

growth is not simply to reduce capital gains tax but to eliminate it entirely.

Under my bill, a family of four earning up to \$25,500 would pay no tax. Low- and middle-income Americans would benefit from my tax cut because millionaires, who often pay little or no tax because of the myriad loopholes and shelters in the Tax Code, would have to pay tax at the 20 percent rate because these loopholes and shelters would be eliminated. It has been shown that under our current tax system, more than half of all personal income in the United States, or some \$2.6 out of \$5 trillion, escapes taxation entirely. A fair tax system, like my flat-tax proposal, taxes all income equally—and just once.

Businesses would also be taxed at a flat rate of 20 percent. My plan would eliminate the intricate scheme of depreciation schedules, deductions, credits, and other complexities that complicate business filing, and that in some cases permit tax evasion. Businesses would only deduct wages, direct expenses, and purchases. Businesses would be allowed to expense 100 percent of the cost of capital formation, including purchases of capital equipment, structures, and land, and to do so in the year in which the investments are made. Although the elimination of most deductions means that business taxes will increase in the aggregate—thus assuring that investment income is fully taxed before it is paid out—that extra cost to business will be offset by the elimination of their enormous tax compliance costs.

For both businesses and individuals, the hours and hours of tax-related recordkeeping, the litany of schedules, the libraries full of regulations and decisions, would be replaced by a postcard sized form that almost all Americans and business owners could complete in about 15 minutes.

But the most important reason for adopting a flat-tax system is in its potential to foster economic growth and job creation. With the elimination of taxation on interest, dividends, and capital gains, the pool of capital available for investment will grow dramatically. Conservative economic projections are that interest rates will come down two full points, and that renewed economic activity will add \$2 trillion to the gross national product over 7 years—an additional \$7,000 for every man, woman, and child in America.

My tax proposal has been carefully calculated to be revenue neutral, so that it will not add one penny to the national debt. My flat tax is based on the analyses done over a period of years by highly respected economic professors, Robert Hall and Alvin Rabushka, of Stanford's Hoover Institute. Hall and Rabushka's calculations show a national flat tax with no deductions and a 19 percent rate matching current tax revenues. My bill deviates from the Hall-Rabushka model by its retention of limited deductions for home mortgage interest on up to

\$100,000 of borrowing and charitable contributions up to \$2,500. While these modifications limit the purity of the flat-tax principle, I believe that these deductions are so ingrained in the financial planning of American families that they should be retained as a matter of fairness. Based on computations provided by the Joint Tax Committee, the additional 1 percent in my flat-tax proposal above the Hall-Rabushka proposal—a 20 percent rate instead of 19 percent—will fully cover the cost of these deductions.

In fact, there is every reason to believe that as the growth aspects of flat taxation take hold, and the economy expands, tax revenues will rise significantly—which will permit either a further lowering of tax rates or actual reduction in the national debt. However, since those savings are speculative, I have not included them in my calculations to set revenue neutral, deficit neutral rate.

I am obviously reluctant to vote against legislation that offers needed tax relief to some Americans. But we ought not be tinkering at the margins where some Americans benefit and others don't. Under a flat tax such as I have proposed, everyone benefits and everyone pays their fair share.

The current tax breaks are, at best, a Band-Aid. A flat tax is a cure for the cancer which retards the productivity of the American economic engine. The relevant committees have had hearings on the flat tax and are in a position to act on these proposals.

Mr. President, I make these comments because of my concern that the pending reconciliation bill may be going too far at a time when our primary objective is to balance the budget, and that Americans are prepared for those cuts if they are fair and if they are just.

At a time when we are tightening our belts, I question the wisdom of the additional tax cuts to people who are in much higher brackets and to corporate tax breaks at this particular time.

Again, I say I am not in concrete on this matter, but I urge my colleagues to carefully consider this matter before we move to the voting state and consideration of final passage of the reconciliation bill.

The Republican leadership has heretofore been advised of my concerns and reservations. While it is late in the process, there is still time to revise the reconciliation bill in the interest of fairness and sound tax policy. It is my hope that modifications can be made so that I and a broad coalition of Members can support this landmark legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the Senator from Arkansas, Senator PRYOR, is recognized for up to 15 minutes.

#### MEDICARE MISINFORMATION AD CAMPAIGN

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, this morning I rise today to sound an

alarm, an alarm about a \$1 million television advertising campaign that supports the Republican plan to cut Medicare and is currently airing all over the United States.

I am here to explain to my colleagues why this commercial does not tell the whole story and why the public needs to know more about the organization that is actually paying for this TV commercial that advocates the Republican cuts in the Medicare program.

