

reported on alleged corruption at high levels of the government;

Whereas, in July 1999, the Government of Russia created a new Ministry for Press, Television and Radio Broadcasting, and Mass Communications;

Whereas, in August 1999, the editors of fourteen of Russia's leading news publications sent an open letter to then Russian President Boris Yeltsin stating that high-ranking officials of the government were putting pressure on the mass media, particularly through unwarranted raids by tax police;

Whereas Mikhail Lesin, Minister for Press, Television and Radio Broadcasting, and Mass Communications, stated in October 1999 that the Russian Government would change its policies towards the mass media so as to address "aggression" by the Russian press;

Whereas the Russian Federal Security Service or "FSB" is reportedly implementing a technical regulation known as "SORM-2" by which it could reroute, in real time, all electronic transmissions over the Internet through FSB offices for purposes of surveillance, a likely violation of the Russian constitution's provisions concerning the right to privacy of private communications, according to Aleksei Simonov, President of the Russian "Glasnost Defense Foundation", a nongovernmental human rights organization;

Whereas such surveillance under SORM-2 would allow the Russian Federal Security Service access to passwords, financial transactions, and confidential company information, among other transmissions;

Whereas it is reported that over one hundred Russian journalists have been killed over the past decade, with few if any of the government investigations into those murders resulting in arrests, prosecutions, or convictions;

Whereas numerous observers of Russian politics have noted the blatant misuse of the leading Russian television channels, controlled by the Russian Government, to undermine popular support for political rivals of those supporting the government in the run-up to parliamentary elections held in December 1999;

Whereas it has been reported that Russian television stations controlled by the Russian Government were used to disparage opponents of Vladimir Putin during the campaign for the presidency in the beginning of this year, and whereas it has been reported that political advertisements by those candidates were routinely relegated by those stations to slots outside of prime time coverage;

Whereas manipulation of the media by the Russian Government appeared intent on portraying the Russian military attack on the separatist Republic of Chechnya to the maximum political advantage of the Russian Government;

Whereas in December 1999 two correspondents for "Reuters News Agency" and the "Associated Press" were reportedly accused of being foreign spies after reporting high Russian casualty figures in the war in Chechnya;

Whereas the arrest in January 2000, subsequent treatment by the Russian military, and prosecution by the Russian Government of Andrei Babitsky, a correspondent for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty covering the war in Chechnya, have constituted a violation of commitments made by the Russian Government to foster freedom of speech and of the press, and have reportedly constituted a violation of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation;

Whereas in January 2000 Aleksandr Khinshtein, a reporter for the newspaper "Moskovsky Komsomolets", was ordered by the Russian Federal Security Service to

enter a clinic over 100 miles from his home for a psychiatric examination after he accused top Russian officials of illegal activities, and such detainment in psychiatric wards was previously employed by the former Soviet regime to stifle dissent;

Whereas the Russian newspaper "Novaya Gazeta" was officially warned by the Russian Ministry of the Press for its printing of an interview with Aslan Maskhadov, the elected President of the Republic of Chechnya; an entire issue of "Novaya Gazeta", including several articles alleging massive campaign finance violations by the presidential campaign of Vladimir Putin, was lost to unidentified computer "hackers"; and a journalist for "Novaya Gazeta" was savagely beaten in May of this year;

Whereas President Thomas Dine of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty on March 14th, 2000, condemned the Russian Government's expanding efforts to intimidate the mass media, stating that those actions threaten the chances for democracy and rule of law in Russia;

Whereas "NTV", the only national independent television station, which reaches half of Russia and is credited with professional and balanced news programs, has frequently broadcast news stories critical of Russian Government policies;

Whereas on May 11, 2000, masked officers of the Russian Federal Security Service carrying assault weapons raided the offices of "Media-Most", the corporate owner of NTV and other independent media;

Whereas the May 11th raid on Media-Most represented a failure of recourse to normal legal mechanisms and conveyed the appearance of a politically-motivated attack on Russian independent media;

Whereas the raid on Media-Most was carried out under the authority of President Putin and Russian Government ministers who have not criticized or repudiated that action;

Whereas on June 12, 2000, Vladimir Gusinsky, owner of NTV and other leading independent media was suddenly arrested;

