

mandates and private-sector mandates for legislation under your committee's jurisdiction. The bills were grouped into three categories: those that do not contain mandates as defined in Public Law 104-4; those that contain mandates but the direct costs are below the relevant thresholds; and legislation that needed further review to make a determination concerning mandates. CBO has completed its analysis of those bills on the lists requiring further review.

CBO finds that the following bills would impose no new private-sector mandates as defined in Public Law 104-4:

S. 92, Bonneville Power Administration Appropriations Refinancing Act.

S. 363, Rio Puerco Watershed Act of 1995.

S. 444, An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to authorize purchase of common stock of Cook Inlet region.

S. 587, An act to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Old Spanish Trail for inclusion in the National Trails System.

S. 852, Public Rangelands Management Act of 1995.

S. 884, Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995.

S. 907, A bill to amend the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986.

S. 1459, A bill to provide for uniform management of livestock grazing on federal land.

H.R. 536, An act to prohibit the use of Highway 209 within the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area by certain commercial vehicles.

CBO also finds that the following bill would impose no new intergovernmental mandates, as defined in Public Law 104-4:

S. 92, Bonneville Power Administration Appropriations Refinancing Act.

If you wish further details on this analysis, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO contacts are Patrice Gordon (226-2940) for private-sector mandates and Marjorie Miller (225-3220) for intergovernmental mandates.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.●

REVISITING A DANGEROUS PLACE

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I had the pleasure of attending the American Jewish Congress' Profiles in Courage Awards Dinner last Saturday night in New York City at which former Israeli President Chaim Herzog delivered a most memorable address.

I first met Chaim Herzog some 21 years ago when then-President Ford appointed me the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations. He was the Israeli Ambassador to that body where a Soviet-led coalition wielded enormous power and used it in an assault against the democracies of the world. In that regard, I cite an editorial in the New Republic which recently said of the United Nations, "During the Cold War, the U.N. became a chamber of hypocrisy and proxy aggression."

Proxy aggression in particular directed against the State of Israel, which became a metaphor for democracy under virtual siege at the United Nations.

Those who failed to destroy Israel on the field of battle joined those who wished to discredit all Western, democratic governments in an unprecedented, sustained attack on the very

right of a U.N. member state to exist within the family of nations.

The efforts in the 1970's to delegitimize Israel came in many forms, none more insidious than the campaign to declare Zionism a form of racism.

With the collapse of the Soviet Union, both the Zionism resolution and the rejectionist Arab Front lost their major source of support.

On June 19, 1991, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held a coffee-hour for then-President-elect Yeltsin of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic. In the receiving line, one of the members of the Russian delegation asked if I remembered him. "I was stationed at the United Nations when you were the U.S. Representative. You did not think anyone was listening, did you? But we heard you." He was, in fact, Andrei Kozyrev.

The very last vote that the Soviet Union cast in the General Assembly was the vote on December 16, 1991, to repeal Resolution 3379. And the same Andrei Kozyrev who served the Soviet Union at the United Nations in 1975, was, in his capacity as Foreign Minister of Russia, one of the two witnesses to the historic Oslo Accords, signed on the South Lawn of the White House on September 13, 1993.

The same Andrei Kozyrev who monitored Leonard Garment's remarks before the Third Committee joined Warren Christopher in witnessing Yasser Arafat's signature to a paper that three decades of Soviet foreign policy sought to prevent.

The Soviet Union has gone to its richly deserved place in the dustbin of history which it once promised would be the burial place of democratic society.

The Soviet Union may be gone. But events during the past few weeks must remind us all that Israel remains very much a metaphor for democracy in the twilight struggle between the forces of totalitarianism and the values of freedom.

The bombs that rocked London and the terrorist violence that shattered the peace of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv were attacks on all democracies. While the immediate victims of the recent bombings in Israel may have been Israeli citizens of the Jewish, Moslem, and Christian faiths and visitors and pilgrims from other nations, those responsible for these actions are simply at war with all civilized societies.

