island leaders and a host of Washington officials, including many on Capitol Hill, found that Mrs. Fanning was a Federal employee who could be depended on time after time to get the job done. It was never a surprise to anyone who knew Nancy to find her in her office late at night or on weekends, working hard, and never complaining. Those who wonder whether Federal workers earn their pay have obviously never met Nancy Boone Fanning.

Nancy Boone arrived at Interior just a few days short of her eighteenth birthday from her home in West Virginia in September, 1971. She was educated in a one-room school house during her elementary school years, and made the decision to seek work in Washington after graduation from high school. Nancy's first job at Interior was as a secretary with the pay level of GS–3. Twenty-seven years later, she was at the top of the Federal pay schedule, a reflection of just how valuable she has been to the Department of the Interior.

With 27 years of long hours and endless commute behind her, Nancy has decided to change her life's priorities and devote time to her husband Mike Fanning and their young son, Michael. All of us wish her and her family the best of success in the future.

I extend to Nancy my best wishes in retirement and thank her, on behalf of my constituents, for the outstanding work she has done on our behalf over the years.

CONFUSING BANKRUPTCY PROVISION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 21, 1998

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, I want to elucidate on the meaning of an isolated and confusing bankruptcy provision which unfortunately appeared in the omnibus appropriations bill approved by the House yesterday. Section 603 of Division I of the bill, entitled Chemical Weapons Convention should have originally been referred to the Judiciary Committee for action and study. As the Speaker is aware, bankruptcy legislation is quite complex and requires scrutiny of Members who are familiar with the impact of proposed amendments.

Most importantly, this legislation should not be read to expand the exceptions to the automatic stay to cases where governmental units are merely seeking to exercise control of a debtor's property to satisfy debt. I believe that the provisions should be read to restrict the exception to the automatic stay to circumstances where a governmental unit is enforcing its police or regulatory power, but not acting to collect a debt or other financial obligations. This interpretation is consistent with Chairman HYDE's reading of the language, which is reflected in a statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on his behalf by International Relations Committee Chairman GILMAN subsequent to previous Congressional consideration of this legislation. See 143 Cong. Rec. H 10951 (Nov. 13, 1997).

I am also concerned that by repealing § 362(b)(4) and § 362(b)(5) of the automatic stay, some may assert that governmental units may now be required to seek relief from stay in order to enforce their pales for regulatory powers in all cases, except in the instance when the governmental units' activities involves action under the Convention in connection with chemical weapons. I do not believe that this new requirement was intended, nor would it be desirable.

ON IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY RESOLUTIONS

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 21, 1998

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, 1998, I cast what I believe was the most significant vote of my entire six-year service in the House of Representatives. The issue of impeachment is as weighty as the Constitution itself—it is a matter that has been debated only three times in the history of our nation.

The House of Representatives received two proposals. Both proposals directed the House to proceed with an inquiry for impeachment. Where the proposals differed was in scope and duration. I voted for the proposal that instructed the House Judiciary Committee to conclude its work by the end of the year, and to examine and make determinations on the Starr Report and the Starr Report only.

Mr. Speaker, this was not a vote for or against the President. It was, in fact, a vote about fairness to the American people and what is in our national interest. The President must be held accountable by our constitutional process, but the American people should not be punished by how Congress applies that process.

TRIBUTE TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CHICAGO EAST FIELD OFFICE

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 21, 1998

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to and recognize the Chicago East Field Office of the Social Security Administration as they celebrate the grand opening of their new office on Thursday, October 22, 1998.

Since 1939, the Chicago East Field Office has provided outstanding service to the people of the city of Chicago and indeed, the entire state of Illinois. They have been instrumental in rebuilding public confidence in the long term solvency of the Social Security Trust funds, Retirement and Survivors Insurance, Disability Insurance and Supplemental Security Income Programs.

