

of association, the right to organize and bargain collectively, freedom from forced or compulsory labor, freedom from abusive child labor, and non-discrimination in employment. The President in his State of the Union address and again in his speech in San Francisco identified ILO standards and the child labor struggle as one which he intends to devote a high degree of personal energy in the balance of his term. We at DRL are committed to trying to develop new approaches to replace what has become an unnecessarily adversarial relationship between labor, business, and human rights groups and to try to move toward a more cooperative model. And there are many of you who were involved in the discussions over the apparel industry partnership, who took a step in the right direction and one that we hope to build on with the goal of developing even stronger partnerships, private partnerships of non-state actors around core labor standards.

Third, we must continue to promote the equal treatment of, and prevention of discrimination and violence against, women. Traditionally, we have sought to do this through a variety of means ranging from domestic legislation to international campaigns against trafficking, female genital mutilation, and to recognize that the women's rights issue cannot be ghettoized as a women's issue that is not of concern to the general human rights community. And our need here is again to heal gender divisions. And we are going to press as hard as we can in the next few years of this administration to bring about the long, delayed ratification of the UN Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women.

Fourth and finally, another area in which I believe we must move forward is the area of economic, social, and cultural rights, and to recognize, as we said in Vienna, that these rights are "universal, indivisible, interdependent, and interrelated." Martin Luther King, I think, understood this idea well when he said "What good is it to have the right to sit at a lunch counter when you don't have enough money to buy anything to eat?" He also said "We must be 'cognizant of the interrelatedness of all [things]. \* \* \* Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny.'" We need to take freedom from poverty, for example, and treat it not just as an economic right, but as something connected deeply to political repression. We need to understand that the right to organize means little without the right to food.

This brings me to my final principle, that no government working to promote human rights can work alone. We need to think of ourselves as members of a global human rights community that now extends beyond public and private lines, that now crosses national lines, that moves beyond institutional lines. Judges, executive branch officials, legislatures, intergovernmental organizations, and NGOs are all parts of this community, of which I think all of us here are part. It is vital that we recognize and embrace its common commitment to truth, justice, freedom, and democratic partnership. If that sounds suspiciously like a commitment to truth, justice, and the American way, I plead guilty because I do believe that in the next century, the real divide among nations will not be ideological divides, or between North and South or East and West, but rather between those nations that respect human rights and those that do not.

These are our challenges. These are the principles that ought to guide our response.

These tasks are daunting, but I think that they are in slow, exacting measure attainable. I don't know how many of us thought that we could get as far as we have, even in the one lifetime that the human rights movement has lived.

When I was in Belgrade in December, I gave an interview to B92, which, as many of you know, is an independent radio station. They were somewhat demoralized, as they should be, by the repression of the media in Yugoslavia. And they said to me, "What can you say to us on the eve of Christmas that can give us some hope?" There was a moment of silence, and then I said: Madeleine Albright was born in Czechoslovakia. And she was exiled. Now she is Secretary of State. My family became political exiles from Korea. Now I am the Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights. Now, both of our countries are free. A lot can change in one lifetime.

In 20 years of human rights policy, we have made progress. Although we have a long way to go, for myself, for my Secretary, for my family, I can think of no higher honor than to carry the banner of democracy, human rights, and labor into the next century. Thank you.

#### RURAL CELLULAR LEGISLATION

### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I'm introducing legislation to improve cellular telephone service in three rural areas located in Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and Florida. Joining me as cosponsors are Reps. CAROLYN MALONEY and ANNA ESHOO.

Most rural areas of this country have two cellular licensees competing to provide quality service over their respective service territories. Competition between two licensees improves service for businesses, governments, and private users, at the same time, improves response times for emergency services.

Unfortunately, three rural service areas in Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and Florida do not enjoy the benefit of this competition. The Pennsylvania rural service area and the Florida rural service area each have two operators, but one of the operators in each area is operating under a temporary license and thus lacks the incentive to optimize service. The reason for this lack of competition is that in 1992 the FCC disqualified three partnerships that had won the licenses, after finding that they had not complied with its "letter-perfect" application rule under the foreign ownership restrictions of the Communications Act of 1934. Significantly, the FCC has allowed other similarly situated licensees to correct their applications and, moreover, Congress repealed the relevant foreign ownership restrictions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

In the 105th Congress, former Rep. Joe McDade, joined by Rep. ANNA ESHOO and former Rep. Scott Klug, introduced H.R. 2901 to address this problem. In September 1998, the Telecommunications Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee held a hearing on FCC spectrum management that included testimony on and discussion of H.R. 2901. Later that

month, the full Commerce Committee incorporated a modified version of H.R. 2901 into H.R. 3888, the Anti-Slamming bill. In October 1998, the House approved H.R. 3888, incorporating a further modified version of H.R. 2901, by voice vote on suspension (Congressional Record, Oct. 12, 1998, H10606-H10615). Unfortunately, the bill died in the Senate in the last few days prior to adjournment for reasons unrelated to the rural cellular provision.

