

any foreign natural or legal person that engages in a prohibited act within the territory of the United States.

In addition, this legislation expands the definition of public official in the FCPA to include officials of public international organizations. It makes foreign employees and agents of issuers and domestic concerns subject to criminal penalties in the same way that U.S. citizens are. This legislation also amends the FCPA to provide for jurisdiction even when U.S. businesses and nationals engage in the offering of bribes wholly outside the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation contains strict monitoring and reporting requirements to ensure that our OECD partners fully implement the anti-bribery convention under their laws. It requires that the Administration report to Congress concerning its efforts to strengthen the Convention by extending the prohibitions contained in the Convention to cover bribes to political parties, party officials, and candidates for political office.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has already passed legislation ratifying and implementing the anti-bribery convention. Although we are rapidly approaching the end of this Congress, it is my hope that Congress can complete action on this important legislation this year.

However, the legislation before us also contains matters having to do with international satellites, which are unrelated to the implementation of the anti-bribery convention. These satellite provisions are not in the implementing legislation passed by the Senate. It is my sincere hope that these extraneous satellite provisions will not prevent the House and Senate from sending the President legislation implementing the anti-bribery convention, before this Congress adjourns.

The Commerce Department reports that there have been significant charges of bribery associated with international commercial contracts valued at more than \$100 billion since 1994. Mr. Speaker, bribery hurts American business and American workers who must compete in the world market place. American business and American workers need the protections the OECD Convention provides, and they need them now.

If we fail to implement the anti-bribery convention because of an inability to reach agreement on extraneous matters, American business and American workers will pay the price. Delay on our part will only give our OECD partners an excuse to delay their implementation of these important anti-bribery commitments.

Mr. Speaker, swift action by this House, and this Congress, is needed, so the United States can set an example for our OECD partners to ratify and fully implement this important convention, as well. I hope my colleagues will give this important legislation their strong support.

PASSAGE OF TAX EXTENSION  
LEGISLATION

**HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, October 12, 1998*

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this tax extender legislation, which

will continue important tax benefits for businesses and individuals.

This bill extends the research and development tax credit, which encourages the development of cutting edge technology and supports the creation of high paying, good jobs in states like Connecticut. From the defense industry to the biotech industry to software development, this tax credit plays an important role in maintaining US leadership in the world economy and helping our firms compete against their global rivals.

I am also pleased that this bill extends the Work Opportunity Tax credit, to create incentives that help businesses, particularly small businesses, afford new staff and help move people from welfare to work. Likewise, the permanent extension of income averaging for farmers will help family farms to sustain their businesses through the swings of income which so many farms experience from year to year.

This bill also accelerates the phase-in of deductions of health insurance premiums for the self-employed. Under this bill, 75% of the cost of health insurance can be deducted in 2002, and 100% can be deducted in 2003. For too many self-employed individuals find the cost of health insurance prohibitive, and this legislation will assist them in obtaining the health coverage that they and the families which depend on them need and deserve.

I am pleased to support this bipartisan bill, which will strengthen businesses, particularly small businesses, and help them to improve their competitiveness and to hire more employees at livable wage. And I look forward to working with my colleagues in the early months of the next legislative session to strengthen the Social Security retirement Trust Fund, so that we can enact broad-based tax relief for all working families.

SONNY BONO COPYRIGHT TERM  
EXTENSION ACT

SPEECH OF

**HON. BOB CLEMENT**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 7, 1998*

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lend my support for copyright term extension. Title I of S. 505 extends the term of copyright protection by twenty years, from the life of the artist plus 50 years to the life of the artist plus 70 years. This copyright term extension will bring the United States in line with most of the rest of the world.

However, Title II of this bill contains a gross injustice. Title II, inappropriately titled the "Fairness in Music Licensing Act", is anything but fair. This provision exempts restaurants smaller than 3,750 square feet and retailers smaller than 2,000 square feet from paying royalties for radio and television. As I previously argued on the floor of the House when this issue was first raised, the so-called "Fairness in Music Licensing Act" compromises the intellectual property rights of this nation's songwriters and assaults their ability to make a living. According to the Congressional Research Service, this provision would allow more than 70% of bars and restaurants to use radio and TV music for free. The earnings of songwriters, composers, and publishers stand

to be reduced by tens of millions of dollars annually. The average songwriter, many of whom live in my hometown of Nashville, makes less than \$5,000 annually from music royalties. Yet, by supporting this provision, we are choosing to take from songwriters and give to restaurant owners, who make on average \$45,000 annually.

