

Program. They can write a letter to us in the Senate. They can call. They can visit. They can fax. But, they do not need to send money to a direct-mail vendor in order to be heard in the Congress.

Mr. President, before seniors send in \$10, \$20, or \$30 to these so-called seniors groups they should consider the following. The most effective way only costs 32 cents. I will always place more importance on a personal letter or a visit from one of my constituents than on a letter or preprinted card from a group that distorts their views.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain material, editorials, and extraneous matter that relate to this issue that I have discussed this morning.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE
SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE,
Washington, DC, October 23, 1995.

Hon. DAVID PRYOR,

Ranking Minority Member, Senate Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR PRYOR: Thank you for forwarding the September 22, 1995 letter of the *Coalition for America's Future*. Regrettably, that letter lists our organization as a member of this coalition and falsely implies our support for its position in favor of the \$245 billion tax cut package contained in the budget reconciliation bill.

I want to emphasize in the strongest possible terms that the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare did not endorse this letter or approve of the use of our organization's name in connection with this letter. We had no advance knowledge that it was sent to Congress and only learned of its existence today after you forwarded it to us.

Our position in strong opposition to the pending budget reconciliation bill is well known to Congress. It is the position of this organization that the \$270 billion cut in Medicare to finance tax cuts, primarily for upper income individuals and corporations, is unfair and unjustified. We supported an alternative bill in the House which eliminated the tax cuts and made only those cuts in Medicare necessary to insure its solvency.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

MARTHA A. MCSTEEN,
President.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 2, 1995]

FUNDRAISER ALREADY A MEDICARE WINNER
(By Jack Anderson and Michael Binstein)

The battle to reform Medicare still has a long way to go on Capitol Hill, but it's already clear who one of the biggest winners will be: Richard Viguerie, the conservative king of direct-mail fund-raising.

Three groups founded by Viguerie—the Seniors Coalition, the United Seniors Association and 60-Plus—have teamed with the House Republican leadership to gather public support for its controversial Medicare changes. The Coalition to Save Medicare was launched in July and includes the three seniors' groups, in addition to leading industry groups such as the National Association of Manufacturers and the Alliance for Managed Care.

But according to documents uncovered by the Democratic staff of the Senate Special

Committee on Aging, much of the money being raised by two of the three seniors' groups is going straight to Viguerie's for-profit company.

Although the Seniors Coalition is no longer associated with Viguerie, having severed its ties with him in 1993, the two other groups remain dependent on Viguerie's fund-raising prowess. United Seniors Association, for example, signed a contract with Viguerie's for-profit direct-mail firm, American Target Advertising, that calls for ATA to receive as much as 50 percent of gross revenue from direct mail until July 30, 1996. After that, ATA will get 25 percent of the take.

In Viguerie's contact with 60-Plus, Viguerie & Associates—later reorganized to become ATA—is slated to own 70 percent of the income for the life of the mailing lists. According to direct-mail experts, this means Viguerie "owns" 70 percent of the organization, including its fund-raising operation. Some direct-mail experts wonder if 60-Plus should be allowed to retain its nonprofit status, which lets it mail solicitations at taxpayer-subsidized rates.

"I've never seen anything like this [contract]," Sen. David Pryor (Ark.) told our associate Jan Moller. Pryor, the ranking Democrat on the Aging Committee, has been directing the Hill investigation. "I've never seen one this flagrant. The worst part of it is the real deception. They're collecting the dollars from the seniors and using those dollars to reduce these programs that are so necessary for their quality of life."

The Viguerie style of fund-raising is as familiar as it is effective: It starts with a "scare" letter warning seniors of the imminent collapse of Medicare unless something is done. It ends with a request for money, often accompanied by a petition to sign or some other device so respondents can get their "voice" heard in Washington. Viguerie did not respond to our telephone calls.

But when Aging Committee staff members called a sampling of Arkansas seniors whose names appeared on a "telegram" sent to Pryor's office by United Seniors Association, they got a surprise: Less than 15 percent of the seniors said they supported the Republican effort to cut Medicare spending by \$270 billion. And only 47 percent acknowledged being members of the association.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the Chair. I also once again thank my colleagues for allowing me to go a little longer than I had originally anticipated.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). Morning business is closed.

JERUSALEM EMBASSY RELOCATION IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 1995

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1322, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1322) to provide for the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator KOHL

be added as a cosponsor to the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. I also ask unanimous consent that the time consumed as a part of this debate be subtracted from the time originally provided for Senator BYRD from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, might I ask unanimous consent to add my name as an original cosponsor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senator WELLSTONE will be added as an original cosponsor.

