

The entity within the Fed responsible for determining the country's monetary policy is the FOMC, which consists of the 7 member board of governors and 5 of the 12 district bank presidents. The FOMC meets every 6 weeks but, unfortunately for the general public, they meet in relative secrecy. I say relative because, in the wake of a FOMC meeting, members of the committee give speeches to business groups where, with a wink and a nod, they reveal specifics of the new policy. Meanwhile, the ordinary American gets a convoluted synopsis of the policy immediately after the meeting, an edited transcript 6 weeks later, and the full story 30 years later. It is time to open these meetings up to all.

Mr. Speaker, the Government-in-the-Sunshine Act, passed in 1976 to increase accountability of over 50 Federal agencies, opens closed meetings to private scrutiny. It requires that "every portion of every meeting of an agency" that is "headed by a collegial body" must be "open to public observation." There are exceptions to the law, however, and the Fed has massaged the English language to the point where the Supreme Court overruled the lower courts and allowed one such exemption to apply to the FOMC meetings. Consequently, the Fed has the extraordinary timetable for disclosure that I mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the sensitivity with which the Fed must treat monetary policy. I also understand the need for apolitical decisionmaking during the FOMC meetings. But when a governmental entity can wield a \$300 billion bludgeoning tool at will in the marketplace, it should be held accountable. The Sunshine on the Federal Open Market Committee Act will ensure such accountability.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important measure.

GUAM COMMONWEALTH ACT

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 24, 1995

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to introduce the Guam Commonwealth Act, an act which embodies all the hopes and dreams for a better future for the people of Guam. The Guam Commonwealth Act would structure a better relationship between Guam and the Federal Government, and would ensure that Guam has sufficient political and economic tools to provide a secure future for our children and for future generations of Chamorros.

Today I call on the Federal Government to expand the Contract With America to include a contract with Guam. This contract with Guam would say that the indigenous people of Guam, the Chamorros, would reserve for themselves the decision over their future political status. This contract with Guam would say that Guam would be freed from economic constraints that have impeded our progress as a people. And this contract with Guam would say that our new relationship with the Federal Government would be based on mutual respect, and mutual consent.

I have chosen this bill as my first in the 104th Congress, just as it was my first bill in the 103d Congress, because the resolution of our political status must be the first priority of the Federal Government in its relations with

Guam. And the desire to take our place as a new Commonwealth is the first and foremost goal of the representatives of the people of Guam.

The long road to Commonwealth began in January 1982 with the first political status plebescite that allowed the voters of Guam to choose a status from among: status quo, statehood, incorporation, commonwealth, independence and free association. Later that year a runoff plebescite was held between statehood and commonwealth. An overwhelming 73 percent of the voters chose commonwealth, launching us on a journey that leads to the 104th Congress, and the introduction of the Guam Commonwealth Act today.

I know that this bill still has a long road to travel, but this journey pales in comparison to the epic struggle of the Chamorro people that began 474 years ago with the first contact with the outside world. The culmination of that struggle still eludes us, but the creation of the Commonwealth of Guam begins a new era of self-reliance, self-respect and self-governance for the people of Guam. I am honored to introduce the Guam Commonwealth Act today, and I am ready to tell Guam's story to the Congress and the Nation.

BELMAR ST. PATRICK'S DAY PARADE

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 24, 1995

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of Sunday, March 6, 1995, the 22d annual St. Patrick's Day Parade will move through the streets of Belmar, NJ.

Mr. Speaker, from its modest beginnings little more than two decades ago, the Belmar event has become the biggest and best-attended St. Patrick's Day Parade in the State of New Jersey, and one of the finest in the Nation. While not quite as big as the New York City parade, the Belmar event has steadily been attracting crowds of more than 100,000 people, drawn from the Jersey shore area and throughout our State, surrounding States and other nations, including Ireland itself. More than 4,000 marchers are expected this year, including members of community organizations, elected officials, 30 marching bands, including the award-winning Friendly Sons of Shillelagh Marching Band of Old Bridge, NJ, 20 floats, bagpipers, and leaders of Irish-American organizations. Both the participants and the many spectators always have a wonderful time.

The 1995 grand marshal is Msgr. Alfred D. Smith, pastor of St. Rose Roman Catholic Church in Belmar. The deputy grand marshal is Eileen P. O'Connell of Wall Township. A previous grand marshal, Monmouth County Freeholder Thomas J. Powers, has been selected by the parade committee to be this year's parade commentator. Mr. Powers underwent heart surgery shortly after Christmas, but he assures all of his friends and many well-wishers that he'll be ready for St. Paddy's Day.