Whereas President Putin claimed not to have known of the planned arrest of Vladimir Gusinsky;

Whereas the continued functioning of an independent media is a vital attribute of Russian democracy and an important obstacle to the return of authoritarian or totalitarian dictatorship in Russia; and

Whereas a free news media can exist only in an environment that is free of state control of the news media, that is free of any form of state censorship or official coercion of any kind, and that is protected and guaranteed by the rule of law: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That the Congress—

(1) expresses its continuing, strong support for freedom of speech and the independent media in the Russian Federation;

(2) expresses its strong concern over the failure of the government of the Russian Federation to privatize major segments of the Russian media, thus retaining the ability of Russian officials to manipulate the media for political or corrupt ends;

(3) expresses its strong concern over the pattern of Russian officials' surveillance and physical, economic, legal, and political intimidation of Russian citizens and of the Russian media that has now become apparent in Russia;

(4) expresses its strong concern over the pattern of manipulation of the Russian media by Russian Government officials for political and possibly corrupt purposes that has now become apparent;

(5) expresses profound regret and dismay at the detention and continued prosecution of

Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty journalist Andrei Babitsky and condemns those breaches of Russian legal procedure and of Russian Government commitments to the rights of Russian citizens that have reportedly occurred in his detention and prosecution;

(6) expresses strong concern over the breaches of Russian legal procedure that have reportedly occurred in the course of the May 11th raid by the Russian Federal Security Service on Media-Most and the June 12th arrest of Vladimir Gusinsky; and

(7) calls on the President of the United States to express to the President of the Russian Federation his strong concern for freedom of speech and the independent media in the Russian Federation and to emphasize the concern of the United States that official pressures against the independent media and the political manipulation of the state-owned media in Russia are incompatible with democratic norms.

#### SEC. 2. TRANSMITTAL TO SECRETARY OF STATE.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State with the request that it be forwarded to the President of the Russian Federation.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 352.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes numbers 285 through 291.

Had I been present, I would have voted present on rollcall 285, yes on rollcall 286, yes on recall 287, no on rollcall 288, no on rollcall 289, yes on rollcall 290 and no on rollcall 291.

□

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□

#### COMMUNITY EMERGENCY ADJUSTMENT ACT

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

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, we are preparing tomorrow evening to drop an important piece of legislation, a bill whose short title is the Community Emergency Adjustment Act. It is a very simple and straightforward solution for communities who are experiencing sudden economic distress. That

sudden economic distress occurs due to plant closures, mergers and acquisitions that lead to dislocation, displacement and layoffs, layoffs that occur because of trade or technology.

I am pleased to announce that we have more than 160 cosponsors, bipartisan support, and am equally pleased that all the members of the Connecticut delegation have sponsored this legislation, along with my good friend the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI), who we will hear from shortly as well, and I especially want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) for their advice in pursuing this legislation.

I know firsthand why we seek this kind of remedy. We are experiencing some 1,700 layoffs within my district. What we know firsthand is that there is often a lack of coordination. It is this kind of coordinated effort that this piece of legislation seeks to remedy.

In short, when there is a natural disaster, FEMA comes in and provides an opportunity to make sure that it integrates with all the Federal agencies the kind of emergency response that is needed when communities are experiencing a natural disaster. It is true when there have been base closures in the past that the Department of Defense comes in and also organizes all the Federal agencies that are impacted, and in this way presenting a coordinated effort in assisting the communities through these problematic concerns.

That is not the case currently when layoffs occur, when workers are displaced. So, what this bill seeks through the Department of Commerce is to create in the Economic Development Administration a coordinating entity that will work with our various agencies, that will work with the Department of Agriculture, Small Business Administration, the Treasury, Labor, HUD, and, of course, the Department of Commerce itself.

The purpose here is to appoint a team leader. Again, when communities are experiencing these kinds of layoffs, currently the communities involved have to reach out to the various Federal agencies. What this will do when a community experiences the economic distress that I have talked about is it will provide the Department of Commerce with the opportunities to come in and coordinate this assistance, so it will be both cost savings, efficient and effective and assist our communities and assist those who are being displaced, those who have been laid off, with getting the kind of immediate coordinated assistance that they expect from the Federal Government.

