Reserve Personnel Center had information from the Federal Bureau of Investigation that ARPERCEN records storage sites could possibly be a target for terrorist activity. In consideration of the information from the FBI and the subsequent oral request made by the Corps of Engineers, Akal Security acted responsibly and deserves compensation for the services performed during a time of heighten national security.

After researching this issue and being in contact with the Department of Defense, I have come to the conclusion that an Act of Congress is needed to pay for these services that were incurred. This bill only concerns the invoice amount of 1991 and does not concern interest on the principle since then.

The introduction of this bill today is the continuance of an effort that was begun in earlier years. This bill is identical to a bill that was introduced in the last Congress by my predecessor, Congressman Bill Redmond.

Thank you Mr. Speaker for your consideration of this matter and I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER NIETCH

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1999

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Christopher Nietch for his excellence in coastal and marine study. Through dedication and hard work, Mr. Nietch has found unique methods and helped create new equipment to aid in the study of coastal marshland research.

Mr. Nietch's research focuses on the nutrient and carbon biogeochemistry of marshes. He is aiding resource managers in determining the effects of land use and is exploring possibilities of unorthodox methods which hones the maximum possibility regarding the usage of coastal wetlands. His work is on the edge, not only exploring, but pushing coastal marshland science to maximize the usage of marshlands.

Using different methods, Mr. Nietch aided in the creation of new equipment that makes the measurements necessary to study some 15 different marsh sites within four separate estuaries in South Carolina not only economical, but also practical and accurate. His findings have been circulated widely among his peers and colleagues within the coastal stewardship, which in effect allows other researchers, coastal resource managers, and policy makers to easily access his findings.

Mr. Nietch's work is a benchmark for future studies that would measure how much potential and access coastal wetland marshes have to offer society. His work has contributed to both the overall public awareness of how sensitive and valuable the coastal wetland marshes are and the necessity to further research and study the long-term management of these priceless resources.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join with me and my fellow South Carolinians as we pay tribute to Christopher Nietch for his diligent work and hours of effort in researching coastal wetland marshes. He is a role model, and I wish him continued success in his new ventures.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO BERTRAM BRINGHURST ON HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1999

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to my constituent, the distinguished Mr. Bertram Bringhurst. Today, Mr. Bringhurst achieves two major milestones: the celebration of his 100th birthday and the award of France's highest honor, the Chevalier of the National Order of the Legion of Honor.

Mr. Bringhurst was among the many bright, energetic young men who answered our nation's call to arms during World War One. At the tender age of 17 he struggled to survive the fierce battles at Chateau-Thierry and Argonne Forest as well as poison gas attacks. Upon returning from France, Mr. Bringhurst set about living his life, starting and raising a family and being an honorable member of his community. According to his family, he spoke little of his time in France. However, the memories that he did share, the memories of German soldiers who died clutching photos of their children, clearly demonstrate his compassion for all mankind.

Today, Mr. Bringhurst will celebrate his 100th birthday at the Castle Point Veterans Hospital in Beacon, New York, surrounded by his family and friends. Mr. Bringhurst will also have a special guest at his birthday party—the French Consul will be on hand to present him with the French Legion of Honor in honor of his service in France in World War One. this is a fitting tribute to a great man.

Mr. Speaker, I feel a debt of gratitude to Bertram Bringhurst for the role he has played in our nation's history. As a veteran, I take great pride in being associated with a man of his caliber. As an American, I am proud that Mr. Bringhurst will get the accolades he deserves for his service in France.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 900, GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES A. LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following for printing in the RECORD:

Unitary thrift holding companies—Section 401 closes the unitary thrift holding company loophole that permits commercial firms to acquire thrifts. This section contains a grandfather provision that permits a company that was a savings and loan holding company on May 4, 1999, or had an application on file as of that date, to acquire and continue to control a thrift and engage in commercial activities. It should be recognized that this exception to the general prohibitions in section 401 on commercial firms owning thrifts applies only to companies that owned or controlled thrifts as of that date (or pursuant to an application pending as of that date) and not to any subsequent acquirer of a grandfathered unitary thrift holding company.

The intention of the conferees on this matter is very clear from the plain language of section 401. First, section 401 provides that no company may acquire a thrift after May 4, 1999, unless the company is engaged only in financial activities. Second, a company that does acquire a thrift after May 4, 1999 may not engage in commercial activities. As such, a grandfathered unitary thrift holding company could not be acquired by another commercial firm or financial firm and retain its commercial activities. A financial firm could not acquire a grandfathered unitary thrift holding company engaged in commercial activities unless such activities are divested because the acquiring financial firm would then be engaged in commercial activities directly and indirectly in violation of section 401.

