the 1940's, the PTA assisted the war effort by working with the Red Cross and other agencies to help abroad. Meanwhile, the PTA also established the Memorial Scholarship Program to train teachers to better educate our children at home. During the 1980's, the PTA launched its ''Come Back to School'' project to improve parent involvement as well as increase participation in the larger cities. Most recently, the PTA has been instrumental in increasing parent involvement, advocating legislation on behalf of the youth, as well as leading the Citizens Against Vouchers coalition.

The Ohio PTA recognizes the role of parents as primary educators in partnership with the schools with whom we entrust our children. The Ohio PTA acknowledges that we are all parents as long as we carry significant responsibilities for a child's development. Presently, there are 150,000 PTA members in 800 local units throughout the state.

The Ohio PTA plays an important role in striving to maintain the safety, welfare, and education of all of our children in the state of Ohio. Please join me in honoring the Ohio PTA on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary.

MARGARET MARKETA NOVAK

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 2000

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to commend my constituent Margaret Marketa Novak for her dedicated contributions to Holocaust education and remembrance, and acknowledge the recent completion of her autobiography One Left, Just One.

For over 30 years, Ms. Novak has been active in Holocaust issues, as a speaker, an author, and a member of Holocaust survivor support organizations. Her volunteerism and commitment exemplify the belief she notes in her book that ''Surviving is not enough, it's what we do with our lives that counts.''

As the only survivor in a family of nine that perished in the Holocaust, Ms. Novak has lived a challenging life, as so many others who, like Ms. Novak, relied upon faith, fear and courage to survive the ghetto, Auschwitz, the DP camps, and the uncertain trip to settle in the United States.

Although nothing can vindicate the murders of the innocent six million who perished, or reclaim the lost childhood she documents in her book, Ms. Novak's resolve to share this history is a testament to the determination of all of the survivors who struggled to reclaim their lives after the war and put them on record for future generations.

Our community is grateful to Ms. Novak for her devoted service. I extend her my best wishes for the future.

AMBASSADOR DAVID IVRY DISCUSSES ISRAEL'S RESTRAINT IN DEALING WITH THE CURRENT MIDDLE EAST VIOLENCE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the Washington Post published an excellent article by His Excellency David Ivry, ambassador of Israel to the United States. Ambassador Ivry has served as commander of the Israeli Air Force and Deputy Chief of the General Staff. For the past year he has represented Israel in the United States. I want to commend Ambassador Ivry's article to my colleagues in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, all of us regret the tragic deaths which have resulted from the violence in the Middle East. It is a great tragedy that this turmoil has turned the focus from efforts to resolve the conflict peacefully to dealing with a new wave of disorder that undermines the basis for peace between Israelis and Palestinians. The violence is unacceptable, and it is undermining the very basis for peace—the notion that Palestinians and Israelis can live together.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the evening newscasts are giving a false image of the true dimensions and nature of this violence. The carefully orchestrated turmoil and the cynical and tragic use of little children should stand condemned by all of us. It is important that we understand the full significance of what is happening as this disorder continues to threaten stability and the progress that has already been achieved.

Ambassador Ivry has laid out in particularly clear and incisive terms the Israeli interest in achieving a peaceful reconciliation with the Palestinians. He also explains the position and policy of the Israeli government in its effort to deal with the unacceptable levels of Palestinian-orchestrated violence that now threatens to undermine the progress that has been achieved over the past seven years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Ambassador Ivry's article be placed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to give it the careful and thoughtful attention that it deserves.

ISRAEL'S RESTRAINT

By David Ivry The Washington Post, Oct. 27, 2000

The current wave of violence in the Middle East has left more than 100 Palestinians dead, while the number of Israeli fatalities has been relatively small. This uneven casualty ratio has raised questions by some as to whether the Israeli forces are too eager to pull their triggers in response to Palestinian violence. The answer to such concerns is clear: Israel has shown the greatest restraint possible in the face of continued violent provocations, and Israel's forces have made a maximum effort to avoid Palestinian fatalities.

Israel has no interest in the continuation of violence, and our tactical response has been to avoid actions that could lead to escalation. Every Israeli soldier on the ground receives strict orders as to the rules of engagement, which state clearly when it is permissible to use live fire. An Israeli soldier may respond only when shot at first or in a life-threatening situation. In either case his response must be directed at the source of the fire.

On Oct. 12, the day the two Israeli soldiers were brutally lynched in Ramallah, Israel responded by sending helicopters into action in Ramallah and Gaza. Not only were our pilots under strict instructions to surgically strike designated points but Israel also warned the Palestinians to evacuate the specified targets. It was no accident that there were no Palestinian fatalities in the Israeli counterstrike.

Israel's operational procedures for dealing with violent crowds involve the use of tear-gas and rubber bullets. Palestinians are propagating the fallacy that Israeli troops meet street demonstrators with live fire. Unfortunately, we have witnessed many incidents in which armed Palestinians have opened fire on Israelis from street demonstrations—using their fellow Palestinians as human shields. The Palestinian leadership has gone as far as closing the schools and busing children to points of friction, knowingly putting youngsters in harm's way. International treaties clearly condemn the enlisting of children to participate in hostilities. The international community should speak out against this reprehensible exploitation of children for political purposes.

Today's violence is quite different from that of the intifada in the 1980s. Israel then controlled the entire West Bank and Gaza Strip, and Israeli soldiers were stationed inside Palestinian cities.

Today, as a result of the Oslo accords, 40 percent of the territories, including all the population centers, are under Palestinian control with more than 95 percent of Palestinians living directly under the rule of the Palestinian Authority. Our forces sit outside the population centers at points agreed to in the Israeli-Palestinian interim agreements. For violent incidents to erupt, Palestinians must seek out those forces or Israeli civilian targets.

During the intifada, our forces had to deal primarily with violent demonstrations. Currently, Israeli soldiers face armed Palestinian forces, either the official Palestinian security or the Tanzim militia (which, according to the interim agreements, should not have weapons at all). Palestinian gunmen have opened fire on Israelis in hundreds of incidents. Pictures of Palestinian boys with slingshots do not accurately reflect this new reality on the ground.

The ultimate irony of the current situation is that Prime Minister Ehud Barak has shown unprecedented flexibility in the peace process. The Palestinians, rather than opting to negotiate, chose to revert to violence. It was the Palestinian side that reneged on the cease-fire brokered by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in Paris, and it was the Palestinian side that failed to implement the deal brokered by President Clinton at Sharm el-Sheikh. Israel did not want, seek or encourage this round of fighting. The questions must be asked: Which side has acted to contain and to end the violence, and which side has not?

The truth about the ratio of Palestinian to Israeli deaths is that Israelis have been actively seeking to limit fatal casualties in this conflict while, unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the Palestinian side. As retired Gen. Wesley K. Clark wrote recently: ''for the Palestinians, every casualty, even their own, can be a strategic gain.'' As long as the Palestinian leadership acts on the assumption that there is a net political advantage in bloodshed, surely they, and those in the Arab world who encourage this violent strategy, should be held accountable for the appalling and unnecessary loss of life over the past four weeks.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 2000

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 29, 2000 I was unavoidably detained from presence in the House. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: