

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### IMF REFORM REQUIRES THOUGHTFUL CONSIDERATION

**HON. JIM SAXTON**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 21, 2000*

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, recently a blue ribbon commission set forth its bipartisan recommendations on reform of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank. The commission's chairman, noted economist Allan Meltzer, worked for months in the most accommodating and fair way with all of the commissioners to maintain a process of honest intellectual inquiry and collegiality. Votes were taken along the way that established overwhelming bipartisan consensus on all of the major issues. The resulting report addresses some of the most difficult and challenging issues in international economics, and proposes a number of serious and substantive reforms of the IMF, World Bank, and regional development banks. Reasonable people can and do disagree on these highly complex issues, but generally do so on the basis of facts, evidence, and analysis.

Unfortunately, however, even before the report was released, a highly coordinated political effort was initiated to attack the commission's report with outlandish charges and inflammatory rhetoric. These attacks generally were uninformed by any familiarity with the substance or tone of the majority report, not to mention the difficult financial issues related to the IMF and World Bank. These attacks only serve to discredit those who made them, and the use of such issues as a political football reflects a lack of responsibility and concern about the future of these institutions. The following article published in the prestigious Financial Times recently shows how these deplorable attacks on the commission have been perceived, and do no credit to those who make them.

[From the Financial Times (London),  
Mar. 10, 2000]

#### POLITICS OF AID

It is occasionally difficult for outsiders to grasp just how poisonously partisan U.S. policymaking has become. That this should be the case in domestic matters is neither surprising nor particularly worrisome. But the collapse of bi-partisanship in crucial areas of foreign policy is another matter. The response in Washington to the report from the international financial institutions advisory commission is a perfect—and disturbing—case in point.

Take, for a moment, not the politics of the majority report, but its substance. It does not propose the abolition of the International Monetary Fund. Nor does it suggest the end of foreign aid. On the contrary, it defines a role for the IMF as lender-of-last resort and suggests deep debt relief and a significant increase in U.S. budgetary support for the poorest countries, "if they pursue effective programmes of economic development".

Though simplistic in important respects, the report does represent an attempt to de-

fine a role for the international institutions and a case for aid that makes sense today. Since this comes from a group dominated by Republicans, the rational response must be that this represents progress. Maybe there could even be a new bi-partisan consensus. At least there would be no harm in exploring that possibility.

That is not happening. In an egregious example of Washington politics at its worst, Richard Gephardt, the notoriously protectionist House minority leader, complained that the report "illustrates an extreme neo-isolationist attitude" towards the IMF and the World Bank. "Pots", "kettles", "calling" and "black" come to mind.

True, this is a radical report. The most controversial recommendations on the IMF are that it should cease long-term lending to the poorest countries and should provide emergency assistance almost exclusively to countries that have pre-qualified for it. Similarly, it suggests that the World Bank should cease to be a lender to middle-income countries with access to private markets.

These ideas do go too far, but they are not crazy. Given willingness to compromise, they could be the basis for discussion between the two sides. The alternative is certainly worse. Continued bitter partisan disagreement, with one side committed to defense of the status quo and the other to radical transformation, must make the environment for these institutions extraordinarily difficult.

The world urgently needs a U.S. consensus on policy towards the international financial institutions. This report is at least the basis for a discussion—and jaw jaw is certainly better than yet more partisan war war.

### SATELLITE REFORM LEGISLATION (S. 376)

**HON. SAM GEJDENSON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 21, 2000*

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 376, international satellite reform. This bipartisan compromise legislation will reform 1960s era satellite policy and promote competition in international and domestic satellite services and technology. This 1962 Communications Satellite Act is woefully outdated. The time for overhaul is now.

The 1960s were a time when the telecommunications sector was dominated by monopolies. We had no cell phones, no pagers, no personal computers and no viable commercial satellite industry. Our international satellite policy reflected the times. It was believed that only government-sponsored entities could provide global satellite services. That may have been true then, but in the past forty years we have seen enormous change. With the passage of this bill, our global satellite policy will finally enter the new millennium.

INTELSAT and INMARSAT are cast in the old mold. For example, INTELSAT is an intergovernmental treaty organization dominated by 143 member-nations, largely through gov-

ernment-controlled telecommunications monopolies. As an intergovernmental organization, INTELSAT is not subject to U.S. or any other country's laws.

