself and worked hard to achieve success. His is a classic American success story, and I am proud to relate it here for the RECORD.

From his simple beginnings on the island of Saipan, Mr. Tenorio moved to Guam at the age of 14. At age 20, he enrolled at Marquette University in Milwaukee, WI, to study civil engineering. While there, he also signed up for ROTC. Juan Tenorio graduated in June 1962. After a brief stint with the Los Angeles road department, Mr. Tenorio joined the U.S. Army. He spent 30 years with the Army Corps of Engineers, active and reserve, and retired as a