

Nevertheless, through all the contacts over the years since Egypt's President Anwar Sadat went to Jerusalem, relationships have developed between Arabs and Israelis on many levels, including the official level. We now are at a stage where a considerable majority of Israelis support the peace process and where 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.

After 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, it has been announced that France and Germany have become each other's major trading partners.

This is the kind of 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 taxes were spent on highways. 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 TRANSPORTATION
(By Bud Shuster)

Abraham Lincoln called Senator Henry Clay "my beau ideal," largely because he was dedicated to building America. Clay, whose nickname was "Capital Improvements 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.

Fiscally responsible Republicans, all.

Fortunately, most modern-day conservatives still believe in building America. Wit-

ness the strong support last year from conservatives at all levels of government 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-Nothing Conservatism."

They criticize increased spending on transportation, but they do not differentiate between transportation trust-fund dollars and general tax dollars. 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 pork barrel 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 didn't stop some conservative critics from immediately attacking the bill as "busting 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 system 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 gimmickry 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 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 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 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 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 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 deterrent 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