

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COLLINS AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

HON. MAC COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will provide a much needed clarification of the Federal Employee Group Life Insurance Act.

This legislation will level the playing field between laws that govern private life insurance and the Federal statute that provides guidelines for the life insurance policies held by Federal employees.

My legislation will amend the Federal Employee Group Life Insurance Act to ensure that a domestic relations order, issued by a court, is considered a designation of beneficiary in the event that no designation of beneficiary has been filed.

Currently, if a Federal employee dies without properly naming a beneficiary for his/her life insurance policy, the law provides a very strict, prioritized list of individuals that are eligible to receive the benefits of that policy.

Unlike most State laws, the Federal code does not give any consideration to an existing court decree that may link that policy to a beneficiary as a part of a settlement agreement.

There are real instances where this inequity in Federal law is causing significant confusion among FEGLIA beneficiaries. It is time for us to clarify the law with this legislation that will correct this inconsistency and ensure that a court decree is given appropriate consideration.

During the 104th Congress, my legislation was included in the Omnibus Civil Service Reform Act, H.R. 3841, as reported by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

The Department of Health and Human Services, Child Support Division, and the Office of Personnel Management have reviewed the legislation and do not oppose this change.

In addition, I have appeared before the Corrections Advisory Group chaired by Representative DAVE CAMP and they have recommended the legislation for inclusion on the Corrections Calendar. I appreciate this opportunity to introduce this legislation and look forward to its enactment.

TRIBUTE TO UAW LOCAL 314 ON ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to the UAW Local 314 as they celebrate their 60th anniversary. On April 5, the membership of this great union will celebrate with an anniversary dinner.

In the 1930's, like most of the United States, the Detroit area was suffering from the Great Depression. In 1934, the Mechanic Educational Society of America tried to organize a union. Unfortunately, company resistance and union-busting activities were too strong for the fledgling union.

However, in February 1937, the UAW organized 90 percent of the Long Manufacturing workers and on April 6, 1937, local 314 was established. Many of the workers remembered the difficult years before the union and knew how important it was to establish a strong leadership. Within 2 months, this leadership helped win a contract that protected the workers' right to bargain collectively, seniority, wage increase, premium pay for overtime, a grievance procedure, vacation with pay, and the right to seek redress.

This was a historic contract in that it laid down the ground rules for protecting the rights of the workers for years to come. For 60 years, local 314 has preserved these basic rights while improving the working conditions for the employees.

Even though the name Long Manufacturing has changed to Borg and Warner Automotive, one thing remains the same—the commitment of the union to protect the workers. The hard work, sacrifice, and dedication of the leaders and members is illustrated in the struggles that the union has surpassed in the past 60 years.

I would like to congratulate the members of UAW Local 314 for their contribution to the labor movement on their 60th anniversary, and I wish them luck as they represent a new generation of union members.

LEGISLATION TO EXEMPT MULTI- EMPLOYER PENSION PLANS FROM COMPENSATION-BASED LIMITS ON BENEFITS

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will help correct a gross oversight within our Nation's pension system.

Under section 415 of the Internal Revenue Code, pension benefits from multiemployer pension plans are limited to the average of the retired employee's three highest consecutive years of income. This compensation-based limit makes perfect sense for many types of corporate pension plans, where pensions are based on compensation and income levels are relatively steady and tend to increase over time. But for many participants in multiemployer pension plans, limiting pension benefits in this way is both unfair and inequitable.

Unlike their corporate counterparts, benefits earned under multiemployer pension plans have very little relationship to actual compensation. Rather, benefits are generally

based on a worker's years of covered service and the collectively bargained dollar amount of contributions made into the multiemployer plan. But the compensation-based limits contained in section 415 override the benefit rates set in the multiemployer plan, often decreasing a retiree's pension benefit well below what was negotiated.

Workers in the building and construction industries are particularly disadvantaged by section 415. Compensation for these workers can fluctuate dramatically from year-to-year, with the availability of work in these mobile, cyclical industries. For workers in these industries, section 415 often has the effect of driving the compensation-based limit much lower than the worker's average income. What's more, finding the 3 highest years of consecutive compensation often means basing the benefit limit on a period well before the date of retirement, which can mean a dramatic drop in income and lower standard of living once the worker retires.

Legislation passed by the 104th Congress, Public Law 104-188, which provided a long-overdue increase in the minimum wage, also exempted public employees from the pension benefit limits contained in section 415. But for reasons that have gone unexplained, Public Law 104-188 did not extend this exemption to multiemployer pension plans.

Mr. Speaker, no one should misinterpret either the intention or the effect of this legislation. These plans are not tax shelters and exempting multiemployer plans from section 415 will not result in an unfair windfall of pension benefits. Instead, my legislation would take a necessary step to ensure that benefits from multiemployer plans are not artificially reduced, and that every retired worker covered by these plans receives the pension benefits that he or she rightly deserves. I urge you and my other colleagues to cosponsor and support this important measure.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY HORAN

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who is truly one of a kind. Larry Horan, who made his mark as a star college athlete before becoming a star director of the Peace Corps in El Salvador, Costa Rica, and Colombia, where I served, was honored last weekend for his many contributions as chairman of the board of the Special Olympics of Northern California. It was quite a tribute. Few men have had as positive an impact on those around him as Larry Horan.

In my own life, Larry has been a model. A defender of the common man and woman, Larry has spent his career standing up for those values that represent the best in all of us. A graduate of the University of California,

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Berkeley, where he earned both undergraduate and law degrees in the 1950's, Larry's first venture into the working world consisted of a 5-year tour in the Alameda County District Attorney's Office where he served on the senior trial staff and worked hard for the people. In 1960, Larry further distinguished himself by joining forces with my father, former California State Senator Fred Farr, in the Law Offices of Farr, Horan & Lloyd, and served with distinction until a greater calling came.

Like many of us who followed the vision of our valiant President, John F. Kennedy, Larry decided the best gift he could give the world was one of service. He enlisted in the Peace Corps to make the world a better place and worked hard for 3 years to improve the plight of those living in the Central and South American countries where he lived with his wife Jean and where his youngest daughter, Maureen, was born. In 1967, Larry was named regional director of the Office of Economic Opportunity for the Western United States. Larry returned to California's beautiful central coast in 1970 where he became president and founding member of the Law Offices of Horan, Lloyd, Karachale, Dyer & Schwartz and Law & Cook Inc.

While working to benefit his local community, Larry has also given of himself in countless other ways. Sitting on the board of directors of the Monterey Institute of International Studies, he also serves as a trustee of the Naval Postgraduate School Foundation, on the board of advisors of the Big Sur Land Trust, as an advisor of the Friends of Moss Landing Marine Laboratories, on the Board of Directors of the Franciscan Workers and as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Special Olympics of northern California, the organization that honored him.

I could go on and on about Larry Horan. To me, he symbolizes the very best qualities of the American spirit. Generous and compassionate to a tee, Larry is one of those very unique people who profoundly impacts all those he touches. He is a natural-born leader and deeply deserving of all the praise we can bestow upon him.

VOLUNTARY ALCOHOL ADVERTISING STANDARDS FOR CHILDREN ACT

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker. This Bud's for you—It's Miller Time—Tap into the Rockies—I love you Man—these phrases have become familiar sounds in the living rooms of homes across the country. Soon, you will also be able to recall slogans for Seagram's Crown Royal whiskey and Hiram Walker's Kahlua liqueur, and a host of other spirits. In too many cases, it is children that are influenced by such ads—remembering and reciting these jingles, leading many to their first drink of alcohol in hopes of imitating the athletic, academic, or social success being sold to them over the airwaves.

The Wall Street Journal and Ad Age recently reported on the prevalence of alcohol advertising on television stations and during programming that have large youth audiences.

For example, beer ads were shown to run frequently on MTV, a rock music station that is popular with kids. So the message to kids is to sit down with a brew to watch Beavis and Butt-Head?

Alcohol use and abuse among our children is on the rise. Alcohol-related deaths are the No. 1 killer of people under the age of 24—killing more than 100,000 people each year, 5 times as many as the death toll for illicit drugs. There are approximately 18 million alcoholics or problem drinkers in our country, 4 million of whom are minors.

We spend \$15 billion a year fighting the war on drugs in this country. Yet alcohol, America's No. 1 drug, is promoted by billions of dollars in slick ad campaigns that tell kids if they want to be the first down the mountain, or get a good-looking date, or win the bicycle race, all they need to do is drink a beer, a wine cooler, or shot of whiskey.

For nearly 50 years the Distilled Spirits Council of the United States [DISCUS] had the right idea. As model corporate citizens, they voluntarily agreed not to advertise their product on television.

However, by ending their voluntary industry ban last November, they made a decision to lower the bar at a time when it needs to be raised.

The hard liquor industry had a legitimate argument that they were at a competitive disadvantage under their old code because the beer and wine industries advertise aggressively. But they took the wrong direction in an effort to even the playing field. We want fewer alcohol advertisements on television, not more.

I have in the past, and will again, introduce legislation which places specific restrictions on all alcohol advertising—beer, wine, and distilled spirits—particularly where alcohol products are being marketed to young audiences. These bills, the Just Say No Act and the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse Prevention Act, prescribe specific restrictions with which I feel the alcoholic beverage industry should comply.

However, today we are embarking on a new, voluntary approach to solving this problem—not to be confused, though, as abandoning old strategies. We are convinced that television broadcasters, under their public interest obligations, should be expected to add their voices to this important debate by developing a voluntary code of conduct for alcohol advertising that will limit the exposure of such ads to children.

Some broadcasters have taken the first step. When the hard liquor industry abandoned its voluntary pledge not to advertise on television, all of the major network stations publicly stated that they would not accept their ads. Yet viewing audiences have been baptized with hard liquor ads around the country because network affiliates have agreed to air them. More can and should be done about all televised alcohol advertising that targets young audiences.

The legislation that I will introduce with my colleagues today, the Voluntary Alcohol Advertising Standards for Children Act, is a tool that will bring to bear a new benchmark for responsible advertising of beer, wine, and distilled spirits. Under this legislation, an antitrust exemption is established so that television broadcasters can come together to devise the new code of "kid-friendly" standards.

While the legislation does not prescribe or mandate what the final code should look like,

it does lay out five general guidelines for consideration:

First, content—alcoholic beverage companies often market their products by using sex, fantasy, sports figures, cartoons, and fast music. Advertisements using such content clearly have a strong market appeal to youthful audiences.

Second, frequency—families should be able to turn on their televisions without being overwhelmed with alcohol advertising campaigns. Alcohol ads should not be airing in homes at a rate that surpasses advertisements of other products.

Third, timing—children are less likely to be watching TV late at night. Alcohol advertisements should not be airing during prime time viewing hours or hours when children are likely to be a significant portion of the overall viewing audience.

Fourth, program placement—what television shows are sandwiched in between alcohol advertisements? "The X-Files"? Early Saturday sporting events? Alcohol ads should not be aired immediately preceding, during, or directly following television programming that has a significant youth audience.

Fifth, balanced messages—some deliberation should be given to the issue of balancing advertisements promoting alcohol consumption with public information messages about the risks of alcohol use by minors.

This bill would give the broadcasters 1 year to develop their code. The Federal Communications Commission [FCC] is required to approve the code before it is implemented, seeking public comment. If after 1 year, the broadcasters fail to develop their own standards, the FCC is given the authority to impose their own code, using the same five guidelines.

Any FCC-imposed code must be developed in a partnership with an advisory committee composed of parents, broadcasters, public interest groups, and other interested individuals from the private sector. The final, approved code would be enforced as a regulation by the FCC, punishable by monetary penalties.

This is largely a hands-off governmental approach. Regulators do not get involved in the creation of this code unless broadcasters abandon their responsibility to do so.

Alcohol is not a legal product for consumption by minors and therefore should not be advertised in a manner, place, or time where children are likely to be influenced. This legislation gives concerned parents and the public a voice in protecting their children from these negative influences. And this bill gives broadcasters the latitude to voluntarily develop alcohol advertising standards which they believe will protect children under their public interest obligations. All would be served well by passage of this legislation.

TIME TO PUT EQUITY FOR WOMEN BACK ON THE AMERICAN AGENDA

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1997

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Fair Pay Act of 1997, a bill that would ensure that men and women receive the same wages for equal

work. It could not be more appropriate to discuss this bill today, because tomorrow is Pay Inequity Day. Pay Inequity Day is April 11—3½ months into 1997—and it is the day on which women's earnings finally equal those of men for the previous calendar year.

Pay inequity is no longer just a women's issue. It is one that intimately affects many American families as more and more American families rely on women's wages. An increasing number of families are headed by single working women. Many more families, those with two parents, find that to make ends meet it is necessary for both parents to work. In two-parent families, 66 percent of women work and the number of female-headed households has more than doubled since 1970.

At a time when families are increasingly dependent on the money earned by their female members, women with similar qualifications still earn less than 72 cents for every dollar earned by men in comparable jobs. Over her lifetime, a woman loses more than \$420,000 to pay inequity. Wage discrimination costs all women together more than \$100 billion a year. This is money that the American family can ill afford to lose.

I ask that my colleagues support this important legislation that will address gender pay inequity and in so doing take a stand to help America's working families.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICIA GORDON

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Patricia Gordon, Secretary of the Year. On April 23, 1997, Ms. Gordon will be honored at the Secretaries Day Banquet during Professional Secretaries Week.

Each year, the Macomb Chapter of Professional Secretaries International chooses the Secretary of the Year based on a list of important qualities. Candidates are chosen based on their education, work experience, and involvement in PSI activities. Ms. Gordon's professional accomplishments and expertise led to the honor of Secretary of the Year.

Ms. Gordon began her career as an office professional 23 years ago as an office co-op at Center Line High School. For the past 10 years she has been employed by East Detroit Public Schools. Ms. Gordon is a group benefit secretary under Assistant Superintendent Raymond Berlin. She has made an important contribution to education and her community by performing many of the fundamental responsibilities that allow the schools to operate everyday.

In 23 years, Ms. Gordon has earned a CPS designation, been an active member of Professional Secretaries International and has obtained her real estate license. Ms. Gordon and her husband have also raised four children, Mellanie, Erica, Lauren, and Alexander. Her future goal is to continue her education and earn a degree in business.

I ask my colleagues to join me as I commend Ms. Gordon on her hard work and accomplishments as she accepts the award of 1997 Secretary of the Year.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE GARY ALUMNAE CHAPTER OF THE DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is truly my pleasure to congratulate the Gary Alumnae Chapter of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority as it hosts a statewide Founders Day Celebration on Saturday, April 26, 1997, at Marquette Park in Gary, IN.

The Gary Alumnae Chapter will host the Founders Day Celebration with the help of 14 Delta Sigma Theta Chapters throughout the State of Indiana. The statewide celebration will feature Delta Sigma Theta Sorority's National President, Marcia L. Fudge, Esq., as the keynote speaker at a private banquet. After the celebration, Ms. Fudge will be introduced to community leaders at a reception held at Marquette Park from 5 to 7 p.m. During the reception, Mayor Scott King of Gary, IN, will present her with a proclamation from the city of Gary. In addition, Ms. Fudge will receive a proclamation from Indiana Governor, Frank O'Bannon. The festivities will conclude with area Deltas worshipping with Ms. Fudge at St. Timothy Community Church in Gary, IN.

Founded in 1913 at Howard University, the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority is a public service sorority comprised of over 200,000 members, both nationally and internationally. The founders of Delta Sigma Theta defined the organization's purpose as "establishing and maintaining a high standard of morality and scholarship among women."

Since its inception in 1938, the Gary Alumnae Chapter has worked diligently to fulfill the Delta Sigma Theta mission in northwest Indiana through members' participation in a variety of public service initiatives. Some of the local activities include: sponsorship of food banks and clothing drives; aid to Marion Home; a local shelter for pregnant teens; sponsorship of Delteens, an organization which organizes activities for high school junior and senior girls; and the awarding of \$4,000 in college scholarships annually. The chapter also participates in Project Read, Stop the Violence Campaign, Kids Vote USA, and voter registration efforts. In addition, the Gary Alumnae Chapter has devoted much of its energy and resources to national public service efforts. Members of the chapter aid the NAACP, NAACP Defense Fund, the United Nations Children's Fund, and Habitat for Humanity, through financial contributions, and participation in local events.

It is my distinct privilege to congratulate the members of the Gary Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta as it hosts the statewide Founders Day Celebration. The members of this organization are most deserving of the pride and honor exhibited on this very special occasion, as they have provided invaluable services to the citizens of northwest Indiana through their hard work and dedication. May this event prove to be most successful and rewarding.

TRIBUTE TO PETER BEHR

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Senator Peter Behr, a dedicated and inspiring public servant of California. Senator Peter Behr was an instrumental force in the California legislature who was driven by principles and a commitment to preserving our precious environment. In his nearly 30 years of service, Senator Behr served as an inspiration to both his colleagues and constituents, including me. He will be remembered for his unparalleled environmental activism and for epitomizing the characteristics of an inspiring leader.

Senator Behr's admirable career in politics began as city councilman of Mill Valley in 1956. While serving in Marin County, he was recognized for leading a grassroots campaign to preserve and protect California's Pacific coastline. Through hard work and dedication, he moved up to county supervisor, and shortly thereafter he was elected to represent Marin in the California Senate.

One of Senator Behr's most notable accomplishments was the save-our-shores petition drive, which was instrumental in the formation of Point Reyes National Seashore, a beautiful expanse of the northern California coast. Additionally, Senator Behr established The 1972 Wild Scenic Rivers Act, which provided protection for priceless rivers.

After retiring from the senate, Senator Behr remained dedicated to preserving California's natural resources by involving himself with various organizations which strive to preserve our precious environment. He demonstrated his leadership among such groups as the Sierra Club Foundation, Friends of the River, and the San Francisco Foundation.

Today, Senator Behr is recognized as an exceptional politician who earned the utmost respect from both his colleagues and constituents. He will be remembered as an avid protector of the environment whose visionary ideology will remain a model forever. I ask my colleagues today, to join me in recognizing Senator Behr's accomplishments and the legacy he will surely leave behind.

ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER NETANYAHU'S ADDRESS TO AIPAC

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu made a major speech at the annual AIPAC policy conference dinner. This event is the pre-eminent pro-Israel activity in our Nation's capital, and was attended by over 150 Members of Congress. Because the Prime Minister's remarks are very timely and deserving of special attention, I would like to share them with my colleagues, and therefore request that they be reprinted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REMARKS OF PRIME MINISTER BENJAMIN NETANYAHU, AIPAC DINNER, WASHINGTON HILTON, WASHINGTON, DC, MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1997

PRIME MIN. NETANYAHU (Applause.) Thank you very much. Thank you. I want to say to Melvin Dow that you should give me these introductions in the Knesset. (Laughter.) I thank you for that, and I thank you for your leadership. I thank you for having AIPAC and for its support for Israel and for Israeli-American relations and for peace. You are doing a magnificent job. Thank you. (Applause.) You know that Melvin is the last—well, not the last—there will be others—but he is the most recent of a distinguished line of heads of AIPAC who are here. I've worked with all of them in some form or capacity or the other—Ed Levy and Bob Asher and Larry Weinberg whom I remember from our first meeting—it must be 20 years ago—you haven't changed—(laughter)—and Barbara Mitchell and Steve Grossman. It's the best people you could find. And they are joined here by some very good friends that I have had. First of all, the two ambassadors—the ambassador of Israel to the United States, Eli Ben Elissar—(Applause)—and the ambassador of the United States to Israel, Martin Indyk. (Applause.) He should stay the ambassador of the United States to Israel, if it were up to me—but I don't decide these things. Did I spill out anything? You should stay the ambassador of the United States to Israel as far as possible (Applause.) These are exceptional diplomats, and we are joined today by many other exceptional diplomats. And I thank you on behalf of the state of Israel for giving us an opportunity to speak to all of you not at the U.N. (Laughter.) This is a distinct advantage. (Applause.)

I want to say to my friends Leon Levy and Art Sandler, and of course my old-time friends Jonathan Mitchell and Sheldon Edelson—this goes on the order of the length of our acquaintance that it is wonderful seeing all of you here today. And it is a great honor for me to be on the stage that you provided so kindly, Howard, with your excellent staff that shepherded us—corralled us right in here—and prevents us from seeing all these extraordinary people in the audience. But I do see the people on the stage, and it is a privilege to be with Senators Ted Stevens and John Kerry—(applause)—two great friends of the state of Israel—(applause)—who represent over 40 senators and over 90 congressmen and congress women who are here. And I am very, very, very, very appreciative of the support that you are rendering Israel. And believe me there is not a person in Israel who does not share that same appreciation and wants to extend the same thanks.

I have to also confess to you that this is my first—I think it is—yes, it is my first AIPAC conference as the prime minister of Israel—(applause)—which—now, wait a minute, wait a minute. What this means in that in this capacity I have only seven more conferences to go—(laughter)—in this capacity. And I look forward to every one of them.

But I was discussing this with Jonathan Mitchell outside. And he said, "Well, what's it like being the prime minister of Israel?" And I said, "Well, it's like a walk in the park." (Laughter.) And he said, "You mean Central Park at midnight?" (Laughter. Applause.) And I said, "No, it's like a bed of roses but with a lot of thorns." But it is with all the challenges of this particular job, it has great rewards, first to see the things we want to see accomplished, and we are accomplishing them however difficult it is—the quest for peace. And Melvin put it correctly: the only meaningful peace, peace with security. And also a small idea that we have to

make Israel—and this should not shock you—economically self-sufficient—(applause)—and a place where Jewish people make money by being good businessmen. These are all things that are happening in Israel. And the country is undergoing a tremendous revolution. It is becoming a technological power of the first order, and the world—we are marrying our special capabilities—technological capabilities—with the idea, with the strange idea of free market principles. And the combination is explosive. It is producing unparalleled investment in Israel. And I think it will be a tremendous boon for peace. It will help all of us. (Applause.)

I think that we in Israel—and I think all of humanity—extraordinary lucky that as we enter the 21st century the United States is the only superpower. It is a great force—a force for more clarity, for democracy, for justice and for peace. (Applause.) And I think Israel is especially lucky that AIPAC exists in this country to present Israel's case. I don't think anyone is more knowledgeable than you about the Middle East as it really is. And I think no one can present our case better. And I must say that no one does it with greater dedication. It is not enough to marshal the facts. It is not enough to muster the arguments. In order to persuade and make a difference you have to bring conviction. You have to couple the heart with the mind. And that is what you do—you give your heart and your mind to Israel, and for this I thank you from the bottom of my heart. (Applause.)

I met with President Clinton today and with Secretary of State Albright, and we had very good meetings. We had I thought open talks—excellent talks—because we tried to get to the root of what it is that we can do to secure the peace. And I think that Israel and the United States share a common view. I found a real understanding for our position that there must be strong resolve in both our parties, but I think also elsewhere, to give the fight against terrorism the top priority it deserves. (Applause.) We all agree terrorism is the enemy. It is the enemy of the United States, it is the enemy of Israel, it is the enemy of peace, it is the enemy of our civilization. And it is an enemy that rears its head, and it must receive an answer. It must be stopped. Terrorism must be stopped and terrorism can be stopped. And we are the ones who ultimately will decide if it wins the day or loses ground. And I believe that it's within our capacities—when I say our capacities I mean not only the government of Israel and the government of the United States, but I think the men and women in this hall can each do their part to ensure that everyone does their part to wage the battle against terrorism.

We have I think a true friend in the White House—actually true friends—the president and the vice president. (Applause.) We have true friends in the State Department with the secretary of state. We certainly have true friends on Capitol Hill—that demonstrated aptly tonight. (Applause.) And I am sure that all of us—the administration, Congress, the government of Israel—will each be doing his part to pull together for our common cause. And with your help, which I think is indispensable, we will achieve the goal that we seek, which is a secure peace between Israel and its neighbors.

Now, this is not an easy task, because peace is elusive, and it cannot be captured merely by repeating the word "peace" like a mantra. For peace to exist in our part of the region of the world—we live in a difficult neighborhood as you no doubt ascertained—for peace to exist and survive and thrive in our part of the world, it must—it must be—the quintessential idea of peace which exists

anywhere else is an obvious thing. Peace means the absence of violence. Otherwise there is no meaning to it. (Applause.) Peace means the absence of terror. If I were to say peace and terror cannot co-exist, this ought to be a redundancy. This shouldn't be said because it is so obvious. And yet it has to be said again and again and again, because we are asked to accept the notion that we can have peace on the one hand and terrorism on the other hand, both in the same process, both co-existing. It cannot be. One drives out the other, and we have to decide if peace drives out terrorism, and not that terrorism drives out peace. (Applause.)

Now, we are engaged today in an effort to rescue the Oslo process. This is a process which was based on two parallel ideas. The first idea was that the Palestinians—the Palestinian Authority would undertake to stop terrorism from its domains. And the second was that Israel would withdraw from the population centers which would become the Palestinian domains. Two ideas. Fight terrorism, leave the population centers. That's the basic deal of Oslo. Everything else is elaboration. And you have to ask how was this cemented. It was cemented not only in the provisions of Oslo that states this quite clearly; it was so important for Israel that the late Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin refused—refused to sign onto Oslo until he got in addition to the provisions of the agreement a specific written commitment from the chairman of the PLO, Yasser Arafat, promising that he would combat terrorism, and the Palestinian Authority would fight terrorism. In other words, this is for Israel from the start this was the most fundamental aspect of Oslo.

I can say here tonight that had the Palestinians lived up to this assurance we would not be busy today trying to save the peace process. (Applause.) Now, it's widely believed that I am against Oslo—this is how it is portrayed. And I made my peace with Oslo. I made my peace with Oslo before the elections, and I said we will keep Oslo. It is not Oslo we are against; it is the idea that we alone shall keep Oslo, and the other side has agreed not to keep Oslo. (Applause.) (Audio break)—most of them before I came to office. But I completed the hardest one, the redeployment in Hebron, which as you know is the oldest point of Jewish settlement on Earth, going back almost 4,000 years to the time of Abraham. We did that.

But when we look at the other side of Oslo, did the Palestinian Authority fulfill its part, then the answer is not a recent no, because in the 30 months that preceded the elections, since the signing of Oslo—the first 30 months of the Oslo agreement Israel suffered the worst terrorist waves in its history from terrorist groups based in those same PA—Palestinian Authority domains that were provided by the Israeli government. And this culminated in a week of incredible savagery, the suicide bombings of February and March of last year which cost the lives of 60 people.

I know this is redundant, but I'll say it anyway: This was before the rise of hard-line Netanyahu government. You can't have just Netanyahu—hard-line Netanyahu government, of the intransigent Likud government, as it is commonly known. It was before all of this. And I can tell you—and I suppose this means reminding too in some quarters—this was also before Har Homa. There was no Har Homa. There was no, quote, "Provocation" in Jerusalem. There was nothing. In fact, there was the most conciliatory—okay, dovish—(laughter)—the most conciliatory government in Israel's existence. It took extra pains not to do anything that would be perceived by the Palestinian Authority as a provocation. And yet we have these incessant attacks from terrorist groups which

were not stopped by the Palestinian Authority. And this is what the people of Israel asked us to correct. They didn't say abandon Oslo. They said correct Oslo—make sure that they fulfill their side of the bargain as well. (Applause.)

I should tell you that when those waves of terrorist attacks took place last March the peace process was in danger of complete collapse. The Labor government at the time suspended the redeployment in Hebron, and in effect it stopped all of the negotiations. And it was then, and only then, that the Palestinian Authority began to do something about terrorism. They began to act then against the terrorist organizations, because they understood that failing to do so would stop the Israeli withdrawal. I have to tell you that this activity was partial, because the PA did not—did not dismantle the terrorist organizations and did not disarm the terrorists. But its efforts, however partial, coupled with the cooperation between our security agencies—and there was important cooperation—all of that was enough to demonstrate that if it wanted to the Palestinian Authority could control the situation and significantly curb terrorism. And indeed this was the case in the following months. And in fact this was the case for a full year, until there was a decision to change the policy. And now we are faced again, once again, with terrorism and violence. The excuse of course is that we are building a housing project in Har Homa. You have heard—well, it's hard to say who of us has heard more nonsense about Har Homa, you or I—but you have heard a lot of nonsense about Har Homa. So let me tell you the facts. Har Homa is not an area in Arab East Jerusalem. (Applause.) It is a barren hill in the southern part of Jerusalem, and it is on land that is mostly private land—75 percent private land owned by Jews. (Applause.) It is not a settlement. I said this morning that I have nothing against settlements, but it happens to be—that is a joke, by the way—(laughter)—but that—that there is a difference between a neighborhood in a city within the municipal boundaries of Jerusalem and a settlement is something that is obvious to you. But of course this is not obvious to anyone who watches most of the news media of the world, because this is deliberately obfuscated, the word "settlement" connoting something bad. And Har Homa is not a settlement; it is a neighborhood designed to alleviate the severe housing shortage in Jerusalem. And it is matched by our plans to have ten such projects of differing size altogether culminating in even more housing units for the Arab residents of Jerusalem, because we consider it our obligation to take care of the city's residents, whether they are Jewish or Arab, with equal effort. (Applause.)

And finally, the building of this residential neighborhood in no way contravenes the Oslo agreement. Oslo doesn't forbid in any way the construction of neighborhoods in Jerusalem—no government in Israel—not the Labor government or Likud government—would ever sign onto an accord that would limit our right to build in our ancient capital. And indeed I have to say the Labor government did not do this. (Applause.)

But Oslo does stipulate something about Jerusalem. It says that Jerusalem will be—the issue of Jerusalem will be negotiated and decided on in the final settlement negotiations, but pending the conclusion of those negotiations. There is only one stipulation about Jerusalem, and it is the curbing not of Israeli activity in Jerusalem but of Palestinian activity. The Palestinian Authority is prohibited—specifically prohibited under Oslo—to have any governmental offices in Jerusalem or any governmental activities of the Palestinian Authority. (Applause.)

So it is not Israel that is violating the Oslo Accords vis-a-vis Jerusalem; it is the Palestinian Authority which maintains illegally and contravening the Oslo Accords those offices in Jerusalem. It's a small point that I thought I should get across, because I didn't see it on the nightly news. (Applause.)

Now, we are told that building houses in Har Homa is introducing instruments of terror. This is a new concept of terror. It's called condominium terror—(laughter)—or terror of the walk-up rentals. (Laughter.) Or apartment—what is this? You can laugh, but it's not funny, because the attack on basic human values is always preceded—always preceded by a corruption of language. (Applause.) You twist people's minds by twisting the meaning of words. And once you can twist it—once you can say that there is this terrorism of the bulldozers—and that's what they say—then you can prepare the way for the acceptance by millions who listen to this pulp day in and day out that there is some kind of equality between a grievance that the Palestinians may have unjustly—unjustly as far as the agreement is concerned—that's for sure. In my opinion, as far as history and as far as justice is concerned, but that's not the point. Suppose they have a grievance. We have a grievance against them in Jerusalem. But that grievance cannot be used to vitiate the meaning of the word "terrorism," to apply it where it doesn't belong, and indeed to legitimize the blowing of 50 people in a cafe in Tel Aviv, and the murder of three young women, one with an unborn child, and the other leaving aside a scarred baby girl that will never grow up a normal human being, that will always be scarred, whether her physical wounds heal or not—her mother she will never see.

I said on another occasion that nothing justifies terrorism. And the attempt to exculpate terrorism, the attempt to excuse it or explain it, understand it, is an attempt, however, unwittingly applied by some, to justify war crimes. (Applause.) Terrorism is a war crime. War crimes—the basic concept of a war crime is that even though mankind is consigned for the foreseeable future to engage on occasion in armed conflict we call wars, we proscribe—we prohibit armed combatants to deliberately attack the other part of humanity outside the war—that is, defenseless civilians—women, children, men, babies. They might be hurt accidentally, but they cannot be deliberately and systematically attacked. That's the whole idea behind the convention outlawing war crimes. If you don't have these limits, then anything is permissible. If you don't have these limits on attacking deliberately and purposefully and systematically, men and women and children and babies, then there are no limits that tell you that you cannot throw a million babies into ovens, or five or six.

And therefore the attempt to in any way explain terrorism—an insidious attempt that we are witnessing today—is an attempt essentially to do what I call—what I recall I must say is Pope John Paul's magnificent statement. He said the greatest danger of terrorism is that it can murder man's sense of sin. And we must never accept this attempt, using Jerusalem or any other excuse, to in any way limit or diminish the horror of the savagery committed by these terrorists. And we will never accept terrorism. Nothing justifies terrorism. Nothing, period. (Applause.)

I think that for the peace process to proceed amid the difficulties that still lie ahead it is important on every occasion that each one of you without exception make your outrage of this obscenity known. It is important that you home—continuously home the perception and understanding of citizens, but especially of political leaders and

government leaders, of the absolute unacceptability of terrorism.

Now, it's now a month—almost a month—since the Palestinian Authority has made it clear to the terrorist organizations that they can resume operations. The results are known. I can tell you that a week after the bombing in Tel Aviv only a miracle prevented the slaughter of scores of young children, ranging in age from four to twelve, and I saw them on the same day in my office, and I was deeply moved and deeply gratified that such a miracle took place. I think that we should make clear that we cannot accept what we are being told. We are being told that if we want the terror to stop we must stop building in Jerusalem. You are familiar in this country with this procedure. In the United States it is called a protection racket. It's extortion. And it never ends. It's something that we reject. We are not going to be a part of it. (Applause.) We are not going to pay a price for the privilege of not being killed. (Applause.)

I've been talking about terrorism, because I think it's important to understand that no peace negotiations can take place under its threat. I think that's understandable to you too. It's the position of another foreign government—foreign to the United States, but a close ally as well. Britain is now considering negotiating with the Sinn Fein. And it is said that they are demanding the complete cessation of terrorism before the British government sits down and negotiates with the Sinn Fein. We are not taking that position. We are not taking that position because we recognize that in our part of the world there are enough fanatics who can crawl out of the woodwork and try to obstruct peace negotiations. We don't demand from our Palestinian partners 100 percent success. We do demand 100 percent effort. (Applause.) We don't attribute the presence or the perpetration of occasional isolated acts as a necessary breakdown of our partner's will.

I'll give you an example. Three weeks ago we had a terrible terrorist incident. A Jordanian soldier killed in a terrible act of savagery seven schoolgirls aged 12 and 13. We didn't point an accusing finger at Jordan. We knew that the army of Jordan, the security forces of Jordan, the government of Jordan, and the king of Jordan make every effort—and spare no effort—in order to fight terrorism. And you saw how movingly King Hussein expressed this attitude when he came to Israel to comfort the relatives of the slain girls. (Applause.)

So as much as we'd like to have 100 percent success, what we are asking from our Palestinian partners is 100 percent effort.

And right now what we are receiving is close to zero percent. And that has to change. (Applause.) And if it changes—if it changes in the coming days and weeks, I can assure you that I will be the first one to welcome this change. (Coughs.) One thing I didn't take is Contac on the plane. (Laughter.)

So it is the fulfillment of the most basic provision of Oslo that we seek. But I don't want to leave you with the sense that we have given up on the other provisions. We have stated that we would keep our side of the bargain. And we should be judged on whether we have done so. Well in the last three months—actually in the last two and a half months, we have done the following: We have redeployed in Hebron—not easy. We have released female terrorist prisoners—some of them with a lot of blood on their hands—a commitment taken by the previous government—not easy, but we did it. We passed over significant funds to the Palestinian Authority, even though they still owe us a lot—they don't pay their phone and gas bills—not easy, but we did it. We lifted the

closure. We encountered a situation where there were 25,000 workers, Palestinian workers, entitled to work in Israeli cities. We raised it to 56,000—some risk—not easy, but we did it. We did all these things—and other things—because these were solemn commitments that we took, and I said we keep Oslo.

Now, look at what happened on the other side. You have already heard Palestinian offices in Jerusalem—violation of the agreement. The fact that we have terrorists that are released rather than incarcerated—violation of the agreement. The fact that there is hostile incitement towards terrorism and violence—contrary to the agreement. The fact that the military size, the size of the military forces and the police forces of the Palestinian Authority well exceeds the limit set by the agreement—violation of the agreement. All of this, and other violations, are shunted aside. And the equation is put forward in the following way: Israel, which keeps the Oslo Accords, is accused of violating them. And the Palestinian Authority, which violates the Oslo Accords, is credited with keeping them. This is the reality within which we find ourselves. I don't have many opportunities to reach such an important audience, so I have gone through in some elaboration on this point. But it is very, very important that the truth come out. We cannot fight this battle for peace if we don't fight the battle for truth. And you are our ambassadors for truth. (Applause.)

So if you want to be truthful, then there are two essential conditions for peace. One of them is the mutual fulfillment of obligations, which I call reciprocity. And the other is the abandonment of violence and terror and the systematic fighting against terror which can enable us to proceed down the road for peace. We have to assure ourselves that this battle against terrorism is not episodic, it's not ephemeral, it's not something that is done for the next three weeks, but is something that is consistent and remains a permanent feature of Palestinian policies and attitudes. And this requires us to be convinced that the sword is not unsheathed to be used periodically every time we have an argument and then sheathed again for a few weeks until we've reached the next impasse. (Applause.) What we want is this sort of terror to be beaten into plowshares and to pruning forth into computers, into anything but terror. And that I think encapsulates the twin expectations that we have from our negotiating partners.

And if that is achieved, if we can have an assurance of a change of policy and a change of heart, then we can proceed towards final settlement negotiations. That is not a diktat; it's an option. It's an idea. And the idea basically says that rather than spend time on a protracted path, eroding mutual confidence, that we try to telescope the final settlement process and try to engage all our energies, all our efforts, on trying to resolve the Palestinian-Israeli conflict altogether. One can spend an enormous amount of effort on a small thing, or one can spend an enormous amount of effort on a big thing. I'd rather spend it on a big thing and get to the end of this conflict. Both our peoples—Palestinians and Israelis—deserve such a solution. (Applause.) And I believe it is within which—I am convinced that an accelerated process will benefit both sides. But this is an option that must be considered alongside other options. And the United States and President Clinton are considering their ideas. I am sure they will be presented to us in full form over the next days and weeks and months, and I am sure the same will apply to the Palestinian Authority. I trust the United States to be not only an indispensable partner for peace—it has been the mainstay of all our successful efforts for

peace—all of them, from Camp David on—and it will be in this successful effort as well.

But I think the key ingredient to assure that these peace talks succeed is the narrowing of the distance between the size. And this requires of necessity tailoring expectations to reality. It's not easy to do that. It's the main job of leaders to do that, because your constituents will always demand more.

Now, we had to take a significant move, and we took it before the elections and after the elections. We recognized that we could not fulfill all of our dreams. We recognized there were facts on the ground. We recognized there were agreements that had been signed. And we said that we would honor those agreements and recognize those facts—and it wasn't easy—not before the elections, not after the elections, not before Hebron and not after Hebron—not today. But that is the job of leaders. They have to tell their people the truth and make them see the vision forward and the reality present. We do not see yet such a movement on the Palestinian leadership's part. (Applause.) They still cling—you clap for that? They still cling to an impossible idea. They cling to the idea that we will return to the '67 boundaries, that we will redivide Jerusalem, that we will build a Palestinian state. I have to tell you we are not going back to the '67 boundaries. (Applause.) We will not risk ourselves and the lives of future generations. (Applause.) And we are not going back to those insecure and indefensible lines. We oppose the Palestinian state because those sovereign powers that accrue to statehood—such as control of the airspace or control of the borders, and the importation of weapons of mass destruction, or even focused destruction—could endanger the very survival of the state of Israel. And we certainly under no circumstances will ever redivide Jerusalem. (Applause. Cheers.)

You hear references today—references today that you hear about Jerusalem or Arab East Jerusalem as a separate city—there is no such thing. Jerusalem is one city. It was divided for 19 years. It was reunited in the Six Day War. It shall stay united. (Applause.) I spent my childhood in that city from Day Two—when I was two days old. And so I grew up in that city, and I remember it. I remember it as a city, a walled city. In the middle of the city there was a wall with barbed wire and sniper positions. And I remember that people could not sit on the terraces of the King David Hotel without fear of being shot from the Old City. They preferred always the rooms facing the other way. Now thank God it has changed. It will remain changed. (Applause.)

And the fact of our bond with the city of Jerusalem is something that all of humanity recognizes, and certainly those that don't recognize it—they don't do so because they don't know our special bond. We have a bond with that city unlike any other bond of any other people to any other city in the world. It is a bond that has existed for 3,000 years. And no other people had Jerusalem as its capital during those three millennia except the Jewish people. No other people will have Jerusalem as their capital for the coming millennia as well. (Applause.)

I don't think there is any other body in the world that recognizes our attachment to Jerusalem and our rights to Jerusalem than the U.S. Congress, the Senate and the House together. (Applause.) Since the Six Day War, since Jerusalem was reunited, Congress has recognized the unity of Jerusalem in 30 special and separate initiatives, and this includes initiatives by such extraordinary figures in American life as Scoop Jackson and Hubert Humphrey and Everett Dirksen and Immanuel Seller (sp)—the youngsters here don't remember those names, but I remem-

ber those names—wonderful, wonderful Americans. And Jacob Javits (sp) and Hugh Scott (sp) and Edward Kennedy and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, and Joseph Lieberman, and Connie Mack, and Newt Gingrich, and Daniel Inouye and many, many others who have raised their voice in Congress on behalf of Jerusalem. (Applause.)

And there are many, many leaders here tonight who are doing and who will continue to do much with the unity of Jerusalem. I think that some of them have spoken in remarkably moving ways. I think of—since this is a bipartisan meeting—that Dick Gephardt's description of Jerusalem as the crown jewel of modern civilization is a wonderful penetration of the truth of what Jerusalem encapsulates in people's aspirations. He called it a triumph of faith and freedom—not just for the Jewish people, but for all people. And on the other side of the aisle Trent Lott, in another house, talked from this podium on his next visit to Jerusalem, and he said to touch those great stones of the Western Wall that still speak to us over all the tragic ages—stones which remained the enduring foundation of faith that has survived the unthinkable and accomplished the impossible.

These are words that come from the heart of people who share our aspirations, because Jerusalem is more than a city. It is a great ideal. It is sacred to the three great faiths of the world—to Islam, to Christianity and to Judaism. And it is something that we will always hold as precious for them as it is for us. (Applause.) It is the city on the hill. It is often the city of harsh reality and conflict, but it's also the city of light and dreams. And it is the city of song and prayer—prayer for a better world, prayer that there will be peace for men and women of good will, that we will see this peace in our lifetime and bequeath it to our children for all time. The people of Israel and the government of Israel are determined to do whatever is possible to realize this hope for peace—peace for Jerusalem, peace for Israel, peace for Israel's neighbors. And with your help—all of your help—I am sure we will succeed in this effort. Thank you. (Applause.)

I want to thank Senators Stevens and Kerry for having the patience to endure. And I have to apologize to them and to you—I have a plane to catch. It's mine—(laughter)—but I have an appointment in Jerusalem. So I want to say thank you again, and see you soon in Jerusalem—not next year, but this year. Thank you. (Applause.)

RETIREMENT OF PAUL
HOLLOWAY, NASA LANGLEY RE-
SEARCH CENTER

HON. ROBERT C. SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Congressman HERB BATEMAN and myself to pay tribute to Dr. Paul F. Holloway on the occasion of his recent retirement from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or NASA. During a career spanning nearly 37 years, which included over 5 years as the director of NASA's Langley Research Center in Virginia, Mr. Holloway exemplified the leadership, wisdom, and scientific achievement for which NASA has long been proud.

Following graduation from the Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University, Paul began his distinguished career at NASA as an aerospace research engineer. By 1972 he was

already the chief of the Space Systems Division, and, only 3 years later, was named the Director for Space. In this position, Mr. Holloway led efforts in advanced space transportation, the space station, large space antenna research, and Langley's atmospheric science programs. As a fitting pinnacle of a dedicated career, Paul was named as the 6th director of the Langley Research Center in 1991.

Among Paul's awards and honors are an honorary doctorate from Old Dominion University in our home State, membership in the International Academy of Astronautics, the Presidential Rank of Meritorious Service, the Senior Executive Service's Distinguished Presidential Rank award—presented in 1987 and again in 1993—and NASA's Equal Employment Opportunity Medal for "exemplary leadership, commitment to equity, diversity, and excellence"

Under Paul Holloway's leadership, the NASA Langley Research Center has continued its 80 years of invaluable service to the Nation's scientific, space, and aeronautic research and development efforts and he has helped it to achieve worldwide recognition. Thanks in large part to Paul's direction, NASA as an agency—and the Langley Research Center in particular—are now both on a direct course toward the 21st century, ready to expand on the proud achievements and heritage which has been the hallmark of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Paul Holloway and, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take the opportunity today to recognize his service publicly.

H.R. 1003, THE ASSISTED SUICIDE
FUNDING RESTRICTION ACT

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 10, 1997, I was absent from this Chamber to be home in North Dakota attending to the flooding crisis plaguing large areas of my district. On the 10th, I accompanied Mr. James Lee Witt, Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, on a visit to North Dakota to coordinate the Federal response to the disaster declared in the State in the wake of recent blizzards and flooding.

Unfortunately, attending to the flooding crisis back home caused me to miss the vote on H.R. 1003, the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act. I strongly support this legislation, and had I been in the House on Thursday, would have voted for its passage. The debate over assisted suicide implicates some of the most troubling moral and ethical questions in today's society. Issues such as whether vulnerable populations might be targeted for assisted suicide and whether patients grappling with depression and severe illness can make sound choices on this matter demonstrate the troubling consequences of an embrace of assisted suicide. In addition, many Americans' strong religious convictions lead them to abhor suicide in any situation. These factors—and the resulting extreme controversy of the practice—make it abundantly clear that the Federal Government should not be in the business of

using taxpayer dollars to fund assisted suicide. H.R. 1003 ensures that this will not occur and consequently has my strong support.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, regretfully, I was unable to attend the vote on the floor of the House of Representatives on H.R. 1003, the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act, on April 10, 1997. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted in support of the measure, as I believe that American taxpayers should not be required to subsidize the practice of euthanasia, that is, assisted suicide.

The U.S. Supreme Court has heard oral arguments for two cases concerning the constitutionality of euthanasia. One case is 95-1858, *Vacco v. Quill*, and the other one is 96-110, *Washington v. Glucksberg*. Both are pending a decision.

H.R. 1003, the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act, is a necessary measure to protect the Federal Government from potentially having to provide Federal funds, under the guise of health care, to be used for euthanasia.

THE BANK OF GUAM: 25 YEARS OF
EXCELLENT SERVICE TO THE
PEOPLE OF GUAM

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, responsibility, service, commitment—these noble words are fitting descriptions for the role Bank of Guam has played on Guam for the past 25 years. Chartered for operation on March 13, 1972, the Bank of Guam was the brainchild of Mr. Jesus S. Leon Guerrero, cofounder and chairman of its board of directors, and the late Mr. Jose L.G. Untalan.

Out of concern for the people of Guam, Mr. Leon Guerrero and Mr. Untalan decided to take on the responsibility of establishing a full service banking institution tailoring to the needs of island residents. Not only did they see this type of institution sorely lacking on Guam, as pioneering businessmen, they were also driven by a desire to service their island community utilizing their business acumen.

December 11, 1972, was opening day for Mr. Leon Guerrero, Mr. Untalan, and 13 staff members. From its humble beginnings in the Santa Cruz area of Agana to branches in Saipan, Rota, Tinian, Chuuk, Pohnpei, Majuro, Ebeye, Kwajalein, Palau, and San Francisco, the Bank of Guam has expanded to tremendous proportions. Their services range from full service banking, to ATM machines, to investment opportunities, to home banking. Currently managed by a cadre of business professionals following in the footsteps of the two founders, the Bank of Guam is fulfilling its promise to the people of Guam and to the people of Micronesia as a responsible banking institution.

In conjunction with the hallmarks of responsibility and service, Bank of Guam is also known for its sincere commitment to the community as a whole. This commitment has made it possible for its successful operation during these past 25 years. With competent staff members and an experienced board of directors, Bank of Guam is leading the banking community in our region into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, although this is a mere outline of Bank of Guam's numerous accomplishments, one can clearly comprehend the overwhelming positive impact this institution has had, and will continue to have, on the people of Guam and Micronesia. On this occasion of their silver anniversary, I am submitting this Record as testimony of their significant achievements. For 25 years, the Bank of Guam has faithfully served our island communities, and I believe that it will continue to provide excellent services. In the words of Mr. Jesus Leon Guerrero, "There are two fundamental reasons why I wanted to take the risk in starting the Bank of Guam. No. 1, provide a service to the community that was not available, and then two, back up that service with a commitment to take care of our people." The Bank of Guam has proven itself numerous times with respect to this philosophy.

Congratulations to the Bank of Guam for 25 years of dedicated service to the community. The legacy which the original pioneers—Jesus S. Leon Guerrero and Jose L.G. Untalan—left behind will continue to be strong, vibrant and beneficial to the people of Guam for generations to come. We have every confidence that current president, Tony Leon Guerrero, and his excellent staff will build on that legacy.

In Chamorro we refer to the Bank of Guam as *Bangkon Ifet*—the Bank of Ifil. Ifil is the hardest wood which can be found in Guam. The Bank of Guam has become synonymous with the strength and durability which the ifil tree represents. More importantly, both the Bank of Guam and the ifil tree represent growth from the soil and soul of Guam. *Si Yu'os Ma'ase Bangkon Ifet*.

IN MEMORIAM OF BLANCHE
WOLFF

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sorrow over the passing of Blanche Wolff, a friend, a constituent and the wife of our former colleague, Lester Wolff.

Lester held the seat which I now represent for eight terms; over the years, I have come to know the family quite well. Beside him, always rendering counsel and advice was his helpmate of 58 years, Blanche, a compassionate able lady who was loved by constituents to whom she was always available. Theirs was a romance that began in elementary school and flourished through the years.

Blanche was born in New York City, matriculated at Hunter College and graduated with an accounting degree in 1940. She was a self-effacing person who was comfortable with heads of state whom she met with Lester, and as well was always sensitive to the needs of those less fortunate than her.

During World War II she volunteered for the security detail at the LaGuardia airport control tower. Never one to pursue her own place in the spotlight, she was the doting parent of Diane and Bruce and glorified in their careers as well as Lester's.

Blanche held strong views in the area of human rights and she used for good purpose the influence that her position allowed. She was an active participant in ORT, Hadassah, Association to Help Retarded Children and the NAACP. She truly exemplified American womanhood: A modern woman who grew with the times, but one who never forgot her heritage or her principles.

This land of ours is better for Blanche; its loss is even greater.

I have lost a constituent. America has lost one of its great ladies.

ON ANDREW McCOLLUM'S
ATTAINMENT OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Andrew McCollum of North Olmsted, OH, who will be honored this month for his recent attainment of Eagle Scout.

The attainment of Eagle Scout is a high and rare honor requiring years of dedication to self-improvement, hard work and the community. Each Eagle Scout must earn 21 merit badges, twelve of which are required, including badges in: lifesaving; first aid; citizenship in the community; citizenship in the Nation; citizenship in the world; personal management of time and money; family life; environmental science; and camping.

In addition to acquiring and proving proficiency in those and other skills, an Eagle Scout must hold leadership positions within the troop where he learns to earn the respect and hear the criticism of those he leads.

The Eagle Scout must live by the Scouting Law, which holds that he must be: trustworthy, loyal, brave, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, clean, and reverent.

And the Eagle Scout must complete an Eagle Project, which he must plan, finance and evaluate on his own. It is no wonder that only 2 percent of all boys entering scouting achieve this rank.

Andy's Eagle Project was the clean up of an island in the Cleveland Metro Park system which will enable animals and birds to feed and reclaim the island as part of a vibrant local ecology.

My fellow colleagues, let us join boy Scouts of America Troop 53 in recognizing and praising Andy for his achievement.

CONGRATULATIONS TO TEMPLE
BETH ZION-BETH ISRAEL SYNA-
GOGUE

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Temple Beth

Zion-Beth Israel Synagogue, in Philadelphia, PA, the congregation and community at large will celebrate with the recitation of the Kiddush Proceed and festive music. Located in central Philadelphia, Temple Beth Israel was established in 1840 and is the third oldest congregation in the Philadelphia. This historic congregation merged with Beth Zion (1946) in 1964.

In 1984, the Neziner congregation merged with Temple Beth Zion-Beth Israel. Today, the Neziner congregation would have been over 100 years old. All the artifacts from the Neziner Synagogue were carefully and lovingly placed at Beth Zion-Beth Israel in the lower level referred to as the Neziner Chapel.

This multicultural congregation represents Beth Israel members from Germany and Poland, and Neziner members from Russia and eastern Europe. Beth Zion members are offspring of both waves of immigrants who defied flight to the suburbs and created a major Jewish congregation in the heart of this great American city.

The present quarters, a gothic stone structure of the 19th century known as "A jewel of a synagogue," with its lofty tower, is reminiscent of the ancient synagogue in Prague, with its distinctive architecture. The sound interior upholds the concept of the threefold function of a synagogue: a house of worship; an area of study; and a meeting place. Some of the services provided to the congregation include a Hebrew School and Youth Activities Program for youth age 1½ through high school. Additionally, the synagogue offers an Adult Education Studies Program which is open to the public.

The anniversary of this great American multicultural Jewish synagogue is worthy of mention to remind us of the extent to which diversity is an integral part of the American character.

ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER
NETANYAHU'S ADDRESS TO THE
"VOICES UNITED FOR ISRAEL"
CONFERENCE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu gave a major address to the participants of the Voices United for Israel Conference in Washington, DC. Comprised of 200 Christian and Jewish organizations, Voices United for Israel collectively represents 40 million Americans whose support for Israel and its security are strong.

Because the Prime Minister's remarks were especially noteworthy, I would like to take this opportunity to share his speech with my colleagues, and therefore request that it be reprinted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER BENJAMIN
NETANYAHU AT "VOICES UNITED FOR IS-
RAEL" BREAKFAST

(By Prime Minister Netanyahu)

I may be 7,000 miles from Jerusalem, but I feel very much at home here. And I think the main reason is that you, too, feel that Jerusalem is your home too. Jerusalem is the home of all of those who believe in our val-

ues—in our values of freedom, in the dignity of man, in democracy, in peace, in belief and faith in the Almighty. That is what Jerusalem is.

Some describe it today as "Arab East Jerusalem." This is the place where David ruled. This is the place where Isaiah prophesied his eternal prophesies. This is the place where I walk and I feel my ancestors' footsteps on those stones, on those paths, on that ground. Jerusalem was, is, and will always be the capital of the Jewish people.

Jerusalem is the City of David, the City on a Hill, the city which the nation of Israel has cherished as its capital for 3,000 years. And it is something that defies all rational explanations. The connection of the Jewish people to its land and to its eternal city has broken all the laws of history.

It is more powerful than all the laws of history because it expresses the deepest yearning of the human soul and of a people to reach its salvation, to return once again to the crucible in which it was formed, in which its most cherished values were forged, and in which its future and its destiny can be realized once again. That is what Jerusalem means for all of us. (Applause.)

So it's not just a city. It is a great city, but it is also an ideal and, I think, an expression not only of the Jewish people's but of mankind's loftiest aspirations.

I know there are attempts to divide the city. It is done sometimes directly, sometimes obliquely, sometimes by challenging our rights to build apartments, for God's sake, in our city—apartments. (Laughter, applause.) But I want to assure you today, we will never allow Jerusalem to be redivided again—ever, never. We will keep the city united, and we will continue to do what we have done for the last two decades—three decades—and that is to keep it an open city, a city of peace, a city accessible to all three great faiths.

And it is only under Israel, in the close to 2,000 years since our dispersion and exile, that we have enabled that city to be open to every believer and every worshiper. That was not the case—it was not the case when the city was ruled by others. It was not the case in the 19 years from the start of the state of Israel, when the city was conquered—that eastern part of the city was conquered, and Jews were barred from the holiest place for the Jewish people, the Western Wall. And you know the fate of Christians in Jerusalem as well. That has changed forever.

We will keep Jerusalem united and we will keep Jerusalem open and accessible for unfettered worship for all Christians and Muslims and Jews. And we shall never resurrect those ramparts.

Now you have heard many things about Har Homa. You have heard that it is an Arab-occupied land in East Jerusalem—a settlement. Indeed. Well, first of all, it's not in East Jerusalem, it's in the southern part of Jerusalem. Secondly, it's not Arab-occupied land, it is land that is 75 percent private Jewish land—by the way, expropriated by the Labor government, god forbid. (Laughter.) The Likud didn't do this. There must be something wrong with this model! (Laughter.) And it is not, as was said, a settlement—not that I have anything against settlements, as you know. But it happens to be a neighborhood.

You can go out of this hotel and you can see a neighborhood: streets, apartments, groceries, supermarkets. What's wrong with that? Nothing.

This is what happens in cities; they grow. People get married, they have children, they need apartments. And that's what governments do. Preferably, they don't build; they allow contractors to build. We call that private initiative. But that's what we're doing.

We're allowing contractors to build in Har Homa for the Jewish couples who need it. But we're also allowing constructions and contracts to build, in 10 Arab neighborhoods, actually a greater number of apartments, in the next three years, than in Har Homa, for Palestinian couples. Why not? That is what we do as a sovereign and a united Jerusalem. We take care of all its residents; Palestinians and Israelis; Moslems, Christians and Jews—everyone—and that is our right; that is our obligation. Now, this simple act has been described as an "act of terrorism"—the terrorism of the walk-up rentals—(laughter)—the terrorism of the condominiums. (Laughter.) Now you laugh; it's not a laughing matter. I'll explain to you why; because people take this seriously. And this is used to justify the most savage crimes that we can conjure up. And a few weeks ago, this was used to justify the blowing up of a cafe in downtown Tel Aviv, where three young women were murdered, one of them carrying an unborn child and another leaving a scarred baby, whose scars may get healed, one hopes, but who will grow up never knowing her mother, who died in that blast. And 50 others were wounded as well. And this is justified.

Well, it's explained; it's not justified. The line goes like this: They say—because you have to say it—that nothing justifies terrorism. "But you have to understand," they say, "that these people had no remedy because of the terrorism of the bulldozers. They felt they had to do something to vent out their frustration."

Now this is a peculiar argument, because I want to give you a corollary argument. If this is true, then we must understand another individual who, seeing hundreds of his countrymen being blown up in the streets of Tel Aviv and Jerusalem and Haifa and everywhere a few years ago by Palestinian terrorists, seeing that there was no recourse from the government at the time, he said, "I have to have a remedy. I have to act!" and he went into a mosque, into the cave of the Tomb of the Patriarchs, the Machpela Cave, and he gunned down 40 worshippers. Would anyone think of saying, "We have to understand it; he had no other recourse, he had to remedy, he had to seek a remedy"? Of course not. We condemned it—everyone in Israel. I condemned it, with the greatest force that I could muster, because nothing justifies the murder of innocent people—nothing, ever—nothing!

If we accept, even in the insidious language that is used to exculpate and explain and wash away these crimes—if we accept that, we vitiate the whole notion of war crimes, because what is a war crime? For centuries, indeed millennia, there was no such thing as a war crime. We had savagery perpetrated and savagery justified.

But for the last 150 years, humanity is making an effort—difficult—we've seen in this century how difficult—to define limits to conflict. And we say that even though mankind has not yet reached Isaiah's peace—and, yes, we still have swords that we haven't beaten into plowshares—we cling to the dream. But even as we are living in this imperfect world, we set limits to the use of swords. And we say that we don't deliberately murder men, women, and children—innocent people.

We divide the world into two. On the one side are combatants—soldiers. On the other side are civilians. We may engage combatants, and we may, on occasion—not deliberately, accidentally, in times of war—hurt and even kill civilians. But we dare not deliberately cross the line and systematically and purposefully murder civilians—men, women, children, babies.

And if we do, that is called a war crime. That means that when you gas babies, that is a war crime. Not everything is allowed. Terrorism is a war crime. And when we say that there has to be a remedy, an understanding, an exculpation, a justification, understand these people, you are saying, "Understand war criminals." We will never understand these war criminals! We will always fight them. Nothing justifies terrorism. Everything justifies a battle against terrorism—everything.

And to create this monstrous equation, we are being told that our building of these flats is a "declaration of war." What a concept of peace! What an inversion of language, what a perversion of the basic concepts that guide our civilization. I can't think of something more insidious.

I think there is nothing more destructive of achieving a real peace than doing such injury to the truth. And the truth is simple; terrorism is incompatible with the peace process. It's incompatible with peace. It's one or the other, but not both. The whole idea of peace is that you live in peace. What does peace mean? It's not being blown to pieces; it means coming back home in one piece.

Ant terrorism is that exact opposite of this. It's not only not morally justified; it's practically impossible to seek peace, to engage in the quest for peace and at the same time sanction terrorism. And, therefore, we have put forward a simple proposition; the other side took on obligations; we took on obligations. And we didn't like this agreement, but we said orderly governments keep their agreements; we keep ours. Sometimes this mandates very difficult decisions on our part, and I have taken them. But we expect the other side to keep their part.

