

in U.S. Federal court against German banks and businesses which assisted in and profited from the Nazi Aryanzation effort.

My legislation would clarify that U.S. courts have jurisdiction over these claims and would extend any statute of limitations to the year 2010.

Now, there are people who say this occurred too long ago and that we should leave these events in the past. Madam Speaker, I strongly and fundamentally disagree. There must never, never be a statute of limitations on Aryanzation, as genocide and related crimes should always be punished.

These companies, these banks need to come forward, open their books, and return their criminal profits to close this open wound on the soul of humanity.

Madam Speaker, this legislation that I am introducing today will right a terrible wrong in the annals of world history, and God knows it is long overdue.

HONORING RICHARD MASUR,
PRESIDENT OF THE SCREEN ACTORS GUILD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am very delighted today to rise to honor Richard Masur who on November 12, 1999, completed his second term as president of the Screen Actors Guild, the world's largest union of professional performers.

Richard Masur was first elected to the Screen Actors Guild board of directors in 1989. He then went to vice president. In 1995, he became president and was then again reelected in 1997.

He is well known to film and television audiences. He starred in over 35 television movies, including the highly acclaimed chronicle of the AIDS epidemic and his Emmy-nominated performance in *The Burning Bed*. Three of his films are among the top 10 rated TV movies of all time. He has also taken a turn as the distinguished director of many productions.

In his role as the Screen Actors Guild president and a leader in the American labor movement, he participated actively in the Guild's international work as a member of the International Federation of Actors, assisting other performers' unions throughout the world in their struggle for recognition and the achievement of fair wages and working conditions.

One of the primary goals was to strengthen the international protections against the exploitation of performance images and performance in cyberspace. He urged Congress to pass the World Intellectual Property Copyright treaties, which applied the international copyright law to on-line violations.

Also, under his leadership, the Screen Actors Guild became a national leader

in the debate over actor diversity in the entertainment industry. He passionately advocated for the accurate portrayal of the true American scene, for color-blind casting and nontraditional thinking where it was appropriate so that the diverse American audience would see itself reflected on the screen in the stories that we tell.

As the Screen Actors Guild president, he established the Guild's first government relations department. In its first 2 years of operation, he was the principal voice and primary advocate in a successful Federal and State legislative agenda, which included a number of issues, including legislation that would provide the first ever legal protections for performers residual compensation, the economic rights of senior performers, the protection of both compensation, education, and the working conditions of child performers, and the right to personal privacy for the Guild's highest profile performers.

Over his 25 years performing as a professional actor, Richard Masur has sustained his activist commitments to issues of political and social justice, ranging from universal health care to international human rights. He has established an unassailable reputation for honesty, integrity, and selfless commitment, not only to his fellow performers, but to all of his fellow citizens as well. His creative and innovative approaches to problem solving has set him apart as a leader in the entertainment community.

He has been a bridge builder between diverse communities and diverse interests, illuminating our understanding of many issues by drawing the common threads together. All in all, he has added to our culture. We respect and revere him.

At this point, we salute our dear friend, Richard Masur, for his services to the Screen Actors Guild and to our citizenry at large. I am sure many of my colleagues will join me in wishing him much success in his future endeavors.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL RECORDING PRESERVATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, since the development of audio-recording technology in the 19th Century, composers, musicians, and others have joined to create thousands of sound recordings which have amused, entertained, and enriched us individually and as a Nation. Sadly, as the 21st Century approaches, many of America's most precious sound recordings, recorded on perishable media, may be lost forever unless we act to preserve them for the use and enjoyment of future generations.

Today I am introducing, along with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), the gentlemen from Tennessee (Messrs. CLEMENT, GORDON,

WAMP, TANNER, FORD, DUNCAN, and JENKINS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY), an important measure designed to help preserve this irreplaceable aspect of America's cultural heritage. I hope all Members will join us in support of this effort.

