was the only thing I had to enjoy. So I got into the metal rock band Kiss, Black Sabbath and things like that.

While Marilyn Manson alone is not the problem, his brand of music promotes violence more aggressively than ever. Indeed, Manson’s own response to the Littleton massacre raises the issue to be addressed here. Television or even religion may cause youth violence, he says, but music plays no role whatsoever. In fact, he claims that he is actually a victim when he asserts that the media “has unfairly scapegoated the music industry. . . . and has speculated—with no basis in truth—that artists like myself are in some way [sic] to blame.”

Unfortunately, it appears that the music industry’s only response to this cultural crisis is simply to deny that its products have any effect on anyone. One the June 29, 1999, edition on CNN’s Showbiz Today program, for example, musician Billy Joel dismissed as “absurd” the idea that music influences violent behavior. Elton John put it more bluntly: “It has nothing to do with the musical content or the lyrics whatsoever. [The idea is] absolute rubbish.”

No one, of course, argues that popular music is the sole cause of youth violence. Something as complex as human behavior does not have a sole cause. The question is not whether popular music exacerbates the cause of youth violence (something no one seriously argues), but whether there is any “basis in truth” for the proposition that some popular music makes a real contribution to youth (something only the music industry denies).

The affirmative answer to this question rests on three pillars. First, media such as television and music are very powerful influences on attitudes and behavior. Second, popular music in an even more powerful influence on young people. Third, some of the most popular music today promotes destructive behavior such as violence and drug use.

Effective prescriptions require accurate diagnoses. Whether the solution involves parental involvement, public policy, pressure on record companies or retailers to change their practices, or all of these and more, the effort must be informed by a comprehensive understanding of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the constituents of Texas in celebrating July 31st, 1999 as “Toni Parks Day.” Therefore, I ask that all citizens of Dallas join in celebrating July 31st, 1999 as “Toni Parks Day.”

**Extensions of Remarks**

**Recognizing Jacque Cortez**

**Hon. George Radanovich**

**In the House of Representatives**

**Thursday, July 29, 1999**

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jacque Cortez upon her selection by Visalia-area schools as a “Good Kid.” Jacque was chosen based on her academic accomplishments, classroom leadership, and efforts in literature and music.

The “Good Kid” program was formed in an effort to provide students with positive reinforcement. The program allows Visalia teachers to nominate students, who have excelled in academics and demonstrated a good work ethic, for recognition in the Visalia Times Delta newspaper. Those individuals selected are mentioned in a piece featured daily in the Times Delta.

Jacque Cortez, who was nominated by her fifth grade teacher, currently attends sixth grade at Willow Glen Elementary in Visalia, California. Throughout Jacque’s years at Willow Glen, faculty and classmates alike have considered her to be someone who is eager to learn and always willing to assist others.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Jacque Cortez for being selected as a “Good Kid.” I urge my colleagues to join me in wishing Jacque continued success in her academic and extracurricular pursuits.

**Insights on the Peace Process**

**Hon. John Edward Porter**

**In the House of Representatives**

**Thursday, July 29, 1999**

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to enter into the record an opinion piece from the May 30th Washington Times by former Illinois Senator Chuck Percy. In this article, Senator Percy concisely points out the present status of the peace process and those steps that must occur next for progress to continue. This is a timely and insightful piece that I commend to the attention of all members.
 Nevertheless, through all the contacts over the years between President Anwar Sadat and Mr. Arafat shows increasing sensitivity to the security concerns of Israelis. We now are approaching the time when the largest and most difficult issues must be addressed. Mr. Barak and Mr. Arafat have a responsibility to lead and to persuade their constituencies of the necessity to make concessions for peace. They must stand strong against radical elements that will seek to undermine their efforts to settle their problems at the peace table.

The horrors of World War II had devastated Europe, the French and Germans, traditional and bitter enemies, came together and gradually their mutual antagonisms faded and they began to enjoy the blessings of peace, security, reconstruction and economic development. And just this year, 1999, we have been announced that France and Germany have become each other’s major trading partners. This is what achievement peace might bring to the peoples of Israel and the Arab world, if they take full advantage of the opportunities created by Ehud Barak.