The Chicago East Field Office is an exemplary community-based, public service institution that has been cited on numerous occasions by the Social Security Administration for successfully processing critical workload assignments that have led to improved service delivery for the agency and cost-effective savings to this nation's taxpayers. This office has worked tirelessly and cooperatively with my district office to ensure that the residents of the First Congressional District receive quality, timely and courteous assistance from their Federal government.

The employees of the Chicago East Field Office are intimately involved in civic endeavors, contributing thousands of dollars annually to the financially less fortunate, through the Combined Federal Campaign and other local, charitable, gift giving initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the Chicago East Field Office of the Social Security Administration and Clara J. Bowers, District Manager; Renette Coachman, Assistant District Manager and Doris Murray, District Operations Officer for their unwavering service and commitment to our community. I am proud to join the celebration of the grand opening of their new service facility and I am privileged to enter these words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States House of Representatives.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 21, 1998

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Congressional Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare, I strongly support Section 117 of the Treasury Appropriations Conference Report now part of the FY 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Bill, which was passed by the House of Representatives on October 20, 1998. This Section arose out of a need to assist American victims of terrorism or extrajudicial killing in recovering assets of states that sponsor terrorism in order to help satisfy civil judgments against such state-sponsors.

I would like to comment briefly on the operation of Section 117. Subsection (f)(1)(A) clarifies existing law to allow the post-judgment seizure of blocked foreign assets of terrorist states to help satisfy judgment resulting from actions brought against them under section 28 USC 1605(a)(7), the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act's exception to immunity for acts of state sponsored terrorism involving the death or personal injury of a United States national.

Subsection (f)(2)(A) establishes requirements upon the Secretary of Treasury and Secretary of State to assist in the location of the blocked assets of terrorist states in order to facilitate attachment and execution. Section (d) allows the President to waive the requirements of Subsection (f)(2)(A). Section (d) however does not allow the waiver of subsection (f)(1)(A), as that subsection modifies existing law, but imposes no ''requirement.''

The Clinton Administration understands the operation of Section (d)'s waiver and has strongly opposed it. During the negotiations over the Omnibus Appropriations Bill, the Administration vigorously sought to expand the scope of the waiver to include Subsection (f)(1)(A). Various proposals to expand the waiver to include Subsection (f)(1)(A) were received from Under Secretary of State Eizenstat, the National Security Counsel Staff and the Department of State's Office of the Legal Advisor. Each of these many proposals were rejected by Congress.

The intent of Congress is clear. We will not tolerate the murder of our children in acts of

state sponsored terrorism. When a Court of competent jurisdiction has determined that a terrorist state has sponsored acts of terrorism resulting in the death or personal injury of a United States national, any and all of their assets in this country may be attached and executed to satisfy the judgment. The significant financial loss to terrorist states will be a critical deterrent to further acts of terrorism targeted at the citizens of this country. I applaud all those members who helped make section 117 a reality.

THE BIGGEST FAILURE OF THE 105TH CONGRESS—NO HATE CRIMES LEGISLATION

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 21, 1998

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, on this our last day of the 105th Congress, I must voice my deep regret that we refused to take any action on a Federal ''hate crimes'' bill. Many of my colleagues argued that the assault and homicide statutes in the individual states were sufficient to address any abuses perpetrated against our citizens because of race, religion, ethnicity or sexual preference. Others argued that many states already had hate crimes laws on the books and therefore a Federal statute was simply an unnecessary duplication.

Unfortunately, our failure to act signals much more than a concern about duplication of laws or an honest debate about the sufficiency of state laws to protect innocent citizens against crimes which occur simply because the victims are in some way ''different'' from their attackers. These physical attacks have increased with alarming frequency; they have been both racially motivated and homophobic. During the 105th Congress, we saw violent racial attacks on Black men and children which resulted in severe injuries in two cases and death in another. The recent death of Wyoming student, Matthew Shepard, was due solely to the fact that he was gay and his attackers hated gays. Bias and prejudice are not figments of a liberal imagination; they are very real acts especially when they result in death or injury.