There can be no place in the family of nations for the murderous cowards who send others on suicide missions to slaughter civilians in the name of any cause. President Clinton has taken important measures to help protect the people of Israel from a continuation of these atrocities.

President Herzog spoke Saturday night of the appropriate response to these terrorist atrocities. His message concerning the future of the peace process is an important one and I ask that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT CHAIM HERZOG TO THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE PROFILES IN COURAGE AWARDS

Mr. Chairman: I am most grateful to you for your kind words, and, indeed, to the American Jewish Congress for having made this memorable award to me in such distinguished company as former comrades-in-arms, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Leonard Garment.

As I stand here in this building I recall the years in which I represented Israel—years in which we were treated by so many as a pariah state, years in which the theater of the absurd which was the United Nations at that time devoted so much time, energy and resources to condemning the small State of Israel while ignoring the evils that befell the world on all sides. At that time, we were outnumbered by the automatic majority comprised of an alliance of hatred based on the Soviet bloc, the Arab bloc and the so-called Non-Aligned group. If ever there was a misnomer, it was this, because nobody was more aligned in those days than the so-called Non-Aligned. They were aligned in hatred of Western democracy, they were aligned in support of Communist hegemony, they were aligned in the common lofty purpose of maligning Israel with a view to leading to its delegitimization.

The battle began in October 1975 in the Third Committee, the so-called Human Rights Committee, with a violent attack against Israel and Zionism. The three great bulwarks of democracy and freedom—Cuba, Somalia and Benin—had submitted to the UN Third Committee, the Human Rights Committee, an amendment proposing an addition to the existing resolution attacking racism and apartheid. What they wanted to add was an attack on Zionism, equating it with racism. This move was particularly grave because it was the first attack in the United Nations on an "ism." Nobody had ever attempted to attack Communism, Socialism or capitalism before. But now our national liberation movement was becoming the center of attack. In that debate, Leonard Garment, the U.S. representative on the committee, attacked the resolution with the dramatic words, "This is an obscene act."

On Friday evening, October 17th, the debate concluded in the Third Committee, and it met to vote on it. In my remarks, I thanked the delegations who had stood by our side, and said that we would never forget those who voted to attack our religion and our faith. I shouted out the last words, "We shall never forget."

The resolution passed with a majority, and our enemies seemed to be on the verge of a victory war dance. I saw Pat Moynihan, the blood rushing to his head, livid, standing up. He straightened his tie, pulled down and buttoned his jacket, and crossed the floor to me. I rose to greet him and held out my hand. He took it, pulled me to him and embraced me in front of the entire hall. I shall never forget that gut reaction of his, which spoke more than anything else. It was not planned, it was not part of policy—that was just Pat Moynihan behaving instinctively. I was very moved. He whispered to me what we could do to our enemies.

I was perplexed and could not understand the absence of any meaningful Jewish reaction to the vote at the time, and when I addressed the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, I pulled no punches. As soon as my remarks at the meeting were published, the reaction amongst American Jewry was something that had to be seen to be believed. Paul Johnson, the brilliant editor of "The New

Statesman," wrote an outstanding article which concluded with his views that "The melancholy truth, I fear, is that the candles of civilization are burning low."

In the General Assembly, I delivered the speech defending Israel, and indeed the Jewish people, and at the conclusion of my remarks I took the resolution in my hands and tore it up in front of the Assembly. The effect of the debate and the resolution on Jews all over the world was electrifying. The fight had done more for Zionism than thousands of speeches by Zionist leaders. It had clearly touched a nerve.

Nothing can demonstrate more vividly the change which has occurred than the attitude to Israel in the United Nations today. The resolution was rescinded by an overwhelming majority in 1992. Our delegation is no longer the whipping boy of the United Nations, and enjoys open and cordial relations with many Arab delegations. The Soviet Union has disappeared, and with it the hostility that it bred in the Assembly. Perhaps few events can demonstrate the unbelievable success of Israel in its efforts to achieve peace and break down the barriers of hatred than the attitude towards Israel in the General Assembly today.