### UNLOCKING THE AVIATION TRUST FUND

**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR. OF TENNESSEE**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Thursday, July 29, 1999**

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the New York Times ran an editorial by Chairman Bud SHUSTER, Chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, concerning the Aviation Investment and Reform Act (AIR–21). I agree with Chairman Shuster 100 percent. Last year, Chairman Shuster unlocked the highways trust fund and ensured that highway spending is kept on the trains. Now, we are preparing to do the same thing this year with the aviation trust fund. I am proud to be a part of this effort to ensure that the taxes paid by aviation users will be spent only on aviation improvements. Unlocking the aviation trust fund will benefit the entire aviation community.

I have attached a copy of Chairman Shuster’s editorial that I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

(From the New York Times, July 17, 1999)

**ONCE, CONSERVATIVES KNEW THE VALUE OF FREE SPEECH**

**Three Unwelcome Developments in Russia**

By Bud Shuster

Abraham Lincoln called Senator Henry Clay “my beau ideal,” largely because he was dedicated to building America. Clay, whose capitol in Frankfort became now known as the Old Harry,” helped pass legislation to construct roads and inland waterways to tie America together. During the Civil War, Lincoln authorized the construction of the first transcontinental railroad. Teddy Roosevelt championed the Panama Canal, and Dwight Eisenhower created the Interstate System.

Unfortunately, most modern-day conservatives still believe in building America. With the strong support last year from conservatives for the Transportation Equity Act, which unlocked Eisenhower’s highway trust fund and allowed it to be used for its intended purpose of improving highways and transit systems.

Unfortunately, some conservatives seem dedicated to breathing new life into Benjamin Disraeli’s adage that “it is much easier to be critical than to be correct.” These critics have little inclination to deal in facts or face the reality of a growing America. They know the cost of everything but the value of nothing. Some have called this “Know-Nothingism.”

They criticize increased spending on transportation, but they do not differentiate between transportation trust-fund dollars and general taxes. They do not tell you that the trust fund receives money from an 18.3-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline and an 8 percent surcharge on airline tickets, all of which is designated solely to pay for our country’s transportation needs.

These conservative critics oppose investments by trying to discredit them. They call spending on public works in someone else’s backyard a “backroom project,” but that is far from the truth. In the Transportation Equity Act, for example, only 5 percent of the money goes to Congressionally mandated projects. The rest goes to the Department of Transportation or to the states.

This year, some conservatives are once again keeping their heads buried in the sand. The House overwhelmingly passed the Aviation Investment and Reform Act last month, by a vote of 316 to 110; 67 percent of Republicans—including the Speaker and the majority leader—approved this measure.

But this doesn’t stop some conservative critics from immediately attacking the bill as “hustling the budget” and “fiscally irresponsible.”

Never mind that many Americans are furious over the decline in air service. Never mind that our antiquated air-traffic control system, which fails somewhere nearly every week, needs both reform and an infusion of capital investment.

Never mind that the National Civil Aviation Review Commission established by our Republican Congress warns that “the United States aviation industry is headed toward gridlock shortly after the turn of the century” and that “it will result in a deterioration of aviation safety, harm the efficiency and growth of our domestic economy, and hurt our position in the global marketplace.”

Never mind that the money in the aviation trust fund will skyrocket to $90 billion within 10 years if we don’t make the investment. Never mind that the aviation taxes would otherwise be used in smoke-and-mirrors budget gimmicks to help finance general 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 real 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 around the national defense and the space program. But would such conservatives have built it in the first place?”

### THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT IS CONDUCTING A FRONTAL ASSAULT 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 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 organizations 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 of 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 tighten control and propagandize the media under the rubric of “ideological work.”

The head of this new ministry is a “press czar” who has been equipped with power to

**July 30, 1999**