many areas including politics and had a unique gift for patchwork quilts and other hand-crafted specialties. Just this past May, Maria participated in the 13th Annual Centennial Reception and was the oldest member of the honored group. "Maintaining a strong faith and an active lifestyle" was her secret to a long and successful life. With five children and dozens of grandchildren and great-grandchildren, Maria's life was full and joyous. It was an honor to have known her.

Maria Morales was an exceptional woman and I am pleased to stand today to pay tribute to my dear friend and join with her daughter, Domitila, granddaughter, Carmen, family, friends, and the Casa Otonal community as they celebrate her life. Her vitality and spirit continues to shine in the many wonderful memories of her that we all share.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President has announced the extension of Normal Trading Relations with the People's Republic of China. I support his decision because I believe that U.S. interests are best served by a stable and open China. However, most importantly, I believe that normal relations with China is the most effective way to convince them to end their human rights abuses and join the international community in support of democracy.

We should demand that China abide by international trade and non-proliferation agreements, cooperate in regional and global peace-keeping security initiatives, and maintain and respect the human rights of the Chinese people.

Our total trade and exports to China has dramatically expanded. The United States maintains a large agricultural trade surplus with China (including Hong Kong), our fourth largest agricultural market. U.S. agricultural exports to China reached almost $2.9 billion in 1998. In addition, engagement has produced significant breakthroughs in opening China's agricultural market.

If the United States chose not to continue normal relations, we would be the loser. China would be more effective in changing its reputation for supporting the international community's and the United States' commitment to the removal of Turkish forces and return of Cypriot sovereignty. Failure to secure a Cyprus solution undermines international law, flouts the UN mission, contravenes stated U.S. foreign policy, and is in conflict with the world community's interest in deterring aggressor states.

If the international community fails to create a just solution to this conflict, we will be implicitly accepting a defeatist premise: that ethnic conflicts are unsolvable and that their use as a pretext for international aggression is acceptable. I reject this doctrine. Events over the past decade in Northern Ireland, in the Middle East, and in the Balkans, have proven that the international community can and should negotiate and work for peace, to put an end to ethnic violence and aggression.

My strong belief in the efficacy of this cause has resulted in my work to eliminate all U.S. aid to Turkey and my cosponsorship of many resolutions urging an end to this abhorrent conflict and injustice. I have also asked President Clinton to become personally involved in the peace negotiations, which are so critical to the resolution in Cyprus. The Clinton Administration has an opportunity in Cyprus to extend its reputation for supporting the international rule of law and brokering peace in conflict-ridden areas.

I will continue to urge this initiative by the Administration and to work hard with my colleagues here in Congress to pursue peace and justice—and I look forward to an end to the Turkish occupation and oppression of the sovereign nation of Cyprus.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to comment on the remarks of my colleague from the other side of the aisle, who criticized Members for support of H. Con. Res. 107. This resolution rejected the conclusions of a recent article published by the American Psychological Association that suggests sexual relationships between adults and children might be positive for children. We passed that resolution 355–0 with 13 Members voting present.

My colleague stated, "I wonder how many of us read the study before we were willing to vote to say that the methodology was flawed. I wonder how many of us were technically competent to make that decision."

I am a medical doctor and I read the meta-analysis in question. This study is based on bad data, as well as, outdated and irrelevant information. The authors cast aside studies by highly respected child-abuse researchers and instead relied heavily on non-published, non-peer reviewed studies. Sixty percent of the article relies on one study conducted in 1950 which did not even focus on physical sexual abuse.

Two of the authors have advanced pro-pedophilia arguments in other forums. One author published an article titled, "Male Intergenerational Intimacy" which questioned the taboo against man-boy love. Another article by the author was published in Paidika—The Journal of Pedophilia which advocates the legalization of sex with "willing" children.

There is nothing untrue or unsubstantiated about these facts.

Yes, the APA does a lot of good work with regard to child abuse. To their credit, the APA recognizes the problem with publishing this article and they are making changes in the peer review process to ensure that future articles consider the social policy implications of articles on controversial topics.

It is an interesting argument that my colleague makes about Members not having the technical expertise to vote on the legislative proposal. Using this reasoning, each Member of Congress would have to recuse themselves for 95 percent of all votes because they deal with matters outside their expertise. That is a ludicrous argument and I would suggest to my colleague that a Member does not need to be trained as a psychologist to understand that pedophilia is wrong.

Pedophiles know that if society cannot demonstrate harm to victims of childhood sexual abuse they will be well on their way to "normalizing" pedophilia.

Hear what one pedophile wrote about the APA study. "For several years now studies have been slowly chipping away at the harm myth. But this study is a major hammer-blow. It represents what is really known about sex with boys, and the conclusion couldn't be clearer: When a boy and a man consent to make love with one another, the experience is positive, or at the very least, neutral. There is, simply, no harm. . . . The genie is absolutely out of the bottle now and nothing in the world will be able to stuff it back in."

Frankly, I am surprised that anyone would defend this study. My colleague even quoted scripture and implied that those who condemned the article on pedophilia were guilty of lynching. I think it is appropriate to remember what the Bible said about people who harm children.