The Belmar St. Patrick's Day Parade was established in 1973 by members of the Jerry Lynch Social & Athletic Club. Mr. Lynch is credited with being the parade founder. The first parade, held in 1974, had 50 club mem-

bers marching in top hats and tails, followed by four marching bands and numerous fire engines. That year, the crowd of spectators was not much bigger than the contingent of marchers. The first grand marshal was my predecessor and a name well known to many of the Members of this body: the late Congressman James J. Howard, a lifelong resident of the Jersey shore who took great pride in his Irish heritage.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to pay tribute to the Belmar St. Patrick's Day Parade, a great and proud tradition of the Jersey shore for Irish-Americans and people of all backgrounds.

INTEGRATED SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1995

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 24, 1995

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues, Mr. UPTON and Mr. TOWNS, in cosponsoring H.R. 1020, the Integrated Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Act of 1995.

The Department of Energy is responsible for receiving shipments of spent nuclear fuel from America's nuclear powerplants beginning in 1998. They have received billions of dollars from America's electricity consumers to fund this program and were given clear direction from Congress in 1982 and 1987 to establish a Federal spent fuel management program.

The Government has less than 3 years to fulfill its end of this agreement, yet the Department of Energy is still 15 years away from operation of a permanent repository for spent fuel. Even more disturbing, the Department is not even considering interim steps to manage this radioactive waste.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we begin consideration of H.R. 1020 in order to ensure that the Department of Energy is ready to accept spent nuclear fuel in 1998, and that it is prepared to do so in a manner that places the public health and safety above all other concerns.

In New York alone, electricity consumers have paid \$584 million into the Nuclear Waste Fund. Consolidated Edison customers have paid more than \$96 million, New York Power Authority customers nearly \$220 million, Niagara Mohawk customers \$162 million, and Rochester Gas & Electric customers \$105 million.

If a federally centralized management facility is not operational by 1998, 26 nuclear power plants will be forced to build additional waste storage or shut down prematurely. One of those is operated by Niagara Mohawk Power Co. which is one of six nuclear power units that generates 25 percent of the electricity used in New York. Rochester gas will also need additional storage for spent fuel at their nuclear units in 1999 and Electric and New York Power Authority plants in the year 2000.

It is clear that New York can no longer wait for the Energy Department to voluntarily decide to fulfill its nuclear waste obligations. This bill would force the Energy Department to develop an integrated spent nuclear fuel management system, including an interim storage facility that the Federal Government can site and build by 1998. The Department of Energy

already has a conceptual design for such a facility which they could site on Federal Government property in Nevada.

I realize that the schedule proposed in this bill is ambitious, but we must consider the necessary adjustments to this program now so that the Federal Government can meet its obligations to electricity customers nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out for the Federal Government to fulfill its duty to consumers and the capacity to store spent nuclear fuel at nuclear power plants is quickly diminishing. Electricity customers will soon be confronted with spending millions of dollars in addition to their monthly payments to the Federal Nuclear Waste Fund.

We have received a number of comments on this legislation from Governors, State attorneys general, State public service commissioners as well as others, and we have attempted to incorporate these comments into H.R. 1020 in order to develop an integrated plan that will get this program on track.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell you that there is widespread support for this legislation. I would like to particularly site the efforts of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners [NARUC], which has spent the last few years examining this nuclear waste problem. I commend their efforts in sponsoring dialogue with affected parties to unearth and examine the different options. There have been a series of resolutions past by NARUC in the past few years which underscore the need for the four essential components of the integrated spent fuel management system.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must chart a new course for the Nation's spent fuel management program. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Integrated Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Act of 1995.

CRIME PREVENTION THAT WORKS

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 24, 1995

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act of 1995, section 101, authorized the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance [BJA] to make grants directly to units of local government for reducing crime and improving public safety. These funds can be used for hiring or training personnel, equipping law enforcement officers, enhancing school safety, or establishing crime prevention programs. The local jurisdictions have great flexibility as to how they used these funds.

An article by Chris Gersten, president of the Anti-Crime Alliance, in the November 28, 1994 issue of the Washington Times describes one new technology that has the potential to take a big bite out of crime. Mr. Gersten outlines how the use of video monitoring in Great Britain in the Washington, DC subway system has led to dramatic decreases in crime. Video monitoring is now employed in over 300 cities in Great Britain with virtually no complaints about civil liberties. The Prince George's County public school system in Maryland has recently pioneered in the use of video monitoring in some high schools.

I request that Mr. Gersten's article be placed in the RECORD and that jurisdiction around the country explore the potential uses of closed circuit video monitoring in their efforts to reduce crime.

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 28, 1994]

CRIME PREVENTION THAT WORKS

(By Chris Gersten)

Despite having a violent crime rate still a fraction of our own, British lawmakers have taken dramatic steps to reduce crime.