For example, they have a covenant calling for the destruction of Israel; they promised to annul it—annul it—finish it. This is an obligation. For another, they promised to fight terrorism emanating from their own domains. Fight terrorism; keep your obligation. Sadat came to Jerusalem; he understood this very clearly. He said, "No more war, no more bloodshed." He didn't say: "Oh, well, we now have protracted negotiations. And if you don't do what I want, there'll be bloodshed." He said, "Once we enter the path of peace, we leave the path of bloodshed."

This is what we expect from our negotiating partners. This is what they have to demand of themselves, if they want to be accepted as genuine partners for peace—peace—and not terror.

Now there has been some talk about our giving something, making a concession in return for a real crackdown by the Palestinian Authority on the terrorist organization. And this means, pure and simple, surrender to terrorism. We are being told to pay for the privilege of not being killed. We are not going to do that.

We demand, as is our right, 100 percent effort against terrorism. We know there can't be 100 percent success, although I must tell you, that another government right now is negotiating, under somewhat analogous conditions—all analogies are imperfect—but the British government is negotiating with the Sinn Fein right now, and they are saying, "A complete cessation of terrorism; otherwise, we don't talk."

Well, we're in a different process. We have inherited it. We don't say that, because we also know that there are fanatics around who could upset the process, if they operate against the wishes of our negotiating partners. Now that, on occasion, can happen.

It happened two weeks ago—three weeks ago—in a terrible incident along the Jordan. And the Jordan—the Jordan's water was

stained with the blood of seven young girls, 12- and 13-year-olds. And a Jordanian soldier broke ranks fired at them, killed them, in an act of savage terrorism.

We didn't blame Jordan. We didn't blame the army of Jordan; we know it's doing all it can to fight terrorism.

We didn't blame the security forces of Jordan; we know they're doing all they can to fight terrorism. We didn't blame the king of Jordan because we know he's doing all he can to fight terrorism. Indeed, you saw him coming to the families, and therein lies the difference. They are making a hundred-percent effort; it, however, there can't be a hundred-percent success.

But look at what is happening on the other side. A hundred-percent effort? Almost zero effort, and at times zero and worse than zero, because a few weeks ago they gave the green light to terrorism. We know they have a capacity to control the terrorists. They have shown it for the last year. Fearing the consequences, they kept tight—a very tight lid on these terrorists. They incarcerated them; they took action against them. But now, witnessing a first impasse, understanding that this is a different government that will not redivide Jerusalem, will not go back to the '67 boundaries, will not establish an armed Palestinian state on our borders, they understand that now.

They want to bend our will by giving the green light to these people, to these criminals, and this will not do; not merely because we will bend—that's obvious—but also because we cannot have peace this way. And if we want peace, they must fight terrorism. That is their obligation. We will fight terrorism, too, I assure you, and we do. And there are many, many successes of which you don't hear because it never comes to pass. But we have every right to demand from our partners for peace, to be partners for peace. And this is what I have come to say here in Washington, and this is what I say also back home in Israel. And this is what I want you to say, far and wide in this country, because we have not only a struggle for peace, we have a struggle for the truth. And I need your help to get the truth out. We have no greater friend and no greater ally than the truth. And we have no greater friends and no greater allies than the people sitting today in this room. And I salute you, and I thank you for helping us pursue this goal.

I think we can convince the world of our justice, the justice of our cause. And I think that you can play an immeasurable role in that part. You can make it clear to the American people, of all persuasions, that the road through peace or to peace goes through the negotiating table, not through the slaughter of women and children. You can convince all fair-minded people that if we allow terrorism to prevail, that if we make concessions to appease terrorists, we will be like those of whom the prophet Jeremiah said, they—he described them as saying, "Peace, peace," when there is no peace. Well, we want there to be peace, and you can tell our friends, your friends and ours, that together we can achieve such a peace, a peace that will last, a peace that will bring prosperity and progress and, above all, security to the people of the Middle East. It is time for that kind of peace. It is time that the children of Israel and the children of the Palestinians will be free to live free of violence, free to enjoy the fruits of God's Earth. It is time for that genuine peace. And that is the peace we aim to achieve and which, I believe, that with your help and with God's help, we will bring to our part of the Earth. Thank you.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, April 15, 1997, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 16

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Higher Education Act.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of the Army.

SD-192

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Federal Communications Commission.

S-146, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Transportation, focusing on aviation safety and security.

SD-124

Armed Services
Airland Forces Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 450, the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999, focusing on tactical aircraft modernization plans.

SR-222

Finance
To hold hearings on education tax proposals, including S. 1, to provide safe and affordable schools.

SD-215

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on the Census in the year 2000.

SD-342

Judiciary
To hold hearings on S.J. Res. 6, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of crime victims.

SH-216

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Education.

SD-124

Armed Services
Strategic Forces Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 450, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, focusing on information warfare programs, policies, and issues.

SR-222

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1998 for Federally-funded research and development projects and to examine associated trends.

SR-253

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the Federal Government's role in television programming.

SD-342

Judiciary
Youth Violence Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the need for more juvenile bedspace and juvenile record-sharing.

SD-226

Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.

SH-219

APRIL 17

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on crop and revenue insurance issues.

SR-332

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

SD-192

9:15 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine opportunities for improvement in the public schools of the District of Columbia.

SD-342

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of the Treasury, focusing on law enforcement programs.

SD-124

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Training Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine innovations in youth training.

SD-430

Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to consider the committee's course of action concerning petitions filed in connection with a

contested U.S. Senate election held in Louisiana in November 1996.

SR-301

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine Persian Gulf War issues.

SH-216

10:00 a.m.

Armed Services
Readiness Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 450, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999, focusing on the status of the operational readiness of the U.S. military forces.

SR-222

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Oceans and Fisheries Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 39, to revise the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean.

SR-253

Finance
To hold hearings on certain revenue raising provisions of the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1998.

SD-215

Foreign Relations
To resume hearings on the ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (Treaty Doc. 103-21).

SD-419

Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on Korea, Burma, and Hong Kong.

SD-138

1:30 p.m.

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Supreme Court of the United States and the Judiciary.

S-146, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations
Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review U.S. efforts relating to the proliferation of Iran.

SD-419

Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.

SH-219

APRIL 18

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to examine proposals to improve the health status of children.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nomination of Thomas R. Pickering, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

SD-419

APRIL 22

9:30 a.m.
 Appropriations
 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the National Science Foundation and the Office of Science and Technology Policy.
 SD-192

Appropriations
 Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Environmental Management Program of the Department of Energy.
 SD-124

Indian Affairs
 To hold hearings on S. 459, to authorize funds for and extend the Native American Programs Act of 1974.
 SR-485

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Agricultural Research Service, the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, the Economic Research Service, and the National Agricultural Statistics Service, all of the Department of Agriculture.
 SD-138

2:00 p.m.
 Judiciary
 Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine the antitrust implications of the British Airways and American Airlines Alliance.
 SD-226

APRIL 23

9:30 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Higher Education Act.
 SD-430

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Defense Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense, focusing on medical programs.
 SD-192

Appropriations
 District of Columbia Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on an additional funding request for fiscal year 1997 by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority for capital improvements to D.C. public schools and for public safety agencies.
 SD-138

Armed Services
 To hold hearings on the Administration's proposal on NATO enlargement.
 SH-216

APRIL 24

9:30 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Interior Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the National Endowment for the Arts/National Endowment for the Humanities.
 SD-192

Appropriations
 Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Corp

of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.
 SD-124

10:00 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 To hold hearings to examine issues relating to vocational education.
 SD-430

APRIL 29

9:30 a.m.
 Appropriations
 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Veterans Affairs.
 SD-138

Energy and Natural Resources
 To hold oversight hearings to review a GAO evaluation of the development of the Draft Tongass Land Management Plan.
 SD-366

Indian Affairs
 Business meeting, to mark up S. 459, to authorize funds for and extend the Native American Programs Act of 1974; to be followed by an oversight hearing on the implementation of the San Carlos Water Rights Settlement Act of 1991 (P.L. 102-575).
 SR-485

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Resources.
 SD-124

Labor and Human Resources
 To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities.
 SD-430

APRIL 30

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Defense Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense, focusing on the structure and modernization of the National Guard.
 SD-192

MAY 1

9:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Interior Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of the Interior.
 SD-192

9:30 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 Public Health and Safety Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine biomedical research priorities.
 SD-430

MAY 6

9:30 a.m.
 Appropriations
 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
 SD-138

MAY 7

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Defense Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense.
 SD-192

MAY 14

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Defense Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense, focusing on environmental programs.
 SD-192

MAY 21

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Defense Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Air Force programs.
 SD-192

JUNE 4

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Defense Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense.
 SD-192

JUNE 11

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Defense Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense.
 SD-192

CANCELLATIONS

APRIL 15

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on counter-terrorism issues.
 S-146, Capitol

POSTPONEMENTS

APRIL 15

9:30 a.m.
 Appropriations
 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
 SD-138

APRIL 16

10:00 a.m.
 Small Business
 Business meeting, to mark up S. 208, to provide Federal contracting opportunities for small business concerns located in historically underutilized business zones.
 SR-428A

[Blank Page]