Mr. KYL. May I also ask unanimous consent that a letter received this morning addressed to Senator DOLE, Senator MOYNIHAN, myself, and Senator INOUE from AIPAC be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIPAC,
October 24, 1995.

DEAR SENATORS DOLE, MOYNIHAN, KYL, AND INOUE: We wish to express our strong support for the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Act, as modified. It is historic and unprecedented. For the first time, the Senate will have voted on binding legislation to move our embassy to Jerusalem by a date certain, May 31, 1999.

The waiver language contained in the bill is very tightly drawn, allowing the President to waive the funding provision only to protect US national security interest—a very high standard to meet. Clearly, the Senate has indicated that it does not expect this waiver to be exercised lightly, without strong and serious justification. Our embassy belongs in the capital of the State of Israel, just as it is in the designated capital of every other country with which we have diplomatic relations.

As celebrations continue marking the 3,000th anniversary of King David's incorporation of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, we wish to thank you and your colleagues for bringing this legislation to the floor. We look forward to its overwhelming adoption by the Senate, and to the opening of our embassy in Jerusalem.

Sincerely,

STEVE GROSSMAN,
President.
NEAL M. SHER,
Executive Director.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I want particularly to commend and thank the Senator from Arizona as well as the majority leader, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator LEVIN, and in particular Senator LAUTENBERG, because I believe that together we have effected an agreement which is significant and important.

Before I go on, I just want to say I am fully aware that the majority leader and the Senator from Arizona could have proceeded on this issue. Clearly they have the votes. I think the fact that they negotiated with those of us who had concerns about the way in

which the resolution was worded is very significant and important, and I must say I believe that is why the American people sent us here and how they expect us to work.

And so to the Senator from Arizona, I would like to offer my deepest respect and thanks for the process which I think worked very well, and I think we now have a bill which can bring about the broadest and I hope even unanimous consensus of this body.

Madam President, I think we all must recognize that Jerusalem is a city of vital importance to people all over the world—not just Israel, not just Arab peoples, but people all over the world. Its layers of history and importance are symbolized best perhaps by the Temple Mount where the Dome of the Rock and the El-Aqsa Mosque, shrines holy to Moslems, sit atop the remains of the Temple of Solomon, while down below Jews worship at the Western Wall, the last remnant of that temple.

One can stand in the Old City and hear simultaneously the Moslem call to prayer from the minarets of the mosques, the sounds of the Torah being read down by the Western Wall, and church bells ringing in the distance. It is truly a special city, and Israel is fortunate to call Jerusalem its capital.

The bill we will pass today, as modified by the leader and the Senator from Arizona, is a good bill, and I believe it is one the President can sign. We worked hard Friday and again yesterday to produce a compromise that protects the President's prerogatives to conduct foreign policy. This was a crucial point because without these protections there was a good chance that this bill would be vetoed, which would be a tragic outcome.

Under our compromise, the President would have to establish that it is in the national security interests of the United States to postpone establishing the U.S. Embassy in Jerusalem in 1999. This is a tough but fair standard for any President to meet. As I said yesterday, it is my belief that if a successful conclusion to the Middle East peace process could be imperiled by the implementation of this act, then the President would be able to invoke the waiver on national security grounds. I am sure that many of my colleagues agree. But the inclusion of the waiver should not obscure the achievement reached by this bill.

For the first time ever, Congress will pass legislation that will mandate moving the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem, and I believe the President will sign it. This represents a major advance in our cause of moving the Embassy. And through this message we will send word that Israel, like every country in the world, has the sovereign right to designate its capital and to have that capital recognized by the nations of the world.

I congratulate my colleagues on this achievement, and I look forward to it passing with overwhelming support.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the majority leader.

I might say to the majority leader that I will take just a few minutes. I actually rise to, first of all, thank the Senator from California and the Senator from Arizona and others for their fine work on this measure. I believe that this is an extremely important step we are taking as we act on this resolution to move our Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, and to condition certain State Department funding on the Embassy's relocation under the specific timeline laid out in this bill. I rise in support of this legislation, and I am delighted to be a cosponsor of the compromise negotiated over the last few days.

Madam President, let me first talk about this issue personally, because the status of Jerusalem is important to me personally, and will always be. As an American Jew, as a Senator from Minnesota, I believe Jerusalem is and should remain the capital of Israel, an undivided city. Never in my life have I had a more moving experience than when I was in Jerusalem a few years ago, and could experience first-hand the marvels of the city.

At the same time, I have had a concern—and I think the Senator from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, and from New Jersey, Senator LAUTENBERG, and others shared this concern—that certainly we did not want to do anything inadvertent which was going to impede the Mid-East peace process. And for this reason I believe that the waiver provided for in the substitute bill is extremely important. The administration has been clear about this concern all along. In fact, United States Ambassador to Israel Martin Indyk observed that moving forward on the original version of the resolution could have placed tremendous strains on the peace process, and even caused its collapse. This measure now tries to address that potential problem.

Our deep and abiding commitment to Israel is reflected in the bill. Our commitment to Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, with the United States Embassy there, is again strongly and clearly stated. At the same time, the clear commitment to Jerusalem as a city for all peoples is there. This was the most sensitive of all issues in the peace process, agreed to be put off by the parties, in the Declaration of Principles, to final-status negotiations. I think that with this provision we now have in this bill something which I would hope all of us can support.

The initial formulation in the bill, which talked about the importance of Jerusalem as the capital, which talked about our locating our Embassy there, I supported. When we began to talk about this in terms of specific timelines, the concern I had was the effect this could have on ongoing nego-

tiations. Those concerns have now been addressed in this most recent version.

Mr. President, passage of this resolution would be simply another indication of the deep and strong support for Israel in this body. That is critical, I think, because our support for Israel must remain strong and steadfast in this difficult period. Maintaining the security of the State of Israel, our good friend and strategic ally, must remain paramount. We must continue to work actively to help her achieve and maintain peace with her neighbors. This requires maintaining adequate foreign assistance to Israel designed to help her resettle refugees, make key economic reforms, and encourage peaceful economic development. Strengthening and building upon historic gains in the peace process, and making sure that the risks which have already been taken for peace were not taken in vain, must be our twin goals.

I think we now have the strong language necessary to accomplish the goal of this resolution. At the same time, we have the waiver built in to give the President appropriate flexibility. I think that now this version of the bill represents the best of people here in the Senate coming together, and working out an agreement which we can all proudly support. I thank my colleagues for their work. I am proud to support this. And I did ask earlier that my name be included as an original cosponsor.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I support the pending legislation to move the United States Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem because I believe that our Embassy should be located in the capital of Israel, which is the custom for all our other Embassies.

I have long supported this proposition, Madam President. A bill was introduced back on October 1, 1983, Senate bill 2031, which I cosponsored. Back on March 26, 1990, Senate Concurrent Resolution 106 was submitted. Again, I was a cosponsor of that measure. I have cosponsored the pending legislation.

I do have some concerns, Madam President, as to whether such legislation would be an impediment to the peace process, but on balance I think it would not, especially as the legislation has been worked out giving a Presidential discretionary period to expand the time when the Embassy would be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

I believe that basically this is a decision which ought to be made by the U.S. Government, and it is entirely appropriate for the legislation to come from the U.S. Senate and for us to take a stand on this matter.

Madam President, today is an auspicious moment for me and many here in the Senate. We are taking action by the passage of S. 1322 to call again on the President of the United States to move the United States Embassy to its rightful location in the city of Jerusalem, the capital of Israel. This is a welcome moment.

I have supported this action since I came to the Senate. I first cosponsored a resolution on this issue introduced on October 1, 1983. That resolution (S. 2031) was cosponsored by 50 Senators. Now, some 15 years later, it is my hope that with the momentum of the peace process, the message of the cosponsors to this bill will resonate sufficiently to move the administration to action on this.

On March 26, 1990, Senate Concurrent Resolution 106 was submitted and was subsequently passed calling for the move of the Embassy to Jerusalem. Again, the Congress acted on this subject through its recent correspondence on February 24, 1995 in its letter to Secretary of State Warren Christopher signed by 93 Senators.

During the August recess, I traveled to Israel as well as other countries. On September 28, I stated here on the Senate floor my impressions of the challenges facing American foreign policy in the near future. It was during that travel that I was able to speak directly with the President of Israel, Ezer Weitzman, Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, the leader of the opposition party Mr. Benjamin Netanyahu, as well as Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Mr. Arafat and significant Palestinian personalities now engaged in attempting to fashion a means to live side by side, Israelis with Palestinians. Many times during these conversations, we spoke of Jerusalem and the future. All of us were aware of the importance of Jerusalem to the future of the region.

Tomorrow, Members of Congress and their guests will convene in the Capitol Rotunda to celebrate the Inaugural ceremony for Jerusalem 3,000, a 15 month long celebration commemorating 3,000 years since the establishment of Jerusalem as the capital city of Israel by King David. I hope to be in attendance at this ceremony.

The action we take today is consonant with the observance of the ceremony as well as with the policy we have around the world in every country we recognize. The United States today locates its embassies, around the globe, in the city designated by the respective country as its capital. It is long overdue that this is our action in Israel. It is most appropriate that, as we move toward the period when both sides in the conflict are scheduled to move into negotiations over a permanent resolution, that the commitment to a date certain be made for the opening of our embassy.