I have come from Israel, which has been through some very difficult experiences in the past months. Like many other countries in the area, we are at war with Islamic Fundamentalism. It is a bitter struggle, fuelled by deep hatred and an approach by the Islamic Fundamentalists which entertains no compromise.

The new type of terror which is being used by our enemies is not easy to cope with, because here you have individuals who have been promised that they go straight to heaven and benefit from the priorities given to holy martyrs on their arrival, if they blow themselves up. This is a very difficult problem to deal with, and it is not always easy to detect the individual bent on creating havoc and chaos by detonating himself. It has been difficult to apply emergency legislation, but every one of these would-be suicide bombers now knows that an attack by them will involve very severe official action against their families, who will not have had the good fortune to reach heaven with them.

I do not have to recall to you the scenes of horror and devastation which filled the television screens of the world and which you doubtless saw, but we can be proud of the fact that the Opposition rallied behind the Government on the occasion of these disasters, and of the leadership given by Prime Minister Peres in these difficult and almost impossible times.

We have been through very difficult periods in the past when we had ranged against us the entire Palestinian people. We are experiencing a very difficult period now. But there is a difference: some 70% of the Palestinian people, represented by the PLO and led by a leader who was elected by secret ballot, has withdrawn from the circle of terror and has ceased to use terror in the struggle against Israel. It has been active in coordination with Israel against the terrorists of the Hamas and the Islamic Jihad, although we have maintained, and continue to maintain, that its action has not been as determined and as effective on occasions as we would wish. But one thing is clear: 70% of the Palestinian people have withdrawn from the circle of terror which endangered us over the years and they no longer partake in such activities.

We have to remember that the forces in conflict with us are also in conflict with the government of Jordan; are engaged in a life-and-death struggle in Algeria; and in Egypt, where President Mubarak has been successfully curbing their activities. The terrorists

who have unleashed this recent violence have the same goal as their predecessors during the past fifty years: the destruction of Israel. They understand that their ambition will never succeed if the peace process succeeds and the Palestinians compromise. Those of us who react to trauma by despairing that the peace process will succeed are handing the terrorists a victory.

The arrangements under the Oslo Agreements have been moving along fairly satisfactorily. The Palestinian elections gave a convincing majority to those favoring the peace process, but we face the danger of terrorism instigated by a comparatively small minority. This is complicated by the new and very serious phenomenon of suicide bombing. We have demanded from the Palestinians to honor their commitments under the Oslo Agreements, and above all, to join us in fighting this new terrorism organized by the Hamas and the Islamic Jihad. There is daily cooperation, there are joint patrols everywhere, but because of the complexities of Arab society we have not been convinced that the Palestinian Authority has been doing its utmost to combat the wave of terrorism. I emphasize that it has done a great deal, and a large number of what could have been tragic events were prevented; but it is just not enough. The closure of the territories and the creation of a dividing wall between Israel and the Palestinians is having a very serious economic effect on the Palestinian population. They will thus have to reach painful decisions for they are entirely dependent on Israel for their economic existence.

The phenomenal success of Israel's economy has placed Israel in a dominant position, from an economic point of view, in the area. Israel's annual gross national product is going on 90 billion dollars and is more than the gross national product of Egypt, Jordan, Syria and the Palestinians together. The closure of Israel to labor from the Arab sector will deprive the Palestinian Authority of an income of some \$700 million, but these facts do not influence the Fundamentalist activities of the Hamas and the Islamic Jihad who would create chaos throughout the area. The battle is going on in each and every one of the countries against the Fundamentalists, but so long as Iran is the home of terrorism and the finance center of the terrorist activities in the area, we have to adapt ourselves to a long struggle in many countries around us.

Let us remember that Israel has been at war with Arab terrorists throughout its history, and the terrorists who have unleashed this present violence have the same goal as their predecessors during the past hundred years—the destruction of Israel.

We have always moved forward and pursued our national interest in the face of violence and horror. Most Israelis understand that Palestinian self-rule with security guarantees for Israel is in our interest. This is no time to throw up our hands and declare that the peace process is finished. That would be an admission of defeat unlike any in our history.

We did not back down in 1929, when hundreds of innocent Jews were slaughtered by Arabs in Hebron. We did not back down in 1947, when the UN resolution to partition Palestine promoted mass murder and the ransacking of Jewish neighborhoods in Aleppo, Syria, in Aden, Jerusalem, Haifa and Jaffa. We buried our dead, rolled up our sleeves and created a Jewish state.

We did not back down in 1948, as Arab armies blocked the roads to Jerusalem and cut off food and weapons from its inhabitants. I was in that city in a building when a bomb destroyed it and nearly killed my wife. After I carried her out of the charred ruins and

rushed her to hospital, it never occurred to us to surrender to those who wanted to destroy us. That spirit was nearly universal in our small population—one percent of which was killed in the War of Independence; it animated most Israelis and our supporters around the world in the decades—and wars—ahead.

We certainly did not back down under Labor, Likud and national unity governments when hundreds of Israeli men, women and children were killed by all manner of terrorist. We fought against terror while emphasizing our commitment to peace. Israel and the Jewish people need much more of that spirit now.

In recent years, the sense of permanent siege that has defined our national experience has begun to lift. But after so many decades of being a pariah state, at times it is hard for many to see that each and every Arab is no longer an enemy. And that is precisely what Hamas wants. As their popularity wanes in the West Bank and Gaza, their only hope is to generate violent conflict by returning to the days when to Israelis, all Arabs were indistinguishable from one another.

That is why Hamas has created a new breed of desperate fanatic with sophisticated explosives and the will to die. We must not let them win, and that means not only stopping murder, but also insisting that peace with legitimate Palestinian partners remains our national goal.

The effect of the recent terrorist attacks in Israel has been dramatic, leading to the joint initiative of President Clinton and Prime Minister Shimon Peres, together with King Hussein and President Mubarak, to convene a summit conference at Sharm el-Sheikh to set up a united international front against the danger of terrorism. We can only be gratified that finally the nations of the world seem to be awakening to the inherent danger of the Terrorist International threatening the free world. We can only hope and trust that the resolutions reached at the summit conference will be strictly adhered to, and what is most important of all, that the organizational aspects of the international struggle against terrorism will be implemented.

As I stand here in this building, I cannot but recall the dramatic debate which took place here in July 1976 after the unforgettable rescue by the Israel Defense Forces of the Jews hijacked to Entebbe, Uganda, in an Air France plane. In the course of my remarks in the debate in the Security Council in this very building, I said: "It has fallen to the lot of my small country, embattled as we are, facing the problems which we do, to demonstrate to the world that there is an alternative to surrender to terrorism and blackmail."

"It has fallen to our lot to prove to the world that this scourge of international terror can be dealt with. It is now for the nations of the world, regardless of political differences which may divide them, to unite against this common enemy which recognizes no authority, knows no borders, respects no sovereignty, ignores all basic human decencies, and places no limits on human bestiality."

"... We are proud not only because we have saved the lives of over 100 innocent people—men, women and children—but because of the significance of our act for the cause of human freedom."

"We call on this body to declare war on international terror, to outlaw it and eradicate it wherever it may be. We call on this body, and above all we call on the Member States and countries of the world, to unite in a common effort to place these criminals outside the pale of human society, and with

them to place any country which cooperates in any way in their nefarious activities."

Mr. Peres has done what an Israeli Prime Minister should do by making it crystal clear that Israel will take stern and—if necessary—unilateral measures to thwart these killers. And he has told Arafat that the Palestinian Authority must prove that it is a real partner by dismantling the terrorist infrastructure in the West Bank and Gaza, once and for all.

If Arafat does demonstrate the capacity to stop the fanatics, Israel should not take the coward's way out by capitulating to the rejectionists: it should do everything possible to make sure that the Palestinian Authority fulfills its obligations under the Oslo Agreements. It must insist that our security comes first, even as we continue to mourn our dead. That is the brave as well as the sensible thing to do.

There is a debate in Israeli society about the advantages or disadvantages of the peace process. When evaluating the possibilities, one has to remember that we are now becoming more and more an integral part of the Middle East. We have relations with many Arab countries; trade with the Arab world is booming; joint projects are being set up on all sides; tens of thousands of Arab tourists are pouring in from Jordan and now from Egypt too; our hospitals are flooded with Arab patients from all over the Middle East. A new form of life is developing which these terrorist organizations see as a great danger to them.

When evaluating our reaction to the current events, we must recall that the alternative to moving along the path of the peace process would cause 70% of the Palestinian population which had ceased to use terror as a weapon to return to a tragic and dangerous situation. It would mean a return to the 'intifada,' with the terrible consequences of such an ongoing struggle. It would mean, according to some, a return to the alleyways and backyards of Gaza, with all that that implies. The enemy says openly that its purpose is to destroy the peace process, hence nothing could be more counter-productive to our cause than giving in to the terrorists and stopping the process.

I emphasize, of course, that we have to insist that our Palestinian interlocutors honor all the obligations which they have taken on themselves, otherwise they know full well that we hold all the strong cards.

My friends, only five years have passed since the Gulf War, during which Iraq attacked senselessly with Scud missiles the civilian population of Israel. At that time, the grand alliance organized by President Bush reacted and soundly beat the Iraqi army. But at that time Israel could not convince the alliance that it had a place in it. It is an indication of the long distance we have covered since then and the revolution which has occurred in the Middle East, that this week the leaders of the Arab world and of the free world sat together with the Prime Minister of Israel, who was treated as a full and equal partner in this international struggle against terrorism. This was followed by President Clinton's third visit to Israel, in which a far-reaching agreement on a joint effort to combat terror has reached between the United States and Israel.

That is the measure of advance that has occurred in our area, and the degree to which Israel has become an ally of, among others, the leading Arab countries in the Middle East. That is the measure of advance and positive change which we have witnessed in the Middle East.

I am convinced that the international effort being made to coordinate the struggle against terrorism will ultimately bear fruit. In the meantime, Israel continues its impres-

sive march along the road to regional peace and economic development, a road along which it is advancing in partnership with the leading Arab countries of the area.

Let us not forget the intricate path along which we have advanced; let us not forget the struggle conducted by many others before me who received the award being given tonight; let us not forget that many of our leaders of old would have given their right hands just to see the revolutionary change which has occurred to Israel in the Middle East. We in Israel have lived through very trying and difficult times, but we have always known that our cause is just. Our dedication to that cause is what will advance us to new goals and a new and promising era in the future. ●

IMMIGRANTS AND JOBS

● Mr. ABRAHAM. I would like to alert my Senate colleagues to today's editorial by the Wall Street Journal on why the Congress should think twice before cutting legal immigration.

As currently written, the legal immigration reform measures, H.R. 2202 and S. 1394, would slash legal immigration by nearly half, largely through the elimination of whole categories of family-sponsored immigration by U.S. citizens. In my judgment, the drastic cuts in legal immigration contemplated in these bills would hurt U.S. economic growth, job creation, and competitiveness. The fact is that many immigrants contribute to our economic well-being by inventing new products, starting new entrepreneurial businesses, and creating jobs for Americans: A new study by immigration policy analyst Philip Peters found that one in four patents in this country is created by immigrants alone or by immigrants collaborating with U.S. born coinventors. Four of the immigrants surveyed in Mr. Peter's study started their own businesses, generating over 1,600 jobs here in America.

