

# HEINONLINE

Citation: 6 Bernard D. Reams Jr. & William H. Manz Federal  
Law A Legislative History of the Telecommunications  
of 1996 Pub. L. No. 104-104 110 Stat. 56 1996  
the Communications Decency Act S16800 1997

Content downloaded/printed from  
HeinOnline (<http://heinonline.org>)  
Wed Mar 20 18:23:49 2013

- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at <http://heinonline.org/HOL/License>
- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.

fied barriers to Indian religious freedom.

In recent years, a number of court cases have emerged involving the right of Native Americans to engage in traditional religious practices. In a case decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1988 involving the construction of a road and allowing timber operations in a part of a national forest used for religious purposes by various Indian tribes—*Lyng versus Northwest Indian Cemetery Protective Association*—the Court held that the first amendment's protection of free exercise of religion did not prohibit the Federal activity. The Court viewed the case as one in which the "Government action would interfere significantly with private persons' ability to pursue spiritual fulfillment according to their own religious beliefs," but not as a case in which affected individuals would be "coerced by the Government's action into violating their religious beliefs."

This ruling has the potential effect of requiring the courts to use a more difficult test than the balancing test that most courts that deal with Native American free exercise claims have used. Since most claims are already being denied by the courts, use of an even more stringent test may defeat even more claims.

It is clear that there must be a rebalancing of governmental interests against Native American religious interests. The amendments to the American Indian Religious Freedom Act that I am introducing today would create an appropriate balance.

The second bill calls for the repatriation of Native American groups or cultural patrimony and human remains. The Smithsonian Institution set a precedent for the Nation when it agreed to return remains and artifacts in its collection that belong to Native Americans. It was a courageous step and one that I hope will be followed by all museums and institutions throughout this country that are holding remains and patrimony that rightly belong to Native Americans.

Ideally, it should be incumbent on the museum community itself, including anthropologists, archaeologists, and museum professionals to set ethical standards that respect the rights of other human beings and groups of people. In practice, however, not all institutions and individuals who engage in the excavation, collection, or trade of Native American artifacts respect the rights of Native Americans.

The legislation that I am proposing would not affect anyone or any institution that has practiced sound ethical standards. I believe this bill is fair and will statutorily provide a much needed standard for the treatment of Native American remains, artifacts and cultural patrimony.

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 1981. A bill to permit the Bell Telephone Companies to conduct research on, design, and manufacture

telecommunications equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT, RESEARCH, AND MANUFACTURING COMPETITION ACT

Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. President, in 1984, the modification of final judgment (MFJ), which ended the AT&T antitrust suit, took effect. The MFJ bars the design and development, as well as the fabrication, of telecommunications equipment by the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs). This includes network equipment as well as customer premises equipment.

After much consideration, I believe that Congress should consider whether to lift this restriction in order to enhance the Nation's industrial competitiveness. That is why I am introducing legislation today to lift this restriction. The manufacturing restriction is one that touches most fundamentally on the issue of American competitiveness. As we all know, this is a matter foremost on our minds.

There is no doubt that this is major legislation that will require serious analysis by the Congress. I hope that we will begin considering this measure during the next session. I look forward to the debate that ensues.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1982. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require that there be at least one regional office of the Department of Veterans Affairs in each State within the United States; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS REGIONAL OFFICES

Mr. BURDICK, Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to require that the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) maintain at least one regional office in every State in the United States.

I believe this legislation is necessary in order to ensure that our Nation's veterans are provided quick information and access to VA programs and services. My State has only one regional office, and recent events have led North Dakota veterans to be concerned that the future of that office is threatened.

The VA Regional Office in Fargo serves a population of 108,000 veterans in North Dakota and western Minnesota. Most of the employees are natives of the region, and they bring to their work a special understanding of the unique concerns of area veterans. At the Fargo office, each veteran is given the opportunity for face-to-face interaction with a counselor or other professional who works with the veteran to solve his or her problems. It is crucial that this personal contact be maintained, and one way to move toward that goal is to require that there be at least one regional office in each State. Inherent in the legislation is the understanding that each region-

al office would offer the full range of access to VA programs and services.

Let us join together to make sure that all veterans, regardless of their place of residence, be it rural or urban, have equal access to VA programs and services.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1983. A bill to expand the inspection by the Secretary of Agriculture of the Nation's food supply to ensure the safety and wholesomeness of the Nation's supply of fish, shellfish and other marine food; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

CONSUMER SEAFOOD SAFETY ACT

Mr. LEAHY, Mr. President, today I am introducing the Consumer Seafood Safety Act of 1989, a bill I am pleased to say has been characterized by Public Voice as providing "far reaching protections for the consumer."

Public Voice has also said that this bill "fills critical gaps in Government protection of the Nation's food supply."

In recent months, the evening news has been filled with stories raising questions about the safety of our food. Fish found with chemical and pesticide residue are among the food safety problems reported.

There have also been several stories on inspection programs—or I should say lack of inspection programs—for the Nation's seafood supply. Currently less than 12 percent of American seafood undergoes some kind of inspection or grading—and these programs are designed more for grading product than for ensuring safety. Only 7 percent of the almost 2,000 seafood processors participate in these voluntary inspection programs.

Food safety is not just a media issue. American consumers are concerned and worried. We have one of the safest food supplies in the world but we should—and can—make the best better. Fish inspection is one area ripe for improvement.

This is particularly important now that fish consumption was at an all time high in 1987. It fell in 1988, in part due to consumer concerns.

Seafood must be inspected. Twenty percent of all reported foodborne illnesses are caused by contaminated seafood. While mandatory Federal inspection cannot completely eliminate all contaminants from the marketplace, it will make our seafood safer and reduce the risk of illness to consumers.

We have made some real progress on this issue. Industry now agrees with consumer organizations that a mandatory inspection program is needed. All sides agree on several critical issues on implementation of the program.

In the past, there has been some disagreement as to which agency should oversee the program. For this reason, I asked Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, and

## **Document No. 122**



INTENTIONAL  
BLANK