

producers, and its recommendations have been widely praised within the agricultural community.

The success of the advisory committee was in no small measure attributable to its membership. The panel consisted of 21 individuals from across the country who represent a cross section of the livestock industry. It included farmers, ranchers, meat packers, processors, poultry growers, retailers, and economists.

While all committee members should be commended for their determination to get to the bottom of the livestock concentration issue, I want to single out for special mention the two members from South Dakota: Herman Schumacher and Tyrone Moos.

Herman Schumacher, who served as vice-chair of the advisory committee, lives in Herried, SD. He owns and operates the Herried Livestock Auction, is past president of the South Dakota Livestock Auction Markets Association, and is part owner of a cattle feedlot.

Without question, Herman is one of the most tenacious and persuasive advocates for cattle producers I have ever met. He understands American agriculture and never stops looking for ways to address problems facing farmers and ranchers. Herman's expertise and leadership were instrumental to the development of the committee's consensus findings and recommendations. In addition, he helped craft additional minority views that are more prescriptive than the consensus views in outlining responses to problems identified in the report.

Tyrone Moos is a grain and livestock producer from Philip, SD, who also serves as director of the Harvest States Cooperative. Tyrone's expertise in both grain and livestock issues were invaluable to the committee's deliberations.

One focus of the committee's review was the impact of concentration in the agricultural transportation industry. The century-old problem of insufficient access to rail cars contributes to the determination of the final price a producer receives for his or her commodities, and Tyrone's experience helped shape the committee's findings in this area. Additionally, Tyrone's influence was evident in the tone and substance of the final recommendations for both the consensus and minority views sections of the report.

When Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman called to solicit Herman's and Tyrone's service on this important committee, it would have been easy for them to decline the invitation. The commitment and sacrifice asked of them was significant.

The Department of Agriculture did not offer compensation, not even for travel expenses. But it did ask for a significant commitment of time. Herman, Tyrone and their colleagues served countless hours on the panel's work—time that could have been spent looking after their own business interests or with their families.

The advisory committee's inquiry directed needed attention to the serious

problem of stagnating cattle prices, provided insights on the nature of that problem and offered recommendations for what might be done about it. Farmers and ranchers in South Dakota and elsewhere should be thankful for that effort.

The work of the Advisory Committee on Agricultural Concentration is done. It is now up to our Nation's policy-makers to evaluate the panel's findings and act on its recommendations. I look forward to taking the baton passed on by Herman Schumacher and Tyrone Moos, and I thank them for pointing the way to a solution to the problem of concentration in agriculture.

ISRAELI ELECTION ABOUT DEFINITION OF PEACE

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, the campaign for Israel's first directly elected Prime Minister not only brought a victory for Benjamin Netanyahu but a defeat for the mistaken idea that peace can only be defined from a liberal perspective.

While two well-qualified candidates with different ideologies each articulated their vision for the country, many in the American media—those who reported on the campaign and the experts journalists chose to interview—hid behind stereotypes and missed the real point of the election. At its very core, the campaign was not about whether there should be peace but how to define it.

The American media told us the issue was simply this: Shimon Peres, the liberal, wanted peace. Benjamin Netanyahu, the conservative, didn't. Implied in this ridiculous statement is the wrong assumption that only liberals understand peace.

In the days since the election, the American media aren't quite certain how to characterize Mr. Netanyahu. When Mr. Netanyahu recently expressed his desire for Israel to continue to seek peace with its Arab neighbors—a position he has advocated all along—a Washington Post story identified him as "kinder and gentler."

The media's failure to understand Benjamin Netanyahu and his conservative principles of real peace—real security underscores the differences in how liberals and conservatives view foreign policy.

The left believes peace is simply the absence of conflict. To achieve peace, the left will do whatever is necessary and in many cases give up whatever is necessary simply to maintain the peace.

Conservatives believe peace without freedom is false. Only through the guiding principle that freedom is the core of all human progress can a nation build a lasting peace. After all, what is peace without freedom? What is peace if it means living in constant fear? In Cuba and China today, there is peace, but certainly no freedom.

When any nation builds its foreign policy on a foundation of freedom, democracy, justice, and human rights, true peace and hope will inevitably prevail.

During the 1980's, the left and the media soundly criticized Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher when their policies boldly stated that negotiations with the Soviet Union must be carried out from a position of strength and security . . . not appeasement.

History proved them right. Freedom won. The Berlin Wall—a symbol of tyranny and oppression—crumbled and communism was replaced by capitalism.

Even if many in the American media apparently believe in the ludicrous claim that appeasement leads to peace, Israeli Jews—a majority of whom voted for Netanyahu—correctly understand that protecting freedom is essential to preserving peace.

In his analysis of the election, A.M. Rosenthal of the New York Times said it best when he wrote: "the majority was not voting against peace—the very idea is idiocy—but for the hope that Mr. Netanyahu and a Likud-led coalition might create a peace they could trust while they slept, not just while they stood at arms."

In a region where Israel's neighbors have vowed its destruction, where thousands of missiles in other countries are pointed at Israel's cities, where well-financed terrorists threaten to murder and frighten Israel's citizens, appeasement through weakness will only invite more violence, more bloodshed and inevitably a loss of freedom and peace.

We all want peace for Israel—a shining jewel of democracy in a region where freedom is often unwelcome. Choosing the best road for achieving that peace is the task that awaits Benjamin Netanyahu. He understands—as well as the overwhelming majority of Israeli Jews who voted for him—that only when Israel is secure, can Israel truly be free and at peace.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at this time when the fiscal year 1997 appropriations level for the National Endowment for the Arts is being determined, I would like to illustrate the importance of the arts to the education of our children and to the growth of the local economy through two examples from my home State of Rhode Island.

The May 23 issue of *Nature* describes the Starting With the Arts [SWAP] Program for 96 first-graders in four Pawtucket, RI, classrooms. The program is based on the internationally recognized Kodaly curriculum that emphasizes musical and visual arts skills. After 7 months, the SWAP children scored better in math than their counterparts who had standard classes—and equally well in reading—even though their kindergarten scores indicated that they were behind. At the end of second grade, math comprehension and