

battles themselves will be unnecessarily destructive both within the military and between civilians and the military.

To be sure, there is much for service members to feel aggravated, if not aggrieved about. For my part, I believe the current pace of military operation is putting too much of a strain on military families. I think the solution is to be more selective in committing forces abroad and to maintain an adequate force structure. But legitimate complaints from within the ranks will be unnecessarily divisive if the civil-military gap does not narrow.

Solutions to some of these problems cannot be found solely within the military. For their part senior civilian officials in the executive branch must constantly be aware of the need to prevent the gap from growing wider. For its part, the Clinton administration deserves some credit for working so hard at this when its relations with the military could easily have soured.

Early in the administration, the conflict over gays in the military, apparent disrespect for military officers among some younger White House staff members and I believe, most importantly, a failure to be clear on the military role in Somalia, all created a potentially disastrous lack of trust to develop within the military.

Secretary of Defense Perry, especially, did much to reduce the tension, above all with his focus on the quality of life of people in the service. Moreover the administration has learned that the use of military force abroad must be thought through carefully. In Haiti, in Bosnia, whether one agrees with the mission or not, it is clear that the administration worked to define the goals of the military actions carefully. I am still concerned that the administration is asking too much of people in uniform but at least it is not lightly taking risks with the lives of military service members.

Congress also has a role to play in keeping the civil-military gap in check. Perhaps most importantly it is incumbent upon Members of Congress to seek consensus on social and political issues that might otherwise have a polarizing effect within the military. I think we have done a good job of that in recent years.

For the most part, however, I do not believe the military can look elsewhere to narrow the civil-military gap. Instead it is incumbent on the military leadership to work at reducing this civil-military gap as assiduously as it has worked at leadership development, recruit training, doctrinal improvements, jointness or other key aspects of organizational management. The public is not going to become more understanding of military concerns and the military requirements on its own, rather, the military itself must reach out to the public to create better understanding, even among those who have never served in the military. In carrying out this responsibility, there

are several things the military should continue doing and some things it should do much better.

One thing it must continue doing is to educate its own leadership in civilian affairs. One thing that is especially striking to me is the growing portion of the military, both officer and civilian, that comes from military families. According to Professor Eliot Cohen of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, roughly 25 percent of the current force comes from families of service members. This is a startling figure which suggests that the professional military could in time become almost a separate caste unless measures are taken to broaden the experience of military service members to include educational, cultural and social contacts within the civilian community.

I am also struck by the fact that an increasing proportion of the officer corps is being drawn from the military service academies relative to the proportion from ROTC or officer candidate schools. According to a recent Congressional Research Service report, if we exclude officers serving in the health care professions, chaplains and some other categories, about 22 percent of the officer corps in 1995, was comprised of graduates of the military academies, a dramatically higher portion than in the past, when ROTC and OCS sources were relatively greater sources of officers.

Among general and flag officers the proportion from the service academies is even greater, about 36 percent in 1995. I would not suggest because of this that we close or significantly reduce the size of the academies. I do think, however, that it becomes more and more imperative that as a military officer advances, he or she receive education in nonmilitary institutions and that military training institutions make it a point of broadening the intellectual and cultural perspectives of their students.

□ 2000

Most importantly of all, I believe that the military must take steps to ensure that the military commanders are held accountable for building much better relations with the civilian community.

In my own experience representing a congressional district with large military bases, I know that some military officers are excellent at community relations and others are not. Increasingly there is no substitute for having commanders who are good at it. Even the most mundane community activities are profoundly effective in building public identification with an understanding of the military.

Participation in Lion's Clubs, sponsorship of Little Leagues, and of Boy and Girl Scout Troops, involvement on school and other similar affairs are essential. Community relations should be made a prominent factor in officer efficiency report ratings that determine whether an officer will be promoted.

Military leaders should also vastly expand programs to educate civilians about the military. There should be many more opportunities for civilian community leaders to visit military facilities and interact with military personnel.

One final step is also critically important, and that is for the active duty Army and the National Guard relations to improve. National Guard and Reserve troops are truly a national treasure for the simple reason that they remain true citizen soldiers.