Mr. President, the organization paying for this television commercial is called the Seniors Coalition. We might not have heard a great deal about the Seniors Coalition because it has not been around all that long. It is an operation founded by Mr. Richard Viguerie.

The star of this ad is our colleague and good friend from Tennessee, Senator BILL FRIST.

Let me make it clear at the start that I mean no disrespect to Senator FRIST. I talked to him this morning, stating I was going to make this statement, and that I was not questioning his integrity in any way.

In fact, I sincerely doubt our colleague, Senator FRIST, is aware of the information that I will share with my colleagues this morning.

The ad, Mr. President, which features Senator FRIST talking about the Republican plan to cut Medicare, is not paid for by the Republican Party but by the Seniors Coalition.

First, some background on the Seniors Coalition. The Seniors Coalition is one of three so-called seniors organizations that have been working exclusively with the GOP leadership. It is working with the GOP leadership to push and help organize and in some cases to fund activities that support the Republican plan to cut Medicare by \$270 billion and to provide a \$245 billion tax break—most of it or a lot of it, Mr. President, going to the wealthiest in our society.

Here we see a chart that includes the Seniors Coalition. We also see 60-Plus here. And, we see United Seniors, or USA, here. These are all founded by Mr. Viguerie, who has control of perhaps some of the most sophisticated mailing lists in America.

The Coalition to Save Medicare was founded to support the House Republican plan to cut Medicare. As one columnist has recently put it, the Coalition to Save Medicare is "deliriously misnamed," and is a "coalition of huge corporations and insurance companies out to loot Medicare to pay for corporate tax breaks."

In fact, Mr. President, the Seniors Coalition, United Seniors Association, and 60-Plus, are all 501(C)(4) organizations. They pay no taxes whatsoever. They have use of a nonprofit mailing permit. They are being subsidized by the American taxpayer.

The other coalition, which is the Coalition for America's Future—and here is a letter of September 22—was created by the majority party, by the Republican leadership, to apply pressure

during efforts to push the Contract With America, including tax breaks for the wealthy, through the House of Representatives.

Let us look at this letter of September 22. This letter is addressed to me:

On behalf of the more than 7 million families, senior citizens and large and small businesses of the Coalition for America's Future, we are writing to urge you to make good on the promise of the budget resolution to provide \$245 billion in tax cuts over the next 7 years.

One of the so-called members of the Coalition for America's Future is the National Committee To Preserve Social Security and Medicare. They are listed along with the Seniors Coalition, United Seniors Association, and 60-Plus as seniors organizations who are members and who support the Coalition's agenda.

Mr. President, just this morning I received a letter from the National Committee to Preserve Social Security, and I will read part of it now:

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.

Martha McSteen concludes by saying:

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.

At this point, I would like to explain how these groups were founded, how they operate and exactly who they are.

First, letters that will grab the attention of seniors, usually through scare tactics, are sent to thousands of seniors across America. These letters make senior citizens think that their Medicare is in jeopardy, that it is in danger, and that what they need to do immediately is to send their money in to one of the three groups founded by Mr. Viguerie. Here is what happens.

The letter is sent by one of these groups to Mr. or Mrs. Smith, Anytown, USA. Then the older American receives this letter, writes a check out of their savings account to either the Seniors Coalition, United Seniors Association, or 60-Plus. Then the dollars go, first—where? To Mr. Viguerie. We have the contract for Mr. Viguerie that we will show in a few moments, that shows that Mr. Viguerie gets up to 50 percent, possibly one-half of all of these checks sent in by mail by the senior citizens to United Seniors Association. Some of the remaining money is used to generate some more mail to send out to scare the seniors.

These groups also use some of the remaining money to lobby the Congress. For example, Seniors Coalition had enough money left over to run TV commercials like we are seeing running in many parts of America today. This ad campaign is telling seniors that the Medicare cuts are necessary to save the Medicare system.

Last year, in 1994, these same groups were doing the exact opposite. They

were scaring seniors by telling them that President Clinton was cutting \$124 billion out of Medicare as part of his health care reform proposal. Here is one letter dated March 28, 1994 from the same organization, the Seniors Coalition, and it was sent out to thousands of seniors all over the country, requesting contributions. In the body of the letter the Seniors Coalition states:

Now President Clinton wants to cut an additional \$124 billion. This is all part of his plan to have the Government take over health care.

Well, they reversed themselves now, 2 years later, because of the Contract With America, because of their desire to cut \$270 billion out of the Medicare proposal, because they want to give a \$245 billion tax break for the wealthy, and because now they are all in the league with the Republican leadership.

This year, however, the same groups are scaring seniors by telling the seniors if the Republican plan to save Medicare is not adopted, they might lose their Medicare benefits. What the letters do not show is that the Seniors Coalition strongly supports the Republican plans to cut Medicare by \$270 billion and to provide a \$245 billion tax break, a great portion going to the wealthiest in America.

Second, many seniors are dipping into their savings—from their piggy banks, like the one shown here—to send so-called contributions to these three groups, thinking the money would be used to lobby Congress to save their Medicare Program. But what these seniors are not told and what they do not know—and they would have no reason to know—is that their dollars are being used, not to save Medicare, but to cut Medicare. A senior sends his check in to one of these groups, and their own money is being used against them, to cut Medicare benefits. This is a fraud. It is a sham.

And, after collecting savings from seniors, the groups spend a lot of it, up to 50 percent in the case of the United Seniors Organization, to pay direct-mail companies. Here we have the direct-mail contract between United Seniors Association and Mr. Viguerie. As part of the contract, Mr. Viguerie takes up to one-half of all of the dollars that are sent into USA. And Mr. Viguerie also does the direct mail for another of these groups called 60-Plus.

Experts have taken a look at this contract between Mr. Viguerie and 60-Plus. In fact, they have taken a very close look at this contract. These experts have all concluded that the provisions in Mr. Viguerie's contract, when added up, indicate that in fact he controls as much as 70 percent of the so-called "not-for-profit" 60-Plus. If this is true, what it means is that the American people, through tax exemptions—because it is a nonprofit organization—and postal nonprofit permits, are subsidizing a private fundraiser's operations. In these days of budget cut-

ting, this sort of thing must be stopped.

Mr. President, I think this is an absolute outrage. In fact, it is my understanding the Postal Service is now investigating some of these issues. I hope they will pursue that investigation to its conclusion.

The money that remains after the direct mail people get their cut is used to send out more scare letters to seniors and to support the Republican plans to cut Medicare by \$270 billion. Once again, the message is clear: Medicare is growing broke. Send us your money, and we will save it.

Well, seniors are sending in their money. And what they are doing with the seniors' money is it is used to cut, not to save, Medicare.

As I have stated, documents make it very clear that these groups are actively supporting the Republican plans to cut Medicare by \$270 billion and to provide a \$245 billion tax break, mostly for the wealthy. The ironic thing is that this is not what their members truly want.

This summer I received a petition from the United Seniors Association, one of Mr. Viguerie's groups, and they had on this petition the names of almost 300 Arkansans listed as "members." I thought something looked strange about this petition, so I instructed my staff during the August break to sit there and call the people on this list, on this petition, and simply ask a very few basic questions. What we learned was most educational. It made me realize that their "members" do not necessarily know that they are members. They do not understand what these groups support, nor do they understand that their names are being used to lobby to cut their Medicare benefits.

This chart also shows the results of a phone survey of these Arkansans listed as USA members. First, 53 percent of the seniors listed on the USA petition that I received from Arkansas as members were not actually members. They said they were not members of USA, despite what the petition to me said.

Second, seniors listed in the USA petition to me expressed confusion about the positions that USA takes; 83 percent said they did not know that USA is working to rally support by the Republicans to cut Medicare by \$270 billion.

These same seniors, on this list that was sent to my office as a petition, listed their opposition USA position's position on Medicare. Again, as a matter of fact, on Medicare, 89 percent were in fact against cutting it by \$270 billion. They oppose the very position of USA that USA and the House majority claims they support.

In sum, the Republicans are saying that a lot of senior groups are supporting these cuts in Medicare. These charts I have shown indicate what these senior groups actually are, how they are motivated, and with whom they are associated.

It is not the case that these so-called seniors groups—Seniors Coalition, United Seniors Association, and 60-Plus—are fighting against these cuts in Medicare. In reality, two things are happening:

First, much of the money is going into the budgets of Richard Viguerie and other direct mail vendors.

Second, the lobbying that these groups are doing amounts not to the saving the Medicare Program but rather supporting the Republican Medicare cuts—even though these cuts could jeopardize the health care received by seniors.

Mr. President, now that we have basically looked at who the players are in this scheme to confuse and to manipulate older Americans, I would like to talk about the million-dollar television campaign that the Seniors Coalition is running across America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised that the time for morning business is expired.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I see no other Senator seeking recognition, and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 6 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Could I ask unanimous consent that it would be 10 minutes, and that I could have 4 minutes after the Senator?

Mr. PRYOR. I would have no objection to that. I see my colleague from Minnesota. I did not see him.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I have no objection. I had 10 minutes reserved earlier this morning. But I know the leader wants to close off morning business as early as possible because of the remaining debate on the resolution S. 1322 dealing with the Israeli question.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, if I might, I would like to ask my friend from Minnesota, is my friend from Minnesota going to be one of the managers or one of those involved with the resolution or with the issue before the Senate?

