

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A NEW REPRESSIVE POLICE APPARATUS IN RUSSIA?

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, since the demise of the Soviet Union, and the dissolution of its repressive police state, Russian society now faces the challenge of balancing law and order with protection of individual liberties. We are all aware that Russia is experiencing a dramatic rise in crime and a high rate of violence. Unfortunately, the cure envisioned by the Russian Government for this dilemma may be worse than the disease.

According to recent reports, the lower house of the Russian Parliament—the Duma—has voted overwhelmingly in favor of a bill proposed by President Yeltsin that would dramatically expand the powers of the domestic intelligence agency of the Russian Federation, known as the Federal Counterintelligence Service, or FSK. FSK agents would be able to enter homes, government offices and businesses without a search warrant from a court or the prosecutors office, as had been the case previously. The FSK would manage its own jails, and could employ undercover personnel working in other government agencies.

Bear in mind where the FSK stands philosophically these days. I would call attention to a FSK report published on January 10 of this year in the Moscow newspaper *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*. In this report, the FSK accuses various foreign policy research centers, non-governmental organizations, and foundations such as the Soros Foundation and Ford Foundation, of being used by United States secret services to conduct intelligence-gathering and subversive activities on the Russian territory. For instance, the FSK alleges that American specialists have set up a "network of contacts for information on legal sources" in Russia that would become a foundation for clandestine sources should United States-Russian relations worsen. Of course, this analysis came from the folks who reportedly did the planning for the Chechnya operation.

The Russian population is plagued by crime and corruption and, therefore, I can understand how this bill could be widely popular. The bill was approved in the Duma through the democratic process. But, Mr. Speaker, we all know that even democratically passed laws, especially those passed in the heat of the moment, can be seriously flawed. The key principle is protection of the civil liberties of minorities while carrying out the will of the majority. A Russian journalist quoted in the February 28, 1995, *Washington Post* said, "In this country, people don't understand [about civil liberties] until the moment the FSK people come to their flats and knock on their door."

Mr. Speaker, as I noted, crime and corruption are an overwhelming problem in Russia today, and our colleagues in the Russian parliament are faced with the serious task of developing the proper legislation to combat it.

But, as chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, an organization vitally concerned with the principle of rule of law in the OSCE signatory states, I would urge the Federal Assembly and President Yeltsin to deliberate very carefully before giving the domestic security service such expansive powers. In legal terms, these proposed powers may even violate the Russian Constitution. In operational terms, there may soon be little to distinguish the FSK from the KGB of the cold-war era.

TRIBUTE TO EARL THOMAS HUCKLE

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, Earl Thomas Huckle lived his life by a code of "community first." While best known as the former editor and publisher of the *Cadillac Evening News*, the impact of his service to the entire area will be felt for generations.

Earl found and promoted the local chapter of the Kiwanis Club; he served for many years on the chamber of commerce; was a member of the Mercy Hospital Advisory Board and later, chairman; he served as chairman of the Retail Merchant's Association; was on the board of directors of Cadillac's first Community Chest; and was a noted historian with a northern Michigan flavor.

In addition, Earl saw the hope and promise in the children of his community. He worked tirelessly on their behalf. Whether encouraging safe skiing techniques, sponsoring competitions or spending time with his 3 children or 6 grandchildren, Earl Thomas Huckle knew that children are the key to the future.

His work with the *Cadillac Evening News* is legendary. He worked hard with his father to make that newspaper not only the leading source of news in the community, but one of the most productive and responsible newspapers in the State. As its publisher, he revolutionized the printing operation by introducing computer typesetting and offset printing; as its editor, he provided consistent and thoughtful commentary on local and world events.

The citizens of the greater Cadillac area will surely miss the presence of Earl Thomas Huckle. His joy in his family and his contributions to that community will live forever.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

HON. EARL F. HILLIARD

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the Republican forces of Speaker GINGRICH are attempting to justify the block granting of child nutrition program funding by arguing that it actually in-

creases the child nutrition funding nationwide by 4.5 percent.