Relations between the active duty force and the National Guard and the Army, however, are laden with distrust. This rift must be healed. The active Army leadership must work on ways to integrate the Guard forces into military plans, and must genuinely rely on the Guard as a key element of the force.

Mr. Speaker, the professional U.S. military force of today is by every measure the best in the world and perhaps the best in history. It is, however, a difficult matter for democracy to maintain a large professional military establishment. To make it work requires that military leaders pay serious attention to the social and political issues that arise.

Both the military and the society as a whole will greatly benefit from the military leadership if the military leadership works more assiduously to prevent a widening rift from developing between civilian and military societies.

#### A LOOK BACKWARD, A LOOK FORWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHERMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, as probably the last Speaker of this session, at least that portion of the session before we go back to our districts for the summer, I am grateful to have this opportunity to speak tonight.

I know we are all anxious to go back to our districts, and yet we ought to reflect a little bit on some of the things that have gone on in this House over the last 6 months. I am especially grateful for a sufficient amount of time to review these events, because during more hectic parts of our legislative business we are recognized for 1 minute or for 2 minutes, which is often not enough time to go even into one topic, and I have several topics I would like to address.

I know that very few of my colleagues are here in the Chamber. I expect that many are back in their offices finishing things up, perhaps watching these remarks on C-SPAN or cable, and I really have not had a chance to introduce myself to all of my colleagues, only most of them, so I would like to take a minute to do that.

I represent proudly the 24th Congressional District in California, which

goes from Northridge on the north to Malibu on the south. That is why FEMA is my favorite Government agency. From the Northridge earthquakes to the other problems that we have had, certainly we have had more than our share of disasters, we have experienced superb help from that agency.

In addition, my district goes on the west from the city of Thousand Oaks in the Conejo Valley into the east to the city of Los Angeles, as far east as America's best named town, Sherman Oaks, CA.

I never expected to be in this House, and for those of my colleagues I have yet to meet and explain my story, I will take a minute to do that.

I began my career over 20 years ago as a CPA. And after a while, my friends got together and said, "Brad, you need to find an occupation held in lower public esteem," so I went to law school. After 3 years of Harvard Law School and 10 years of practicing business law, these same friends got together and they said, "Brad, for anyone else we know, law would be low enough, but you must find an occupation held in even lower public esteem."

They spent some time trying to think of what it might be, and they decided that I had to find some unique combination of occupations held in low esteem. In my State we have an elected tax commission called the State Board of Equalization. With their help, I ran for that board, and for 6 years I was simultaneously a politician and a tax collector.

Those of my friends in California who are already lawyers and aspire to be held in even lower esteem might examine the opportunity of running for the Board of Equalization next year.

These same friends gathered together last year, when our Congressman was retiring, and perhaps they thought that coming to this House would be an occupation held in even lower public esteem than being simultaneously a politician and a tax collector. This year we have proved them wrong.

This year my occupational self-esteem is on the rebound, because while last Congress was noted for deadlock and division, so far in this Congress we are noted for working together, sometimes with some acrimony, sometimes with some division, but eventually coming together in a bipartisan spirit, in a spirit that gives America the government that America voted for last year, a government of the vital center; government not catering to a right wing or to a left wing, but rather balancing those wings with policies that make sense.

It is in that spirit that I would like to review our last 6 months and take a look at the next several months of Congress that will be reconvened this September. I would like to look first at one bill that I have introduced, that I hope people around the country will bring to the attention of their Members of Congress and their Senators, be-

cause when people come back in September I would like to have hearings on this bill and I would like to see it pass.

After I review that bill, I would like to review my own efforts on the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on International Relations. But first I would like to address that one piece of legislation, and that is the Child Protection Act of 1997.

There were 425,000 children sexually abused last year. It is time for the Federal Government to do everything possible to protect our children from sexual predators. A good idea came out of California that I would like to see adopted on a national basis, and that is the idea of providing parents with the information they need about adults who may be coming in contact with their children because of their proximity or occupation.

In California there is a 900 number that parents can call, and if they have very specific information about an individual, can ask whether this individual has been convicted, not merely arrested but convicted of a sexual predatory offense. Making use of the data base required by Megan's law, officials of the California attorney general will advise parents whether that person has been convicted.

In fact, there have been 11,000 inquiries to this line and on over 1,000 occasions parents, those who administer day care programs and others with a legitimate interest have been advised, told on over 1,000 occasions that the individual that they were concerned about had, in fact, been convicted of a sexual predatory offense.

For example, there was an amusement park that noticed that an individual would show up by himself every day, would often be talking to children and striking up what appeared to be friendships, and that this individual had purchased a year-long pass, but never came with a child to this amusement park that catered to children.

They checked on this individual and found that the person who had purchased a year-long pass to the amusement park had, in fact, been convicted of a sexual offense involving a child under 14 years of age.

In another circumstance, a parent was concerned about someone who wanted to serve as the new Little League coach, and discovered that that person had been convicted in 1990 and again in 1992 of child molestation.

This system in California works well, but it suffers from two limitations: The data base is statewide and only parents in the State can use it. This line and database should be nationwide. Parents in California who call should be able to get information about convictions that occurred anywhere in the United States. And, likewise, this service ought to be available to parents from Maine to Arizona, not just to those in California.

So I ask my colleagues who may be listening to consider cosponsoring the

Child Protection Act of 1997. Already 28 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle and from all parts of the country, have cosponsored this legislation.

And to those who are watching at home, the next month will be an outstanding opportunity to interact with your own Senators and your own Representatives and, I hope, urge them to support the Child Protection Act of 1997.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the work of the various committees that I have been privileged to serve on. The first of these is the Committee on the Budget.

First, I would like to review how it is that well before the deadline and surprising all the skeptics, first the Committee on the Budget and then the House overwhelmingly adopted a bipartisan budget plan for this Nation which balances the budget by the year 2002 and makes sure it remains balanced for at least 5 years thereafter.

Credit must go to prior Congresses because they adopted a fiscal policy for this country and supported the Federal Reserve Board in a monetary policy that has given us unparalleled economic growth, an economic recovery that is the longest in the post-World War II era.

□ 2015

They did their job. As a result, just a few months ago, in predicting the future economic developments of this country, the Congressional Budget Office was able to tell us that they expected \$45 billion of additional unexpected tax revenue not only in this year, but in each of the next 5 years.

Our reaction to that news was calm. And we deserve credit, both Democrats and Republicans, and I am particularly impressed by my colleagues, in the mature reaction that we had to that wonderful discovery. Because all around the world, developed countries are running huge deficits because they are slashing taxes on the one hand and coming up with very expensive government programs on the other.

The European Union is trying to create its own European currency, but they decided to do that only when the countries involved are able to reduce their deficit to 3 percent of gross domestic product. We in the United States, even before this budget deal, reduced our deficit to well less than 1 percent of our gross domestic product.

In fact, looking around the world at the developed countries, the only countries that meet the European Union's standards for a new currency are Luxembourg and the United States and arguably Cyprus. Perhaps the United States and Luxembourg should create our own currency, because the rest of the developed world has not mastered the fiscal discipline displayed in this House. The most important thing we did this week is that we did not foul it up. Prior Congresses, when confronted with good news, would have responded with \$100 million spending programs,

\$200 million tax cuts, attempts to buy votes from this constituency or that, paying a price that the country could not afford. Instead, we acted with restraint.

Yes, we adopted some additional spending programs, more than offset by the spending reductions that we achieved. And yes, we provided tax reductions. But tax reductions that were moderate tax reductions this country could afford, tax reductions that were far less than had been proposed just 2 years ago.

Another area where we did not foul things up is that of the Social Security. Earlier this year we were urged by many to artificially adjust the Consumer Price Index, to tell those who are dependent on Social Security that if the Consumer Price Index said prices had gone up by 3 percent, we were only going to count 1½ percent. That would have been a breach of faith with America's seniors, and this Congress said no. Yes, we are going to balance the budget, but no we are not going to do so by artificially tinkering with the promise that we have made to our seniors to maintain their purchasing power.

Instead, we adopted a spending bill that will extend the Medicare trust fund and its solvency to the year 2007, and that will allow us to provide insurance to children who do not currently have medical insurance. Five million children who now must worry and whose parents must worry about whether they can afford to see a doctor, or if they can get medical care, will be told yes, you can, the door of the clinic is open.

