

Tunas and recommend actions the President could take against such a nation.

This is a very important component of H.R. 716. U.S. fishermen have been doing an outstanding job when it comes to conserving the highly migratory species under the jurisdiction of the Convention. I believe every nation, which is a member of the Convention, should share in the burden of conservation and, if they choose not to, should be held accountable to the other member nations.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 716 and urge my colleagues to vote aye on this important conservation bill, which makes a number of positive contributions to the health of various fish stocks around the world.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to being note to what the gentleman from New Jersey has just said, this is truly a sound piece of conservation legislation. This makes sense. Unfortunately, many of the groups that support the conservation movements bring forth to this floor and talk about topics that are not true scientific conservation, and this is one. It is bipartisan supported and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 716.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 716, the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

JERUSALEM EMBASSY ACT OF 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1322) to provide for the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Each sovereign nation, under international law and custom, may designate its own capital.

(2) Since 1950, the city of Jerusalem has been the capital of the State of Israel.

(3) The city of Jerusalem is the seat of Israel's President, Parliament, and Supreme Court, and the site of numerous government ministries and social and cultural institutions.

(4) The city of Jerusalem is the spiritual center of Judaism, and is also considered a holy city by the members of other religious faiths.

(5) From 1948–1967, Jerusalem was a divided city and Israeli citizens of all faiths as well as Jewish citizens of all states were denied access to holy sites in the area controlled by Jordan.

(6) In 1967, the city of Jerusalem was reunited during the conflict known as the Six Day War.

(7) Since 1967, Jerusalem has been a united city administered by Israel, and persons of all religious faiths have been guaranteed full access to holy sites within the city.

(8) This year marks the 28th consecutive year that Jerusalem has been administered as a unified city in which the rights of all faiths have been respected and protected.

(9) In 1990, the Congress unanimously adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 106, which declares that the Congress "strongly believes that Jerusalem must remain an undivided city in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected".

(10) In 1992, the United States Senate and House of Representatives unanimously adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 113 of the One Hundred Second Congress to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem, and reaffirming congressional sentiment that Jerusalem must remain an undivided city.

(11) The September 13, 1993, Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements lays out a timetable for the resolution of "final status" issues, including Jerusalem.

(12) The Agreement on the Gaza Strip and the Jericho Area was signed May 4, 1994, beginning the five-year transitional period laid out in the Declaration of Principles.

(13) In March of 1995, 93 members of the United States Senate signed a letter to Secretary of State Warren Christopher encouraging "planning to begin now" for relocation of the United States Embassy to the city of Jerusalem.

(14) In June of 1993, 257 members of the United States House of Representatives signed a letter to the Secretary of State Warren Christopher stating that the relocation of the United States Embassy to Jerusalem "should take place no later than . . . 1999".

(15) The United States maintains its embassy in the functioning capital of every country except in the case of our democratic friend and strategic ally, the State of Israel.

(16) The United States conducts official meetings and other business in the city of Jerusalem in de facto recognition of its status as the capital of Israel.

(17) In 1996, the State of Israel will celebrate their 3,000th anniversary of the Jewish presence in Jerusalem since King David's entry.

SEC. 3. TIMETABLE.

(a) STATEMENT OF THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) Jerusalem should remain an undivided city in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected;

(2) Jerusalem should be recognized as the capital of the State of Israel; and

(3) the United States Embassy in Israel should be established in Jerusalem no later than May 31, 1999.

(b) OPENING DETERMINATION.—Not more than 50 percent of the funds appropriated to the Department of State for fiscal year 1999 for "Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad" may be obligated until the Secretary of State determines and reports to Congress that the United States Embassy in Jerusalem has officially opened.

SEC. 4. FISCAL YEARS 1996 AND 1997 FUNDING.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 1996.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for "Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad" for the Department of State in fiscal year 1996, not less than \$25,000,000 should be made available until expended only for construction and other costs associated with the establishment of the United States Embassy in Israel in the capital of Jerusalem.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 1997.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for "Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad" for the Department of State in fiscal year 1997, not less than \$75,000,000 should be made available until expended only for construction and other costs associated with the establishment of the United States Embassy in Israel in the capital of Jerusalem.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate detailing the Department of State's plan to implement this Act. Such report shall include—

(1) estimated dates of completion for each phase of the establishment of the United States Embassy, including site identification, land acquisition, architectural, engineering and construction surveys, site preparation, and construction; and

(2) an estimate of the funding necessary to implement this Act, including all costs associated with establishing the United States Embassy in Israel in the capital of Jerusalem.

SEC. 6. SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.

At the time of the submission of the President's fiscal year 1997 budget request, and every six months thereafter, the Secretary of State shall report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on the progress made toward opening the United States Embassy in Jerusalem.

SEC. 7. PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER.

(a) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—(1) Beginning on October 1, 1998, the President may suspend the limitation set forth in section 3(b) for a period of six months if he determines and reports to Congress in advance that such suspension is necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States.

(2) The President may suspend such limitation for an additional six month period at the end of any period during which the suspension is in effect under this subsection if the President determines and reports to Congress in advance of the additional suspension that the additional suspension is necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States.

(3) A report under paragraph (1) or (2) shall include—

(A) a statement of the interests affected by the limitation that the President seeks to suspend; and

(B) a discussion of the manner in which the limitation affects the interests.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF WAIVER TO AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—If the President exercises the authority set forth in subsection (a) in a fiscal year, the limitation set forth in section 3(b) shall apply to funds appropriated in the following fiscal year for the purpose set forth in such section 3(b) except to the extent that the limitation is suspended in such following

fiscal year by reason of the exercise of the authority in subsection (a).

SEC. 8. DEFINITION.

As used in this Act, the term "United States Embassy" means the offices of the United States diplomatic mission and the residence of the United States chief of mission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation pending before us today, S. 1322 would move the United States Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This has been a priority of many in Congress for decades. Each time the issue was raised, successive administrations maintained that Congress was infringing on the Executive's power to conduct foreign policy, or that the hopes and dreams for peace in the Middle East rested on this one issue.

Under the Speaker's leadership, and that of Senate majority leader DOLE, legislation was introduced which is finally seeing the light of day, and which we fully expect will become law. Original sponsors of H.R. 1595, Speaker GINGRICH's legislation, in addition to myself, Mr. HORN, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WELLER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MCINTOSH, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ARCHER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NUSSLE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BARR, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

This measure, the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995, makes a series of findings, concluding with stipulation that it is the policy of the United States that "Jerusalem should remain an undivided city in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected; Jerusalem should be recognized as the capital of the state of Israel; and the United States Embassy in Israel should be established in Jerusalem no later than May 31, 1999."

In negotiations with the administration and other opponents on the original bill, this revised measure does contain a 6 month, renewal Presidential waiver based on national security interests. I question this inclusion, since the waiver authority does not end on a date certain, and the standard being employed is inappropriate.

Congress does not intend for the President to utilize this waiver indefinitely, nor should the employment of such a waiver, on national security grounds, be invoked lightly. Frankly, it is preposterous that a national security waiver is being employed. The national security interests of the United States are not threatened because our Embassy is located 40 miles from where Congress and the American people believe it ought to be. The legislation is

clear that congressional intent is for our Embassy in Jerusalem to be established no later than May 31, 1999.

This bill is important because it rectifies an imbalance in our relationship with Israel—a nation that has shown itself to be, time and time again, the best friend that the United States has in the world, bar none.

When Saddam Hussein was raining Scud missiles throughout Israel, Israel did not retaliate, abiding by the United States request not to do so. To those cynics who may believe that Israel complied because of United States foreign assistance, I say—no moral nation, especially one that was born out of the ashes of the Holocaust as Israel was, will sacrifice its people for any sum of money.

But, a nation that has proven its friendship and reliability over the decades, as Israel has, often suppressing its own national interests in favor of ours, especially when the very lives of its own citizens is at stake, deserves our particular American brand of loyalty. There is nothing more basic than recognizing the capital of a country, which is why I strongly endorse this bill.

Since 1967, when Israel reunified Jerusalem, access for the three major religions, an American priority, became the norm. It is only under Israel that each religion has had free access to their holy places as well as control over them. In 1969, Secretary of State William Rogers modified United States policy further by stating that Jerusalem should remain a unified city, a point made repeatedly by subsequent administrations.

Administration officials maintain that the United States should not move our Embassy until negotiations have taken place on Jerusalem. This policy infers that such a move would demonstrate a preference for one of the parties, and that the U.S. role as honest broker would be compromised. But, United States policy on Jerusalem changed both before and after the onset of the peace talks in 1991.

In January 1989, the United States signed a 99-year lease with the Government of Israel at \$1 per year for a 14-acre site in southwest Jerusalem. The Middle East peace process did not collapse when it was disclosed that the site had been chosen. That action, 6 years ago, did not prevent the Madrid peace talks from convening, did not prevent them from moving forward, and did not prevent the various agreements Israel signed with the PLO or its peace treaty with Jordan.

Another departure from previous U.S. policy took place in March 1994. In prior instances, the United States had supported U.N. resolutions claiming Jerusalem to be "occupied territory". That month the United States insisted on voting paragraph by paragraph on U.N. Resolution 904, considered in the aftermath of the Hebron massacre.

On language pertaining to Jerusalem, the United States abstained. United

States Ambassador to the United Nations Madeleine Albright explained that Jerusalem was improperly included in the resolution as occupied territory and that the United States would continue to oppose including Jerusalem in this category.

It is not a major departure from existing U.S. policy to support moving the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem by 1999, which is what the legislation being considered today proposes to do. The administration, Israel, Jordan, and the PLO have all stated that the peace process is irreversible.

This past spring, along with other Members of the House, I circulated a letter to Secretary of State Christopher, expressing support for Jerusalem as the undivided capital of Israel, noting that with negotiations on Jerusalem expected to begin in May 1996, discussion should begin in order to move the United States Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem by May 1999, when the negotiations are expected to end. Two Hundred fifty-seven Members of the House signed that letter, another resounding measure of support from Congress to move the embassy.

Unfortunately, no response was received from the Secretary of State, and no attempt at outreach to discuss the letter's contents was made by the administration.

Congress today has the opportunity of expressing its support through the adoption of this legislation that would relocate our embassy to Jerusalem no later than 1999. I urge my colleague's strong support for this legislation, despite the inclusion of the waiver language. Moving our embassy in Israel is something the United States should have done in 1948. We have an historic opportunity today to right a wrong, to rectify an imbalance against one of our staunchest allies. Accordingly, I urge strong support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose S. 1322, the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995.

I do so reluctantly because I share the goal of the legislation—eventually moving our embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, which is and has been Israel's capital since the founding of the state in 1948.

I do so reluctantly also because the bill before us is a vast improvement over the bill introduced by the Speaker and the Senate majority leader a few months ago. It now contains a Presidential waiver, which allows the President to delay relocating the embassy if he decides it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so.

I. PROBLEMS WITH PROCESS

I am deeply disturbed about the manner in which the bill comes to the floor today.

The House cannot be proud of the process we are following: No hearings were held; no committee consideration occurred; the administration was not

given a chance to state its case before the Members; few Members will be allowed to speak today; no amendments are in order; the bill was placed on the suspension calendar without consulting the minority; and no opportunity has been given to assess the impact of this bill on the fragile peace process.

In the past, decisions about whether bills would be considered under suspension of the rules were a matter of comity. The majority's conference rules specifically require that the minority agree before bills are placed on the suspension calendar.

Those rules were violated here.

We demean the role of the House in the making of American foreign policy by the quick and cursory handling of this sensitive and difficult issue.

The politics of this bill. This bill is being rushed through the House today. We should understand why.

The President has not requested it. No emergency requires immediate legislative action. A decision about where to locate U.S. diplomatic missions is inherently an executive branch decision—it goes to the President's constitutional responsibilities for the conduct of diplomacy.

The Government of Israel has not requested it. There is no urgency about this issue for Israel, either. Jerusalem is and has been Israel's capital since the founding of the State, regardless of where the U.S. Embassy is located.

This bill is being rushed through the Congress today for reasons of domestic politics, not foreign policy. The chief sponsors of this bill simply want to present this bill to the Prime Minister of Israel and the Mayor of Jerusalem when they arrive for a ceremony in the Capitol rotunda tomorrow.

This bill is a classic congressional foreign policy maneuver. We pass this bill to win political and financial support.

Yet we in Congress are unwilling to act decisively. This bill sets a date for the transfer of the Embassy. Then, a few sentences later, it steps back and hands the problem to the President by giving him a waiver.

We have it both ways. We pretend that we are acting, but we are really tossing the problem into the President's lap with a waiver. We get the domestic political advantage, but the President must take the responsibility.

II. PROBLEMS WITH SUBSTANCE

The final status of Jerusalem is not an isolated problem. It is part of the entire web of issues in the Middle East conflict. Those issues must be resolved in the context of a just and lasting settlement of the conflict. It must be resolved by the parties themselves.

I quote from Secretary Christopher:

There is no issue related to the Arab-Israeli negotiations that is more sensitive than Jerusalem. It is precisely for this reason that any effort by Congress to bring it to the forefront is ill-advised and potentially very damaging to the success of the peace process.

The issue of Jerusalem has been left for the final status negotiations, which

start in May 1996. The Congress should not jeopardize negotiations on this key issue, which we may do by this bill. Jerusalem has been left until last: Because of the strong emotions it engenders; because of the controversy it promotes; and because of the necessity to build confidence among the parties in any proposed solution of the Jerusalem issue.

Unilateral efforts to predetermine a particular outcome for Jerusalem has the potential to damage the peace process. That is precisely the risk we run today.

A few examples are worth noting:

In 1978, the Camp David negotiations nearly came unglued when the parties—the United States, Israel, and Egypt—tried to hammer out a simple joint statement on Jerusalem;

In 1980, Israel proclaimed the Jerusalem law which made Jerusalem Israel's eternal and undivided capital. It was, from Israel's viewpoint, a natural and right step. But what happened? Thirteen of the fifteen embassies then in Jerusalem moved out;

In 1984, Congress considered several resolutions to relocate the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem. According to the Israeli press, Prime Ministers Begin and Shamir, successively, asked key Senators involved to desist, lest the ensuing political storm work to Israel's detriment;

More recently, the Israeli Government attempted to confiscate land in the Jerusalem area. Once confronted with the damage this move did to the credibility of the peace process, the Israeli Government backtracked. The Israelis simply misjudged the Jordanian reaction and the fragility of the peace process when the issue of Jerusalem was pushed to center stage.

The point of reciting these examples is to show that unilateral and provocative actions on Jerusalem can hurt the peace process and Israel's interests.

At this critical juncture in the peace process, when progress is being made, all sides should seek to avoid provocative acts: The Government of Israel has now resolved to avoid confiscation of Arab land in Jerusalem for housing purposes; the Palestinian Authority, too, should avoid provocation involving, for example, trying to use buildings in Jerusalem for its own activities; and the United States should step back from this resolution and other acts which can disrupt the peace talks.

The peace process represents the best chance for a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. I want it to go forward. I do not want to put obstacles in the way, or to make the tasks of the negotiators more difficult.

I am sometimes frustrated by the slow pace of the peace process. But I believe, there is no substitute for the fragile—and so far successful—process we now are trying to promote.

The daily interaction of Jews and Arabs in Jerusalem—and the acknowledged religious rights of Jews, Muslims, and Christians in the heart of the

city—require a solution based on mutual trust. Confidence between Israelis and Palestinians is building slowly. Let's not risk tearing it apart with ill-timed action on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, Jerusalem is the proper location for the U.S. Embassy. It is not a question of whether: it is a question of when. I share the goal of this resolution. But I also feel strongly that setting a rigid timetable for moving the Embassy ignores the realities of the peace process. Timetables are markers the parties set to try to move the peace process forward.

Furthermore, we should be careful about where we put an embassy. This bill is silent on this key point. There could well be serious repercussions throughout the Islamic world from building an embassy on land claimed as Islamic Trust, or Waqf land, considered sacred by Muslims. This issue will have to be addressed.

We should declare our intention, which has been the clear policy of eight successive Presidents, to move the embassy to Jerusalem as soon as its status as Israel's capital is confirmed by a peace agreement—and to reserve our right to recognize that status if the peace process collapses.

For now, our policy should remain unchanged. Our policy has made an extraordinary contribution to the peace process. The labors of many Presidents are now bearing fruit. Our policy should continue to be based on strong support for Israel's security, coupled with our role as a credible mediator.

Let's not make a difficult peace process even more difficult.

I urge a "no" vote on S. 1322.

□ 1645

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for yielding and for his lifetime commitment to the state of Israel and to peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, with due respect to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], who always presents the most persuasive arguments, I rise in strong support of relocating the U.S. Embassy in Israel to its ancient capital in Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, for 3,000 years, Jerusalem has been the cultural, religious, and spiritual capital of the Jewish people—and yet our 200-year-old Nation still does not afford it the proper dignity virtually every other nation enjoys. In fact, Israel is the only country in the world where the United States neither recognizes the designated capital of the host country nor has our embassy located in that city.

Let me remind my colleagues, no matter what happens as the peace process unfolds, Jerusalem will remain the capital of Israel.

We must bring an end to this 50-year debate about when is the right moment to move the embassy to Jerusalem.

Tomorrow, Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin will participate in a congressional ceremony in the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol to celebrate the 3,000th anniversary of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. What better time than now for Israel's strongest supporter to finally acknowledge that Jerusalem is the eternal, undivided capital of Israel and to begin the process of relocating our embassy there.

I call on my colleagues today to make a clear statement to one of our strongest allies—and support this resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1322, the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Implementation Act.

Israel is the only country in the world where the United States does not maintain its embassy in the host nation's declared capital. It is now time for the United States to accept Jerusalem as Israel's capital and to move the U.S. Embassy accordingly.

Israel has never wavered from its position that Jerusalem is its capital. Jerusalem is Israel's seat of government—the president, the prime minister, and the supreme court are located in the capital city of Jerusalem. The reunification of Jerusalem under Israeli sovereignty and its restoration as the capital of Israel is of utmost importance to the Jewish people in Israel—as well as to all friends of Israel around the world. As a matter of duty and principle, the United States must take a leadership role and support Jerusalem's permanent status as the capital of Israel and locate the U.S. Embassy there.

Furthermore, I reject that this bill will undermine the peace process. The Israeli Government has never committed itself to opening up to negotiation the issue of its sovereignty over unified Jerusalem. Israel has always asserted that Jerusalem is its capital, and it is unrealistic for anyone to believe that Israel will compromise on the issue. In fact, I believe that the reluctance of the United States to locate its embassy in Jerusalem is more likely to undermine the peace process. It implies that even Israel's closest allies might be open to the idea of redividing the city or challenging Israel's sovereignty there.

Again, as a world leader, the United States must act now and move the United States Embassy to Jerusalem—the capital of Israel.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], ranking member, my friend,

and someone whom I admire, for this time, but I must disagree with the gentleman and rise in support of this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget something: For any of the time that Israel has had control of any portion of Jerusalem, it has been open. The world's holy places have been open. When the Arab nations had control of Jerusalem between 1948 and 1967, no Jew was allowed to visit any of those holy places, and many are important to the Jewish religion, as well as the Christian and Islamic religions.

Mr. Speaker, whenever I went to Israel and would have to meet with American officials and leave Jerusalem and go to Tel Aviv, it was embarrassing. It was humiliating. It was wrong.

As has been said before, it is a nation's sovereignty to choose its capital. Israel has chosen Jerusalem. It is about time the United States went along.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES].

(Mr. FORBES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time is right for the action of this Congress, both this House and the other body, moving forward to embrace the relocation of the United States Embassy to the Holy City of Jerusalem. It is the time to do it. I wholeheartedly embrace this legislation and think it is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, we need to send a signal that this embassy, which is so critical in such a critical part of the world, should be located in the Holy City. I am very honored to rise in support of the action today and look for its swift and prompt passage, and urge the administration to embrace the tenets of this bill and support it as well.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, we should not be jeopardizing the prospects for peace for the sake of political posturing.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Presidential candidate that is pushing this legislation used to be opposed to this move. What compelling reason is there to depart from our policy on Jerusalem that has served both Republican and Democratic administrations for over 45 years?

Mr. Speaker, since President Truman, this Nation has stuck firmly to the policy that Jerusalem's final status could only be determined by negotiation. Now, we have a chance for lasting peace through United States-sponsored negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. In these peace talks sometime next year the permanent status negotiations on Jerusalem will occur.

Mr. Speaker, both the Palestinians and the Israelis recognize that this issue must be deferred to the end of the peace process in order to make the progress that has been made to date. This is not the time, unilaterally, for the United States, contrary to the desire of Israel and the Palestinians, to begin the process of moving the capital to Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, do not do this to Prime Minister Rabin and do not do it to the peace process.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to emphasize that this bill will not damage the peace process. In fact, it complements the peace process in terms of when construction would actually begin on the embassy and when it would actually be completed.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to stress that an undivided Jerusalem needs to be recognized as the capital of Israel and that our embassy should be moved there. This move is long overdue. Particularly now, with Jerusalem's 3,000th anniversary as the capital of Israel, I think it is time to support it and support it on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, I would stress that this is not a Republican bill; it is not a Democratic bill; it is a bipartisan bill and will, I think, complement the peace process and not take away from it in any way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bill, which establishes a time-frame for the United States embassy in Israel to be relocated to Jerusalem.

I, along with many of my colleagues, have been fighting for this relocation for many years now. It is fitting that as we celebrate the 3,000th anniversary of King David's establishment of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, we will finally pass this bill to move our embassy to Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, Jerusalem is the capital of Israel, and it shall always remain the capital of Israel. Yet Israel is the only country in which the United States embassy is not located in the capital. This is not right.

By having our embassy anywhere other than Jerusalem, we are sending mixed signals about the United States' position on Jerusalem as the capital of the Jewish homeland. This is not the type of message we should be sending. Our position should be unequivocal: the United States recognizes Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this sensible bill that puts into law what we have been talking about for all of these years.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO].

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1322—the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Improvement Act.

Mr. Speaker, Jerusalem has been a United City, administered by Israel since 1967. For 28 years, it has been a city in which the rights of all faiths have been respected and protected. It is not only the historic center of Judaism, but it is clearly the functioning capital of Israel.

Yet Jerusalem is the only functioning capital in which the United States does not maintain its embassy.

Mr. Speaker, Israel is a proven friend of the United States. It is a strategic ally and a democratic state. The United States should recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and as such, should begin construction on, and open, its U.S. Embassy in the city of Jerusalem as soon as is practical. This bill accomplishes that goal and I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California, [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there are three things to commend it. First of all, it reflects a bipartisan compromise on the issue, and it is my view, absolutely, that the more bipartisanship we can have in this institution, the better.

Second of all, it recognizes something which was, is, and will be the fact, and that is that Jerusalem is the capital of the State of Israel. It is very important that everyone understand that Jerusalem was, is, and will be the capital of the State of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, third, it allows for flexibility in the timing and manner of the move of the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, consistent with progress on the peace talks. It is imperative that we allow the peace process to go forward and do nothing to undermine it.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the resolution and urge all our colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1595, the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Implementation Act.

First, the bill reflects a bipartisan approach to the issue—something essential to effective policy.

Second, the bill officially acknowledges that Jerusalem is and should always be the capital of the State of Israel. I have always supported a unified Jerusalem under Israeli rule, and note that this year the world celebrates the 3000th anniversary of King David's establishment of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. In this century, after suffering one of the greatest tragedies in history, the Jewish people have finally been able to return to Israel, and to call Jerusalem their own. By moving the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem, America reaffirms the success of that struggle, and the incomparable friendship between our Nation and the State of Israel.

Third, the bill carefully permits the time and manner for moving our Embassy to take into account developments in the peace process now underway. The Clinton and Rabin administrations have made tremendous strides in recent days, and it would be counter to the interests of both nations to destabilize that process for the sake of a timetable to move an embassy.

I strongly support moving the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem, and urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, in the Roman Empire the idea of Rome was more than it was simply a city. It was a symbol of its power and its majesty. The time when Britain rose to prominence, London was more than simply its largest collection of people. It was the seat of its merchant and industrial power.

So with Israel. Jerusalem is more simply than a place where its citizens live. Jerusalem is a symbol of the Jewish State; the capital of its faith, not only its nation.

The United States plays an important role in this great truth, this special role of Jerusalem to Israel and to the Jewish people, because America is not an equal among the families of nations. We set a standard. So, with 184 other nations, the presence of an American Ambassador, the flying of our flag, is an important recognition of the legitimacy of those governments and the place of its power.

Yet, today, Mr. Speaker, though the United States was the first Nation in the world to recognize the state of Israel, our Ambassador is absent from the seat of its capital.

□ 1700

This is more than a matter of prestige. It is also an important matter of political power. Unless and until an American Ambassador sits in Jerusalem, this matter will be misunderstood and misinterpreted by all those who still have hostile intent against the Jewish State. This resolution sets the matter right, that America will stand with Israel.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

(Mr. RAHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I rise in vehement opposition to this legislation.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, it is not hard to understand the passions on both sides of this issue.

Jerusalem is sacred to Jews, Muslims, and Christians—and we should respect the rights of all religions to honor Jerusalem as a holy place.

But this bill today is the wrong move—at the wrong time.

Not only will it disrupt the peace process;

Not only could it lead to an explosion of passions on the West Bank and Gaza; If we pass this bill today, we may very well put the lives of innocent Israelis, Palestinians, and Jordanians at risk;

That is what our negotiators in the Middle East tell us today—and I believe we should heed their warnings.

Mr. Speaker, we have made great strides toward peace in the Middle East the past few years.

As a nation, we have historically supported Israel. At the same time, America has been able to play a strong role in these negotiations because we've been seen as something of an honest broker.

If we vote to move our Embassy today—we would be siding more directly with one side on one of the major issues in the peace process. And I believe we could disrupt negotiations entirely.

Mr. Speaker, the question of Jerusalem must be resolved. But it can only be resolved through honest discussion and negotiation in the context of the peace process.

The fact is, every country but two is keeping its embassy in Tel Aviv—pending the outcome of negotiations.

Every President and every Secretary of State since the 1950s has said that the future of Jerusalem must be worked out in negotiations.

The Government of Israel itself says that this issue must be worked out in negotiations.

The leaders of Israel have shown tremendous courage and vision in embracing the peace process. Passing this bill will be a step backwards.

Mr. Speaker, we should not try to resolve 3,000 years of history with 40 minutes of debate under suspension of the House rules.

This bill weakens our hand—undercuts our effectiveness—and destroys the trust we have worked so hard to build in the peace process.

It is the wrong move—at the wrong time—and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join with my colleagues in support of the legislation which will recognize for the first time that Jerusalem is the appropriate place for our Embassy, the capital of Israel. In every other country across the world, the United States has its Embassy in the capital of the country; not so, of course, in Israel.

This will send a clear signal to everyone around the world that we regard Israel as one of the most important allies we have, a country that has stood the test of time in its restraint during recent conflicts, not that long ago in the Middle East, a country that is the only democracy in the Middle East, a country that has been America's best

friend. There is no better substantive or symbolic item that I think could come before this Congress today than to have us approve the legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I express myself in opposition to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, with no hearings, no report, no adequate consideration of this legislation in committee the House is taking up legislation passed just today in the Senate.

This is no way to legislate.

It disregards the normal, correct, and proper practices of the House. It, like other recent actions in this body, raises questions of the propriety of the process here.

Adoption of this legislation at this time raises real fears as to the continued viability of the peace process in the Middle East.

I do not take the view as to where our Embassy in Israel should be located. Perhaps we should decide that it should be located in Jerusalem, but only if we are satisfied such action is fully consonant with our national interests, and in the interest of peace in the area.

The peace process is ongoing. This Nation is subsidizing the Israeli economy to the amount of more than \$3 billion per year, and have been doing so for years. We are subsidizing other countries with billions more of our tax payers dollars.

A peace process, pedaled, pushed, and driven by our efforts goes on. What happens to that process if this legislation is passed.

Secretary Christopher warns of the peril of this legislation.

The U.S. Ambassador to Israel, Martin Ludyk warns, "Any move now, (on the location of our Embassy) I believe strongly, would explode the peace process."

The Forward a major Jewish newspaper in New York says "Efforts (by Presidential Candidate Dole and others) to emerge as the greater champion of Israel would be laughable, were it not so blatant a play for positioning in the coming primaries."

The Israeli Minister of Communications said, "If the Americans decide to do it immediately, they would be liable to cause tensions, which we don't need."

Shimon Peres, Israeli Foreign Minister said, "There is no need for our involvement at this point."

And a spokesman for Yitzhak Rabin, the Israeli Prime Minister had this to say, "The rightist Likud opposition is behind the effort in the hope of torpedoing the peace negotiations."

Why then are we considering this legislation? The Israeli government does not want the legislation and it will be offensive to other parties to the negotiations. It will severely threaten the peace process, and it will hurt our efforts to bring peace to the Middle East.

The United States has major interest in returning a just peace to the Middle East. We are spending billions of dollars of American taxpayers money there to promote peace and restore stability as well as to sustain governments of Israel and other countries in the area.

This legislation can be passed enthusiastically when the time is right. I will happily support it then. Now is not the time for this action. It is not in the interest of our country. Nor is it in the interest of peace in the Middle East, or of the people there.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this bill—to move the American Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, which is the real and proper capital of Israel.

Tomorrow, in this very building, many of us will join with prime Minister Rabin to celebrate the 3,000th anniversary of the founding of Jerusalem. I can't think of a better anniversary gift than to move past the rhetoric and the nonbinding resolutions, and finally acknowledge the city that the people of Israel chose as their own capital nearly five decades ago.

To me, Jerusalem embodies the very notions of liberty justice and freedom from persecution upon which Israel was founded. That is why we must follow the example of the other body, which passed this bill by an overwhelming, bipartisan margin this morning.

Of course, we must all be concerned about the delicate peace process in the Middle East, above all else. That is why this bill is designed to move the American Embassy to Jerusalem in 1999, when the peace process is expected to be completed.

But if, for some unforeseen reason, moving the embassy at that time would damage the peace process, this bill gives the President the authority to delay the move. The Speaker and I, along with many other strong supporters of Israel, felt it was important to include that condition, because a lasting peace in the Middle East must take precedence over all other goals and concerns.

Barring that kind of unforeseen development, we can allow no further delay or excuses. It is only fitting that the holiest city in the world be acknowledged as the official center of the Jewish people, who have strived for so long to express their faith freely and openly.

Let's pass this bill, and affirm what the Jewish people have known for 3,000 years—that Jerusalem is their capital, not just spiritually, but politically as well.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say today that I rise in very strong support of the measure presented by the gentleman from New York. It was, after all, 45 years ago, 45 years ago that the state of Israel established Jerusalem as its capital. Since and during those 45 years, the Knesset and the prime minister's office have been in continuous operation in the city chosen by the people of the country to be their capital.

During that time, it goes, I think, without saying that every American,

virtually every American that visits Israel visits the city of Jerusalem and considers it, because the people of Israel have chosen it, as their capital. And we consider it the same. Yet our embassy remains in Tel Aviv.

It seems to me that we all know what the right thing to do is. As a matter of fact, in the last presidential campaign, candidate Clinton, now of course the President of our country, said, and I will quote this as closely as I can remember it, he said a very few words to express his feelings on the matter. He said Jerusalem is the eternal and undivided capital of Israel.

So this bill essentially does two things: It moves toward the positive aspects of a decision which would move our embassy to Jerusalem. And it recognizes that there is a tenuous peace process which is currently under way. Therefore, it says to the President, if you need a temporary delay, we grant a waiver in order that you make take advantage of some time, some time sensitivities, if you believe they exist.

So I believe we should move forward today with this. I think it is a very important matter. I conclude by saying that I support it very, very strongly.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pending measure that would relocate the U.S. Embassy now located in Tel Aviv, to Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, when this legislation was first introduced in May of this year, and word went out in the world about it, there were quite a few statements made about its negative impact upon the Middle East peace talks.

A spokesperson for Prime Minister Rabin said: "the rightist Likud opposition is behind the effort in the hope of torpedoing the peace negotiations."

Shimon Peres, Israeli Foreign Minister, said: "There is no need for our involvement at this point."

Shulamit Aloni, Israeli Minister of Communications, said: "If the Americans decide to do it immediately, they would be liable to cause tensions, which we don't need."

Martin Indyk, our new Ambassador to Israel, said: "Any move now, I believe strongly, would explode the peace process."

The Forward, a Jewish Newspaper based in New York, said:

"Efforts by individuals to emerge as the 'greater champion of Israel' would be laughable, were it not so blatant a play for positioning in the coming primaries."

It is not lost on anyone that five Presidential candidates have come out in support of the legislation.

The bill, which will have the force of law, emphatically states that Jerusalem is, and has always been, the capital of Israel. Yet it is a matter of record that no nation—no country—since Israel's annexation of east Jerusalem in

1967—has recognized Jerusalem as Israel's capital. As a matter of fact, no country has moved an embassy to Jerusalem since 1967 except Costa Rica. The fact that the new embassy would be in west Jerusalem does not change a thing.

I understand that waivers have been placed in the Senate measure passed yesterday in that body, to allow the President to waive this move in the interest of our National Security, but that it does not necessarily mean that the President may consider a breakdown of ongoing peace talks in the Middle East, or a breakdown of relations between Israel and the PLO, as being "in the national security interests."

What kind of "National Security Interest waiver authority" is that?

No doubt, King Hussein of Jordan, Yasir Arafat of Palestine, King Hassan of Morocco—now feel they have been made unwitting collaborators in a plot to destroy the peace process.

Mr. Speaker, not since 1967 has a single country, including the United States, recognized Israel's annexation of east Jerusalem, nor that Jerusalem was the capital of Israel. Not one. How then is it that we have a bill on the floor today that states—unequivocally—that Jerusalem is, and always has been, the capitol of Israel and that being so, we should move our embassy there?

Jerusalem is a holy city, and it is called the City of Peace. It belongs to Judaism, to Christianity, and to Islam.

It is not only Israel that feels bound by its history and its religious beliefs and practices to Jerusalem. It is not only Israel's holiest of cities—it is the holy city of Christians and of Moslems too. It always was, and it always will be.

Passage of this bill flies in the face of the recent outstanding gains the United States has made in the Arab world as an honest, and objective, broker of peace in the Middle East.

The President has been advised, by the Department of State, to veto the bill, because of constitutional questions about its usurping the President's constitutional authority to conduct foreign affairs and set foreign policy.

I understand that, the President will sign the bill, based on these waivers, and that no veto can be expected.

Mr. Speaker, as our Ambassador to Israel, Martin Indyk, stated in May of this year, I believe strongly that any move now would explode the peace process." I also believe it will have an extremely adverse effect on Prime Minister Rabin's ability to continue as Prime Minister, playing dangerously into the hands of the hard-line Likud party. Certainly I believe it will place chairman Arafat in an untenable position with respect to his ability to keep the peace, comply with the accords, and particularly with respect to the first Palestinian elections scheduled to take place in January 1996.

I hope that the President will see the so-called waivers as actually binding his hands as an honest broker of Middle East Peace. That he will see such binding of his hands is a threat to our national security interests and that he will veto this legislation with a veto message stating that the upending of the Middle East Peace talks is, in his view, a matter of our National Security Interest, and further that he demand a bill that says so in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to passage of this legislation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I rise today in support of H.R. 1595 of which I am a proud original cosponsor.

Jerusalem has been the spiritual capital of Israel since King David established it as the capital of the Jewish Kingdom 3,000 years ago. Since 1950, it has been the official capital of modern Israel. It is time the United States recognized it as such. All across the world we maintain our embassies in the functioning capitals of every country except Israel—we didn't build our embassy in Lyons instead of in Paris, or in Bath instead of London. It is time we extend the same diplomatic courtesy to Israel. To do otherwise is to ignore Israel's legitimate historic claim.

With the significant progress that has been made in the peace process, I firmly believe that the recognition of Jerusalem as the undivided capital of Israel and a city open to all ethnic and religious groups—is the next step to take.