In 1988, Congress wisely enacted the National Film Preservation Act, which established a program in the Library of Congress to support the work of actors, archivists and the motion-picture industry to preserve America's disappearing film heritage. The bill we introduce today, the National Recording Preservation Act, follows the trail blazed by the Library's successful film program.

The measure would create a National Recording Registry at the Library to identify, maintain and preserve sound recordings of cultural, aesthetic, or historic significance. Each year the Librarian of Congress will be able to select up to 25 recordings or groups of recordings for placement on the Registry, upon nominations made by the public, industry or archive representatives; recordings will be eligible for selection ten years after their creation.

A National Recording Preservation Board will assist the Librarian in implementing a comprehensive recording preservation program, working with artists, archivists, educators and historians, copyright owners, recording-industry representatives, and others. A National Recording Preservation Foundation, chartered by the bill, will encourage, accept and administer private contributions to promote preservation of recordings, and public accessibility to the Nation's recording heritage, held at the Library and at other archives throughout the United States.

The bill authorizes appropriations of up to \$500,000 per year for seven years to fund the Library's preservation program, and up to \$500,000 yearly for the same period to match the non-federal funds raised by the Foundation for preservation purposes.

I include for the RECORD a letter received from Dr. James H. Billington, the Librarian of Congress, expressing his strong support for this measure, which will be introduced in the Senate by the senior senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU):

Madam Speaker, my co-sponsors and I fervently hope that by enacting this modest bill, the Congress, working with the private sector to leverage the available resources, can spark creation of a comprehensive, sensible and effective program to preserve our Nation's sound-recording heritage for our children and grandchildren. We look forward to its quick enactment.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
BICENTENNIAL 1800-2000,
Washington, DC, November 9, 1999.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HOYER: Thank you for seeking comments from the Library of Congress on your draft legislation to create a National Sound Recording Board and Foundation. We have had great success with a similar program to preserve the nation's film heritage, and I believe your legislation will allow the Library to build on that success in developing a national program for sound recordings.

The key components of the legislation—a national recording registry, an advisory

board bringing together experts in the field, and a fundraising foundation—have all been reviewed by the staffs of the Library's Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division and American Folklife Center, as well as our legal staff, and appear to provide the necessary elements of a comprehensive program to ensure the survival, conservation, and increased public availability of America's sound recording heritage.

I am pleased that the legislation includes a directive for a comprehensive national recording preservation study and action plan, such as the one produced in 1993 under Congressional directive, which laid the framework for a national film preservation program. This study would serve as the basis for a national preservation plan, including setting standards for future private and public preservation efforts, and will be conducted in conjunction with the state-of-the-art National Audio-Visual Conservation Center we are developing in Culpeper, Virginia. The Center and the program created by your legislation will each benefit from the existence and work of the other.

I support the bill in both goal and substance. I will need your support, however, in assuring that any funds appropriated for the Board or Foundation are new funds added to the Library's base. We cannot afford to absorb these costs, as happened this year with funds for the National Film Preservation Foundation. Please thank your staff members, Bob Bean and Michael Harrison, for their hard work and extensive consultation with the Library in developing this legislation. Please let me know if Congressional staff would like to visit the Library's sound recording program to see what we do currently and how your legislation might be implemented.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. BILLINGTON,
The Librarian of Congress.

TEAR DOWN THE WALL OF MILK MARKETING NONSENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, every morning back in Minnesota, on about 8,300 farms, the lights go on between 4:30 and 5 o'clock in the morning. On those 8,300 dairy farms, people get up; the farmers get up to go out and milk their cows. Now, if there was a group of people in America that works harder than our dairy farmers, I do not know who they are.

Ever since 1937, the dairy farmers in the Upper Midwest have labored under the yoke of the milk marketing order system. It is a convoluted, complicated, and unfair system whereby the price that the dairy farmers receive for their milk is priced based on how far they are away from Eau Claire, Wisconsin. It makes absolutely no economic sense. Now, it may have made sense back in 1937 before the refrigeration we have today, before the interstate highway system that we have today; but it makes no sense today.

