

The Polish values we celebrate during the month of October are universal values, embraced by millions of Americans. On behalf of the active and growing Polish-American community that I am proud to represent in northern New Jersey, I urge all my colleagues to reaffirm our nation's warm relations with Poland during Polish-American Heritage Month.

To be sure, Polish-Americans are rightly proud of the high level of cultural, social, economic and political involvement they have established in America. By assisting Poland's current transition to democratic governance and a market economy, the Polish-American community is continuing a long tradition of aiding their homeland. Following World War II, it was the Polish-American community that initiated legislation that enabled the resettlement to America of over 200,000 members of the Polish Armed Forces who had fought for the cause of freedom. These efforts, coupled with the unbridled patriotism and ingenuity of millions of Polish-Americans, have made our country a better place to live.

Mr. Speaker, I want to praise the dedicated work of the Polish-American Heritage Month Committee and the hard work of the Polish-American Congress in sponsoring this worthwhile month-long celebration of the Polish experience in America. I salute the efforts of all those who have endeavored to highlight the tremendous contribution Polish-Americans have made to our nation.

CALLING ON THE PRESIDENT TO RESPOND TO INCREASE OF STEEL IMPORTS AS A RESULT OF FINANCIAL CRISES IN ASIA AND RUSSIA

SPEECH OF

**HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, October 12, 1998*

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 350.

This resolution, while drafted with the best intentions, falls far too short. It completely misses the mark. Foreign nations are illegally dumping their cheap steel in our market, and with this resolution, what is the U.S. going to do? With this non-binding resolution, we're only asking the Administration to go and consult. We're not even telling them. We're asking if they could please go and consult with Japan, Taiwan, South Korea, Russia, Europe, and so forth. Consult? Under this Administration, under the Republican controlled Congress, we've been consulting for years. How much longer do we have to consult? How many more reports do we have to look at? How much longer should workers in Illinois and across this nation suffer? How many more good-paying jobs in the steel industry do we have to lose? How long do we have to wait?

With this resolution, we might as well wait. Let us continue to wait as American workers see their paychecks shrink. Let us continue to wait as the U.S. steel industry closes more plants and factories. Let us continue to wait for more consultations and more reports that tell us what we already know. Let us continue to wait as American workers wind up on the unemployment lines. Let us continue to wait as more and more families file for bankruptcies.

Mr. Speaker, we can talk all we want, but if our talk isn't backed up with action, foreign nations will see all the talk as hot air, and unfortunately, that is what has happened. Instead of hot air, let's back up our words with trade sanctions. Instead of a non-binding resolution, why not pass a law that directs the President to take a stronger stand against cheap imports and unfair competition?

Since I've been a Member of this body, I have always advocated a simple philosophy. If you don't let us sell American products in your market, we won't let you sell your products in ours. But instead of fighting for American workers and American industry, this Administration and free trade advocates continue to bend over backwards to let foreign competitors flood our markets with cheap products while putting up protectionist barriers around their markets. How is that free trade? Let us not kid ourselves any longer. We do not live in a world of free trade. We live in a global economy of special interests. Our special interests should be American workers, but our trade policies don't reflect that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote against this empty resolution. This resolution is watered-down, toothless, and ineffective. A yes vote for this is pure political posturing and does nothing for the U.S. steel industry. We don't need more talk. We need the force of law, and this toothless resolution isn't it.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FORMER SOVIET UNION'S REPRESSIVE POLICIES TOWARD UKRAINIAN PEOPLE

SPEECH OF

**HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Saturday, October 10, 1998*

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, this fall marks the 65th anniversary of the Ukrainian famine, or more precisely, of the world's recognition of the famine that had been developing in Ukraine for two years. We have seen many horrors in this century of civilization. The holocaust in Germany and Central Europe in World War II was the most shocking and has justifiably attracted the most recognition. But it was by no means the only incident of diabolic mass slaughter. We have seen the slaughter of Armenians in the early years of the century, the massacre of Cambodians by their own leaders, and most recently the horrors in Rwanda and Bosnia.

We should not allow the abundance of horrors to dull our senses or to allow us to forget any of these terrible incidents. We must remember that the instruments and techniques we have developed in this century can be used against any people in any country, no matter how advanced or supposedly civilized.

