

the process of enlarging NATO. A number of countries, including Romania, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, and Ukraine have already asked NATO to dispatch missions to their capitals in order to receive further details on the process.

Russian reaction to these developments has been predictably sharp. Moscow's vocal opposition to NATO expansion could, ironically, further solidify support for membership in former Warsaw Pact countries and, perhaps, in some of the New Independent States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the administration to resist firmly any attempt by Russia to veto NATO expansion, in general, or the admission of any state or states, in particular. President Clinton should clearly communicate this point to President Yeltsin when the two meet next month in New York. It is my view that every state should be given the same chance to pursue NATO membership, including the Baltic States and Ukraine.

It is up to Russia to determine what, if any, relationship it is interested in pursuing with the Alliance. Mr. Speaker, the process of NATO expansion should not be further delayed as the Russians attempt to sort out their own affairs. Mr. Speaker, a democratic Russia has nothing to fear from the expansion of a voluntary defensive alliance founded upon democratic principles and norms of behavior. Russia has sown the seeds of mistrust through its brutal military campaign in Chechnya and it is up to the Russians to demonstrate that they can indeed be a reliable partner with the West.

STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANKS— INNOVATIVE FINANCING FOR OUR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the State Infrastructure Banks Act of 1995. This bill will provide new opportunities for State and local governments to finance vital transportation infrastructure needs.

This act gives States the option of creating State Infrastructure Banks [SIBs]. SIBs are infrastructure investment funds designed to provide States with a variety of financing options for infrastructure projects.

Traditionally, Federal transportation funding programs offer only one form of financial support—reimbursement grants. SIBs offer a new financial concept for funding transportation programs which cannot be accommodated within the structure of traditional Federal reimbursement programs. With traditional grant programs the Federal share of a project's costs is set, usually at 80 percent, and there are not alternative ways to finance the transportation projects. This act would allow States to transfer up to 15 percent of their federally apportioned transportation funds into SIBs. States would then utilize the SIBs to tailor the role of Federal funds to a project's needs. This is especially important when over time the project needs change.

In addition, SIBs would encourage innovative financing partnerships between the public and private sectors. Private financing sources are very interested in investing in public infrastructure. Unfortunately, the traditional Federal

funding requirements do not provide these potential investors with any opportunity. SIBs provide States with a range of loan and credit options for each infrastructure project. Such options may include low interest loans for all or part of a project, loans with interest-only periods in early years, construction period financing and more. Other potential investors may include the bond market, commercial banks, construction consortia, mutual funds, insurance funds and retirement funds.

Current funding approaches do not allow infrastructure development to keep pace with the private economy it is designed to serve. Historically, Federal transportation programs require that States obligate Federal-aid funds on a so-called pay-as-you-go basis. In effect, this requires that project sponsors have all the cash required to build a project available well before beginning construction. In private sector terms, this structure effectively dictates that States fully fund a project's costs with 100 percent government equity before construction begins. The sectors of the economy that depend on transportation do not wait until 100 percent equity financing is available before they begin development. As long as infrastructure financing practices are tied to the current rules, infrastructure investment can be expected to perpetually lag behind the economy's needs and demands.

By requiring the accumulation of all capital as equity in advance, traditional funding rules actually result in deferred reconstruction projects. This serves to drive up construction costs much more rapidly than inflation rates due to the increased rate of deterioration of the infrastructure. As a result, projects cost more than anticipated. Therefore, fewer projects can be undertaken.

Additionally, SIBs allow the States to leverage decreasing Federal funds. Historically, the Federal Government substantially underwrote the costs of new transportation projects often with reimbursement grants of up to 90 percent. Today, the Federal Government's share of investment in transportation infrastructure is estimated to be only 30–40 percent of total investment.

Leveraging is accomplished in the State Infrastructure Bank Act of 1995 by giving SIBs the option of using Federal funds as a capital reserve. The SIB may then borrow money in the bond market and establish a significantly larger loan fund. Another way of leveraging is to use the funds as a credit reserve for enhancement and support of privately financed projects by using reserve ratio accounting methods. This maximizes Federal dollars.

SIBs also maximize taxpayer dollars used for transportation in other ways. With SIBs, this same money can be recycled numerous times for making several different loans for infrastructure needs. Second, the initial Federal investment is expanded with each new loan when they are repaid with interest.

A modern transportation infrastructure is a critical element for creating economic development and job growth. Additionally, these improvements in our transportation networks generally enhance the quality of life for everybody. I believe the State Infrastructure Banks Act of 1995 offers solutions to the inherent problems of the current funding mechanism and better accommodates the needs of our Nation's infrastructure.

RENE ANSELMO TRIBUTE

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleagues to join me in paying special tribute to a remarkable individual whose long and distinguished career can forever be a symbol of determination, perseverance and audacity. Mr. Rene Anselmo, who died earlier this month from heart disease, was not only the millionaire chairman of Alpha Lyracom Space Communications, operating under the name Pan American Satellite, but also made a lasting contribution to the Hispanic community by helping to create television's Spanish International Network [SIN], now Univision.

Reynold Vincent Anselmo was an energetic and restless young man who joined the Marines in 1942 at the age of 16, spend 3½ years as a World War II tail-gunner, and completed 37 missions in the South Pacific. After the war, he enrolled in the University of Chicago's Great Books programs and after earning a theater and literature degree in 1951, he moved to Mexico where he discovered an affinity for Hispanic culture.

In Mexico, Mr. Anselmo directed and produced television and theater shows, and in 1954 he started working for Mexico's largest media company, Televisa, selling its TV programs to other Latin American companies. His hard work and dedication attracted the attention of Mr. Emiliano Azcarraga Vidaurreta, the founder and head of Televisa, who in 1961 hired him to start up television's SIN, now Univision Two years later, Mr. Anselmo moved to New York to manage SIN and oversee the TV stations.

At that time, Hispanics comprised less than 5 percent of the U.S. population, and the only Spanish-language stations were on the UHF channels that most TV sets were not then equipped to receive. Mr. Anselmo, however, used his Mexican connections and experience to build the business. By 1984, SIN had 400 TV stations and cable affiliates and served the more than 15 million Hispanic people in the United States who represented the fastest-growing segment of the population. SIN provided an alternative to the U.S. media, which did not pay too much attention to the Spanish community or when it did, cast it in a less than favorable stereotype.

In 1986 SIN was under siege by the Federal Communications Commission, which claimed that SIN's ownership violated rules against ownership of United States networks by aliens. As a result, Mr. Anselmo abdicated his position in 1986 and separated from his old friend and partner Mr. Azcarraga. Instead of retiring, Mr. Anselmo founded Pan American Satellite Corp. [PanAmSat], the world's only private global satellite services company. To do this, Mr. Anselmo had to fight against steep odds to break the monopoly on satellite transmission of video images held by the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization, or Intelsat owned by 120 governments, including the United States.

Before Mr. Anselmo launched his satellite company, no one had challenged Intelsat's international monopoly. Today, PanAmSat handles a significant share of transatlantic news, transmissions by ABC, CBS, CNN and

the BBC; and channels financial data for Volvo, Citibank Corp. Latino, and others.

In addition to Mr. Anselmo's devotion to his companies, he was a loving husband, father and grandfather, and a great neighbor. In fact, he was probably best known in his hometown of Greenwich, CT not for his business success, but for his beautification of the town. Mr. Anselmo personally paid for the planting of tens of thousands of bulbs each spring.

Not only will Greenwich, CT be a less pretty place with his passing, but all of America loses a great businessman, family man and war veteran. For a better understanding of this great man, my colleagues may be interested in reading a profile of him which was published in *Continental Profiles* in August 1991.

[From *Continental Profile*, Aug. 1991]

HIGH FLIER

(By Frank Lovece)

Look! Up in the sky! It's a bird! It's a plane! It's . . . well, it's a bird, as artificial satellites are affectionately called. And this particular bird is a rare duck indeed: The first privately owned, international telecommunications satellite in orbit. Not surprisingly, the guy who sent it flying is a bit of a strange bird himself.