Unless we make a clear public policy statement opposing these acts, we give the attackers the impression that their abhorrent behavior is acceptable. That is why I have sponsored amendments to The Civil Rights Act, H.R. 365, which would give Federal civil rights protection against discrimination on the basis of sexual preference. But we must go beyond anti-discrimination laws; we must ensure that there is a Federal statute to punish the perpetrators of bias-based attacks.

It is my fervent hope that the biggest failure of the 105th Congress will not be repeated in the 106th Congress. Let us pass a Federal hate crimes bill as our first order of business in January.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSWOMAN CONNIE MORELLA, CHAIRWOMAN SUBCOMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 21, 1998

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the House on an issue of importance to our Nation's ability to compete in the 21st Century's high-tech economy. Although the issue involves arcane subjects such as international standards, chip rates and band width, it has the potential to impact every American consumer who owns a cell phone and every U.S. manufacturer and service provider whose products enable our citizens to communicate on-the-go.

The International Telecommunications Union (ITU) is currently in the process of deciding on a third generation wireless communications standards, better known as 3G. 3G is intended to provide cell phone customers with seamless global roaming capacity. In theory, wireless communication devices will be able to work not only in every State in the Union, but in virtually every country.

Such a universal standard, or series of standards, clearly has the potential to greatly benefit U.S. consumers, cell phone manufacturers, and wireless telecommunications providers. It also has the potential to harm all three.

That is why I, along with Technology Subcommittee Ranking Member JAMES BARCIA (D–MI) and Congresswoman ELLEN TAUSCHER (D–CA), wrote to the administration outlining our findings from a hearing entitled ''International Standards Part II: The Impact of Standards on the Digital Economy.'' The hearing was held by the Subcommittee on Technology on June 4, 1998, in advance of the U.S. submission to the ITU of proposed standards for 3G. As the letter stated:

> While the witnesses at the hearing had divergent views on a number of substantive issues, one issue which seemed to generate a significant degree of consensus was the need to ensure that any future glogal standard not strand technologies which are currently in use. While some members of the panel made the point that this is only one of several important issues that must be addressed in 3G, they all agreed that avoiding stranding systems was an important goal for any global standard.
>
> One method to ensure technologies are not stranded is to require backwards compatibility. With the significant investment made in the U.S. by developers, manufactures and service providers of wireless telecommunications technologies, [it is imperative that the U.S. Government] should work diligently to ensure that these investments are not rendered worthless through the international standard setting process.

To further emphasize this point, I entered into a colloquy with Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman HAROLD ROGERS (R–KY) on August 3, 1998 indicating that the Department of Commerce, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Department of State need to work diligently to ensure that the large U.S. investments in built networks are not rendered useless through the international standard setting process.

That danger persists today. The European Union (EU) is currently considering adoption of a single technical standard known by the acronym W–CDMA. W–CDMA is not compatible with existing CDMA technologies. Because of previously approved EU-wide technological standards, CDMA is not being used in the EU. CDMA, however, is one of the leading technologies used in the United States. While U.S. consumers, manufacturers, and service providers use a variety of technologies, many are heavily vested in CDMA technology.

I have long been a proponent of allowing the marketplace to determine which technologies survive. In the case of wireless standards, however, we currently face a government mandated technological monopoly in Europe and a free and open technology marketplace in America.

Clearly, the current system is unfair and greatly disadvantages a number of U.S. companies. It is my goal to ensure that the 3G process does not perpetuate this unfair technical barrier to trade, and unnecessarily waste billions of dollars in U.S. investments.

Though often overlooked, international standards, including 3G, are an extremely important component of international trade. We must, however, be ever vigilant to ensure that these standards are not used to bar U.S. businesses from competing abroad.

Mr. Speaker, as the 105th Congress draws to a close, I want to assure my colleagues that, if my constituents give me the honor of representing them in the 106th Congress, I will continue to vigorously pursue, through hearings and if necessary legislation, the arcane but vital issue of preserving U.S. competitiveness in the international standard setting arena.