

tax cuts. Never mind the bill does not contain any projects earmarked for any specific Congressional districts.

And never mind that some "Know-Nothing" conservatives in the media will attack this session for being a "do nothing" Congress. The one thing Congress is doing, over their objections, is building assets for the future of our country.

Perhaps the next time they attack Government spending, they might reflect on an observation by the columnist George Will: "Many of today's conservatives rallied 'round keeping control of the Panama Canal. But would such conservatives have built it in the first place?"

THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT IS  
CONDUCTING A FRONTAL AS-  
SAULT AGAINST FREEDOM OF  
THE PRESS

**HON. TOM LANTOS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 29, 1999*

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely concerned about the very disturbing reports from Russia which indicate that Kremlin authorities are intimidating, harassing and attempting to control the nation's news media. These unwarranted attacks have been directed primarily at Media-Most, which is the largest and most successful privately-owned television and publishing company in Russia.

Democracy and freedom are still new and largely untested in Russia, and efforts are still underway to develop firmly rooted democratic institutions. Until now, however, press freedom has been one of the early successes in Russia's transformation from a totalitarian society to one that permits true freedom, including free speech and uncensored news reporting.

Mr. Speaker, any efforts to impose government censorship or control over any news media—and particularly over private news organizations—would be a tragic and serious setback for democratization in Russia. The news media must be free to report, even when that it is critical of the government. There is absolutely no justification for government agencies to threaten media companies as a means of controlling what is reported in the news.

I want to report to my colleagues in the Congress about recent disturbing actions by the Russian government that seem to be directed at some of the most professionally respected news organizations in Russia. Reports from Moscow indicate that the Director of Presidential Administration, Mr. Alexander Voloshin, is engaged in a personal campaign against the prestigious NTV and other private media enterprises because he is dissatisfied with how the news media are covering the government and its activities.

It has been widely reported by wire services that the Federal Tax Policy Service of the Russian Federation is relentlessly monitoring the financial and economic activities of privately owned television companies, publishing houses, and other mass media outlets. The Russian Government appears to be involved in a campaign of targeting these news organizations in order to undertake investigations or other legal or quasi-legal actions against those who own or operate independent news media outlets.

Mr. Speaker, another form of harassment has been an effort to censor the media. Just this month, the Russian Government established the Ministry for Publishing, Television and Radio aimed at "consolidating" the government's "ideological work." That last phrase, Mr. Speaker is a chilling throw-back to conditions under the totalitarian Soviet regime, when the government and Communist Party made a concerted and successful effort to strictly control and censor all news media under the rubric of "ideological work."

The head of this new ministry is a "press czar" who has been equipped with power to oversee and possibly censure the content of news reports and other information programs in Russia. This is a frightening prospect for all news organizations—and particularly for privately owned independent media—who could lose their freedom to report news as they see it. This censorship effort could be particularly destructive during periods of increased political activity, such as national election campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, the situation today in Russia is especially precarious given President Yeltsin's fragile health and the absence of strong leadership at the national level. This has been clearly demonstrated by the fact that President Yeltsin has dismissed three Prime Ministers in the past two years. With the upcoming parliamentary elections in December 1999 and presidential elections in June 2000, the situation is expected to become even more politically charged and volatile.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the newly launched effort to control and/or censure the media in Russia is in large part explained by these upcoming elections. With the beginning of serious political activity over the next year in connection with the parliamentary and presidential elections, Kremlin authorities have accelerated their offensive against NTV and other independent news outlets. One of the clearest indications of this struggle is the fact that the state-owned television network ORT is using its news programs to undermine privately-owned rival television network.

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported U.S. programs to assist Russia to get back on its feet economically, to develop strong private institutions, and to establish a functioning market-oriented economy. All of us want to see Russia succeed and become a strong and viable democratic country which plays a positive role in the community of nations. Respect for freedom of expression and freedom of the press, however, are absolutely essential if we are to assist Russia, and an uncensored press is essential if Russia is to take its appropriate place in the world.

I call upon President Boris Yeltsin and Prime Minister Sergei Stepashin to take quick and decisive action to end once and for all the efforts within the Kremlin to punish, intimidate or threaten independent news reporting in Russia. The government must also end its policy of favoritism by rewarding those who gratuitously promote the official Kremlin line.

Mr. Speaker, with the critical parliamentary and presidential elections coming up in Russia during the next twelve months, the Russian government must do everything in its power to insure free and fair reporting of all political events. Freedom of expression and freedom of the press are absolutely essential for any democratic nation. Russia's international reputation and its position among the community

of nations depend on how it deals with this most serious threat to its democracy.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 29, 1999*

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, I was unable to record my vote on the following measures that were considered here in the House of Representatives today. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 343.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall vote 344 I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall vote 345, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall vote 346, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall vote 347, I would have voted "nay."

AFTER KARGIL—WHAT?

**HON. BILL MCCOLLUM**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 29, 1999*

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern over an important foreign policy decision. If left unpunished, the Pakistani conduct during the recent Kargil crisis—particularly in view of the Clinton Administration's handling of the crisis—would set a dangerous precedent for would-be aggressors and rogue nations. Failing to address the Pakistani precedent swiftly and decisively is therefore detrimental to the national security and well being of the United States.

Three aspects of the Pakistani behavior during the crisis should worry us:

1. Intentional reliance on nuclear capabilities in order to shield one's own aggression. A policy advocated by radical Islamists since 1993, the current Pakistani nuclear doctrine constitutes a profound deviation from the post WWII norm of using nuclear weaponry—an ultimate deterrence in the form of weapons of last resort in case of aggression against one's own state and/or most vital interests. The Pakistani intentional and unilateral ultimatum—repeated warnings to escalate the Kargil crisis into a nuclear war in case India's reaction to the Pakistani aggression threatened to deprive Pakistani of any achievement—exceeds even the most aggressive use of the nuclear card by the USSR at the height of the Cold War (when Moscow reiterated its commitment to use nuclear weapons solely at time of a major world war). In contrast, the Pakistani nuclear ultimatum is identical to the nuclear blackmail doctrine of the People's Republic of China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea—a doctrine based on brinkmanship and blackmail which both states tinkered with but are yet to have implemented despite repeated crises. Thus, it is Islamabad that was the first to cross the threshold of aggressive use of one's own nuclear potential.

2. Concealing the use of one's own national military forces as deniable "militants." In so doing, Islamabad demonstrated unwillingness

to face responsibility for actions that amount to an act of war. This is a blatant break of the international order stipulating that sovereign governments acknowledge their own actions—thus opening up to United Nations intervention as well as other forms of crisis management and containment by the international community. While such international intervention may not be welcome in Islamabad, or elsewhere for that matter, this is the way the modern world works: The acknowledged responsibility and accountability of sovereign governments are the cornerstones of international relations and are thus the key to preventing all out chaos in an already volatile world. Indeed, governments that internationally break away from this posture are labeled rogue and are shunned by the international community.

3. Using Pakistani-controlled Islamist terrorists in a war-by-proxy against India, presently waged mainly in Kashmir. The kind of terrorism Pakistan is blatantly using against India in pursuit of primary and principal interests of the state has long been considered unacceptable and illegal by the international community. The Kargil crisis and the ensuing marked intensification of Islamist terrorism throughout Kashmir constitute an unprecedented escalation of Islamabad's continued sponsorship of, and reliance on, terrorism to further national strategic objectives. Even in the aftermath of the Kargil crisis, Islamabad is yet to demonstrate any inclination to stop its war-by-proxy against India.

By stressing the imperative for a "face saving" exit for Nawaz Sharif, the Clinton Administration in effect went along with Islamabad's lies—thus covering up Islamabad's rogue-state actions. The Clinton Administration in essence rewarded Pakistan for its aggression and nuclear blackmail, as well as blatant violation of previously signed international agreements (most notably the 1972 Simla Agreement). Taken together, the "solution" to the Kargil crisis forwarded by the Clinton Administration and the definition of the "Kashmir problem" the US is now committed to help resolve, make a mockery of the most basic norms of international relations and crisis resolution dynamics. As such, the Clinton Administration effectively encourages other rogues and would-be aggressors to pursue their objectives through brinkmanship, blackmail, aggression, and terrorism.

Instead, Pakistan should be recognized as the rogue and terrorism sponsoring state that it now is. Pakistan should be treated accordingly and, given the cynical use of war-by-proxy and nuclear threats for such a long time, dealt with harshly by the international community. This is an urgent imperative for the United States. With several other rogue states accumulating weapons of mass destruction and long-range delivery systems capable of hitting the heart of the United States, as well as sponsoring high-quality terrorists capable of conducting spectacular strikes at the heart of the United States, it is imperative for Washington to ensure that none would dare to use these instruments against the United States, its allies and vital interests. The Clinton administration's "understanding" of, and support for, Islamabad's rogue state behavior and blatant aggression send the opposite message—encouraging rogues and would-be aggressors to dare the United States and harm its interests with impunity.