Title II of this bill also violates our International treaty responsibilities. One or more of our trading partners will file a complaint in the World Trade Organization. As the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable William Daley, so aptly observed, ". . . we know that our trading partners will claim that it is an overly broad exception that violates our obligations under the Berne Convention for the Protection of [Artistic and] Literary Works and the Agreement on the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights. The United States will lose, and we will be presented with a series of unfortunate options: ignore the WTO, incur sanctions, or modify our law. All will be contentious and difficult."

Finally, I would like to point out that my friends on the other side of the aisle are tireless in their pursuit of protecting property rights. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that intellectual property deserves every bit as much protection as tangible property. In Nashville, you can now get a bank loan using your songs as collateral.

In a heartbeat, without informed debate, Congress is taking away the property of songwriters and transferring it to restaurants without due process of law or just compensation. The Fifth Amendment of the Constitution, as my colleagues well know, states that "no person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

I am unequivocally opposed to Title II of S. 505.

INTERNATIONAL ANTI-BRIBERY  
AND FAIR COMPETITION ACT OF  
1998

SPEECH OF

**HON. ZOE LOFGREN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 9, 1998*

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cast my vote in favor of the conference report on the Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1998. This legislation is the culmination of a long, hard effort to enact reform of securities litigation.

When Congress passed the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act in 1995, we thought we had stopped the increasingly troubling practice of "strike suits." In these suits, a small group of attorneys took advantage of the legal system to coerce huge settlements out of growing high-tech companies, often with little or no evidence of wrong doing.

Unfortunately, loopholes in the new law were found. To avoid the new heightened pleading standards, cases were moved from Federal Courts into State courts. According to a recent study by Stanford Professors Joseph Grundfest and Michael Perino, 26% of securities litigation activity has shifted to state courts.

Because the threat of "strike suits" still exists, many executives in Silicon Valley are reluctant take full advantage of key provisions of

the 1995 law. For example, the 1995 Act created a "safe harbor" provision to encourage companies to disclose valuable information about their prospects to investors. However, this provision is not being implemented because executives still are concerned about their exposure to strike suits in State courts. This hurts investors who lose access to valuable information, and it undermines the efficiency of securities markets.

It is time to close the loopholes. The Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998 will finally slam the door on strike suits by establishing Federal court as the exclusive venue for securities class actions. This legislation targets abuses in our court system, but it also protects the rights of consumers who actually suffer from fraud.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

---

## PROGRESS FOR LATVIA

### HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, October 12, 1998*

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial of the October 12, 1998, edition of *The Washington Post* very appropriately lauds the continued progress Latvia is making in perfecting its democratic form of government, especially as it relates to the complex and controversial subject of extending citizenship and civil rights to the very large proportion of non-citizens which reside in that country. Of the estimated 600,000 non-citizens in a population of 2.5 million, most of the non-citizens are Russian nationals who are part of or ancestors of the Russian populations encouraged to resettle in Latvia by the Soviets after their brutal subjugation of the Baltic states to implement the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939. Many of the Latvians including their president, Karlis Ulmanis, were forcibly removed to Siberia to fall unspeakable hardship and death.

Despite the understandable frustration and anger among Latvians of their loss of independence under the domination of the Soviet Union, the Latvian votes commendably rejected a referendum that would have derailed legislation to liberalize the requirements for obtaining citizenship for its non-citizen residents. In a country like Latvia, where ethnic Latvians now make up slightly less than half of the people living there, Latvian voters have sensibly recognized the reality of the changes it must make to maintain domestic tranquility and integrate its citizens into a unified force to build its future and reduce one crucial element of controversy with its neighbor, the Russian Federation.

Mr. Speaker, this Member encourages his colleagues to read the following editorial and to act to individually commend the Latvian government and voters for their good judgment, even in the face of the suffering and repeated provocations they have felt from the Soviet Union.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 12, 1998]

#### LATVIA'S PROGRESS

One of the great dramas of this decade has been the struggle of three small Baltic countries to reestablish their national identities after a half-century of Soviet occupation. Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania are succeed-

ing more quickly and with less fuss than anyone had reason to hope. Only on rare occasions of tension, such as when Russia suddenly began putting the squeeze on Latvia last spring, does one or another Baltic nation make a brief appearance in the news. A recent referendum held in Latvia typically went mostly unnoticed here.