It seems as though the Republicans will say almost anything to hide that they have cut children's food programs to fund tax breaks for the rich.

The fact is, that Federal funding for our child nutrition and WIC programs, will be slashed by GINGRICH's Republicans by over \$2 billion over 5 years.

While the Republicans slash and cut our children's food programs, they are taking care of their wealthy friends.

In fact, the Ways and Means Committee yesterday reported on the Republican tax break plan for the rich. More than 76 percent of the benefits for the break go to people earning over \$100,000 a year.

Speaker GINGRICH, why is your Republican Party sacrificing our children to make the rich, richer?

TRIBUTE TO CLARION AREA JAYCEES

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a group that has proudly been serving the Clarion community for an outstanding number of years. I am pleased to recognize the Clarion Area Jaycees on this their 30th year of continued service.

In 1965, this organization was founded for the sole purpose of improving the community around them. I am sure these young people were not aware of all the great things they would eventually, and continue to, accomplish. It is no small task for a group to work together closely and be productive for such a long period of time. As one generation of volunteers contributes to the Clarion area, the next generation readies itself for future challenges. Their dedication throughout the 30 years is apparent in every project they take on.

The Jaycees' enormous contributions are not felt by just a few individuals, but by the entire population. The work they do touches every member of the community. The creed of the Jaycees is, "service to humanity is the best work of life." It is obvious to all of us that these are not just words, but a conviction for this group of men and women. As a member of the community that is touched by the Clarion Area Jaycees, I want to thank them for all of their hard work. The mission of the Jaycees is fulfilled with every person they help. So in keeping with that tradition, I have the utmost confidence this organization will continue to render valuable services.

Today marks the Jaycees' celebration of 30 years of service. This event is made even more special by the fact the entire community can join in this special occasion; this accomplishment has certainly benefited us all.

• 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.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to recognize the Clarion Area Jaycees on this milestone. Once again, I want to thank them for all of their devoted service and my best wishes for continued success.

REPUBLICANS SHOULD SUPPORT
THE COMMUNITY SERVICE
BLOCK GRANT

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think it useful for me to share with my colleagues a brief but very pointed letter from Mark Sullivan, who is the head of the community action agency in the city of Fall River, Citizens, Inc. Mr. Sullivan is one of the outstanding leaders in the fight to improve the quality of life for people in the lower economic brackets, and he has been doing it long enough to have considerable perspective. Thus, he points out that the arguments in favor of the creation of the community action agency, and their subsequent inclusion in a community service block grant, grew from concern that we bypass bureaucracy and provide help directly to the people most in need. Citizens for Citizens is one of the organizations that exemplifies the success of this approach. And because the point Mr. Sullivan makes about the relevance of that experience to much of the rhetoric we are now hearing from my Republican colleagues, I ask that this letter be printed here.

CITIZENS FOR CITIZENS, INC.,
Fall River, MA, January 31, 1995.

DEAR BARNEY: I just finished watching a 30 year history of the War on Poverty on PBS and the irony of history repeating itself became crystal clear.

The basic concept of all the programs in the War on Poverty was the empowerment of local citizens to make decisions and help design economic programs that affect their lives.

Thirty years later, the new majority in Congress headed by Speaker of the House Gingrich, is talking about designing government so that citizens will be empowered to make economic decisions on the local level for policies that affect their lives.

It seems to be redundant to reinvent the wheel when there is a Community Service Block Grant which serves all of the purposes and meets all of the criteria as established by the new leadership; albeit, it deals with low-income people who need the economic empowerment the most.

I believe that Speaker Gingrich, with his background as a historian has a knowledge and appreciation of these programs for economic empowerment.

I welcome him as a spokesman for the need to extend and expand the Community Action Agency through increased funding for the Community Services Block Grant, and wish you would thank him for his generous forthcoming support.

COMMITTEE FUNDING
RESOLUTION

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman THOMAS for his hard work and diligence in bringing the committee funding resolution to the floor today. This bill represents the new Republican Congress commitment to downsizing and accountability.

On the very first day of the 104th Congress Republicans voted to cut our own committee staffs by one-third. We proved to the American people that we are serious about keeping our commitment to giving them the smaller, more effective Government they voted for.

This bill before us today shows the American people that we are keeping our promise. Chairman THOMAS has introduced a funding request that reflects the change we voted for just a few short months ago. It represents the largest decrease in committee funding ever.

Spending the taxpayers' money wisely is important. Chairman THOMAS' bill not only downsizes Congress but introduces a new level of accountability. Changing the way committees pay for staff and supplies forces them to justify every penny they spend.

Congress must now publicly authorize all committee spending every 2 years and fund all staff salaries out of a single account. For the first time, committees will have to account for all of their operating expenses. Congress will no longer hide long distance phone call charges or paper costs in extraneous accounts. The American people will see just how we spend their money.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of Appropriations I am responsible for funding congressional operations. Mr. THOMAS' bill offers guidelines to my subcommittee—guidelines which I am proud to accept.

He and I both share a commitment to the American people who work hard for the tax dollars they have to send to Washington. The least we can do is spend those dollars wisely.

TERM LIMITS

HON. JAY DICKEY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been a supporter of term limits since my initial election to the House in 1992, and I continue to support term limits today. Due to provisions added to House Joint Resolution 2 during the February 28, 1995, House Judiciary Committee markup, I can no longer support this bill.

In its current form, House Joint Resolution 2 preempts State term limit laws, like amendment No. 73, passed by the voters of my home State of Arkansas. The amended bill also removes the lifetime cap for service in the House. Specifically, it would allow a Member to serve six terms, sit out one term, then serve six terms more. That is not real term limits.

LEGAL REFORM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, March 15, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

LEGAL REFORM

The House last week approved three bills that would effect wide-ranging legal reforms in civil lawsuits. The measures respond to a public perception that the legal system has become burdened with excessive costs and long delays and that the growing number of lawsuits, particularly frivolous suits, are swamping the courts. These bills seek to curb lawsuit abuse which weakens the economy, eliminates jobs, and injures our global competitiveness.

I supported two of the three bills, albeit with some reservations. The civil justice system needs reform—and these bills are a first step in the reform process—but the bills considered in the House were poorly drafted and hastily considered and they overreach. My greatest concern is that their impact would be to tilt the courts in favor of large companies at the expense of individual plaintiffs. My expectation is these problems will be addressed during Senate consideration.

PRODUCT LIABILITY REFORM

This measure, which I supported, would for the first time create a uniform product liability law (covering state and federal actions) in three areas: punitive damages; joint and several liability; and fault-based liability for product sellers. First, the bill caps non-economic and punitive damages for all civil lawsuits. Punitive damages are awarded to punish negligence, rather than to compensate a victim, and non-economic damages are for things such as pain and suffering. Non-economic damages would be capped at \$250,000, and punitive damages would be capped at three times the claimant's award for monetary losses (such as lost wages and medical bills) or \$250,000—whichever is greater. Second, the bill restricts "joint and several liability" by allowing non-economic damages only up to the level of a defendant's responsibility. In other words, someone who is only 20% responsible would pay only 20% of the non-economic damages. Third, the bill prohibits product liability suits for injuries caused by products that are more than 15 years old, unless the product is expressly guaranteed for a longer period, or if the product causes a chronic illness that does not appear for more than 15 years (such as asbestos).

It is probably necessary to narrow the risk of manufacturers' and sellers' liability in certain cases involving defective products. Juries are sometimes confused and sometimes come in with awards that are neither reasonable nor justified by the evidence. In many cases, judges routinely reduce those jury awards drastically, but perhaps not in all cases. The restrictions on joint and several liability also make sense. The important link is between behavior and responsibility, and the bill limits a defendant's liability to the share of damages caused by his own actions.

Capping punitive damages, however, has to be approached with great care. This bill represents a federal encroachment on well established state authority and responsibility. Furthermore, high punitive damages serve to keep a manufacturer on his toes.