I want to thank as well the administration, especially the Department of Commerce, for working with us on this approach. We hope to pilot this approach by getting them up to Connecticut and having them work through some of these particularly

thorny areas so that we can coordinate in a whole-hearted effort to make sure that workers are receiving the kind of relief that they have.

Mr. Speaker we are seeking original cosponsors on this bill that we are going to drop tomorrow evening. As I have indicated, we have more than 160 cosponsors to what is a very pragmatic, straightforward solution in addressing communities that experience economic distress.

□

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 2000, I was away from the House on official business and missed rollcall vote number 288, the Nethercutt amendment to H.R. 4578. I would have voted no.

On rollcall vote 289, the Weldon amendment to H.R. 4578, I would have voted no.

On rollcall 290, the motion to recommit with instructions regarding H.R. 4578, I would have voted aye.

On final passage, rollcall vote number 291 on H.R. 4578, the Department of Interior Appropriations for FY 2001, I would have voted no.

□

□ 2130

#### U.S. MEMBERSHIP IN THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about a bill that is coming to the floor either tomorrow or the next day. It is H.J. Res. 90. This resolution, if it were to pass, would get us out of the World Trade Organization.

There are many of us here in the House and many Americans who believe very sincerely that it is not in our best interests to belong to the World Trade Organization, who believe very sincerely that international managed trade, as carried on through the World Trade Organization, does not conform with our Constitution and does not serve our interests.

It said by those who disagree with this so often in the media that those of us who disagree with the World Trade Organization that we are paranoid, we worry too much, and that there is no loss of sovereignty in this procedure. But quite frankly, there is strong evidence to present to show that not only do we lose sovereignty as we deliver this power to the World Trade Organization, that it indeed is not a legal agreement. It does not conform with our Constitution; and, therefore, we as Members of Congress should exert this privilege that we have every 5 years to think about the World Trade Organization, whether it is in our best interests and whether it is technically a good agreement.

The World Trade Organization came into existence, and we joined it, in a

lame duck session in 1994. It was hurried up in 1994 because of the concern that the new Members of Congress, who would have much more reflected the sentiments of the people, would oppose our membership in the WTO. So it went through in 1994; but in that bill, there was an agreement that a privileged resolution could come up to offer us this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, let me just point out the importance of whether or not this actually attacks our sovereignty. The CRS has done a study on the WTO, and they make a statement in this regard. This comes from a report from the Congressional Research Service on 8-25-99. It is very explicit. It says, as a member of the WTO, the United States does commit to act in accordance with the rules of the multilateral body. It is legally obligated to ensure national laws do not conflict with WTO rules. That is about as clear as one can get.

Now, more recently, on June 5, the WTO director, General Michael Moore, made this statement and makes it very clear: the dispute settlement mechanism is unique in the international architecture. WTO member governments bind themselves to the outcome from panels and, if necessary, the appellate body. That is why the WTO has attracted so much attention from all sorts of groups who wish to use this mechanism to advance their interests.

Interestingly enough, in the past, if we dealt with trade matters, they came to the U.S. Congress to change the law; they came to elected representatives to deal with this, and that is the way it should be under the Constitution. Today, though, the effort has to be directed through our world trade representative, our international trade representative, who then goes to bat for our business people at the WTO. So is it any surprise that, for instance, the company of Chiquita Banana, who has these trade wars going on in the trade fights, wants somebody in the administration to fight their battle, and just by coincidence, they have donated \$1.5 million in their effort to get influence?

So I think that the American people deserve a little bit more than this.

The membership in the WTO actually is illegal, illegal any way we look at it. If we are delivering to the WTO the authority to regulate trade, we are violating the Constitution, because it is very clear that only Congress can do this. We cannot give that authority away. We cannot give it to the President, and we cannot give it to an international body that is going to manage trade in the WTO. This is not legal, it is not constitutional, and it is not in our best interests. It stirs up the interest to do things politically, and unelected bureaucrats make the decision, not elected officials. It was never intended to be that way, and yet we did this 5 years ago. We have become accustomed to it, and I think it is very important, it is not paranoia that makes some of us bring this up on the floor.