This is the first time we will vote on legislation that is real. It is more than just a promise or a resolution; it is an action that demonstrates the seriousness of our intentions. It is my hope that we can accomplish this goal by the date we have set—May 31, 1999.

Congress has already adopted four resolutions on this matter. Now is the time for the rhetoric to cease. Now is the time to take action.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

(Mr. DEUTSCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1595, which is a piece of legislation that will facilitate a long overdue movement of the United States Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This is the only Embassy in the world, American Embassy, that is not in the capital that is designated by the country that the Embassy is in.

It is unprecedented and almost bizarre that it exists at this point in time. It is an anachronism from a misguided policy of really 40 years ago that this country has continued. I really congratulate my colleagues in the leadership of this House for bringing this bill to the floor at this time.

It is a bill that really should not be necessary, but we are here today discussing it and hopefully we will pass it in a few minutes. It is setting the size of the sandbox. Why should this Congress be dictating to another country what their capital is? Obviously Jerusalem is the center of the world for most people on this planet. But still that remains the capital of the state of Israel.

To offer anything else but passage of this resolution today, I think, would be really sending a terrible signal to the world, a terrible signal. In fact, I would argue very strongly that failure to get the two-thirds vote on this bill today would be sending an exactly wrong message because it would be sending a message that there is not resolve in this Congress of support of the peace process and that there is an opening in terms of what could happen in terms of Jerusalem, that the United States Congress has weakened its supports for this peace process.

□ 1715

So I really urge my colleagues, hopefully as close to unanimous as we can be in support of this process, that we will continue an effort, and I hope we have a situation in the Middle East that we will have peace in that region for all time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a reunited Jerusalem has been a dream for so many throughout the world. As for many of us right here in the Congress, our dream has been to see the day that our United States Embassy would be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This legislation moves us that much closer to reality, the reality of a comprehensive peace in the Middle East and the reality of the United States Embassy property in Israel's capital, Jerusalem.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to fully support this landmark legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, let me just give a quote from Secretary Christopher, if I may, about the question of Jerusalem. This is the quote:

There is no issue related to the Arab-Israeli negotiations that is more sensitive than Jerusalem. It is precisely for this reason that any effort by Congress to bring it to the forefront is ill-advised and potentially very damaging to the success of the peace process.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, for almost 45 years only one country has had the dubious distinction of having to send its government officials out of its capital to visit the United States Embassy. This insult was not reserved for Libya, North Korea, Cuba, or any of America's historic detractors. It was reserved for Israel—one of America's closest friends and our

most important ally in the turbulent Middle East.

Because the U.S. Embassy in Israel is based in Tel Aviv, not Jerusalem—Israel's declared capital—the United States has managed to reject a general principle of international practice: The placement of a state's embassy in the location of a foreign nation's capital. I, therefore, rise in strong support of S. 1322, the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Act, which states that an undivided Jerusalem should be recognized as the capital of Israel and that our Embassy should be moved to that city. As the sponsor of the resolution declaring Jerusalem to be the united capital of Israel, which overwhelmingly passed the House in 1990, I strongly support this resolution and urge the House to pass it.

Some have raised concerns with the impact of S. 1322 on the ongoing peace process in the Middle East. According to those opposed to the bill, any decision to move the Embassy before the conclusion of final status talks on Jerusalem would damage the process and set back chances for peace in the Mid East. I would like to take this opportunity to allay those concerns. According to the Oslo agreement signed by Israel and the PLO in 1993, the issue of Jerusalem will be discussed during final status negotiations beginning of 1996. Moving the Embassy by 1999 is not only the principled thing to do, it is fully compatible with the time table of the peace process. Final status negotiations are to be complete by May 1999.

While I strongly support this bill, I would like to express my opposition to the procedure under which it has been brought to the floor. S. 1322 is authorizing legislation and should rightfully have been referred to the International Relations Committee, of which I am a member, for hearings and a markup. Similar to the procedure—or lack thereof—on the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, the International Relations Committee has not seen fit to exercise its jurisdiction on this critical issue.

On this 3,000th anniversary of the establishment of Jerusalem, the city of David, however, I am proud to announce my support for this legislation. As Israel's closest ally, the United States must take the lead in supporting the unity of Jerusalem and its permanent status as capital of Israel by moving our Embassy to the holy city.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1322, the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Implementation Act. The United States enjoys diplomatic relations with 184 countries. Israel is the only country in which our nation does not have its Embassy located in the nation's capital. I believe that is wrong. I realize the historical and religious importance of Jerusalem to all sides involved in this matter and support the ongoing peace process taking place between Israel and the Palestinians.

I believe it is important for the United States' position on Jerusalem to be clear. S. 1322 declares that it is official United States policy to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. The actual moving of the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem would not take place for several years. This would allow enough time for peace negotiations between Israel and the

PLO to be completed. This is a bipartisan piece of legislation which should receive strong support from the Congress and the President of the United States. Now is the time for our Nation to show some leadership by supporting S. 1322.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the legislation we are considering, S. 1322—the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Implementation Act of 1995.

Symbolically, this is an important and an appropriate gesture for the United States to make at this particular time. This week we commemorate the anniversary of the date 3,000 years ago when David, the King of Israel, captured the city of Jerusalem and made it his capital. Under David and his successors, Jerusalem became the religious and political and emotional center of Israel, and it remains so to this very day.

Mr. Speaker, almost 12 years ago—in November of 1983—I introduced legislation in the Congress that was identical in purpose to the legislation that we are considering here today. At that time, a majority of the Members of the House cosponsored this legislation, and a majority of the Members of the Senate cosponsored the identical bill which was introduced in the other body by the distinguished Senator from New York, Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN.

Then—as now—this legislation had broad bipartisan support. Our distinguished colleague, Congressman BENJAMIN A. GILMAN of New York, was the principal cosponsor of our bill in the House, and a broad bipartisan group of our Democratic and Republican colleagues joined us in cosponsoring the bill. I might add that there were fewer Republican cosponsors at that time, in part because there were fewer Republican Members of the House in those days. I might add that 12 years ago, the administration of Republican President Ronald Reagan and his Vice President, George Bush, opposed our legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed important changes since 1983 and 1984—changes which now make the adoption of this legislation more timely and appropriate. The peace process has transformed the Middle East. The Government of Israel has taken bold steps in a courageous effort to resolve the conflict with the Palestinians. The end of the cold war has created the fundamental conditions that have permitted this peace process to move forward.

U.S. administrations have played a critical role in encouraging and facilitating this peace process—administrations of both parties with the bipartisan support of the Congress. The Bush administration played a major role in starting the process following the victory of U.S.-led forces in the gulf war. The Clinton administration continued actively to encourage, cajole, and support the process, culminating in the signing ceremony on the White House lawn in September 1993. With the support of the United States, a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan has been signed, and agreements have been signed regarding Palestinian administration of Palestinian-inhabited territories and arrangements for democratic Palestinian elections.

Although conditions in the region have changed that now permit us to move forward

on this legislation, the arguments and reasons for adopting this legislation have not changed over the past 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, the United States maintains diplomatic relations with 184 countries. In virtually all of these countries where we have a resident Embassy, our Embassy is located in the capital city. When the Government of Brazil decided to move its capital from Rio de Janeiro to Brasilia, the United States moved its Embassy to the new capital. When the Government of Saudi Arabia, which until a few years ago indicated that it would like to have Embassies located in Riyadh, the United States Government followed traditional diplomatic practice and constructed an Embassy building in Riyadh. This is as it should be. An Embassy should be in the same city as the Government to which it is accredited.

In one case, however, our Embassy is not located in the capital city—despite the expressed desire of the house country that this be done. Although Jerusalem is the capital of Israel, our Embassy is located in Tel Aviv.

Jerusalem has been the capital of Israel since 1949. Presidents of the United States, Secretaries of State, United States Ambassadors, Members of Congress—all have done business with the Government of Israel at the seat of government in West Jerusalem. When Anwar Sadat of Egypt paid a historic visit to Israel and addressed the Israeli Knesset, he spoke at the Knesset building in West Jerusalem.

Moving the U.S. Embassy to West Jerusalem does not affect any of the issues surrounding the peaceful resolution of the Palestinian issue. West Jerusalem has been an integral part of Israel since 1949 and this has been recognized by all nations with whom Israel maintains diplomatic relations.

An analogy with the situation in East Germany prior to the unification of Germany just 4 years ago this month is particularly appropriate in this case. The Government of East Germany claimed that East Berlin was an integral part of its territory. The United States, however, did not recognize this claim and maintained that East Berlin and West Berlin had a unique status guaranteed by the four occupying powers—the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain and France. Nevertheless, when the United States established diplomatic relations with East Germany in 1971, we located our embassy in East Berlin. At that time the State Department affirmed:

The United States Government proceeds on the basis that the locations and functions of an American Embassy in East Berlin, where it will be convenient to the government offices with which it will deal, will not affect the special legal status of the Berlin area.

We were broadminded enough to enunciate and observe this rational principle in dealing with a communist dictatorship which sought to undermine our own treaty obligation for all of Berlin. Why should we not follow the same rational principle in dealing with a democratic ally?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting the adoption of this legislation. The time has come to end inconvenience, inefficiency, and expense by moving our Embassy to Israel's capital city—Jerusalem.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of S. 1322, a piece of legislation that will facilitate a long overdue movement of the United States Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. As an original cosponsor and strong advocate of relocating our embassy to Jerusalem, I congratulate the leadership in both the House and Senate for making this a priority and moving this legislation.

For 3,000 years Jerusalem has been the capital of the Jewish people, the very heart of its religious, spiritual, cultural, and national life. It is and will forever be the eternal, undivided capital of Israel. Yet for nearly five decades Israel's closest ally—the United States—has failed to acknowledge Jerusalem as the capital. In fact, Israel is the only country in the world that the United States does not recognize the designated capital of the host country.

When you think about it, our position is nothing short of bizarre, illogical, and offensive. For 47 years, the United States has shared an extraordinary friendship with Israel but for 47 years, the United States has been frozen in this state of inconsistency and insensitivity.

But instead of looking back at what may be our mistake let's look ahead at what may be our fortune. As the peace process moves forward, moving the United States embassy to Jerusalem will send a clear message to the world, to the Middle East and most importantly, to the Palestinians that America supports Israel's claim to Jerusalem. We must stand behind Prime Minister Rabin's words to the Knesset:

United Jerusalem will not be open to negotiation. It has been and will forever be the capital of the Jewish people, under Israeli sovereignty, a focus of the dreams and longings of every Jew.

For far too long, the United States has allowed this matter to linger in ambiguity throughout the peace talks. There is absolutely no reason to risk uncertainty about the U.S. Government's commitment to the status and the destiny of Jerusalem.

Tomorrow, Prime Minister Rabin will be here to celebrate the 3,000th anniversary of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. What better way for the United States to celebrate this occasion with Israel than to begin the process of relocating our embassy to Jerusalem.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this extremely important resolution, and I want to commend the leadership for bringing this bill, a bill that is 47 years overdue, to the floor for consideration today.

Mr. Speaker, in the last half century, the United States has rightly shown its support and respect for our most loyal ally in the Middle East, and one of our best friends in the world, in just about every area—except for one. That, of course, is in the matter of proper diplomatic recognition. Yes, we obviously recognize the sovereignty of Israel, yet by not placing our Embassy in Israel's declared capital, we do a great disservice to her, as well as to us. Israel is the only nation, out of 184 with which we maintain diplomatic relations, in which we do not have our Embassy in its declared capital. I think it is highly inappropriate to continue this overt, and undiplomatic gesture on our part.

This issue as a whole is intrinsically emotional and complex. However, the bottom line

is that Jerusalem has been and always will be, the capital of Israel. Undeniably speaking, the Middle East peace process is a fragile entity. It is a process that has been almost a century in the making. Just as Israel has greatly committed to the success of this venture, so too have many in the Arab world. However, the future of Jerusalem has never been in doubt to the Government of Israel, nor to the millions of Jews still living in the Diaspora. It has been clearly stated time and again that Jerusalem is the eternal capital of the State of Israel, and to a larger extent, the Jewish people.

This issue goes to the heart of relations between the United States and Israel. What we are accomplishing with this bill is something that should have been accomplished 47 years ago—when the United States became one of the first countries to recognize and support the State of Israel, after its declaration of independence in May 1948. What we are finally doing here today is setting right a wrong of the largest magnitude.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House passed a historical piece of legislation, the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Improvement Act. This legislation, H.R. 1595, declares that it is official United States policy that Jerusalem be recognized as the permanent and undivided capital of Israel. Pursuant to this recognition, the bill directs the State Department to begin the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

Jerusalem, a city of great historical and religious significance for Jews, Muslims, and Christians, has been the capital of Israel since 1950. But for millennia, Jerusalem has been the focal point of Jewish life and has held a unique place and exerted a special influence on the moral development of western civilization. The city was divided between Israel and Jordan from 1948 to 1967, during which Jordan prohibited access to its half of the city to Jews and other religious pilgrims. However, in 1967 Israel united the city during the Six Day War, the second of three wars it would fight against its primary adversaries of the time: Egypt, Syria, and Jordan. During the 28 years following the reunification of Jerusalem, Israel has allowed full access to all holy sites in the city for persons of all faiths. It is a unique and treasured city to persons around the world.

Although the United States recognizes Israel as an important friend and ally in the Middle East and conducts official meetings in Jerusalem, it does not maintain an embassy there, but rather in Tel Aviv. By moving our embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, a much more appropriate and productive location, the United States will demonstrate a firm commitment to the national sovereignty and unity of Israel.

As someone who has always had a warm place in my heart for Israel, I am pleased with this legislative accomplishment. I look forward to a deeper, closer, stronger working relationship between the United States and Israel.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today in support of S. 1322, the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Implementation Act of 1995. S. 1322 declares that it is official policy that Jerusalem be recognized as the capital of Israel. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill and rise today to urge my colleagues to vote for S. 1322.

For centuries the City of Jerusalem has been a religious and cultural beacon for people of all faiths. Our Nation's embassy in Israel

should be located in Jerusalem—the holiest of cities, which has always been the capital of Israel.

It is fitting that Congress pass this bill today on the eve of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin's visit to the U.S. Capitol to commemorate the 3,000th anniversary of the founding of Jerusalem.

It is time to recognize that Jerusalem is Israel's capital by moving our Embassy there. I am pleased to support this bill today and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation to move the United States Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Israel is the only country in the world in which the American Embassy is located outside of the host nation's capital. It is time for the United States to show that it supports Jerusalem and its permanent status as the capital of Israel.