The Soviet government shipped so many Latvians to Siberia and settled so many Russian-speakers in Latvia that when it regained independence in 1991 barely half its residents were ethnic Latvians. For any tiny nation trying to preserve a language and culture in the shadow of a large power, this would have posed a challenge; for a nation that felt it barely had escaped extermination, the challenge was particularly sharp. At the same time, many Latvians realized they could not hope to join modern Europe unless they welcomed and integrated all of their residents into their society. Many realized that a large pool of disaffected ethnic Russians would offer a perpetual pretext to make trouble for politicians in Moscow.

The Oct. 3 referendum concerned the rights of these 600,000 noncitizens (in a population of 2.5 million). In June, parliament approved a liberalizing law allowing any number to apply for citizenship instead of setting an annual quota. The law also qualified for citizenship children born since 1991 to noncitizens. Latvian nationalists opposed to the law, or resentful of Russian and Western pressure on the matter, gathered enough signatures for a referendum. But Latvians, by 55 percent to 43 percent, endorsed the changes.

Latvians still must demonstrate a sustained commitment to integration through language classes and other means. Russian speakers still must demonstrate their commitment to their new country. But the referendum result is an important symbol of Latvia's desire to join the West as a liberal democracy. Now Western institutions that strongly encouraged this result, and in particular the European Union, should respond by accelerating Latvia's inclusion in Europe.

---

## THE ASSET-BUILDING FOR WORKING AMERICANS ACT

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, October 12, 1998*

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, as you know, there are a variety of different manners through which eligibility for public assistance programs are limited according to income and resources. Unfortunately, these complex procedures often produce unwanted effects. I have particular concerns with the manner in which eligibility for public assistance programs is affected by savings accrued through the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). The legislation I will introduce today, the "Asset-Building for Working Americans Act," will seek to correct these problems. While the Asset-Building for Working Americans Act may undergo some changes before next year, I hope this original draft will stimulate a productive debate and suggestions for possible improvement before its reintroduction in the 106th Congress.

Existing income and resource limitations governing eligibility for Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Medicaid, and public housing disregard money saved from EITC payments for two months. At the end of these two months, working families must spend their

EITC payment in order to prevent losing their eligibility for these programs. As a result, working families may miss the opportunity to build the savings needed to accrue enough assets to escape poverty permanently.

The Asset-Building for Working Americans Act corrects this unfortunate situation by adjusting the resource limitations for SSI, Medicaid, and public housing to disregard savings made through the EITC for 12 months—the same provision governing the eligibility for food stamps at the present time. The bill will also encourage states to define eligibility for Temporary Aid to Needy Families payments in the same manner.

Permitting families to save their EITC payments for up to a year and still remain eligible for these public assistance programs would allow low-income working families to live and raise their children in health and safety while saving money for long-term security. In effect, families could save two EITC payments rather than just one—up to \$4,304 for a family of three. Once these two annual EITC payments make such a family ineligible for public assistance under the new resource limitations proposed in my bill, the family would have saved the money needed to take good steps towards building a better future, such as starting a small business; getting an education; or making a down payment towards a first home.

The Asset-Building for Working Americans Act does not encourage increased government handouts or dependence. It will instead encourage working Americans to save their EITC payments for the future by assuring them of access to the temporary assistance needed at the present. The Asset-Building for Working Americans Act is a good first step towards encouraging low-income families to look towards tomorrow today, and I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work with me in support of it during the next Congress.

---

## NATIONAL SALVAGE MOTOR VEHICLE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, October 9, 1998*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, at some point, I hope that my Republican friends will explain to me their views on federalism. With this bill, the Majority is embracing the notion that the Federal Government possesses wisdom superior to the states on the subject of issuing motor vehicle titles.

The legislation stops short of a federal takeover of the state function of titling motor vehicles or creating a new Federal Department of Motor Vehicles. However, it tells every state in the country that it must comply with new federal regulations governing how states title motor vehicles. These new regulations will establish, and I quote, "uniform standards, procedures, and methods for the issuance and control of titles for motor vehicles and for information to be contained on such titles."

In Committee, Democratic Members raised a number of concerns about this legislation. Those problems still remain in the bill we have before us today.

First, this legislation gives no money to the states to perform inspections, if required, nor