

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RETIREMENT OF PAUL
HOLLOWAY, NASA LANGLEY RE-
SEARCH CENTER

HON. ROBERT C. SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

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

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

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

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

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

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

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

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

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

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

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

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

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

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

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IN MEMORIAM OF BLANCHE
WOLFF

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1997

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

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

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