The legislation I am introducing today is based on the rural cellular provision contained in H.R. 3888, as approved by the House. The legislation would direct the FCC to allow the partnerships denied licenses to serve the Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and Florida rural services areas to resubmit their applications consistent with FCC rules and procedures. The partnerships would pay fees to the FCC consistent with previous FCC auctions and settlements with other similarly situated licensees. To ensure speedy service to cellular customers, the FCC would have 90 days from date of enactment to award permanent licenses, and if any company failed to comply with FCC requirements the FCC would auction the license. The licenses would be subject to a five-year transfer restriction, and the Minnesota and Florida licenses would be subject to accelerated build-out requirements.

I am submitting a copy of this legislation to be included in the RECORD.

H.R. —

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. REINSTATEMENT OF APPLICANTS AS TENTATIVE SELECTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the order of the Federal Communications Commission in the proceeding described in subsection (c), the Commission shall—

(1) reinstate each applicant as a tentative selectee under the covered rural service area licensing proceeding; and

(2) permit each applicant to amend its application, to the extent necessary to update factual information and to comply with the rules of the Commission, at any time before the Commission's final licensing action in the covered rural service area licensing proceeding.

(b) EXEMPTION FROM PETITIONS TO DENY.—For purposes of the amended applications filed pursuant to subsection (a)(2), the provisions of section 309(d)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(d)(1)) shall not apply.

(c) PROCEEDING.—The proceeding described in this subsection is the proceeding of the Commission In re Applications of Cellwave Telephone Services L.P., Futurewave General Partners L.P., and Great Western Cellular Partners, 7 FCC Rcd No. 19 (1992).

#### SEC. 2. CONTINUATION OF LICENSE PROCEEDING; FEE ASSESSMENT.

(a) AWARD OF LICENSES.—The Commission shall award licenses under the covered rural service area licensing proceeding within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.—The Commission shall provide that, as a condition of an applicant receiving a license pursuant to the covered rural service area licensing proceeding, the applicant shall provide cellular radio-telephone service to subscribers in accordance with sections 22.946 and 22.947 of the

Commission's rules (47 CFR 22.946, 22.947); except that the time period applicable under section 22.947 of the Commission's rules (or any successor rule) to the applicants identified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 4(1) shall be 3 years rather than 5 years and the waiver authority of the Commission shall apply to such 3-year period.

**CALCULATION OF LICENSE FEE.—**

(1) **FEE REQUIRED.**—The Commission shall establish a fee for each of the licenses under the covered rural service area licensing proceeding. In determining the amount of the fee, the Commission shall consider—

(A) the average price paid per person served in the Commission's Cellular Unserved Auction (Auction No. 12); and

(B) the settlement payments required to be paid by the permittees pursuant to the consent decree set forth in the Commission's order, *In re the Tellesis Partners* (7 FCC Rcd 3168 (1992)), multiplying such payments by two.

(2) **NOTICE OF FEE.**—Within 30 days after the date an applicant files the amended application permitted by section 1(a)(2), the Commission shall notify each applicant of the fee established for the license associated with its application.

(d) **PAYMENT FOR LICENSES.**—No later than 18 months after the date that an applicant is granted a license, each applicant shall pay to the Commission the fee established pursuant to subsection (c) of this section for the license granted to the applicant under subsection (a).

(e) **AUCTION AUTHORITY.**—If, after the amendment of an application pursuant to section 1(a)(2) of this Act, the Commission finds that the applicant is ineligible for grant of a license to provide cellular radiotelephone services for a rural service area or the applicant does not meet the requirements under subsection (b) of this section, the Commission shall grant the license for which the applicant is the tentative selectee (pursuant to section 1(a)(1)) by competitive bidding pursuant to section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)).

**SEC. 3. PROHIBITION OF TRANSFER.**

During the 5-year period that begins on the date that an applicant is granted any license pursuant to section 1, the Commission may not authorize the transfer or assignment of that license under section 310 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 310). Nothing in this Act may be construed to prohibit any applicant granted a license pursuant to section 1 from contracting with other licensees to improve cellular telephone service.

**SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.**

For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) **APPLICANT.**—The term "applicant" means—

(A) Great Western Cellular Partners, a California general partnership chosen by the Commission as tentative selectee for RSA #492 on May 4, 1989;

(B) Monroe Telephone Services L.P., a Delaware limited partnership chosen by the Commission as tentative selectee for RSA #370 on August 24, 1989 (formerly Cellware Telephone Services L.P.); and

(C) FutureWave General Partners L.P., a Delaware limited partnership chosen by the Commission as tentative selectee for RSA #615 on May 25, 1990.

(2) **COMMISSION.**—The term "Commission" means the Federal Communications Commission.

(3) **COVERED RURAL SERVICE AREA LICENSING PROCEEDING.**—The term "covered rural service area licensing proceeding" means the

proceeding of the Commission for the grant of cellular radiotelephone licenses for rural service areas #492 (Minnesota 11), #370 (Florida 11), and #615 (Pennsylvania 4).

(4) **TENTATIVE SELECTEE.**—The term "tentative selectee" means a party that has been selected by the Commission under a licensing proceeding for grant of a license, but has not yet been granted the license because the Commission has not yet determined whether the party is qualified under the Commission's rules for grant of the license.

**HONORING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE SANTA ANA POLICE EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION AWARDS**

**HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1999

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the recipients of the Santa Ana Police Employee Recognition Awards. It is because of their dedication and commitment to law enforcement that the City of Santa Ana is safer for all of its residents.

It is in honor of National Law Enforcement Week that I salute our nation's police officers, and especially those of the 46th Congressional District in Orange County.

Seven hundred thousand police officers serve the U.S. each day. Most Americans probably don't know that our nation loses an average of almost one officer every other day. And that doesn't include the ones who are assaulted and injured each year.

More than 14,000 officers have been killed in the line of duty. The sacrifice of California officers has given our state the highest number of police deaths: 1,205. In Santa Ana alone, we have lost three officers who bravely protected our community.

The calling to serve in law enforcement comes with bravery and sacrifice. The thin blue line protecting our homes, our families and our communities pays a price, and so do the loved ones they leave behind when tragedy strikes.

We cannot replace the officers we've lost. We can't bring them back to their families or departments. All we can do is grieve for their loss.

But as their federal representatives, we have a greater responsibility. We must ensure that our law enforcement agencies—and their officers and staff—have the resources they need to do their jobs safely.

And today, we fulfill the most solemn part of our obligation to America's police force: we promise that when an officer does make that sacrifice, he or she will earn a place of the highest national respect with all due honor from the U.S. government.

**FIRE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999**

SPEECH OF

**HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE**

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1999

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1550, the Fire Adminis-

tration Authorization Act of 1999 because it embodies the proper role the federal government can play in the important area of fire prevention.

The U.S. Fire Administration (USFA) is charged with reducing the number of fires and fire deaths in the United States. In 1997, the number of fires reached 1.79 million, claimed 4,050 lives, and produced \$8.5 billion in damages. Given these large numbers, sometimes the temptation is to forge ahead creating new programs and pouring billions of taxpayer dollars into grants with Federal strings attached despite the expertise and accountability found best at the local level. In my state of Delaware, most of the firefighters are volunteers. They serve as firefighters out of dedication to their communities. In addition, because they are taxpayers in these communities, they make careful, calculated decisions about what investments are really needed in fire prevention. The United States should encourage more of this style of government and less top-down, centralized control.

H.R. 1550 resists that temptation and maintains the proper role of the federal government in these affairs. It increases discretionary funding by \$96 million to a total of \$45.1 million in FY 2000 and \$47.5 million in FY 2001 so USFA can improve its service as a research center and clearinghouse of information for state and local governments to draw upon.

Furthermore, the bill sets aside \$6 million in FY 2000 and \$8 million in FY 2001 to train fire crews for anti-terrorism and response activities. This goes beyond the Clinton Administration's budget request. One of the best areas the federal government can play a role in fire prevention, is in helping states respond to terrorist attacks. The federal government is best suited to provide training or anti-terrorism and response activities due to its expertise in national defense, its strong intelligence capabilities, and the often-international character of terrorism.

More work may be needed in training our state and local governments to respond to terrorism incidents. H.R. 1550 requires USFA to investigate the need for further counter-terrorism training programs. Last year, Congress passed the Rescue and Emergency Services Prepared for Our Nation's Defense Act. It created a commission to assess our nation's weapons of mass destruction domestic response capabilities. I am anxious to read these reports when they are completed and begin to implement the suggestions in a timely manner. As the world's only superpower, the United States is a big target for terrorist attacks. We must accept the reality that comes with being a world superpower and respond accordingly.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill as a strong common sense, fiscally responsible measure that preserves the principles of federalism that have helped make the United States a world leader. Firefighting will always be predominantly a local responsibility carried out by dedicated members of the community. The federal government should not interfere in this effort, but provide appropriate support to help on national problems such as terrorism. This bill maintains that important balance.