

What does it lead to overall? This is a chart of a Fordham University study on the culture. They have tracked the culture in America since 1970, and they use a whole set of different factors, some of which I would not consider; in others, I would add additional factors. But they overall said the culture, in their objective assessment, has declined from, in 1970, a 73 percent objective number to a 38 percent objective number—in half, the cultural decline in America, in a period—look at the time period we are talking about here—25 years. Is this incredible?

I think on our National Day of Prayer we ought to be praying about the culture. And we ought to be thinking about what we can do ourselves and what we can do corporately in this society.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

A SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there are times when I listen to the remarks of another Senator that I realize the statement being made is most significant. That was my feeling recently as I sat next to the junior Senator from Massachusetts. Senator JOHN KERRY spoke to the national meeting of AIPAC—The America-Israel Political Action Committee—here in Washington, DC. This was a bipartisan meeting of AIPAC members from throughout our Nation.

In a strong worded presentation, Senator KERRY made an appeal for the United States to be a true friend of Israel. I, particularly, agreed with my friend as he forcefully said:

As a democracy, Israel has both the burden and the glory of a vigorous public square. We as Americans must be the truest and best kind of ally—both forthright enough to say what we think—and steadfast enough to stay the course during the hard passages as well as the easy ones.

Herzl's famous words—"If you will it, it is no dream"—signify the promise and the greatest power of Israel—and the hope, after half a century, that a fair and secure peace is finally within reach. For our part, we must leave here more committed than ever to support Israel in the exacting, essential, and sometimes tense search for that dream. I think it's fair to say that the ashes of Holocaust victims were scattered on the wind.

But that wind also carries on it their prayers and purpose—above mountains and sea, across hundreds or thousands of miles, so that the pain of history is redeemed in the land of Israel. It is a sacred place—for them, for their people who live there, and for all the world. So let us now resolve again that the day will never come for Israel when the redemption is put at risk—when any of us would ever have to repeat Schindler's cry and say: We could have done more.

Mr. President, the days seem to be disappearing when a Senator compliments another Senator who sits on the other side of this aisle by making the Senate aware of a significant accomplishment of a colleague. For myself, I would like to restore that tradition.

Senator KERRY's statement was one of the best I have heard. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator KERRY's speech to AIPAC be printed in the RECORD. It is one, I believe, all Members of Congress and many citizens of this great Nation of ours should read, contemplate, and discuss.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR JOHN F. KERRY—ADDRESS BEFORE
AIPAC—WASHINGTON, DC—APRIL 7, 1997

I really want to share with you that I am honored to be here tonight—and I'm privileged to stand up here tonight and represent the Senate in bi-partisan fashion—because I share your cause, and I also want to pay you respect for the way that you fight the battle. The way that you do so literally does honor to our democracy. The letters you write, the phone calls you make, involvement in our campaigns, your willingness to come to Washington, your commitment to, and search for the truth, is the way it is supposed to be, and you set an example for this country.

I was delighted to participate just a few days ago with Steven in Boston in a Washington club event. And I think it renewed in me my sense, in the intimacy and in the exchange, the dialogue, that meetings like that really give a continuing vitality to a fundamental truth that Israel and the United States do share great ideas as well as a great alliance; and security of Israel is indispensable to the security of the United States of America.

But you know, in truth, our two nations really share something much more than that, and I think you know it. As Prime Minister Netanyahu stated so eloquently tonight—and what a privilege it was to be able to listen to the truth that he spoke this evening—Israel and the United States are neither of us just a place in the land, a piece of geography; both of us are founded on a shining vision of human dignity and purpose.

The Jewish people have taught the world much about dignity and purpose because they have preserved their vision through two thousand years of exile and persecution. And they had to outlast history's fiercest fires of hate.

Teresa and I watched *Schindler's List* as 25 million other Americans did a few weeks ago. We were obviously left asking, as anyone in their right mind and conscience would, why—why—why? But I remembered my trip to Israel, as we all do. My first visit to Yad Vashem in Jerusalem. And I will never forget one sight there that stood out above all others—not the documents or the photographs as stark as they are—but a small child's single lonely shoe, which brought home to me the incomprehensibility of the Holocaust expressed on the most human of scales.

Again, as I watched this movie about a handful who entered the Nazi hell and returned, a small remnant who proved that millions did not have to perish, I thought of the words of Elie Wiesel about others who could have acted to prevent, to stop, to oppose this crime of the century: "Not all were guilty," he said, "but all were responsible."

Schindler himself was a rogue and a philistine, whose transformation was heroic—but it was all too rare. Too many of the God-fearing forgot God. And at the end of the movie, after the Nazis have surrendered and Schindler is preparing to escape, he cries that he had not done all he could have done—or early enough. He could have done more—sold a watch, a lapel pin, a car to secure the lives of others. And so many could

have done more in Germany and elsewhere—and yes, done more in America, and in the highest places of power in Washington.

And as we know—and I say we, all of us, with connections of any kind with Israel—anti-semitism did not disappear with the ashes of Auschwitz. Over fifty years after the end of World War II, the ancient evil still stalks our time—striking at Jews around the world and at the Jewish people and the Jewish soul of the state of Israel. What Robert Wistrich called the longest hatred continues to reach far and wide. An explosion ruins a peaceful afternoon in a street cafe in Tel Aviv. There are bombings in a Jewish Community Center in Argentina; the rising popularity of the National Front in France; the prevalence of Skinhead violence and murders in Germany; the arson of Warsaw's last synagogue; the anti-Jewish scape-goating and conspiracy of Louis Farrakhan and the militia groups; the Nazi-like images of Jews in the press in Egypt and Syria, and the blatant anti-Jewish hatred of Hamas proclaiming: "We worship God by killing Jews."

These are different sins, but they are rooted in the same anti-Semitic temptation. Some cannot face the truth, or the twisted hates in their own soul, even today in this country, or the rationalizations for the sake of political advantage or profit. As the youth of Europe ask about the Holocaust and challenge their parents about what they did or didn't do, the legacy of collaboration and oppression still emerges from under the rocks of a hidden history. We have just witnessed the end of the myth of Swiss neutrality—and we are beginning to look anew at what happened to the stolen property of Jews in Vichy France and Peronist Argentina.

So the question must be asked: Would active resistance to the Holocaust or the preceding anti-Semitism have made a difference? I am not naive about the brutality with which the Nazis often responded to dissent. But in recent years, from the Philippines to Haiti to South Africa, to the former Soviet union, resistance and dissent—and pressure from the outside—changed the course of events. And it is no excuse for citizens or the Church or other leaders of the world to say that it would not have worked. For the most part, they did not even try—and that is the shame of a century.

So the millions who watched "Schindler's List" must contemplate, then amid the tears and heavy hearts, the deeper lesson that we carry out of this blood-stained century. Speaking out against injustice, acting to end bigotry, raising our collective consciousness and looking honestly into the unsparing heart of conscience, and standing up for what is right and hopeful. This is the collective burden—the collective burden and I say privilege of all of us who live today. It is a collective responsibility that we must meet—in our own country—and for so many of us, in the other country of our hearts—the land of Israel.

So we need AIPAC's unwavering voice on this long and winding road to peace in the Middle East. And the journey is harder now than it was a year ago, harder than it was a month ago, harder than it was a few weeks or days ago because we must remind the world that peace is more just than a piece of paper; it is the replacement of death with life, of danger and violence with the laughter of children whose playgrounds no longer need to be guarded with guns, Arab or Israeli. Oh yes—the peace process has delivered a certain amount to Israel—diplomatic, economic, and political benefits—but again in a simple truth—it has not delivered full or real security. It is not peace when seven Israel girls are murdered at the Jordanian border. It is not peace when three more innocent people are killed on the eve of Purim in

Tel Aviv, with fifty more injured—among them many children—cut and bleeding from broken glass and nails embedded into the bomb. It is not peace when people cannot get safely on a bus and arrive home to the embrace and joy of family.

No—that is not peace—but I state emphatically—it is a reason why the peace process must go on—not naively, not in a rush, not on a fragile foundation—but it must go on in a genuine search for real peace—and for the real security which defines peace.

So frankly, we all have to work harder, we have to work harder to make real the peaceful dreams of millions of Israelis and millions of others in the world, who look to part of the world for peace. And all of us cannot continue to be held hostage to Hamas and Hezbollah. We must all of us reject the absurd, dishonest and cruel approach—the propaganda, if you will—from some Palestinians—the attempt by some Arafat advisers—to equate terrorist attacks with Israel's decision to construct new housing in Jerusalem, however controversial that decision may be. It is one thing for the Palestinians and others to hear Prime Minister Netanyahu say it, but I want to say it also: Terrorism is an incontrovertible evil, and an unacceptable response. The idea that every bitter dispute between Israelis and the Palestinians can justify Palestinian violence, or justify Arafat's winking at it, or should warrant the release of yet most Hamas leaders, or could excuse the PLO's failure to rewrite its covenant—all this reflects a moral blindness, a failure of courage that only encourages the cowards, the haters and the killers. As Israel is assailed with almost unrelenting fury and Prime Minister Netanyahu is all but demonized by the world press, the parting cry of Schindler—I could have done more—that cry ought to resonate in this room. Are we speaking up enough against a one-sided enforcement of the Oslo Accords? Are the supporters of Israel who did not support Netanyahu now less willing to rebut inaccuracies and attacks than they were when Rabin and Peres were in office? Did too many people just breathe a sign of relief when Israel in a single day carried out the withdrawal from Hebron rather than shouting their support in words, letters and op-eds? Will we demand again and again that Iran, Iraq, and Syria be held accountable for Hezbollah and Hamas? Will we insist, over and over, that our Arab friends must move forward with full diplomatic relations with Israel? Will we make clear that the re-institution of the Arab boycott of Israel is not only morally repugnant but unacceptable to all Americans?

Let me say to you with humility and respect that this all must happen first of all in AIPAC—or it will not happen at all. Now I know that not everyone in this room completely shared the vision of Rabin or Peres about the peace process. Just as I know that not everyone in this room today shares the vision of Prime Minister Netanyahu. Nor is that diversity of opinion here different from what is going on in Israeli living rooms or in the Knesset. There is a distrust of the process, of Arafat, and there is division over how to proceed—or in some quarters whether to proceed at all. But one thing is clear, you know and we know it, an overwhelming majority of people—there and here—seek, work and pray for peace—not a passing illusion—but the reality of a solid, meaningful, secure and reliable peace. As Americans, we owe it to our Israeli partners to stand with them so that they can negotiate from greater strength—to be an ally beside them, not an ally that undermines them. Israel will and should choose its own leaders, its own policy, its own bargaining position; and the United States cannot and should not dictate the outcome.

Let me state it as plainly as I can: The U.N. Security Council has no right to impose insecurity on Israel. President Clinton was right to veto the Security Council resolution on Har Homa—and the United States can and should veto any other similar, one-sided measures that bring discredit on nations such as France and Russia—whose own anti-Semitic records now rebuke their anti-Israel votes.

And I also say to you that for the parties to move ahead—and I believe they will—for the peace to proceed—and I believe it will—AIPAC must be both vigilant and tireless. Legitimate criticism of Israel should be heard, yes. But malicious charges without foundation have no place in our policy debates—as when a shameless Syria sought to blame Israel for intra-Syrian terrorism in Damascus. Last month, on national television, repeated media questions about Israel's alleged failure to carry out its obligations in Hebron were forcefully rebutted by the State Department's Dennis Ross. But they easily could have been accepted by a less knowledgeable guest. It is critical—and this is your role, and ours, as we listen to you—critical that the American public be kept accurately informed about the obligations of Palestinians—and whether they are being fulfilled. What Prime Minister Netanyahu calls lapses in reciprocity are not side issues, but central ones. Such lapses wouldn't be accepted in our arms reduction talks with Yeltsin, they wouldn't be accepted in our trade negotiations with China. How can they be ignored in the life or death arena of the Middle East? Signed agreements have to mean something. They build confidence. They are the road to future negotiations. And broken commitments—or neglected ones—foretell other betrayals to come. Both parties must be held to the same high standard.

In each of my visits to Israel, I have had the privilege of seeing first-hand the special dangers of the Middle East, and of beginning to comprehend the special nature of the Middle East. On one occasion I became an honorary Israeli Air Force pilot when I was allowed to fly an air force jet from the Ovda Airbase. I want you to know it did not come easily. I was frustrated, at one of those terrible, boring luncheons when you're on those journeys, and this great colonel—he was an ace in the war, several times an ace—was sitting next to me, and I'm a pilot and I love to fly every chance I get. And I kept saying, you're sure Tel Aviv won't let me go flying? And finally I persuaded him to make a last phone call, and he came back to me in the middle of a meal, and said to me, "Senator, I hope you haven't eaten too much. We're going flying."

So I raced down to the tarmac, and they had a helmet and a suit for me, and put me in the front seat. He said "I don't have time to do the run-up with you or anything, but the minute we're off the ground, it's your airplane." And I said, boy this guy is trusting. I didn't even tell him if I'd ever flown a jet before. So we took off into the sky, he gave me the airplane the moment we took off, and the next thing I know, he says point-blank into my helmet, "Senator, you are about to go into Egypt airspace." So I immediately ground the stick in and turned, and within a matter of minutes, this United States Senator came close to violating the airspace of Egypt, Jordan, and Syria. Let me tell you something, I learned a magical lesson: The promise of peace must be secure before the promised land is secure on a thin margin of land.

Back on the ground on that first trip, I, like so many of my colleagues, toured the beautiful country from Kibbutz Mizgav Am to Masada to the Golan. I stood in the very

shelter in a kibbutz in the north where children were attacked and I looked at launching sites and impact zones for Katousha rockets. And like many visitors, I was enthralled by Tel Aviv, moved by Jerusalem and inspired by standing above Capernum, looking out over the Sea of Galilee, where I was bold enough to read aloud the Sermon on the Mount to those who were traveling with me. And I met people of stunning commitment, who honestly and vigorously debated the issues as I watched and listened intently. I went as a friend by conviction; I returned a friend at the deepest personal level with new connections, new understanding.

Who would have thought so much would have changed since that first journey of 1986. But still the Middle East remains a place of deep and disturbing contradictions. Israel's oldest Arab peace partner—Egypt—has a press obsessed with Nazi-like images of Jews and Israel. At the same time, a Jordanian soldier murders seven Israeli school girls and Jordan's King Hussein pays a personal, poignant, eloquent and historic shiva call on their families.

Through all these contradictions let no one doubt the importance of the road we are on, for the truth is that Hussein's beautiful gesture to a nation all too used to mourning alone is a symbol of real progress. Without Oslo, it would not have happened. It's not that sympathy calls make the peace process worthwhile; it's that bridges between leaders and their people are being built.

Needless to say, there is a very long journey yet ahead of us, and we must march through criticism abroad, and at home, and internally, and in Israel.

As a soldier in Vietnam, who came home to oppose the war, I must say to you that I don't see that kind of criticism as being unpatriotic. For nations like Israel and America that are founded on principles and not just as places, dissent can be the loyalist act of all, and lively debate the living proof of freedom.

As a democracy, Israel has both the burden and the glory of a vigorous public square. We as Americans must be the truest and best kind of ally—both forthright enough to say what we think—and steadfast enough to stay the course during the hard passages as well as the easy ones.

Herzl's famous words—"If you will it, it is no dream"—signify the promise and the greatest power of Israel—and the hope, after half a century, that a fair and secure peace is finally within reach. For our part, we must leave here more committed than ever to support Israel in the exacting, essential, and sometimes tense search for that dream. I think it's fair to say that the ashes of Holocaust victims were scattered on the wind. But that wind also carries on it their prayers and purpose—above mountains and sea, across hundreds or thousands of miles, so that the pain of history is redeemed in the land of Israel. It is a sacred place—for them, for their people who live there, and for all the world. So let us now resolve again that the day will never come for Israel when the redemption is put at risk—when any of us would ever have to repeat Schindler's cry and say: We could have done more.

I might say to you on a personal note that that imperative has been clear since long before the Holocaust. I learned it and I learned how long it has endured in an emotional moment on top of Masada, when I stood on that great plateau where the oath of new soldiers used to be sworn against the desert backdrop and the test of history. I spent several hours with my guide and friend Yadin Roman. On top, we argued, we debated, at his insistence whether or not in fact Josephus Flavius was correct in his account of the siege—whether these really were the last Jews fighting for

survival—whether they had escaped since no remains were ever found. And we journeyed back and forth through the possibilities and finally, after our journey through history—which we resolved with a vote in favor of history as recorded—Yadin motioned to me and said come over here and stand with those that we were travelling with, and we stood at the edge of the chasm looking out across the desert, across to the mountains at the other side. And we stood as a group, and altogether, at his command, we shouted across the chasm—across the desert—across the silence—Am Yisrael Chai. And back a slow, echoing voice speaking to us through history came the word Am, Yisrael Chai. Israel lives. The State lives. The people of Israel live. And that is the cause of America, it is the cause of people of conscience all across this planet, and that is why I am proud to be here with you tonight.

Mr. DEWINE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

ADOPTION PROMOTION ACT

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I think our friends in the House of Representatives deserve a great deal of praise for what they did yesterday. They passed a bill that would save the lives of many gravely threatened young people in this country. I am referring, of course, to the Adoption Promotion Act of 1997, the Camp-Kennelly legislation, which passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 416 to 5.

For the children in foster care in this country, the average time they spend in foster care is almost 2 years. That is just the average time. These 2 years are often the most important time in that child's development. We need to do everything we can to get these children in safe, stable, permanent, loving adoptive homes.

Why are these children being kept in foster care for so long? I said the average time was 2 years. Sometimes it is 3, 4, 5 years. Sometimes the most important years of their lives are spent in foster care, and sometimes they move from foster home to foster home to foster home. Why do they get shoved from one home to another? Why do they spend so many years in foster care? One reason is that, in some of these cases, the child protective services feel hemmed in by a misinterpretation of a Federal law, a well-intentioned Federal law that this Congress passed in 1980, a law that has done a great deal of good, but a law that contains one provision that I believe has caused a great deal of harm and has caused a great deal of confusion.

Under this 1980 law, the Federal Child Welfare Act, for a State to be eligible for Federal matching funds for foster care expenditures, that State must have a plan for the provision of child welfare services approved by the Secretary of HHS. The State plan must provide, that in each case, reasonable efforts will be made, first, prior to the placement of a child in foster care to prevent or eliminate the need for removal of a child from his home and, second, to make it possible for the child to return to his home.

In other words, Mr. President, no matter what the particular circumstances of a household may be, the State must make reasonable efforts to keep that household, that family together, and then to put it back together if it falls apart.

There is very strong evidence, evidence that I have seen firsthand as I have traveled the State of Ohio and talked to people who are professionals in this field, talked to judges, talked to child services workers, very strong evidence that reasonable efforts have, in some cases, become extraordinary efforts, efforts to keep families together at all costs, efforts to keep families together that are families really in name only. This has resulted in children being put back in abusive homes, put back in situations where no child should have to exist or live.

Every day in this country, three children die of abuse or neglect. Children who are being abused by their parents should simply not be reunified with those parents. That is common sense. The legislation passed yesterday by the House of Representatives makes it clear, by an overwhelming vote, that this is what the House thinks.

Now is the time for the Senate to take action. We have a very good piece of legislation, the Chafee-Rockefeller bill, of which I am honored to be a co-sponsor, that has been introduced in this body. It is a piece of legislation that contains many good provisions. One of the provisions it contains is identical language to what the House passed yesterday to simply say what we all know in our heart was intended by the 1980 act, and that is, yes, we should make reasonable efforts to put families back together, we should try to help them, but—but—when those decisions are made at the local, county level or city level, the people who make those decisions must always put safety and the welfare of that child first. The safety of the child must always be paramount. That is good common sense; it is good legislation.

We are halfway there. Now is the time for the U.S. Senate to complete the action and send that bill on to the President. The President has already said that he supports this language, that he supports this concept, that there is, in fact, a problem. The Senate should act very quickly and move on this legislation and really plug this loophole, which has caused a great deal of pain and many problems for our young people in this country today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENS). The Senator from Missouri.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, May 1 is a special day in the United States of America. It has been designated and observed as a national day of prayer. Citizens across the country—having recognized that those of us in positions of responsibility need the kind of wis-

dom to allow us to make good decisions—have today been observing this National Day of Prayer in our behalf. I rise to thank them.

Abraham Lincoln, in the midst of the crisis that perhaps did more to threaten this country and at the same time, more to unify it than any other crisis in history, continued to have a strong commitment and dedication to the concept of prayer when he called upon the Nation to reserve a time for repentance, for introspection, and for prayer.

This Nation has survived great challenges—yet still faces great challenges. I believe that its success in the face of challenge in large measure is due to the fact that people have prayed.

A couple thousand years ago, when the Apostle Paul was writing a letter to his friend Timothy, he advised Timothy to say, "Pray for each other and pray especially for those who are in authority that we may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all Godliness and honesty."

I think that was good advice 2,000 years ago, and it is good advice today.

I rise today, as we close this day in the U.S. Senate, to say to those Americans who have been a part of this observance, referred to as the "National Day of Prayer," thank you for your prayers and, as a matter of fact, I think all America owes a debt of gratitude to those who have carried the well-being and welfare of this country to God in prayer on a regular basis. It is with that in mind that I believe the National Day of Prayer is a strong symbol that we have prayer all year—on a continuing basis so that we might do things that advance the very cause for which I think God sent his Son to the world—that we might live life and live it more abundantly. That is the true position of Government, that we would create conditions under which people could live and live in greater abundance and greater freedom.

So I take this moment to reflect upon those who have cared enough to pray for us and to extend to them my appreciation for what they have done in our behalf.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPRESSION OF GRATITUDE FOR PATTY MCNALLY, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT PROTOCOL OFFICER

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to express the deep gratitude of the Senate to Ms. Patty McNally, Executive Assistant and Protocol Officer in the sergeant at arms' office, who is retiring after more than 20 years of dedicated public service in the Senate.