those who choose to take part in it, and We the People will ensure that generations to come will make that choice. Our Nation should be proud that they are dedicated to learning and advocating the fundamental ideals and principles that define us as Americans and bind us together as a Nation.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2004

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce legislation to protect America's national security. My bill prohibits foreign governments from controlling or owning U.S. communications networks. This is not a new concept. It has been the law for more than fifty years, but the Federal Communications Commission has failed to enforce it in recent years.

Let me be clear from the onset—this bill places ownership and control restrictions on foreign governments, not on companies, which simply happen to be foreign. This distinction is important, and we must recognize the realities of the world we live in. Foreign government interests are not always our own, just as our interests will, at times, vary from theirs. If we do not protect our interests, no one else will either—which leaves a massive security vulnerability when it comes to communications.

For example, most people are not aware that nearly half of the U.S. video distribution runs over a satellite network controlled by a foreign government, Luxembourg. That same government opposed the U.S. led coalition in Iraq and was one of the few nations which wanted to throw NATO out of Europe. So I ask, is it really a good idea to put those satellite links under foreign government control, especially when those very links are used to distribute our nation's news? Whether it is the recent blackout or 9–11, we all know the panic created when we are cut off—no information coming in, and no information going out. We are an information-based society, and when access to information is compromised, our security is compromised.

Another concern is the vast amount of U.S. military communications in the Gulf region, which rely upon satellite networks controlled by foreign government. The Wall Street Journal reported on September 9, 2003, that Eutelsat, and I quote, ''snared much of the extra business to help U.S. forces conduct surveillance and battlefield operations in Iraq.'' The article went on to say ''Some company officials say the deal is a big reason Eutelsat's financial results have been stronger than those of its competitors, accounting for nearly 10 percent of total revenues.''

For those not familiar with Eutelsat, it is a conglomeration of multiple government-owned phone companies, with its headquarters in Paris. Some of Eutelsat's government owners have been some of our closest allies for decades, yet when it came to Iraq, we parted ways. It seems to me that it is not prudent policy to allow our lines of communications to be controlled by even our closest friends, because even the closest friends may, at times, have differing opinions and interests. Furthermore, the satellite market is in tough shape right now. I find it difficult to understand why we support a corporation that is controlled by a foreign government to the detriment of U.S. providers.

For several years, I have expressed serious reservations about the Federal Communications Commission's enforcement of foreign government ownership restrictions under Section 310 of the Communications Act. I repeatedly pointed out that companies controlled by foreign governments are too often controlled by considerations other than those of the competitive marketplace. Notwithstanding my concerns, the Commission has repeatedly approved foreign government acquisitions of U.S. licenses.

In view of the clear differences between the Congress and members of the Commission about the meaning and application of Section 310, I requested that the Commission conduct a ''vigorous review'' of the proposed acquisition of GE Americom by SES-Astra. In the end, the acquisition was treated as such a routine matter that it was approved at the staff level. We have laws on our books which restrict such acquisitions, yet a merger involving a foreign government is more easily approved, and with fewer conditions, than most U.S. mergers. After approving the application, the Commission staff subsequently ''found'' SES-Astra had not divulged the full extent of foreign control in the company. Even then, the Commission still allowed the staff approval to stand.

Accordingly, I am introducing this legislation to make clear, in no uncertain terms, that foreign governments, directly or indirectly, are specifically prohibited from owning or controlling U.S. communications networks. This legislation does not break new ground. It simply preserves and clarifies current law, stating that we will never place our lines of communications in a position where they can be compromised by foreign governments.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. ALAN J. FRIEDMAN'S TWENTY YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE NEW YORK HALL OF SCIENCE

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 2004

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the New York Hall of Science and its distinguished leader, Dr. Alan Friedman. On March 18, 2004, the Hall will celebrate Dr. Friedman's twenty years of outstanding service to the New York community. Dr. Friedman is largely responsible for the development of the New York Hall of Science as a destination for visitors and a world class center for the training of science teachers.

Dr. Friedman turned—quite literally—an empty shell of a building into one of the world's most enjoyable centers for science education. Under Dr. Friedman's leadership, the Hall has received national recognition for its efforts to encourage new technologies, to evaluate the effectiveness of informal science teaching and to develop new strategies for training science teachers. This fall, the Hall of Science will open an expansion of its facilities, which will double its exhibition space and allow for increased enrollment in its educational programs.

Dr. Friedman's efforts to make science education fun and interactive have been highly influential in the academic community, and have enriched the lives of a great many young people. At a time when many feel that America's commitment to science education has faltered, Dr. Friedman has been a pioneer in furthering our children's understanding of both the history of science and recent breakthroughs in scientific research.

Indeed, the New York Times editorial page celebrated Dr. Friedman's contributions, saying:

New Yorkers of a certain age will recall the Museum of Science and Industry in the Daily News Building and later in Rockefeller Center. It folded. Boomers will recall the New York Hall of Science at the 1964 World's Fair. That one was shuttered in 1979. Its building languished until 1984, when the city hired the physicist Alan Friedman and pumped in funds to bring it back to life. That he has done, with innovative educational programs and strong links both to city schoolchildren and their teachers.

Dr. Friedman is the recipient of the American Association for the Advancement of Science's AAAS Award for Public Understanding of Science and Technology. He is a Fellow of the AAAS, the New York Academy of Sciences and the Association of Science-Technology Centers.

Alan Friedman truly exemplifies the tradition of civic involvement that makes America the greatest nation in the world. Dr. Friedman and the New York Hall of Science deserve our respect, admiration and support.

Mr. Speaker, I request that my colleagues join me in paying tribute to this wonderful organization and its director, Dr. Alan Friedman.