American observers were surprised to read of England's new Criminal Justice and Public Order Act which became law two weeks ago. The most controversial aspect of the new law is the modification of the right to silence. Now, anyone who remains silent after being arrested, can have his silence used against him in court. The new statement by police reads: "You do not have to say anything. But if you do not mention now something which you later use in your defense, the court may decide that your failure to mention it now strengthens the case against you."

The law also contains new powers for police to stop and search vehicles and pedestrians, to arrest squatters and trespassers, and to prevent or break up raves—drug-laden parties sweeping the country.

In addition to the new restriction on the right to silence and the increase in police powers, the British have employed new technology to curtail what they see as a dramatic increase in crime. At least 300 towns across great Britain have installed or are planning to install video surveillance of public spaces to catch and deter criminals, according to PhotoScan Ltd., a leading British video system installer. The pioneering British city, King's Lynn, and other towns have installed monitoring cameras in city centers, parking lots, streets, high-crime housing projects, industrial parks, sports complexes, churches and alleyways. Officials report a high rate of arrest and conviction since installation of the monitoring systems.

The British Home Office, which oversees the police, is promoting video monitoring as "one of the most exciting and constructive applications of new technology in the fight against crime, according to Junior Home Minister David Maclean. A clear majority of citizens express support for the use of video cameras to stop crime.

Video monitoring has been utilized successfully in the United States for some time. The Washington D.C. Metro subway system has had a closed-circuit monitoring system since it opened in 1976. The system has a total of 1,200 cameras and an equal number of monitors with 10 to 30 cameras in each station, depending on station size. The entire system cost approximately \$3 million to install with the cameras costing \$2,000 to \$2,500 each and the monitors \$200 each. It costs roughly \$250,000 per year to maintain the system.

The monitors for all the cameras in each station are housed in one enclosed booth where an official watches the screens. This creates a strong deterrent effect as potential criminals are aware that every movement in the station is being monitored. If a crime is committed, the station guards can usually reach the suspect within seconds.

The use of the camera system has made the Washington subway system the safest in the country, according to Patricia Lambe, spokesman for the Washington Metro Area Transit Authority. In 1993, only 33 violent crimes occurred in the system. From 1990 through 1993, only one murder. All the other violent crimes were classified as aggravated assaults. Many of these crimes were commit-

ted in parking lots and garages not covered by video cameras. This is an amazing record for a metropolitan area subway system serving over 4 million people.

Closed circuit camera technology has increased dramatically since the Washington subway camera system was installed. Cameras can be installed which rotate and tilt to cover a wide area and can zoom in on an individual up to a mile away. Cameras can be programmed to turn to any area where there is movement or noise. A camera covering a huge parking lot can detect someone breaking into a car or committing an assault and zoom in on the crime.

Police watching closed circuit monitors are alerted that a crime is being committed and move in on the suspects immediately. One person can watch up to 10 television monitors at a time. Police substations should be located within a short drive to the scene of any crime located by the monitoring system.

Closed circuit systems should be tested in high-crime inner-city areas such as public housing facilities, playgrounds, parking garages and lots, open air drug markets, and schools. The cameras should be mounted on inaccessible rooftops or street lights.

A pilot project in 10 cities, funded with federal dollars, could produce dramatic results for under \$50 million. Each city could install 1,000 cameras in high-crime areas for a cost of \$3 million each or \$30 million for 10 cities. Upkeep and replacement costs would be approximately \$250,000 a year per city or \$2.5 million per year for the 10 cities. The city or state government would be expected to pick up the cost of the personnel to watch the monitors. The total cost of maintenance would be \$12.5 million for five years for a total cost of \$42 million.

This is less than the cost of midnight basketball, self esteem-building classes or a handful of other very dubious programs just passed in the federal crime bill. It is the cheapest way to reduce crime in our cities and make our urban residents feel free to go outside again.

While civil libertarians will complain about invasion of privacy, we are being monitored by video cameras already in a host of private establishments including banks, supermarkets, department stores, airports and subway systems. Such monitoring doesn't make most of us feel like big brother is watching. It makes us feel safer. If closed circuit monitoring works in Great Britain, in the Washington Metro subway and in a variety of private businesses, isn't it time to try this approach in our crime ridden inner-cities?

Get-tough legal changes are being enacted by the federal and state governments and through the voter initiative process. Many of these reforms, such as life sentences for third felony convictions (three strikes you're out), eliminating parole and longer sentences for violent offenders are important steps in reducing crime.

These get-tough laws will keep prisoners incarcerated for much longer periods, resulting in reduced crime rates in the years to come.

But installation of closed circuit video cameras and monitors will have an immediate and dramatic impact on the crime rate and on the lives of America's beleaguered inner city residents.

As the new GOP leadership in Congress contemplates serious changes in the recently passed Crime Bill, taking resources from the social programs and earmarking them for closed circuit cameras and monitors would be a good investment with an immediate payoff.