Insurance company portfolio investments—New section 4(k)(4)(I) of the Bank Holding Company Act permits insurance company subsidiaries of financial holding companies to acquire equity interests in nonfinancial companies (''portfolio companies''). Such acquisitions, however, must represent an investment made in the ordinary course of the insurance company's business and must be made in accordance with relevant state insurance law. The Act also prohibits a financial holding company from routinely managing or operating a portfolio company held pursuant to this section, except as necessary to obtain a reasonable return of the investment. It has been suggested that this would permit officer overlaps between the financial holding company and the portfolio company held under the authority granted by this section. This is not the case. The restriction in fact was intended to prohibit financial holding companies from becoming involved in the day-to-day operations or management of a portfolio company, except in unusual circumstances, and thereby maintain the Act's general prohibition on the mixing of banking and commerce. Since the officers of a company are involved in the day-to-day management of the company's affairs, officer interlock between a financial holding company and a portfolio company would, in most circumstances, involve the holding company in the routine management and operation of the portfolio company. Director interlocks, on the other hand, would properly allow a financial holding company to monitor its investment as long as the director was not involved in the day-to-day management of the portfolio company.

CT–43A FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SETTLEMENT ACT

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1999

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been three and a half years since my constituent, Adam Darling, died. He died on the same airplane that carried the late Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown. Together, they and 33 others perished on the side of a cold, dark mountain outside of Tuzla, Croatia.

Since that fateful day, the families of the victims of that crash have sought redress with the government, first through the Air Force, then through the Department of Commerce, and now with Congress. It is for that reason that today I and more than 30 bipartisan members of this body, introduce this bill. We introduce this bill in the name of justice and in the name of every person who died in this crash. And for me, I introduce this bill in the memory

of Adam Darling and all the energy and hope and spirit that emanated from his young, idealistic heart.

Mr. Speaker, when TWA 800 went down, and more recently Egypt Air 990, the families of the victims on those planes are met with helping hands and offers of assistance. They are met with intensive investigations as to causes and apologies for events gone wrong. If the families are unsatisfied, they have recourse to means (namely the court system) to alleviate their loss.

This was not true for everyone on the Ron Brown trip. Because this trip was government sponsored and occurred on a government aircraft, and because the crash happened on foreign soil, the victims on that plane were caught in a tremendous catch-22 that prevented their grieving families from seeking restitution for their loss. After extended negotiations, families of private citizens were awarded settlements from the Air Force.

Families of deceased federal employees were not.

Federal employees' survivors are not entitled to seek such restitution because the law provides only for those benefits within the scope of the Federal Employees Compensation Act (FECA). Even under situations where there may be clear cause, these persons are barred from the court system to argue their case.

The victims of TWA 800 could go to TWA or the Boeing Company for redress. The victims of Egypt Air 990 could go Egypt Air or the Boeing Company for restitution. The victims of CT43–A have only their government to turn to, and their government has turned them down.

This rejection is hurtful not because the law is so strict in its treatment of the victims. The rejection is hurtful because the post-crash investigation found deliberate violation in the chain of command that allowed the airplane to fly the day of the crash; numerous safety deficiencies on the airplane; and overt aircrew error. When this much goes wrong, and when the wrongs are items that should never have happened had normal precautions been in place and standard operating procedures been followed, then there is every reason to ask for redress.

The legislation being introduced today will provide $2 million to each family of the victims on the Ron Brown plane who were federal employees. This will provide some measure of confidence to the families that yes, the government that employed the victims cared about them, in their lives and in their deaths. I ask all of you to join with me today in making these families who lost so much know that the circumstances of their loved ones' deaths will be met with justice.

SUPPORT SATELLITE REFORM LEGISLATION

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1999

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3261, the ''Communications Satellite Competition and Privatization Act of 1999.'' I want to commend Chairman BLILEY for his commitment to this important legislation and for his efforts in working with Congressman TAUZIN and Congressman MARKEY. Together, they have produced an excellent, bipartisan bill that is designed to bring the benefits of competition to consumers of satellite communications. This bill will reform the 1962 Act—a law that is woefully outdated and in need of a complete overhaul.

Today, we still rely on a foreign government-controlled treaty organization—INTELSAT—to provide the bulk of international satellite services to and from the United States. This structure was designed in the 1960's when it was believed that only governments and monopolies could finance and operate satellites. So much has changed since those early days. Today, the United States leads the world in satellite manufacturing and technology. Yet, we still cling to the 1960's governmental model that stifles competition, trade, and ingenuity—all to the detriment of consumers.

H.R. 3261 will end the last remaining telecom monopoly in the United States and provide incentives to encourage INTELSAT, and its sister organization, INMARSAT, to privatize in a procompetitive manner. The bill uses access to the U.S. market to encourage INTELSAT and INMARSAT to so privatize. If they refuse, they will still have access to the U.S. market for the services they were originally created to provide—such as public telephone and maritime services—but they will not be permitted to compete with private commercial providers of new services such as direct-to-home TV and high-speed Internet. To gain admission to the U.S. market for these new competitive services, they will first have to shed their governmental privileges and immunities and become truly competitive and private.

COMSAT will also be normalized by this legislation. When Congress created COMSAT 37 years ago, it granted COMSAT a monopoly over access to the INTELSAT, and later, the INMARSAT satellites. COMSAT has been the only U.S. company permitted by law to directly use these valuable satellites. Any other U.S. company that wanted or needed access to these satellites, like AT&T, MCI, the networks, had first to go to COMSAT. It has enjoyed the exclusive U.S. franchise.

COMSAT is not only the monopoly reseller of INTELSAT services in the U.S., but under the law no other company or individual is permitted to invest in INTELSAT. This has been a very lucrative benefit as INTELSAT pays a guaranteed rate of return to its investors of about 18 percent annually. We should all be so lucky with our investments. The time is long overdue for Congress to end this—we must end COMSAT's monopoly over access to and investment in INTELSAT. Congress shouldn't be dictating who can invest in INTELSAT. The U.S. would not be alone if we finally end this as over 90 other countries permit direct access of some kind, and 29 of those permit multiple investors.

COMSAT also has much to gain from this legislation. In exchange for the monopoly benefits granted to COMSAT under the 1962 act, Congress imposed some restrictions as well. For example, no one could own more than 49 percent of COMSAT. This legislation will free COMSAT of these restrictions.

This bill will permit users of satellite services to go directly to INTELSAT to purchase satellite capacity. The FCC has determined that this will result in cost savings of up to 71 percent. A 1998 study documented that reform legislation would save U.S. consumers $29 billion over 10 years. Worldwide savings would reach $6.9 billion.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3261. It brings the full benefits of competition to consumers and it will permit COMSAT to move ahead in this rapidly changing world of telecommunications.

CABIN USER FEE FAIRNESS ACT OF 1999

HON. GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR.

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1999

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce the Cabin User Fee Fairness Act of 1999 with my colleagues, Senator CRAIG and Senator THOMAS. The legislation will establish a new appraisal process to determine a fair fee for Forest Service cabins. Under the formula established by the bill, appraisals would be based on the raw value of the land, adjusted for structures and services provided by the Forest Service.

The Cabin User Fee Fairness Act will address two major concerns with the current appraisal process. First, the appraisal methodology currently used by the Forest Service is not arriving at the appropriate value of the use of a lot by a cabin owner. Federal property differs from private land in that the owners do not maintain the same rights and privileges to their property as those held by private landowners. For example, permit holders cannot make modifications to the land or their cabin without the approval of the Forest Service, they cannot reside in their cabin on a year round basis and they cannot deny others access to the land on which the cabin is built. These factors should be taken into consideration in the appraisal process.

A second major concern with the current process is how the traditional objectives of the Forest Service are changing under the new appraisal process. Recreational residences have been dominated by families. Some of these families are older, some young and some span generations, but the existence of families, many from relatively modest economic backgrounds, enhances the mission of the Forest Service to provide for the public at large. A dramatic and rapid fee increase diminishes the family atmosphere of the areas. Public lands exist for the enjoyment of a broad spectrum of Americans and dramatic fee increases hurt this objective.

In each of the last two years, Congress enacted stop-gap measures through the Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, to gradually increase the fee rates while a long-term solution could be developed. The legislation I introduce today will provide for such a permanent solution to the problem.

The passage of well thought-out legislation today, with the support and understanding of all parties, will avoid costly and adverse conflicts down the line. I urge my colleagues to support the Cabin User Fee Fairness Act.