This is Rene Anselmo, chairperson of Alpha Lyracom Space Communications, operating under the name Pan American Satellite—no relation to the airline. Prior to this particular first, he's distributed American TV shows in Mexico, founded a theater company that evolved into Second City, and helped create television's Spanish International Network (SIN), now Univision. And despite having cleared a cool \$100 million when he sold his SIN shares five years ago, he is far less Michael Douglas as Gordon Gekko than James Whitmore as Harry Truman.

In his plush office on the second floor of a modern, red-brick low-rise in Greenwich, Connecticut, the crusty, 65-year-old Anselmo is dressed comfortably in an open-collared shirt and a pull-over sweater. Except for the halo of cigarette smoke from the Winstons he chain-smokes, he looks more ready for his grandkids than for multimillion dollar business deals.

"I don't consider myself a businessman," Anselmo says "I guess I'm just your classic, basic promoter entrepreneur."

That he is, with a high-tech twist. Until Anselmo came along, U.S. TV networks, news organizations, and banks needing to transmit voice, data, or video internationally had virtually no other avenue but Intelsat, a 15-satellite, 120-nation co-operative. Each member-nation has a signatory organization, generally the government PTT (post/telephone/telegraph) monopoly. In the United States, it's the Communications Satellite Corp., a publicly traded company created by an act of Congress in 1962 just for this. Known as Comsat, it enjoys a legal monopoly. And just like nature feels about vacuums, Rene Anselmo abhors monopolies.

Spurred by the deregulatory climate of the 1980's, and flush from the sale of SIN, Anselmo put up most of the \$85 million needed to buy and launch his RCA-made satellite, dubbed PAS-1. It lifted off June 15, 1988 from Kourou, French Guiana, via Arianespace, the European private-rocket company-with Anselmo having no assured customers, and only about \$40 million in insurance if the darned thing blew up.

Yet his pie in the sky paid off: Among other things, Pan American Satellite beamed this year's Academy Awards ceremony overseas, live; handles a significant share of transatlantic news transmissions by ABC, CBS, CNN, and BBC; and channels fi-

ancial data for Volvo, Citibank Corp. Latino, and others, Financial observers say Anselmo's privately held firm should surpass its projected 1991 revenue of \$25 million. The company is now well positioned in a telecommunications equipment-and-services market that the U.S. Department of Commerce predicts will be worth \$1 trillion next year.

Yet even with that big a market, why start such a risky, untested venture at age 61, after having cashed in on a fortune? "Well, I gotta do something," Anselmo protests. "Satellites and broadcasting are so integrally related, and with SIN I was an early user of satellites, so it was just a natural adjunct," he says, shrugging. "And the reason nobody ever did it before is nobody was ever allowed to do it."

This is so. It wasn't until 1984 that a Rockville, Maryland firm called Orion Network Systems began nudging the government for permission to launch a private, international telecommunications satellite (private domestic satellites are a separate and fairly common thing). Thusly nudged, President Ronald Reagan signed a 1984 document called Presidential Determination Act #85-2, allowing private satellites to compete in the Intelsat market.

"I immediately jumped in," Anselmo recalls, "because I knew all the satellite service we weren't getting—and the costs for what was available were exorbitant because it was a monopoly market. The whole system had to be changed," he says, "and it was a nice, personally challenging thing to do."

Reynold Vincent Anselmo has had a lifetime of nice, personally challenging things to do. Born in Medford, Massachusetts, he joined the Marine Corps at 16 and spent three-and-a-half years as a World War II tail-gunner, completing 37 combat missions in the South Pacific. He came home to earn a theater and literature degree from the University of Chicago in 1951, and to found a campus theater group called Tonight at 8:30—some of the core members later went on to create the famous troupe, Second City.

"Rene and I lived side by side in basement apartments," recalls acting teacher Paul Sills, who co-founded Second City and the two predecessor groups. "He was an interesting man, full of details. Always wore white shoes and carried an umbrella; had some of the Harvard Yard about him. What I learned from Rene was that you could actually start a theater—that you didn't need anybody's permission."

By now it was the beat 1950s, the era of Jack Kerouac's *On the Road*. Anselmo drifted to Mexico. He liked it enough that after a brief return to the States—where he was a guest director at the Pasadena Playhouse, and met Mary Morton, his future wife—he returned to Mexico to live.

After a \$25-a-week stint dramatizing *Time* magazine stories for the U.S. government's Voice of America radio broadcasts, Anselmo hooked up with a radio-show distributor named Paul Talbot, and began a small syndication company. When a television developed, Talbot began buying syndication rights to Americans shows and had them dubbed in Spanish; Anselmo would lease them to Mexico TV stations. Some years later, Emilio Azcarraga, founder of the Mexican TV network Televisa, S.A., hired Anselmo to start up a division to export their programs to other Spanish-speaking countries.

In 1961, Anselmo—still a Televisa employee—and other investors began buying UHF TV stations in the United States, and pioneered Spanish broadcasting here. Over the course of 25 years, that core of stations grew into SIN/Univision, with 400 TV stations and cable affiliates. Yet since it was 20 percent owned by Azcarraga, Anselmo—a

U.S. native who ran it out of New York City—had to divest himself because of a complicated federal issue over whether the network was foreign-owned—which was strictly forbidden.

The incident, to Anselmo, is an example of bureaucracy and authority gone awry. Scrappy as ever, he sees the same red-tape morass in Intelsat and Comsat. "It's like Communism and Socialism in Eastern Europe," he grumbles. "You wonder how the people over there put up with that for 75 years."

He's probably overstating the case—Intelsat has done much demonstrable good, making telecommunication available to countries that otherwise couldn't afford it. Yet Anselmo's correct that as in any monopoly situation, you can't go across the street if you don't like the price or service.

Comsat charges a reported flat rate of \$2,637 an hour; Pan American Satellite, between \$1,000 and \$2,400 an hour, depending on usage based on volume per year, with most customers paying, says Anselmo, about \$1,300. Even with a few hundred added at each end for earthstation fees (included in the comsat rate), Pan American Satellite is a bargain. And to the joy of news organizations with breaking reports, Anselmo always has a satellite transponder or two set aside for last-minute spot bookings.

He's also fighting like a bulldog for access to the international telephone systems. Known as "public switched networks" (PSNs), these phone lines are used to transmit almost everything, from voice to data. The right to compete with Intelsat in this market would be a boon to Anselmo. However, such access was specifically excluded from the Presidential Determination Act that allowed the formation of Pan American Satellite in the first place. Not one to lie down in the face of a monopoly, Anselmo has embarked on an ambitious, yet seemingly quixotic campaign to remedy the situation. Tired of writing lengthy missives to politicians and bureaucrats, which he feared were not being read, Anselmo took out a paid advertisement in *The New York Times*, to address the situation. But this was no staid political ad. In the form of a 17-frame comic strip, it featured Anselmo and his dog taking on well-heeled lobbyists (in football regalia) and in one panel depicts Anselmo as a Kurdish refugee. The cartoon culminates with Anselmo making a plea for President Bush to "strike a blow for global telecommunications liberalization. Lift the PSN restriction now."

Most of the U.S. telecommunications industry wants Anselmo and others to have the access to PSNs: Literally dozens of telecommunications users, satellite makers, and others filed comments on his behalf with the Federal Communications Commission last February.

That prompted Intelsat to recommend Anselmo be given 100 PSN circuits to use—an amount Anselmo says is "like having a billion dollars in your pockets and saying, 'Here's a penny.'" He exaggerates, yet according to spokespersons at both Intelsat and the F.C.C., 100 circuits is, indeed, a pittance.

But the game seems destined to change. Orion Network Systems Inc. is close to launching its two satellites, and Anselmo is negotiating to order three. And chances are, every bird will be booked: The last few years have seen explosive growth in satellite news services, fax transmissions, video teleconferencing, private telephone networks, and bank/credit data communication—the latter of which increased over 40-fold from 1970 to 1985, and could soon account for 40 percent of all telecommunications traffic.

At present, however, it's still a poker game with an enormous ante. Anselmo's first satellite cost a cut-rate \$47 million; slightly more advanced ones are double that now. "And launch costs have quadrupled," Anselmo says. "You have an \$80 million satellite, an \$80 million launch, another \$32 million for insurance—and then it's \$10 million a year [operating and maintenance costs] for 13 years," the average life of a communications satellite. Now add in the cost of a satellite earthstation teleport in Homestead, Florida, and 40 or so employees.

Each bird Anselmo puts up will top out, he figures, at \$40 million in revenue a year. "You're making money there," Anselmo says. "But owning satellites is not a good business in itself. You have to develop services. Let's say you're an airline. You want to put in VSATs, these dishes for data, and hook up travel agencies all over the place, so they can get into the computer via satellite. Now the airline doesn't want to operate that. So you provide that service: You install the stations, take care of them, provide the satellite transmission—there's money *there*."

"You don't do these things to make money," Anselmo claims. "You do and you don't. I'm doing it to give me something to do, and I just love breaking up this whole monopolistic system—all these state-owned telecommunications systems that don't provide good service in their countries and don't let anyone else provide it. I'd just *love* to break up that system," he says, tilting his lance.

SALUTE TO THE SIKH NATION OF KHALISTAN

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to salute the Sikh nation of Khalistan on the eighth anniversary of its declaration of independence. The Sikh leadership declared Khalistan independent on October 7, 1987.

Many of us have been long-time supporters of Khalistan's struggle to achieve its rightful place among the independent countries of the world. Frankly, it is in America's best interest to support the independence of Khalistan. Upon achieving its independence, Khalistan has promised to sign a friendship treaty with the United States, as opposed to occupying Indian regime which votes against the American position in the United Nations 84 percent of the time. I am inserting an article from India Abroad of May 5, 1995, on this issue. As India deploys the Prithvi nuclear missile and continues development of the Trishul, in violation of international standards, it would help promote America's interests in the region if we had a reliable, democratic ally which could serve as a buffer between India and Pakistan.

But while strategic concerns are important, they are not the best reason to support freedom for Khalistan. We should support freedom for Khalistan because it is the right thing to do. Currently, the Sikhs of Khalistan live under the boot of brutal Indian oppression. This oppression has caused the deaths of more than 120,000 Sikhs since India's brutal attack on the Sikh Nation's holiest shrine, the Golden Temple at Amritsar, in June 1984. Thousands of Sikhs have been arrested, tortured and killed by the brutal Indian regime. Thousands of others have simply disappeared, never to

be heard from again. In some cases, their families have been waiting for several years for word of their whereabouts. Our own State Department reported in 1994 that between 1991 and 1993, over 41,000 cash bounties were handed out to police officers as a reward for killing Sikhs. In November, the Indian newspaper Hitavada reported that the late governor of Punjab, Surendra Nath, had been paid the equivalent of \$1.5 billion to organize and support covert terrorist activities in Punjab, Khalistan, and in neighboring Kashmir. I am again entering this report into the RECORD so that my colleagues can see clearly the true nature of Indian democracy.

One definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. Despite years of evidence that their repression has only strengthened the Sikh Nation's determination to liberate Khalistan, the Indian regime continues to increase the brutality and tyranny in a futile effort to scare the Sikh Nation into submitting to India's brutal rule. So great is the Indian regime's fear of the Sikh Nation that when Sikh leader Simranjit Singh Mann called for a peaceful movement to liberate Khalistan, he was arrested and held in illegal detention for 6 months. So great is their fear that when Jaswant Singh Khalra, general secretary of the Human Rights Wing, Shiromani Akali Dal issued a report showing that the regime had arrested, tortured, and killed 25,000 young Sikh men, then declared their bodies unidentified and cremated them, the police kidnapped Mr. Khalra and made him disappear like so many before him. These are merely two of the most recent examples of India tyranny in occupied Khalistan. There are so many other examples, large and small, that it would take me the rest of the session to list them.