We also adopted very important tax reductions. The most important one for my district is a virtual elimination of the tax on the gain on the sale of a home. We in Los Angeles are blessed with high property values or high housing costs, however you choose to view it. And so many southern Californians are faced with a situation where they are thinking of selling their home now that their children have moved. They have a 3-bedroom, a 4-bedroom, a 6-bedroom home and are still living in it, not because they need the space and not because they want to invite their 20-something children to move back into their old bedrooms, but because they are concerned about the huge tax that they would pay if they sold their home and moved into a smaller one. Today we said yes, people can sell their homes and do not have to pay taxes on the first \$500,000 of gain.

And for those in other parts of the country where the gains are smaller, please reflect on the fact that your interest payments are lower, your mortgage payments are lower. We in California spend far more for housing than people in most of the rest of the country.

Just as important, we adopted a \$500 tax credit per child so that parents would have some help with the high cost of raising their own children. And

we provided tax relief for college students and their parents, a HOPE scholarship that provides a \$1,500 tax credit for those who spend \$2,000 on tuition during the first 2 years of college. Dollar for dollar, this is not a mere deduction but a credit dollar for dollar on the first \$1,000 and a 50-percent credit on the next \$1,000 spent during the first 2 years of college. And for those who have gone beyond their first 2 years of college, we have provided a tax credit of 20 percent on the first \$5,000 that they spend on college tuition.

America needs to invest in education. Our colleges and universities are still the envy of the world. And if we are to maintain the high living standards that we enjoy compared to the rest of the world, we must encourage people to pursue a college education in their post high school years.

The country benefits. The revenue people benefit. We in the Federal Government are all too happy to benefit when someone gets a college education, earns more, and therefore pays higher taxes. We should be there on the front end providing tax breaks and incentives to encourage people to get that college education. If we are partners in the profits of education, we should be partners in the expense.

Another element that is very important to me in the budget resolution revolves around the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Most people at home and, frankly, some of my colleagues have not focused on the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This is a special fund in the U.S. Treasury, is funded with money received by the Federal Government from royalties on offshore oil drilling. I have always opposed offshore drilling, especially off the coast of California. But wherever there is already oil being produced off our coast and royalties being paid to the Federal Government, those funds should be used to mitigate environmental degradation by providing us with the funding we need to acquire new Federal lands for our national parks and forests.

This year, for the first time in nearly a decade, we are going to live more or less in conformity with the law that established the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I am particularly proud of the work I did in the Committee on the Budget, because in that committee we reviewed a White House-negotiated deal which provided that there should be \$700 million of new funds to acquire lands around the country, environmentally sensitive lands, but that that \$700 million of new funds should be spread out over the next 5 years. I could see it happen, could see the problem. The problem is that we traditionally spend about \$150 million every year, which is not nearly enough, on acquiring environmentally sensitive lands. If we provided for \$700 million spread out over 5 years, the new money could simply displace the old money. The \$700 million spread out over 5 years could then be the excuse to dis-

continue the \$150 million that we have spent year after year for the last several years.

Instead, in the Committee on the Budget, I proposed an amendment, the only substantive amendment that we were able to get adopted in the Committee on the Budget of this House, which provided first documentation and inescapable documentation, no wiggle room documentation, that \$700 million of additional funds should be spent in the next 5 years on acquiring environmentally sensitive land.

Beyond that, the amendment provided that all of those funds should be spent in 1998. That is important for several reasons. The first is that the \$700 million will have the greatest purchasing power if spent now before land prices go up. But second, spending the money in 1998 assures that what was supposed to be extra money is in fact extra, that we spend the \$700 million extra in 1998, and come 1999, with the support of my colleagues, we should go back to spending at least \$150 million year in and year out. And I would urge this House to spend far more.

So we have a budget resolution that is very clear, that has been passed by both Houses of Congress, and that is supposed to be binding on both Houses, providing that an additional \$700 million be spent during 1998 on acquiring environmentally sensitive lands.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives did not follow that instruction and adopted an Interior Committee appropriations bill which did not include the expenditure of that \$700 million.

The other body, the Senate, did follow the budget resolution, did follow the amendment that I had offered for that resolution, and provided for the \$700 million to be spent. I am confident that we will spend that money and that we will acquire environmentally sensitive lands before they are doomed to development and degradation.

I acquire this confidence for one reason. My colleagues are going home. The ladies and gentlemen watching us in this House will have a chance to talk to them about the priorities of this country. We are very close to the end of this millenia. What greater gift could we make to the next millenia than to preserve forever the Headwaters Forest, to preserve forever the Yellow Stone area, and to preserve forever the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area?

I am confident that as the people of America interface with their Representatives, they will say, you have a balanced budget resolution. It provides for \$700 million of additional funds to acquire these lands, you have told us that that resolution will give us a balanced budget and fiscal responsibility. If we can protect the lands and be fiscally responsible, we should do it and do it now. And I am confident that when my colleagues return and go into that conference committee that they

will be strong advocates for the environment and strong advocates for protecting lands and adding to our national parks.

I would especially hope that there is attention to the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area. This is the last great chance to have a national park and a great national park just on the fringes of one of America's great metropolitan areas. We are close to being able to acquire the last parcels we need to acquire to complete the backbone trail and provide a 65-mile hike that starts in Santa Monica and continues through unabated wilderness and through nationally-owned and State-owned lands.

□ 2030

We have a chance to preserve for posterity a park that already generates 30 million visitors a year. There are far more visitors to the mountains and beaches of the Santa Monica National Recreation Area than to Yellowstone or Yosemite or any of the other units of the National Park System. We have a chance to complete the construction and acquisition of a park that is already, even in its current form, the most popular element of our National Park System.

And so, if you happen to see my colleagues back in your districts, please tell them now is the time to protect our national treasures.

This completes what I would like to say about the Committee on the Budget. I would like to turn my attention now to my work on and the work in general of the Committee on International Relations. I especially want to turn my attention to the tragic events in Jerusalem of just a few days ago, for these events remind us that the Middle East has not yet achieved peace, that Israel remains surrounded by those who would destroy her and that Israel is not yet secure, and it reminds us of the importance of the eternal city of Jerusalem.

It was not covered much by the press, but a few months ago there was a resolution in the Committee on International Relations to cut aid to Israel. The proponent pointed out that the living standards in Israel are somewhat higher, considerably higher than many of the other countries that receive our aid, and wondered why Israel needed economic aid from the United States.

The answer of the committee was overwhelming. The answer of the committee was clear. As long as Israel must confront hostile neighbors in so many directions, as long as Iran and Iraq swear every day that they will push Israel into the sea, Israel needs both the military aid that it gets from the United States and the economic aid that is necessary so that Israel can afford to spend its own money on dealing with the greatest security threat of any country in the world.

There is only one country in the world where there are millions of people, or at least governments governing

millions of people, who question its right to exist and plot its extermination. No other country faces that kind of security threat, and no country has a closer relationship with the United States than the State of Israel which has supported us. Israel has supported us again and again and again when we needed a friend in a very dangerous and very important region of the country.

Particularly I want to point to the fact that this latest terrorist act occurred in Jerusalem, and it was probably committed by those who were trying to destroy the peace process. But it was allowed to occur, or at least not prevented, by a Palestinian Authority that is still trying to negotiate about the status of Jerusalem and has again and again signaled that terrorism, or at least turning a blind eye to terrorism, is a negotiating tactic that it is willing to employ.

We must tell the Palestinian Authority that terror is not an appropriate or tolerable method for negotiation, and we must tell the entire world that the United States recognizes Jerusalem, an undivided and indivisible Jerusalem, as the capital of the land of Israel.

Up until now there has been some question as to American policy. Congress has always been clear. Congress has directed the United States to move our embassy to Jerusalem to signal for the entire world that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel and always will be. So far that embassy has not been moved, but congressional enactment after congressional enactment has instructed the State Department to do just that, and when it comes to the American Embassy, we must say, "Next year in Jerusalem."