At the same time, we have many private satellite companies that offer high-quality international services. Two such companies have corporate ties to Connecticut—GE Americom and PanAmSat. These companies have launched private sector ventures that must compete with these intergovernmental organizations which enjoy advantages such as legal immunities which the private sector does not.

I commend Mr. BLILEY and Mr. MARKEY for their long work over the last few years to bring competition and privatization to U.S. global communications policy. This legislation eliminates the privileges and immunities that these intergovernmental organizations enjoy. The bill offers incentives for INTELSAT and INMARSAT and their successors to privatize in a pro-competitive manner. As a result, we can expect to see improved access to foreign markets for the U.S. satellite communications industry.

I am particularly pleased that the final conference bill contains definite, clear criteria for the FCC to use in determining if INTELSAT, INMARSAT and their spin-offs have privatized in a pro-competitive manner. If they don't, there are real consequences in terms of U.S. market access. This feature of the legislation provides meaningful incentives to these two organizations to privatize properly. It also governs the market entry of their spin-offs, such as New Skies Satellites, a Dutch company that is a wholly-owned subsidiary of INTELSAT and its signatories. Although we welcome New Skies into the U.S. market, strict compliance with the criteria of S. 376 is necessary to ensure that its market entry will benefit competition and will not serve as a Trojan horse for the INTELSAT cartel.

I am also pleased that the bill prohibits all satellite operators serving the U.S. from enjoying the exclusive right to handle telecommunications traffic to or from the U.S. and any other country—no matter how the exclusive relationships were derived.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation promises to benefit the American public with lower costs, more innovative services, and more high tech jobs. I urge my colleagues to support S. 376 and to bring the full benefits of competition to consumers.

### PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

**HON. DOC HASTINGS**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 16, 2000*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2372) to simplify and expedite access to the Federal courts for

● 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.

injured parties whose rights and privileges, secured by the United States Constitution, have been deprived by final actions of Federal agencies, or other government officials or entities acting under color of State law; to prevent Federal courts from abstaining from exercising Federal jurisdiction in actions where no State law claim is alleged; to permit certification of unsettled State law questions that are essential to resolving Federal claims arising under the Constitution; and to clarify when government action is sufficiently final to ripen certain Federal claims arising under the Constitution:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2372, the "Private Property Rights Implementation Act of 2000." This commonsense legislation makes it easier for landowners that have had the use of their property taken by the Federal Government to get their day in court.

While the fifth amendment requires the Government to compensate citizens for the taking of their private property, these property owners have found it almost impossible to gain access to the Federal courts to pursue their claims. Quite simply, H.R. 2372 would provide a way out of the regulatory limbo that requires property owners to seek a "final" answer at the local level before pursuing this constitutional issue in Federal court. Contrary to claims that the bill would circumvent local authority, it outlines specific requirements that claimants must pursue before receiving action from the Federal courts. These include an appeal to the local planning commission, an application from the local zoning board, and an appeal to the local board of elected officials. Thus, the bill protects local authority while ensuring that justice is done in a timely manner.

Mr. Chairman, we in the Pacific Northwest are being inundated with new Federal requirements and restrictions relating to salmon and other species protected under the Endangered Species Act. The impacts of these new Federal actions on private property owners are only beginning to be felt, but promise to be significant. This legislation will ensure that the victims of Federal takings do not have to wait 10 years—the current average time it takes to get access to a Federal court—to seek just compensation. Private property owners in my district need to know that there is a clear and fair process in place for them to defend their fifth amendment rights. That is exactly what H.R. 2372 provides.

I commend the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CANADY, for bringing this legislation before the House and I urge my colleagues to support it.

**GREATER PITTSTON FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK HONOR WILLIAM MCFADDEN**

**HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 21, 2000*

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to William P. McFadden. This year, the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick will honor Bill with the W. Francis Swingle Award at their annual St. Patrick's Day Banquet. I am pleased and proud to have been asked to participate in this event.

The Swingle Award is named in honor of Professor Frank Swingle, a noted and re-

spected educator and orator, active in civic organizations locally. Bill McFadden will be the eleventh recipient of this prestigious award.