Mr. President, it is also important to point out that not all these talented immigrants and entrepreneurs came to America through the employment-based immigration system; some of them, like the Intel Corp.'s founder Andrew Grove, arrived through the refugee system. Others came through the family-sponsored system as minor children, adult children, and siblings. The bottom line is that restrictions on immigration categories not labeled as "economic" will end up hurting our economy and our competitiveness.

Both the academic literature and empirical evidence strongly suggest that legal immigrants make important positive contributions to American society. I would hope that my colleagues would keep this fact in mind as we debate the merits of the pending legal immigration reform bill. I ask that the Wall Street Journal article and the study by Mr. Peters be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 18, 1996]

REVIEW & OUTLOOK

SCAN THE CONGRESS

First, require all laws that apply to the rest of the country also apply equally to the

Congress.—Contract With America, September 27, 1994.

Wise words, and we hope they apply to the immigration bill being pushed on the House floor by Congressman Lamar Smith (R., Texas) and up for a vote as early as Tuesday night. By all means, set up a little office in the House gym and let Congresspeople be the first to line up for their retina scans.

Indeed, such an amendment was pondered by Colorado Democrat Pat Schroeder, bless her palpitating heart, though it didn't make the long list of amendments and resolutions available Friday. While the Republican Contract also called for a smaller government, Representative Smith's brainstorm would move toward requiring all citizens to get verification from a federal database before they are allowed to take a new job. Like the Senate version of the bill, it would also pilot a "voluntary" national ID system, although both sides, for the moment, seem to be backing away from the sinister biometric identifiers such as retina scans we heard about earlier.

The ID system is an ornament, of course, on the bill reducing legal immigration by nearly half, cutting family reunions and slashing the intake of refugees. It at least has the virtue of not hiding behind arguments about illegal immigration; it is purely a mean-spirited outburst against legal immigration. The horde of amendments and resolutions try to separate "good" immigrants—former H'Mong soldiers, for example, from "bad" immigrants—parents of citizens, for example. All of this is to be decided by a Congress that routinely deplores micromanagement from inside the Beltway; proposals to vitiate the family unification principle for immigration come from the same lips that deplore the decline of family values.

The reality of the immigration contribution to American society comes clear in a study by Philip Peters of the Alexis de Tocqueville Institute. As a proxy for intellectual and economic contribution, Mr. Peters looked at recent U.S. patents. He found that one patent in four in this country is created by immigrants or immigrants working with U.S.-born engineers or investors. This is three times their presence in our population (8.7%), so presumably immigrants are out there doing more than their share to keep the U.S. competitive with Japan.

Nor of course did all the patenters in the Tocqueville study enter the country on skilled worker visas. Take Alexander Owczarz (O-zarz), a product development engineer who stopped counting after registering his 25th U.S. patent. Mr. Owczarz reckons that one recent patent alone generated 20 jobs at Semitool, the Kalispell, Montana, exporter where he works. Mr. Owczarz is a citizen now, but he entered this country on a tourist visa when he got sick of Communist Poland. Nineteen-nineties restrictionists would expel people like Mr. Owczarz when they overstay their visa.

Or how about refugees? Mr. Smith would cut them. Tocqueville found Ernesto E. Blanco, a professor at MIT who fled Havana in 1960 on a visa provided through a special accelerated program to rescue Cubans from Castro. Mr. Blanco has 13 patents, including a flexible arm that makes endoscopic surgery easier. There are more famous examples: Smith-Simpson-style legislation would bar the door to the future equivalents of Intel's Hungarian refugee, Andrew Grove. For that matter, another big job creator in Silicon Valley, Borland International, was founded by an illegal immigrant, Philippe Kahn.

In recent days we've seen growing recognition of these points. On the Senate side, Spencer Abraham was able to defeat the far