We have been, and continue to be, the catalyst in bringing the parties to resolution; it is my hope that our action in the Senate today will be accepted and acted upon by President Clinton and that no further roadblocks will be put up which would impede the opening of the Embassy in Jerusalem on May 31, 1999, as provided for in this legislation.

I think it is very, very important that Jerusalem remain undivided, and I think the expression by the U.S. Con-

gress putting into law the timetable for moving our Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem is entirely appropriate, and accordingly I support that legislation. I yield the floor.

PROTECT THE PEACE PROCESS

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, this bill, which would mandate a move of the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem by May 31, 1999, may be popular with a very vocal segment of the United States population, but it represents precarious foreign policy for the United States as a whole. The United States has played a central role in carrying forward the very difficult and sensitive negotiations that will, hopefully, bring a lasting peace to Israel and the Middle East. It ill behooves us now to undermine what is arguably the single most sensitive issue of the negotiations, that of the status of the holy city of Jerusalem, by impetuously acting to side with one party to the negotiations. If the United States is to be credible as a facilitator of the peace process, it must act with fairness and impartiality.

Proponents of this legislation argue that negotiations on the final status of Jerusalem are to be complete by May, 1999, so that this bill is compatible with the timetable of the peace process. But this presupposes the outcome of the negotiations, which do not even begin until next May. This may be exactly what the proponents desire. If it is "imperative to establish now the U.S. conviction that realistic negotiations must be premised on the principle that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel and must remain united," as an October 20, 1995 mailing from the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) asserts, then what is left to negotiate at all? Acting in advance of the negotiations undermines the incentive for the Palestinians, who also have political and religious claims to the city, to participate in the talks.

United States support for Israel is well known. Israel and the United States have close military and diplomatic ties. The United States provides more economic aid and military assistance to Israel than to any other single state. Moving the United States Embassy from its current location in Tel Aviv to Jerusalem at this time is not necessary to help shore up Israeli support for the peace process. It can wait and let the ground breaking in 1999 serve as a visible signal of the success of the peace negotiations, should the outcome be as expected. Not moving the Embassy at this time is, in my view, probably more important to help shore up the willingness of the Palestinians to continue along this rocky path to peace. Let the ground breaking for a new U.S. Embassy in Jerusalem in 1999 be a visible sign of U.S. support for the final outcome of the negotiations, if that is the result, rather than a continuing reminder to them that

the negotiations were rigged from the outset.

Jerusalem is an ancient city, considered holy by three of the world's religions, Christianity, Judaism, and Islam. There is no more volatile mixture in the world than religion and politics, and Jerusalem has suffered the devastating effects over the centuries as wars, occupations, and divisions have forever marked her walls and buildings. Peace is within our grasp, if we can act with sensitivity to acknowledge the ancient and competing claims to this most contested plot of land. No one, I believe, wants a city torn by terror and divisiveness, a Jerusalem that cannot stand as a beacon of tolerance and understanding among three religions and all of the peoples of the Middle East. Therefore, I will vote against this bill, which does so much to undermine the peace process.

Mr. ROBB. Madam President, I recognize the city of Jerusalem as the united, undivided, eternal, and sovereign capital of Israel, and where the United States Embassy is located should reflect that reality. While some have urged caution about relocating our mission in the midst of the peace process, it is my sense that such a move, as envisioned by the Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Act, will not create a detour on the road to achieving a comprehensive Arab-Israeli peace.

Jerusalem stands today as an international city, where the rights of all ethnic religious groups are protected and freedom of worship is guaranteed. Diverse religious faiths coexist peacefully. This week we are seeing a hopeful spirit of internationalism expressed by many world leaders celebrating the founding of the United Nations 50 years ago. Like the community of nations joining together in support of the United Nations many religious faiths and sects engender a collective spirit of interdenominational harmony in Jerusalem.

Madam President, Prime Minister Rabin has told the Israeli people that "I assure you that Jerusalem will remain united under Israel's sovereignty, and our capital forever." That expression leads me to the conclusion that the final status talks on the city should not focus on issues of overall sovereignty. Rather, making permanent each denomination's jurisdiction over its respective holy sites and collateral issues of autonomy should be the subject of the negotiations next year.

Even President Clinton has stated that "I recognize Jerusalem as an undivided city, the capital of Israel—whatever the outcome of the negotiations, Jerusalem is still the capital of Israel and must remain an undivided city, accessible to all." That statement represents a consensus that our Embassy belongs in the functional capital of Israel.

Among the 184 countries we maintain diplomatic relations with, Israel is the single exception to the rule of locating