I do want to talk about several other points that arose involving international relations and the Committee on International Relations. One of those was an idea, a rather bad idea, to transfer free, three Perry class frigates to the Navy of the Republic of Turkey.

Now Turkey does face significant security threats facing Iran and Iraq on its eastern borders, but my question for the Defense Department is: In efforts against Iran and Iraq, how do you deploy the frigates? Obviously, these frigates would be deployed in the Aegean where they would threaten Cyprus and Greece. They should not be transferred, and it is certainly an insult to American taxpayers to think of transferring them to Turkey for free. When you think of the idea of frigates being used to combat the threat of Iran and Iraq, we should reflect that the last oceangoing ships seen in eastern Anatolia, the last such ship was Noah's ark.

The idea of strengthening the Turkish Navy, a Navy whose work in Cyprus and the Aegean we are not overly happy with, is an incredibly bad idea. I am very gratified that Richard Holbrooke, arguably our most accomplished ambassador has been appointed to try to deal with the problem of Cy-

prus. We look forward to the unification of Nicosia, not the division of Jerusalem. We look forward to peace in Cyprus and a united federal Cyprus joining the European Union.

I also would like to address the unfortunate visit to the United States of the President of Azerbaijan Mr. Aliyev. We met with this individual yesterday. He tried to convince us that Nagorno-karabagh was a natural part of Azerbaijan. He was wrong. The only individual who had a hand in transferring that territory to Azeri sovereignty even for a while was Joseph Stalin. The idea that Azerbaijan would claim a territory populated by Armenians and their only claim to it is Joseph Stalin gave it to us; I think that is a rather weak claim. President Aliyev urged us to repeal Section 907 which prohibits aid to a country that is receiving aid and is blockading another country to which we would like to send aid. The blockade of Armenia must end, and it is time for Turkey and Azerbaijan to provide humanitarian corridors so that food and medicine can reach the people of Armenia and so that Armenia can trade with the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 50th anniversary of the reemergence as an independent democracy of the Nation of India, and I would like to take this opportunity as the sun sets on this Congress until September to urge the President, and if that is impossible, then the Vice President or the Secretary of State to go to India to celebrate its independence.

We have more in common with India than is commonly acknowledged. They are the world's largest democracy, we are the world's greatest democracy. It is time to celebrate Indian independence.

I am particularly proud of the role I played in the Committee on International Relations when one of my colleagues put forward an amendment that was a hidden attack against India, which said that we would end all aid to countries that did not vote with us all the time in the General Assembly of the United Nations. This was a ill considered amendment. Counting votes is not a way to see whether a country shares our values. Many of us here in the Chamber cast votes on a variety of things that are inconsequential, and those who try to judge our values by tabulating votes and producing scores, particularly if they look at every vote as being equivalent and of equal importance will be misled.

Just one example. Every day we vote on whether to approve the Journal. The Journal for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I think is professionally prepared, and so I vote to prepare it, to approve the Journal, to say, yes, there are no typos in it that I have been able to find. The Republican leadership votes to approve the Journal in every recorded vote. The Democratic leadership, many of them, vote against approving the Journal. Perhaps they have a keener eye for typos than I do. It

would be rather absurd to decide that I shared more values with the Republican leadership than the Democratic leadership on the basis of such an inconsequential vote, and likewise our Committee on International Relations knows that you cannot judge whether America and other countries share values by tabulating of votes in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Now on the Committee on International Relations I serve on the trade subcommittee, and again and again my voice is there to say it is time for America to get tough on trade. Unfortunately on trade issues there appear to be only 2 voices, one a protectionist voice that says build a wall around America. That is impossible. The other a, quote, free trade voice that says open America to every import regardless of how that country treats our trade. That is absurd, but unfortunately it is treated as a serious policy by the trade establishment and by the foreign policy establishment of the United States.

We even had a distinguished gentleman testify before our subcommittee that trade deficits do not matter. That is as absurd as the people who 10 years ago told us that budget deficits do not matter.

America runs a huge trade deficit with the world year in and year out every year and it is time for us to focus on that deficit with the same intensity that we focused on the Federal budget deficit.