Mr. McFadden has had an exemplary career in nursing for more than thirty-two years. He specialized in industrial nursing at Bethlehem Steel, Lebanon, Pennsylvania, and also the Ford Motor Company, Chester, Pennsylvania, and San Jose, California. Administratively, Bill was Staff Nurse and Supervisor at Wilmington Veterans Administration Hospital, Director of Nursing at Fresno Community Hospital in California and a nursing home supervisor in New Jersey. Until his retirement in 1985, he served as Nursing Supervisor at East Orange Veterans Hospital, New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McFadden is a native son of Northeastern Pennsylvania, having been born and raised here. He attended St. John's High School in Pittston, went on to St. Joseph's School of Nursing in Philadelphia and received his degree in nursing from Villanova University in 1959. He served in the Navy Reserves from 1945 to 1947.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate William McFadden on this prestigious award. I join with his wife Ann, family, and his many good friends in sending him my most sincere best wishes as he accepts this honor.

**ROBERT MILLER, JR.: MAN OF THE YEAR**

**HON. NICK SMITH**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 21, 2000*

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I honor today Robert B. Miller, Jr., of Battle Creek, Michigan, Scene Magazine's 1999 Man of the Year.

"Bob," as he likes to be called, is one of Battle Creek's best known citizens due in large measure to his legacy of personal and financial commitment to the greater Battle Creek community. Today, the community will show its appreciation and gratitude for Bob's many years of philanthropy and dedication, as they gather to pay tribute to him as the 1999 Man of the Year.

Robert Miller, Jr. is a naval veteran and graduate of Michigan State University, with degrees in marketing and English. He has spent most of his professional life in the print media, working for such newspapers as the Lansing State Journal, Idaho Statesman and the Daily Olympian, before making his mark on Battle Creek as publisher of the Battle Creek Enquirer and News, a position he inherited from his father, the late Robert Miller, Sr.

Robert Miller, Jr. epitomizes the word philanthropy. He has been as much involved in civic duties as he was in professional journalism. He's served as a trustee of the Miller Foundation and as a member of its Grants Review Committee, as well as being a member of the local Red Cross, United Way and numerous other boards and committees. Most recently, he can be found working on behalf of the Humane Society and as an advocate for Big Brothers/Big Sisters.

As a professional, Bob has led by example, blending strength, drive and determination with tremendous character, devotion and kindness. I admire Bob for his professional involvement and dedication to civil activities and service to

the community. He exemplifies what it means to be a citizen, having set a standard of excellence which serves as an example for others in the community.

I commend Robert B. Miller, Jr. for his many years of hard work and tireless devotion in making his community a better place to live, work and raise a family. And I congratulate him on being named Scene Magazine's 1999 Man of the Year.

**INDO-AMERICAN HI-TECH LINKS**

**HON. JIM McDERMOTT**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 21, 2000*

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we can all be justifiably proud of the fact that our nation is continuing its unparalleled record of economic growth. We can also be proud of the fact that our growth, which has benefited so many American citizens, rests in large measure on our hi-tech industries.

But how many of us recognize that our prosperity also rests in part on the intelligence, entrepreneurship and skills of many thousands of Indians, and Indo-Americans?

Let me provide my colleagues with some facts about how Indian trained software engineers, computer programmers and designers contribute to America's prosperity.

Indians own or run over 750 Silicon Valley firms that collectively employ over 16,000 people and have achieved over \$3.5 billion in sales.

Of the 115,000 visas given by the United States for skilled workers in 1999, 35,000 went to Indians.

The vast majority of India's \$4 billion in software sales last year went to American companies.

American firms like Hewlett-Packard, Microsoft, IBM and Oracle increasingly are looking to invest in India or purchase hi-tech products from India.

President Clinton recognizes the contributions India has made to America's economic growth. When he visits India later this month, he is expected to stop in the city of Hyderabad, one of the centers for India's growing hi-tech industry. His stop will dramatize India's rapid development as a cutting edge hi-tech nation and it is a confirmation that India and the United States have both greatly benefited from the business acumen of Indian entrepreneurs. It is also a recognition that our ties to India are far broader and far deeper than most observers believe.

Mr. Speaker, India is important to the United States. Our policies in that region should reflect this. That is why I am pleased to have had this opportunity to share the reason for being optimistic about the future of U.S.-Indian relations.

**RETIREMENT TRIBUTE TO SYLVIA McLAUGHLIN**

**HON. GEORGE MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 21, 2000*

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues