

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