Much has been said about how this legislation could send the wrong signal at a time when both sides of the conflict in the Middle East are pursuing peace. However, the realities of what we have seen to date in the peace process do not support this argument. Significant progress in the peace process has occurred since the introduction of this legislation in the House and Senate. Just a few weeks ago, Israel and the Palestinians signed the second phase of the Oslo Accords. This agreement came after the Palestinians and the Arab world had time to consider this legislation. This is compelling evidence that the peace process is not impeded by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the location of our embassies abroad is not a subject in the ongoing peace negotiations. Next year marks the 3,000th anniversary of King David's establishment of Jerusalem as the capital of the Jewish kingdom. Now is the time to begin the process of transferring the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem, just as our other 183 embassies are located in the capitals of their host nation. I urge support for S. 1322.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to show my support for H.R. 1595, the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Improvement Act.

Jerusalem is a city of great historical significance for Jews, Christians, and Moslems. Since the 1950's, Jerusalem has been the capital city of Israel. However, the United States has never maintained its Embassy in Jerusalem. We have located it instead in Tel Aviv. This is inconsistent with every other U.S. Embassy which is located in the host country's capital city. Our policy is particularly inappropriate since Israel has been one of our strongest allies. I strongly believe it is time for the United States to fully recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

Some critics say that the moving of the Embassy to Jerusalem would upset the tense peace negotiations. I do not believe this to be the case. In fact, I believe this change shows that the United States strongly supports the peace process and wants to see a peace which includes a unified Jerusalem.

I believe this matter to be one of principle and priority for the Jewish people. Jerusalem is the seat of government. The President, Parliament, Prime Minister, the supreme court, and most of the government agencies are located there. As one of Israel's closest allies and friends, the United States should lead the

way in showing its support for the unity of Jerusalem and its permanent status as the capital of Israel.

H.R. 1595 is the most direct and strongest statement the United States can make concerning a unified Jerusalem. That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor and supporter of this legislation.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, the United States has a crucial role to play as the honest broker—the convening authority—in the Middle East peace effort. To fulfill the responsibilities we've assumed, we must maintain a semblance of official evenhandedness regarding matters in controversy among the parties. It is of overarching importance, as we fashion Middle East policy, not to do anything that would undermine our own role and responsibility. That's why its long been official U.S. policy that the final status of Jerusalem be left to negotiations among the parties in interest.

I personally want to see Jerusalem as a unified city, with free access for people of all religion to its great holy sites. I also personally believe that Jerusalem is the legitimate capital of the State of Israel. Clearly, that's the view of most of us. But it is not appropriate to transpose our personal views into a mandate of U.S. policy at this sensitive time.

We should not pretend that the legislation will not be seen as compromising the U.S. role as honest broker in the peace process. By declaring that "Jerusalem should be the recognized capital of the State of Israel," we will be sending a clear signal to the Palestinians and the Arab States that we have prejudged the solution on Jerusalem.

In dictating how the President must deal with a foreign policy matter of great delicacy and subtlety, this bill is also on extremely questionable constitutional grounds. It seeks to micromanage a function that falls squarely within the Executives's foreign policy authority under article II. It would set a precedent by legislating for the first time in history where an Embassy must be located. The escape clause, enabling the President to defer the requirements of the bill for 6 month intervals under a finding of national security necessity, may save it from unconstitutionality in law, but not in spirit.

We should recognize this measure for what it is—something driven by domestic Presidential politics—not an effort to make sound foreign policy. The Government of Israel itself has made it clear—though off the record—that a law like this would be counterproductive.

This legislation, however well intended, is unwise, and we should reject it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Act. I am very proud to be an original cosponsor of this moral, long-overdue legislation.

It is nothing short of preposterous that we keep our Embassy in Tel Aviv rather than in Jerusalem. In every country in the world, the U.S. Embassy is located in the capital of that country. Why not in Israel? Every day that passes by without our Embassy in Jerusalem is 1 day too many.

Israel's claim to Jerusalem as its eternal capital is stronger than that of any other country in the world to its capital. That claim is rooted in a 3,000-year-old bond that is recorded in the Bible itself. "By the waters of Babylon, there we sat and wept, as we remembered thee, O Zion!"

For 3,000 years, the Jewish people have kept their faith with Jerusalem. Every year, on Yom Kippur, and at Passover, Jews repeat the phrase: "Next year in Jerusalem!" Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Congress to tell the President, regarding the United States Embassy: "Next year in Jerusalem!"

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1322.

The question was taken.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2002, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-289) on the resolution (H. Res. 241) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution that raises a question of privilege of the House. The form of the resolution as a follows:

RESOLUTION

To direct the Speaker to provide an appropriate remedy in response to the use of a forged document at a subcommittee hearing.

Whereas, on September 28, 1995, the Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight held a hearing on political advocacy of Federal grantees;

Whereas, the president of the Alliance for Justice, a national association of public interest and civil rights organizations testified at that hearing;

Whereas, a document was placed upon the press table for distribution at the hearing which contained the letterhead, including the name, address, phone number, fax number, and E-mail address of the Alliance for Justice, and the names of certain member organizations and the dollar amounts of Federal grants they received;

Whereas, in her opening statement at the hearing, the president of the Alliance for Justice identified the document as being

forged and contained errors and requested an explanation from the chairman of the subcommittee as to the source of the document;

Whereas, in response, the chairman acknowledged that the document was created by the subcommittee staff;

Whereas, House Information Resources, at the request of the subcommittee staff, prepared the forged document;

Whereas, the document was prepared using official funds;

Whereas, the chairman of the subcommittee acknowledged in a letter, dated September 28, 1995, to the president of the Alliance for Justice that "the graphics, unfortunately, appeared to simulate the Alliance's letterhead";

Whereas, the September 29, 1995, issue of the National Journal's Congress Daily reported that Representative McIntosh's communications director said that the "the letterhead was taken from a faxed document, scanned into their computer system and altered"; and

Whereas, questions continue to arise regarding the responsibility for preparation of the forged document: the chairman of the subcommittee stated during the hearing that he had no prior knowledge of the document's preparation; the chairman later stated that the subcommittee staff prepared the document; and other published reports suggested that Chairman McIntosh's personal office prepared the document;

Whereas, on September 27, 1995, the Speaker expressed concern over the distribution of unattributed documents and announced a policy requiring that materials disseminated on the floor of the House must bear the name of the Member authorizing their distribution;

Whereas, Members and staff of the House have an obligation to ensure the proper use of documents and other materials and exhibits prepared for use at committee and subcommittee hearings and which are made available to Members, the public or the press, and to ensure that the source of such documents or other materials is not misrepresented;

Whereas, committees and subcommittees should not create documents for use in their proceedings that may give the impression that such documents were created by other persons or organizations, as occurred at the September 28, 1995, hearing of the Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs;

Whereas, the dissemination of a forged document distorts the public record and affects the ability of the House of Representatives, its committees, and Members to perform their legislative functions, and constitutes a violation of the integrity of committee proceedings which form a core of the legislative process: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Speaker shall take such action as may be necessary to provide an appropriate remedy to ensure that the integrity of the legislative process is protected, and shall report his actions and recommendations to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time or place designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within two legislative days its being properly noticed. The Chair will announce the Speaker's designation as tomorrow. In the meantime, the form of the resolution proffered by the gentlewoman from New York will appear in the RECORD at this point.