In contrast, India should be rewarded for the responsibility and self-restraint practiced by

New Delhi. Under the extreme pressure of a foreign invasion—albeit of a limited scope—on the eve of bitterly contested national elections, the Indian government rose to the challenge and placed the national interest ahead of political expediency. In so doing, New Delhi behaved like the major democratic power India has long claimed to be. India should therefore be recognized and treated as the great power it is by the United States and the rest of the international community.

COLORADO BLUESKY ENTERPRISES IS COMMITTED TO HELPING OTHERS

**HON. SCOTT MCINNIS**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 29, 1999*

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the innovation and dedication of Colorado Bluesky Enterprises, Inc., of Pueblo, Colorado. The services which this institution provides for the developmentally disabled citizens of Pueblo and Pueblo County are both noble and commendable.

Formerly known as Pueblo County Board for Development Disabilities, Inc., Colorado Bluesky Enterprises was established in March of 1964. As one of 20 Community Centered Boards which contracts with the state of Colorado, Colorado Bluesky provides services for people with developmental disabilities. CBE first began its work in an old former school building with only 12 students, CBE has grown to serve several thousand people. Currently, CBE dedicates time to working with the 750 citizens with developmental disabilities.

CBE provides numerous services and opportunities for the individuals whom rely on its benefits. Through an array of day programs for people of all ages, job training, community participation, and OBRA day services for individuals in nursing homes, CBE strives to make a better life for the people of Pueblo.

Colorado Bluesky Enterprises provides personal care alternatives such as host home services, staffed personal care alternatives, and drop in supports. CBE also works to ensure affordable housing for families with low incomes.

I am grateful for the dedication and courageous efforts of Colorado Bluesky Enterprises, and I would like to congratulate them on 35 years of commitment to helping others. On behalf of all of those it has served, I would like to thank CBE and offer recognition of their dedication to the Pueblo community.

TAXPAYER'S DEFENSE ACT

**HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 29, 1999*

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, today I join with Mr. HAYWORTH to introduce the Taxpayer's Defense Act. This bill simply provides that no federal agency may establish or raise a tax without the approval of Congress.

One of the principles on which the United States was founded was that there should be no taxation without representation.

In The Second Treatise of Government, John Locke said, "[I]f any one shall claim a power to lay and levy taxes on the people, \* \* \* without \* \* \* consent of the people, he thereby \* \* \* subverts the end of government." Consent, according to Locke, could only be given by a majority of the people, "either by themselves or their representatives chosen by them." The Boston Tea Party celebrated Americans' opposition to taxation without representation. And the Declaration of Independence listed, among the despot acts of King George, his "imposing Taxes on us without our Consent." First among the powers that the Constitution gave to the Congress, our new government's representative branch, was the power to levy taxes.

The logic of having only Congress establish federal taxes is clear: only Congress considers and weighs every economic and social issue that rises to national importance. While any faction, agency, or sub-agency of the government may view its own priorities as paramount, only Congress can decide which goals are of the importance to merit spending taxpayer dollars. Only Congress can determine the level at which taxpayer dollars should be spent.

The American ban on taxation without representation has not been seriously challenged during our nation's history. The modern era of restricted federal budgets, however, threatens to erode the essential principle of "no taxation without representation." In ways that are often subtle or hidden, federal agencies are taking on—or receiving from Congress—the power to tax. Federal agency taxes pass the costs of government programs on to American consumers in the form of higher prices. These secret taxes tend to be deeply regressive and they create inefficiency in the economy. They take money from everyone without helping anyone.

The worst example of administrative taxation is the Federal Communications Commission's Universal Service Tax. "Universal service" is the idea that everyone should have access to affordable telecommunications services. It originated at the beginning of the century when the nation was still being strung with telephone wires. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 included provisions that allowed the FCC to extend universal service, ensuring that telecommunications are available to all areas of the country and to institutions that benefit the community, like schools, libraries, and rural health care facilities.

Most importantly, the Act gave the FCC the power to decide the level of "contributions"—taxes—that telecommunications providers would have to pay to support universal service. The FCC now determines how much can be collected in taxes to subsidize a variety of 'universal service' spending programs. It charges telecommunications providers, who pass the costs on to consumers in the form of higher telephone bills. The FCC recently nearly doubled the tax to \$2.5 billion dollars per year, and Clinton Administration budgets have projected a rise to \$10 billion per year. Mr. Speaker, this administrative tax is already out of control.

The FCC's provisions for universal service have many flaws. Among them are three 'administrative corporations' set up by the FCC. The General Accounting Office determined that the establishment of these corporations was illegal and the FCC has collapsed them