For all too long our foreign policy around the world could best be described by one sentence uttered by an American diplomat to a diplomat from any of the other countries. America's position was that we would like the honor of defending Europe and Japan for free, defending their territory, their trade routes and their interests, and in return for that honor we were prepared to make trade concession after trade concession.

No country in the history of the world has ever exercised our responsibility or our power around the world. But no great country has survived with such unmitigated generosity. We cannot simultaneously open our markets to Japan and Europe and China while their markets remain closed to us.

Now at least this year we voted in favor of Most Favored Nation status for China, and it is good that we retain a trade relationship with China. But it is time for us to demand that they give Most Favored Nation status to the United States. Perhaps the least audible part of the debate on Most Favored Nation status was the fact that China sends \$45 billion of goods to the United States every year and accepts only \$11 billion of our exports.

□ 2045

We must restore balance to this relationship. We must insist on parity. We must insist that a country like China, which, whether we like it or not, is a Communist State with a government

in control of major economic decisions, make those economic decisions in a way that opens their markets to American goods.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend many of us will get a chance to see a movie, and we should reflect that at least for the area I represent, the movie business is the biggest business and the television business is included in that. We have tolerated for no ascertainable reason a policy that discriminates explicitly, repeatedly and consistently against American television programs and against American movies when we seek to exhibit them in France and other European countries. The French explicitly discriminate and say that one-third of all TV shows, one-third of all movie screens are available only for domestic content. I am not sure of that standard of one-third; it might even be higher.

They say it is not a matter of trade; they say it is a matter of culture. Well, I am from California, where in the south of California culture is Hollywood, but in the north of California culture is exemplified by our fine wines. If the French can tell us that we cannot have our movies and our TV programs in their country because it corrupts their culture, then why are we drinking French wines? Are they not having an equivalent effect on our culture?

Certainly, we should be as aggressive in trade negotiations with the French and we should use every device, including exaggerated cultural sensitivity if that is what we need to get access to their markets, and to deny access to the French where they deny access to us.

Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks I will get a chance to go to Israel with a delegation of our colleagues, and I will have a chance to see for myself what can be done to maintain a strong relationship between the United States and Israel. Our group will meet with Prime Minister Netanyahu and we will also meet with the head of the Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat. We will have, I believe, some very pointed questions for Mr. Arafat, for it is his government that announced a death warrant for those people whose crime it was to sell land to Jews.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of realtors in my district. Now and then they face some danger in their business, maybe a flat tire on the way to show a house, but the idea that one would assassinate people for engaging in the real estate business strikes me as an all-time low in human rights and human dignity, and an all-time low in an effort to create peace in the Middle East. Likewise, it is the Palestinian Authority which time and again has arrested terrorists, known terrorists, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, arrested them and then released them.

Certainly one must take responsibility for the actions of those one facilitates. One must take responsibility for the actions one was obligated to pre-

vent and chose not to prevent. The deal in the Middle East is land for peace, and again and again and again Israel has conceded and provided land.

Lands that Israel came to occupy by defending itself in a war of aggression it returned, not by force of arms of its adversaries, but by a genuine and sincere wish for peace. The land is there, the Sinai has been returned. Gaza is now under the Palestinian Authority. Huge areas of the West Bank have been turned over to Mr. Arafat's government. The land is there. Where is the peace?

We must remember that turnovers of land are permanent, or relatively so. They are ascertainable. Each acre turned over to an Arab government or to the Palestinian Authority can be measured, ascertained and protected. In contrast, the peace which is supposed to be delivered to Israel is ephemeral. There can be peace today and a terrorist incident tomorrow, and then peace the next day.

It is time to insist that peace be delivered, and it is not just peace with the fathers of the Middle East that Israel deserves, because what good is it to have peace with all of those in their 40s and 50s and 60s in positions of power in various Arab States, if the children are educated for hatred and war? It is time for the Middle East peace treaty to reach into every textbook in every Arab land and to begin to teach Arab children the truth: that Israel is a legitimate, permanent, unerasable part of the Middle East; that its presence in the Middle East may well lead to prosperity and enlightenment for much of that region; that lands have been returned because of a pledge of peace.

But instead, Arab children are taught lies. They are taught hatred. There are still textbooks that teach math by asking what happens when you add two dead Jews to three dead Jews.