Mr. GRAMS. No. I was going to go ahead with another statement. But I will yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, if I could perhaps clarify this, it has been my understanding that we are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement which will cause the Senate to begin literally right now at 11 o'clock on the debate on the Jerusalem Embassy bill, and that the vote would then occur at 11:40. Is that a correct understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KYL. And the leader has asked that we begin that debate as soon as people are here to speak to it. Until the leader or Senator HELMS arrives, I would be acting in their stead. I see Senator FEINSTEIN is here. I do not know whether others may wish to, but I would suggest, in order to comply with the unanimous-consent agreement, that we wind up the business we are on so we can get to that.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. KYL. Sure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I might say to my colleague from Arkansas that I withdraw my request, and I think the only question is whether the courtesy might be given to the Senator from Arkansas to finish his statement. He only has a few more minutes to go.

Mr. PRYOR. I will try to be very brief. I will try to proceed if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will proceed under a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. PRYOR. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I think it would then be important to indicate to Members that the vote would occur at 11:45, and not at 11:40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would observe that under the unanimous consent, under the previous order, the vote will not occur at 11:40 but at 11:45.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I want to sincerely thank my colleagues, and my colleague from Arizona, for allowing me to proceed.

Mr. President, as part of the million-dollar Seniors Coalition ad campaign that we are talking about, the television commercials state that in the Republican plan there are "no cuts in benefits." The facts are simple and indicate otherwise. With this particular Republican plan that the ad campaign is supporting, \$270 billion will taken out of Medicare. The question is this: If this level of cuts causes the only hospital to which we have access to close its doors, is this not a cut in benefits? In rural America this is exactly what is about to happen to hundreds of hospitals.

Second, if this level of cuts causes the nursing home or a doctor in our town to stop taking Medicare beneficiaries, is this not a cut in benefits?

Third, if this gives incentives to home health care agencies and other providers to treat only healthy people, is this not a cut for older and more frail citizens?

There is another claim expressed in this television commercial. This commercial states that "the Republican plan increases spending by nearly \$2,000 per senior."

The fact is, Mr. President, that the yearly per beneficiary growth rate allowed under this plan is 4.9 percent. It is, in fact, much below the expected 7.1 percent growth rate in private sector health care costs. Medicare's ability to respond to health care costs decreases with the severity of these cuts.

Mr. President, the commercial further states that the Republican plan gives "patients more choices." The fact is what good is offering choices when only bad choices are offered? While seniors may have more health care

plans to choose from, choosing the one that they can afford may mean they must give up their choice of a physician.

And, finally, the proposed medical savings account threatens the viability of Medicare by allowing insurance companies to cherry-pick by moving healthy, wealthy people out of the Medicare pool. The result would be far higher costs to the beneficiaries who stay in Medicare.

Also, the Seniors Coalition television ad says nothing about the Republicans using the cuts in Medicare to fund tax breaks for the wealthy. Why is this, Mr. President? It is perhaps because seniors who are actually paying for these commercials do not want the Medicare Program to be cut to fund tax breaks. I think this is a legitimate question.

Mr. President, only \$89 billion is actually needed to shore up Medicare's trust fund in the short term. Why then are our people not being told where the \$181 billion cuts are actually going to go? Were those same seniors who sent their dollars to Mr. Viguerie's groups told this? Of course not. They have been used, they have been abused, and they have been manipulated by a slick campaign of distortion and untruths.

Mr. President, this is a situation where the seniors of America are being scared to death. They are sending their money in to basically, as the letters call for, to protect Medicare.

Mr. President, this television advertising campaign cost the Seniors Coalition \$1 million and is running in 19 markets across the country. I want to make sure everyone knows that this campaign was paid for by the elderly, many of them poor and disabled, who sent in money thinking that the Seniors Coalition was going to lobby the Congress to save their Medicare Program—not cut it.

That is why my advice to seniors who are thinking about sending their hard-earned savings to these three so-called seniors groups is that "Contributions May Be Hazardous to Your Health." They should think twice before writing a check to a Viguerie-founded group.

As I said earlier, I am here today to sound the alarm and expose this scam. I am concerned not only because some seniors are being taken advantage of, but also because this scam is a cynical manipulation of our political process. It threatens the democratic principles under which we operate.

Americans who think they are getting involved with the political process are actually being financially exploited. Furthermore, they are not being represented the way they think they are. This is a perfect example of why so many people today have such little confidence in our political system.

Mr. President, older Americans—all Americans—can say "no" to this type of cynical manipulation and misrepresentation.

Let me encourage every senior to get involved with reform of their Medicare

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