recognize, though, that true justice demands that the net be cast further than the one person most responsible.

As a supporter of the Tribunal, I believe it is critical that the Tribunal take a proactive stance in Kosovo that could serve as a possible deterrence against a new round of war crimes in the Former Yugoslavia. In the case of Bosnia, the Tribunal could only react to crimes that were mostly committed before and during its formation. In Kosovo, however, crimes could perhaps be deterred, if the Tribunal is vigorous and visible in its investigation of ongoing activity.

Mr. Speaker, we saw a couple of days ago the reports of a major massacre in three villages in Kosovo, where women, children and the elderly were slain and, in some instances, their bodies mutilated by the Serbian security forces. These scenes are all too familiar and, absent determined action, will be repeated over and over and over again. The Helsinki Commission has received disturbing reports from Senator Bob Dole and Assistant Secretary of State John Shattuck who formed a fact-finding mission to Kosovo. They told us about men being separated from women and children and simply taken away, perhaps to lengthy detention or maybe their execution. There are also reports, again of the mass rape being used as a weapon of war.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 4660, I believe adoption of this legislation will underscore the continued commitment of the United States to see that those responsible for the war crimes and other serious violations of international humanitarian law are held accountable for their actions. While it is unlikely that the offer of rewards alone will lead to the arrest or conviction of all of those responsible for war crimes in the Former Yugoslavia, even if one war criminal is brought to justice as a result of our action today, the modest investment would have been worth the effort.

ELECTRICITY DEREGULATION

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 1998

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today, together with my Ways and Means colleague, Mr. NEAL, I have introduced a bill setting forth the Administration's approach to legislation addressing the tax consequences of electricity deregulation upon tax-exempt bonds issued by municipally owned utilities for the generation, transmission and distribution of electricity. As my colleagues may recall, the Administration unveiled a comprehensive electricity deregulation proposal on March 24, 1998, which included a section dealing with the tax issues associated with deregulation.

The 105th Congress did not have an opportunity to take up this or other proposals on electricity deregulation this year. However, despite the lack of Federal legislation in this area, 18 states have already gone forward and begun to deregulate electricity at the state and local level. My own home state of California has deregulated much of its market already. The era of competition has already started for the utilities operating in these states.

Municipally-owned utilities have operated up to now under a strict regime of Federal tax rules governing their ability to issue tax-exempt bonds which were enacted in an era that did not contemplate electricity deregulation. These so-called ''private use'' rules limit the amount of power that municipal or state-owned utilities (''public power'') may sell to private entities through facilities financed with tax-exempt bonds. For years, the private use rules were cumbersome but manageable. As states deregulate, however, the private use rules are threatening many communities that are served by public power with significant financial penalties as they adjust to the changing marketplace. In effect, the rules are forcing public utilities to face the prospects of violating the private use rules, or walling off their customers from competition, or raising rates to consumers—the precise opposite of what deregulation is supposed to achieve. The consumer can only lose when this happens.

The Administration proposal that I am introducing today would protect consumers by grandfathering already outstanding bonds, continue to permit public utilities to issue tax-exempt bonds for facilities involved in the distribution of electricity in the future, but eliminate their ability to issue tax-exempt debt in the future for facilities involved with the transmission or generation of electricity.

In addition, because the restructuring of the electric utility industry is affecting the investor-owned utilities as well as public utilities, the Administration proposal includes a provision intended to address a tax problem that a number of the investor-owned utilities face in a deregulated world. Specifically, under present law, the amount of contributions to a qualified nuclear decommissioning fund a utility is entitled to deduct is the lesser of ''cost-of-service'' amount or the ''ruling amount.'' In a restructured market, if a nuclear power plant is no longer subject to cost-of-service ratemaking, it could be determined that the amount of decommissioning costs included in cost-of-service would be zero. To eliminate this possibility, the provision would change the present law limitation on the amount of the deduction by limiting the deduction solely by reference to the ''ruling amount''

I am introducing this legislation at this time in order to give affected parties, including consumers, an opportunity to review the bill and provided us in Congress with input on its provisions. With this input, we will be in a position to address this important issue more capably in the 106th Congress. I am certainly aware that there are other approaches to the private use problem, some of which have been introduced this year in the House and others in the other body. There are numerous policy and technical issues to be resolved in designing a fair and workable solution to this problem.

The bill does not resolve all of those problems, and indeed, is intended to be a starting point for the consideration of the tax issues involved with electricity deregulation. Other approaches, for instance, providing an election for public utilities to live within the current private use regime or opt into a regime without the ability to issue tax-exempt bonds except for distribution and transmission, merit serious review and discussion.

Even within the approach the Administration has taken in this bill, there are issues that might be decided differently. For instance, the legislation somewhat arbitrarily defines ''distribution property'' as output facilities that operate at 69 KV or lower. It is our understanding that this definition does not pick up all facilities used for distribution, and that a more flexible definition may be necessary. We welcome input on this issue.

In addition, the legislation ties the relief in the bill to enactment of a Federal electric deregulation bill, which, of course, has not yet been enacted. Because states like California have already deregulated, public power consumers need this relief now. An alternate effective date tied to state deregulation activities would be appropriate.

Another example of an important issue that might be addressed differently is the refunding of bonds. The legislation permits only current refundings of tax-exempt bonds within the grandfather of existing debt, but it also permits the maturity of the bonds to be extended for a limited period. On the other hand, it does not permit advance refundings. The legislation could be drafted to permit either approach to refunding, or advanced and current refundings without extension of the maturity term. I urge affected parties to comment on which is the more appropriate rule.

Another complex issue on which we seek comment is whether public utilities should be able to issue bonds for generation and transmission where the proceeds of the bonds are used just to repair or make environmental improvements to existing facilities and are not used to expand significantly current capacity. The bill as introduced does not address this issue.

Mr. Speaker, we plan to work with all interested parties including American consumers to ensure that we end up with the fairest, most reasonable solution to this complex problem. We want electricity deregulation to be a good deal for everyone involved, especially the American consumer who certainly deserves the lower electric bills that a competitive marketplace is supposed to provide. I urge my colleagues to review this legislation carefully over the coming months and welcome their input, as well as that of all affected parties.

STATEMENT RECOGNIZING SYRIA'S LIBERAL POLICY OF JEWISH EMIGRATION

HON. TOM CAMPBELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 1998

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to recognize with commendation that the country of Syria followed through on its promises regarding Jewish emigration over the past 6 years.

Beginning in 1992, without fanfare, Syria eased its strict travel and emigration policies on its Jewish community. Numbering around 100,000 at the turn of the century, the Syrian Jewish community numbered only approximately 5,000 by 1992. Up until 1992, Syrian Jews could only travel outside of the country individually, and only if family members remained behind. Between April and October of 1992, however, approximately 2,600 of this 5,000 were allowed to emigrate from Syria.

In October of 1992, Syria temporarily suspended this eased emigration policy. However, in December of 1993, Secretary of State Warren Christopher visited the country, and in a goodwill gesture during this visit, President