In fact, Justice Scalia described the system as Byzantine. Ever since about 1938, those of us who represented the good dairy farmers in the Upper Midwest have been trying to get this sys-

tem reformed. We have asked for just a modest amount of reform.

Finally, in the last farm bill, we made an agreement that we would request that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Glickman, would come back with a proposal to level the playing field at least a little bit in this milk marketing order system so that dairy farmers in the Upper Midwest would not be punished as much just because their dairy farms are located closer to Eau Claire, Wisconsin, than dairy farms in other parts of the country.

Finally, the Secretary of Agriculture came back with a plan, a modest plan. It was not strong enough for many of us. We wanted more reform than the Secretary brought forward. But in the sense of compromise, we were willing to live with that. But, unfortunately, some of our colleagues from the rest of the parts of the country said no, no, no, we cannot even have that modest amount of reform.

Well, Madam Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues some excerpts of an article that was written back in about 1985 about a U.S. Representative from the State of Texas who was a former economics professor. He is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY). The title of the article is "Moscow on the Mississippi; America's Soviet-style Farm Policy." Let me just read some excerpts from this article.

He starts off by saying, "Even as perestroika comes to the Communist world, our own Federal farm programs remain as American monuments to the folly of central planning. If we have reached the end of history with the vindication of free economy, the USDA has not yet heard the word.

"Fifty years ago, when the Roosevelt administration announced certain 'temporary emergency measures,' farm programs were highly controversial." Even Henry Wallace, the Secretary of Agriculture "who conceived the idea, remarked, 'I hope we shall never have to resort to it again.' The USDA has been resorting to it ever since.

"Under the current farm law passed in 1985," and this was in 1986, I believe, the article was written, passed in 1985, "the Department of Agriculture has paid dairy farmers to kill 1.6 million cows."

I go on. He says, "Under the dairy program, local dairy cooperatives are allowed to form government-protected monopolies. Because there is no competition, people have no choice but to buy the milk at higher prices, which is a good arrangement for the big cooperatives, but a bad arrangement for parents who buy milk for their children. The resulting dairy surpluses have been reduced by government's paying dairy farmers" large amounts "to slaughter or export their cows and leave dairy farming for" at least "5 years."

"Like any central planning effort, whether in the Soviet Union or the American Corn Belt, all supply-control

policies are riddled with irrationalities and unintended consequences. Even though the USDA has one bureaucrat for every six full-time farmers, fine-tuning the farm economy is a difficult task."

I go on and I quote from the end of this column where he says, "Repeal all marketing orders. Current law prohibits the Office of Management and Budget from even studying them. Marketing orders should be repealed.

"Terminate the dairy program."

Well, Madam Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), a wall of protectionism cannot stand against free markets. Milk marketing orders cannot be explained, let alone defended. Compacts are trade barriers. Trade barriers are walls.

I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), if they mean what they say about perestroika and open markets, then come here to the well of this House and stop the milk marketing nonsense. Tear down this wall.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 66TH OBSERVANCE OF UKRAINIAN FAMINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, as a cochair of the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, I rise to commemorate the 66th observance of the Ukrainian Famine, to help record this century's largely untold story of famine and repression in the former Soviet Union.

During 1932 and 1933, the people of Ukraine were devastated by hunger, though not the kind caused by unfavorable natural conditions. Instead, only certain regions or a part of the country suffered famine while the government of the former Soviet Union turned their backs upon the population.

The famine of 1932 and 1933 stemmed from political rather than natural causes. In 1932, Ukraine had an average grain harvest of 146,600,000 metric tons of wheat, and there was no danger of famine, or at least there should not have been.

But the famine was first and foremost a planned repression of the peasants by the Soviet government for their resistance to collective savings. Second, it was an intentional attack on Ukrainian village life, which was the bulwark of Ukrainian heritage. Third, it was the result of the forced export of grain in exchange for imported machinery which was required for the implementation of the policy of industrialization.

The events of 1932 and 1933 are considered a man-made famine because food was available. But what happened was politically motivated. It characterized the Soviet system and ultimately resulted in the deaths of over 6