

proposal but the Arab community, along with the rest of the Arab world, refused. Instead, Arab armies invaded the nascent Jewish state intent on destroying it—a de facto rendering the Partition Resolution null and void.

Nevertheless, the United States established its embassy in Tel Aviv, where it sits to this day. But Jerusalem is Israel's capital: it is the seat of its government, its parliament, its supreme court. The President and Prime Minister reside there. Our ambassador travels daily from Tel Aviv to meetings with Israeli government officials in Jerusalem. All major political parties in Israel agree, moreover, that Jerusalem will remain Israel's undivided capital.

The United States Congress also agrees. Congress overwhelmingly passed legislation in 1995 that contained an official statement of US policy on Jerusalem: that it should remain united and be recognized as Israel's capital, and that our embassy should be located there by the end of May, 1999. If the embassy were not located in Jerusalem by that date, 50 percent of the State Department's budget for buildings and maintenance abroad would be withheld unless the President issued a national security waiver. That is the waiver which the President now considers issuing. I strongly believe that he should not do so, that instead he should do what is right by recognizing that Jerusalem is Israel's capital.

There are those who timidly argue that to do what is right will damage the peace process. How can that be possible? Is it not more harmful to fuel unrealizable expectations by pretending that Jerusalem is not Israel's capital or that it might someday be redivided? Would it not be better simply to finally do what we should have done fifty years ago by recognizing the only city that could ever be Israel's capital, the one city that has always been Israel's capital, the eternal city of Jerusalem?

President Clinton stated when he was running for office on June 30, 1992 the following: "Whatever the outcome of the negotiations, . . . Jerusalem is still the capital of Israel, and must remain an undivided city accessible to all." He was right then, and he has the chance to do right now.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BOND:

S. 1053. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to incorporate certain provisions of the transportation conformity regulations, as in effect on March 1, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 1054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance various tax incentives for education; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWBACK (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 1055. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to designate the day before Thanksgiving as "National Day of Reconciliation"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAFEE:

S. 1056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve tax equity for the Highway Trust Fund and to reduce the number of separate taxes deposited into the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. KERREY, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. ROBB, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. HELMS, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 1057. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain provisions applicable to real estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Finance.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOND:

S. 1053. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to incorporate certain provisions of the transportation conformity regulations, as in effect on March 1, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

##### CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, on March 2, 1999, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia issued its decision in the Environmental Defense Fund versus Environmental Protection Agency lawsuit whereby the EDF filed suit challenging several provisions of the EPA's air quality conformity rule. The court ruled in favor of the EDF.

This decision overturned a well-established EPA rule permitting previously approved transportation projects being "grandfathered" into transportation air quality conformity plans. The court decision eliminates any flexibility for local authorities to proceed with projects and protect them from disruptions caused by issues often beyond their control—including changes in federal regulations and standards. In addition, the court decision impacted use of submitted budgets, non-federal project flexibility, grace periods before SIP disapprovals, and SIP safety margins.

As of April 19, the Federal Highway Administration had identified ten areas in conformity lapse where transportation projects are impacted. The areas are: Ashland, Kentucky; Memphis, Tennessee; Raleigh, North Carolina; Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Atlanta, Georgia; Monterey, California; Santa Barbara, California; Knoxville, Tennessee; Paducah, Kentucky; and South Bend, Indiana.

Many people probably thought that would be the end of the list. To give another example of why this is such an important issue—one week ago today the United States Department of Transportation determined that the

Kansas City metropolitan area's conformity plan had lapsed. The Kansas and Missouri Divisions of the Federal Highway Administration halted approval of transportation projects in the region. More and more areas could be faced with this situation.

If we do not address this issue, it could potentially bring to a halt transportation improvement projects around the country—further jeopardizing the safety of the traveling public, hindering economic growth, and in my opinion, doing nothing to improve the air quality situation in any of these areas.

Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk.

Mr. President, the only thing this legislation does is amend the Clean Air Act to reinstate those EPA rules which were struck down or remanded in the Environmental Defense Fund vs. Environmental Protection Agency lawsuit. No more. No less. This legislation has zero impact on the Clean Air Act of EPA's rules.

In 1997, in the EPA's information on the final conformity rule that incorporated the 1997 changes, EPA reported the following:

The conformity rule changes promulgated today result from the experience that EPA, the Department of Transportation, and state and local air and transportation officials have had with implementation of the rule since it was first published in November of 1993. While these changes clarify the rule and in some cases offer increased flexibility, they will not result in any negative change in health and environmental benefits.

So the EPA got together with the stakeholders, issued a rulemaking, provided the public comment period, issued a final rule, practiced for several years, and defended the position in court. I want to take this position and codify it.

Mr. President—there will be some who will argue for more or less restrictive changes to the underlying conformity provision in the Clean Air Act. Should that discussion and debate occur? Yes. I might support some of those changes. However, we have an immediate situation where transportation projects around the country are or could be impacted by the court's ruling. States and metropolitan areas across the country are needing assistance with this issue. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support this common sense legislation that simply takes EPA's own regulations on conformity that the court overturned and puts them into law.

Mr. President, we must address the immediate situation and then continue the debate on conformity to address further needs.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 1054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance various tax incentives for education; to the Committee on Finance.

##### SAVINGS FOR SCHOLARS ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation, the Savings for Scholars Act, to help families