As a Ukrainian-American I wish to call the attention of the House and the American people to the crimes against my family's people. Ukraine is the most fertile farmland of Europe, long called the breadbasket of the continent. Yet millions of Ukrainians—perhaps as many as 10 million, we will never have an exact figure—starved to death in the midst of plenty in the early 1930's. They starved because Stalin decided that traditional farming in the Ukraine

would stop, and with the power of the Soviet state, he was able to make it stop. If people did not conform to his will, he would see to it that they had no food to eat, no seeds to plant. The wheat that was harvested was sold at cheap prices on world markets. Protests around the world did not stop the famine; instead, the markets found ways to profit from it and conduct business as usual.

In this respect and others, the Ukrainian famine resembled the great Irish famine of the nineteenth century, when the British government allowed people to starve by the millions rather than interfere with grain markets. I am an Irish-American too, and many of us in this chamber are descended from the people who fled that famine.

The Ukrainian famine did not end until Stalin had gotten his way and subjugated the Ukrainian people. They still suffer today from the consequences of his actions: they have never been able to fully rebuild the agricultural economy that had once made Ukraine the envy of the region. I believe they will rebuild it, hopefully with our help.

But let us learn from the horrors they endured. Let us commit ourselves to the principle that people should always come first, that no one should be allowed to starve. Let us apply that lesson at home, and pledge that no one should go hungry in our prosperous country because of the strictures of ideology or because of the discipline of the market. Let us commit ourselves to opposing oppression around the world, when oppression leads to genocide and death, whether the tools of that oppression are overly violent, or whether they are the subtler but no less cruel tools of deliberate starvation, deliberate hunger, deliberate poverty. Let us remember that all people are our brothers and sisters.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 13, 1998*

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in my family, I was unable to record my vote on several measures. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of H. Res. 494, Commending the Loyalty of the U.S. Citizens of Guam; "aye" on final passage of S. 1364, Federal Reports Elimination Act; "aye" on final passage of H.R. 4756, Ensuring that the U.S. is Prepared for the Year 2000 Computer Problem; and "aye" on final passage of S. 1754, Health Professions Education Partnerships Act. I appreciate being granted a leave of absence, and thank the Speaker for having my remarks appear at the appropriate place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND LYNN HAGEMAN

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 13, 1998*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary human being and a man who made an enormous contribution to the lives of the people of East Harlem,

New York City and State, and the United States, the Reverend Lynn LeRoy Hageman. Reverend Hageman, who died last Saturday evening at the age of 67, was known in New York, the United States and around the world as a pioneer in the area of addict rehabilitation for his integrated, comprehensive approach to helping drug addicts.

Reverend Hageman was born in 1931 in Lincoln, Nebraska. In 1956, he received a Bachelor of Divinity from the University of Chicago. Upon graduation, he worked with children in the Department of Welfare in Chicago and at St. Mark's Episcopal Church in Chicago, the site of the first church-centered program for addict rehabilitation.

In 1959, he moved with his wife Leola and their three children, Erika, Hans and Ivan, to East Harlem, where he began serving as an Evangelical United Brethren minister at the East Harlem Protestant Parish. In 1963, he founded an experimental narcotics program at Exodus House on 103rd Street, between Second Avenue and Third Avenue. There, Reverend Hageman developed a step-by-step approach to rehabilitation, involving total abstinence, spiritual guidance, group therapy and artisan training. The program served thousands of addicts with exceptional rates of success.

As a result of his work, Reverend Hageman served on the Mayor's Committee on Narcotics Addiction and frequently appeared in professional journals, newspapers and on television. Reverend Hageman was an active participant in the fight for civil rights and spent time in an Albany, Georgia jail with Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. Even as he was carrying on his work, Reverend Hageman received a Doctor of Ministry from Drew Theological Seminary in 1976.

Reverend Hageman was a man of rare courage, intelligence and dedication, whose energy, creativity and perseverance were without limit. His legacy is simple and powerful: he worked tirelessly to improve the lives of others, particularly those women and men who were working to overcome drug addiction. He helped thousands, but approached each as an individual, one by one, step by step.

His legacy is also very much alive and can serve as an inspiration to all of us. It is alive in the lives of the thousands of individuals he was able to help, and who are living more fulfilling and productive lives today. It is also alive at Exodus House on 103rd Street. After Reverend Hageman suffered a stroke in 1981, and was unable to carry on his work as fully, his wife Leola reinvented Exodus House as an after-school program for the children of drug addicts. In 1991, his two sons, Hans and Ivan, transformed Exodus House into the East Harlem School, a highly successful middle-school now in its seventh year of operation.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the 15th Congressional District, the City of New York and the United States owe Reverend Lynn Hageman a great debt of gratitude for his exceptional life of service to others. Through his work and energy and courage, his warmth and wonderful sense of humor, he was an enormous presence in our community. He will be sorely missed.