There is only one way to secure freedom for the Sikh Nation; a sovereign and independent Khalistan. Only by supporting independence for Khalistan can the United States, the bastion of freedom for the world, help to insure freedom in the Indian subcontinent. It is time for our government to speak out in support of freedom for Khalistan and the other nations living under Indian misrule. Until then, I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Sikh Nation on Khalistani independence day.

[From Heritage Foundation Study: India Abroad, May 5, 1995]

THINK TANK LISTS INDIA'S U.N. VOTES AND RECEIPT OF AID

A study by the Heritage Foundation, an influential conservative think tank in Washington, has found that India is high on the list of the top 10 countries receiving American aid though it voted against the U.S. at the United Nations, Aziz Haniffa writes. The study noted that India, which is slated to receive over \$155 million in U.S. aid this year, voted against the U.S. last year at the U.N. Meanwhile, the World Bank is seeking to convince industrial nations, specially the U.S., that aid can be profitable, Ela Dutt reports.

TOP 10 COUNTRIES VOTING AGAINST THE UNITED STATES AT THE U.N. AND TOTAL UNITED STATES FOREIGN AID FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

	U.N. votes against United States in 1994 [Percent]	Fiscal year 1995 aid
India	84	\$155,479,000
Laos	80	2,000,000
China	77	771,000
Labanon	71	9,195,000
Burundi	70	15,772,000
Sri Lanka	70	35,872,000
Zimbabwe	70	31,729,000
Algeria	69	75,000
Angola	69	5,000,000
Ghana	69	58,587,000

STUDY LINKS U.N. VOTING WITH AID (By Aziz Haniffa)

WASHINGTON.—A study by the Heritage Foundation, an influential conservative think tank here, particularly in Republican circles, has found that India headed the list of the top 10 countries receiving U.S. aid, while voting against the United States in the United Nations.

The study, written by Bryan T. Johnson, a policy analyst, with the foundation, noted that India, which is slated to receive over \$155 million in U.S. assistance in the fiscal year 1995, cast its ballot in opposition to America 84 percent of the time last year at the U.N. "That is as often as Cuba," the report said.

TOP 10 LARGEST RECIPIENTS OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN AID AND THEIR VOTING RECORD

	Fiscal year 1995 aid	U.N. votes against United States in 1994 [Percent]
Israel	\$3,003,800,000	5
Egypt	2,121,729,000	85
India	155,479,000	54
Peru	150,516,000	55
Bolivia	134,178,000	58
Bangladesh	112,679,000	64
Ethiopia	92,148,000	51
Haiti	85,813,000	57
South Africa	82,463,000	58
Philippines	74,004,000	61

According to the document, India was followed closely by Laos (80 percent anti-U.S. voting record, while receiving \$2 million in U.S. aid); China (77 percent, \$771,000); Lebanon (71 percent, \$9.1 million); Burundi (70 percent, \$15.7 million); Sri Lanka (70 percent, \$35.8 million); Zimbabwe (70 percent, \$31.7 million); Algeria (69 percent, \$75,000); Angola (69 percent, \$5 million), and Ghana (69 percent, \$56 million). By contrast, Russia, which as part of the Soviet Union confronted the U.S. on nearly every issue during the Cold War, was found by the Heritage study to have voted against the U.S. only 33 percent of the time last year. It also said that of the 10 countries that voted with the U.S. the most, nine are former Soviet-bloc countries. The study noted that some 74 percent of U.S. foreign aid recipients voting in the 1994 U.S. session did so against the U.S. a majority of the time. It said that of the 113 countries that are foreign aid recipients and also members of the U.N., 95 of them voted against the U.S. more often than Russia.

It reported that the top 10 countries, headed by India, that voted against the U.S. the most would receive nearly \$313 million in foreign aid in the fiscal year 1995.

All but one of America's top 10 largest recipients, which the report identified as Israel, voted against the U.S. a majority of the time in the 1994 U.N. session.

While acknowledging that while there are many reasons why a country may vote with