The answer is that they do not have peace, and it is time for Arab states to deliver the ephemeral by looking at every aspect of their society and saying, have we complied with the peace agreement? Have we provided Israel with the security of knowing that the next generation and the generation after that will accept the borders that Israel has voluntarily retreated to?

So while we take a minute to reflect on those who died in Israel and in Jerusalem just a few days ago, we must reflect on what needs to happen: the reinternment of those that were wrongfully released by the Palestinian Authority, and education for peace among all the Arab States who once were at war. From Morocco to Tehran, Arab and Islamic children should be educated for peace. And until that happens, Israel will have conceded land and will have received only a temporary peace, a peace that may die with the fathers, a war that may be born with the sons.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for their patience and indulgence, for I have spoken longer than I

had imagined, but it has been a long session of Congress, and we all look forward to returning to our districts.

I look forward to returning to Woodland Hills, where I am available to my constituents at 818-999-1990, and I especially look forward to seeing hundreds of people at a new home-buyer fair, a fair designed to give people, particularly first time buyers, information about buying a new home. We will also have information about the new tax law and how it affects those selling a home. We will convene on Saturday, August 9 at 9 a.m. through 1 p.m. If my constituents cannot be there the whole time, we will have information for people for part of the time. We will be at the Coast Federal Bank in Canoga Park.

I know that all of my colleagues are smiling today. We all get to go home, but none of them deserve to smile more than me. I get to go back to the San Fernando, the Conejo and the Las Virgenes Valleys, and I am looking forward to it.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The Chair will remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the viewing audience.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOEKSTRA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POSHARD) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOLOMON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUINN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOEHLERT, for 5 minutes, on July 23.

Mr. HOUGHTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, on August 1.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found

truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution waiving certain enrollment requirements with respect to two specified bills of the One Hundred Fifth Congress.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution waiving certain enrollment requirements with respect to two specified bills of the One Hundred Fifth Congress.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 1, 1997, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4479. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fresh Cut Flowers and Fresh Cut Greens Promotion and Information Order [FV-97-703] received July 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4480. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Regulations Governing the Fresh Irish Potato Diversion Program, 1996 Crop [Docket No. FV-97-80-02] (RIN:0581-AA93) received July 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4481. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Buprofezin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300519; FRL-5732-1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received July 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4482. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting on behalf of the President, the Annual Report on the Panama Canal Treaties, Fiscal Year 1996, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3871; to the Committee on National Security.

4483. A letter from the Director, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Compensation of Certain Former Operatives Incarcerated by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (RIN: 0790-AG43) received July 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4484. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter concerning the mobilization income insurance program for activated Reservists, pursuant to Public Law 104-201, section 1233; to the Committee on National Security.

4485. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Base Closure Community Redevelopment and Homeless Assistance [FR-3820] received July 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4486. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the Demonstration Program to Train Military Medical Personnel in Civilian Shock Trauma Units, pursuant to Public Law 104-201, section 744; to the Committee on National Security.

4487. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on Dual Use Application Program Investment Strategy for Fiscal Years 1998 through 2000, pursuant to Public Law 104-201, section 203(g); to the Committee on National Security.

4488. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary for International and Commercial Programs, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report to Congress describing the activities of the Defense Production Act Fund, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2094; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4489. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Homeownership of Single Family Homes Program (HOPE 3); Streamlining Rule [FR-3857] received July 24, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4490. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Amendment of Affordable Housing Program Regulation [No. 97-44] (RIN: 3069-AA28) received July 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4491. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Investment and Deposit Activities (RIN: 3133-AB73) received July 30, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4492. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and RECORDS Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Glenrock, Wyoming) [MM Docket No. 96-227, RM-8910] received July 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4493. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and RECORDS Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Mt. Juliet and Belle Meade, Tennessee) [MM Docket No. 97-97, RM-9047] received July 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4494. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and RECORDS Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Fife Lake, Michigan) [MM Docket No. 97-25, RM-8981] received July 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4495. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and RECORDS Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Bear Creek and Pocono Pines, Pennsylvania) [MM Docket No. 96-151, RM-8808, RM-8891] received July 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.