CHILD PROTECTION AND SEXUAL  
PREDATOR PUNISHMENT ACT OF  
1998

SPEECH OF

**HON. ROBERT E. (BUD) CRAMER, JR.**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, October 12, 1998*

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of passage of the Senate Amendments to H.R. 3494, the Child Protection and Sexual Predator Punishment Act. As a former District Attorney and founder of the National Children's Advocacy Center, I can state, without a doubt, that this legislation will make a positive impact on the lives of children across this nation.

This bill will protect children from Internet-based sex crimes and toughen punishments for sexual predators. It will crack down on the criminals who prey on our kids.

The Internet has opened up new ways for sexual predators to get access to our children, and we have to take serious measures to stop these criminals and punish them. The bill makes it a federal crime to use the Internet to contact a minor for illegal sexual activities such as rape, child sexual abuse, child prostitution, or statutory rape. Under this legislation, using the Internet to contact a minor for these kinds of sex crimes would result in a punishment of up to 5 years in prison. The bill also makes it a federal offense to use the Internet to knowingly send obscene material to a minor.

I am especially proud of the provision in the bill that would allow volunteer groups that serve children to perform background checks to make sure their volunteers have no record of crime against kids.

The bill gives groups like the Boys and Girls Clubs and Big Brothers-Big Sisters access to fingerprint checks to make sure their volunteers haven't been convicted of crimes against children, like child sex abuse. Most states, including Alabama, don't have laws to let volunteer groups do these kinds of background checks. For the sake of our children's safety, we have to change that, and that's what this bill is designed to do.

I appreciate the bipartisan approach to this legislation. In matters dealing with the safety of our children, it is important that we put politics aside and focus on solutions.

DIGITAL MILLENNIUM COPYRIGHT  
ACT

SPEECH OF

**HON. TOM BLILEY**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, October 12, 1998*

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I want to make some additional comments. Specifically, given that the Conference Report contains several new provisions, I want to supplement the legislative history for this legislation to clarify the Conferees' intent, as well as make clear the constitutional bases for our action. Given the inherent page and time limitations of spelling everything out in a conference report, I wanted to share our perspective with our colleagues

before they vote on this important legislation. Moreover, given the unfortunate proclivity of some in our society to file spurious lawsuits, I don't want there to be any misunderstanding about the scope of this legislation, especially the very limited scope of the device provisions in Title I and the very broad scope of the exceptions to section 1201(a)(1).

Throughout the 105th Congress, the Committee on Commerce has been engaged in a wide-ranging review of all the issues affecting the growth of electronic commerce. Exercising our jurisdiction under the commerce clause to the Constitution and under the applicable precedents of the House, our Committee has a long and well-established role in assessing the impact of possible changes in law on the use and the availability of the products and services that have made our information technology industry the envy of the world. We therefore paid particular attention to the impacts on electronic commerce of the bill produced by the Senate and our colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee.

Much like the agricultural and industrial revolutions that preceded it, the digital revolution has unleashed a wave of economic prosperity and job growth. Today, the U.S. information technology industry is developing exciting new products to enhance the lives of individuals throughout the world, and our telecommunications industry is developing new means of distributing information to these consumers in every part of the globe. In this environment, the development of new laws and regulations could well have a profound impact on the growth of electronic commerce.

Article 1, section 8, clause 8 of the United States Constitution authorizes the Congress to promulgate laws governing the scope of proprietary rights in, and use privileges with respect to, intangible "works of authorship." As set forth in the Constitution, the fundamental goal is "[t]o promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts. . . ." In the more than 200 years since enactment of the first federal copyright law in 1790, the maintenance of this balance has contributed significantly to the growth of markets for works of the imagination as well as the industries that enable the public to have access to and enjoy such works.

Congress has historically advanced this constitutional objective by regulating the use of information—not the devices or means by which the information is delivered or used by information consumers—and by ensuring an appropriate balance between the interests of copyright owners and information users. Section 106 of the Copyright Act of 1976, 17 U.S.C. 106, for example, establishes certain rights copyright owners have in their works, including limitations on the use of these works without their authorization. Sections 107 through 121 of the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. 107–121, set forth the circumstances in which such uses will be deemed permissible or otherwise lawful even though unauthorized. In general, all of these provisions are technology neutral. They do not regulate commerce in information technology. Instead, they prohibit certain actions and create exceptions to permit certain conduct deemed to be in the greater public interest, all in a way that balances the interests of copyright owners and users of copyrighted works.

As proposed by the Clinton Administration, however, the anti-circumvention provisions to