

Taliban and bin Laden. Syria has allowed Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad to maintain their headquarters in Damascus and to operate training camps in the Bekaa Valley of Lebanon. Iran provides about 10 percent of Hamas' total budget and virtually all of the funds used by Palestinian Islamic Jihad, according to a wide variety of reports and analyses. It also funds weapons to Hizbollah in Lebanon, an organization that helps train Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

In conclusion, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of this resolution will send to Chairman Arafat a clear, strong message that our patience with him is at an end. As some Israeli leaders have noted, Mr. Arafat should be told to either surrender the terrorists, or surrender his power. The same policies that we are pursuing against Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan should be applied to Mr. Arafat. I urge my colleagues to fully support this measure.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the gentlewoman from Nevada, I want to make some observations on the speaker prior to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

I do not take back one single word of my statement. Units of Arafat Palestinian Authority have participated repeatedly in the most heinous terrorist acts and claimed credit for it. Arafat paid tribute to mass murderers and assassins on a repeated basis. He is part and parcel of the terrorist cabal.

Let me also say, with respect to sanctimonious statements about peace, there was an opportunity for peace when, under President Clinton's leadership and at his urging, former Prime Minister Barak made sweeping and phenomenal concessions to the Palestinian Authority, and instead of accepting those or coming up with a counteroffer, he started a 14-month mass murder, sweeping the region, with hundreds of Israelis and Palestinians being killed, the Palestinian economy in shambles, tourism in the whole region from Egypt to Lebanon dead. All of it because of terrorism and violence.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), my distinguished colleague and good friend.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Hyde-Lantos resolution.

I would like to personally thank both the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for bringing this measure to the floor and for their excellent leadership on our committee.

Mr. Speaker, after the vile terrorist attacks perpetrated by Palestinian suicide bombers this weekend in Israel, many are claiming that this is the moment of truth for Yasar Arafat. The fact is, Chairman Arafat has had too many moments of truth, and he has failed them all.

The patience of the United States has been abused time and again by the Pal-

estinian leadership. It is far past time for Chairman Arafat to start producing results. He started this Intifada over a year ago after rejecting Prime Minister Barak's generous calls for peace and, since then, has chosen to ignore America's calls for negotiation in favor of blowing up discos and pedestrian malls. Mr. Arafat and the entire Palestinian leadership must listen very clearly to the message that we are sending: You have gained nothing by killing innocent teenagers, except the wrath of America, Israel and the civilized international community.

Palestinian apologists have tried to link these terrorist attacks to Israeli policies. Let me say loud and clear that those who make this argument are the same, in many instances, who claim that the attacks on America on September 11 were motivated by America's foreign policy. Only the most despicable or deliberately blind human beings can rationalize the murder of innocent teenagers for a supposed political cause.

Mr. Speaker, our patience with the Palestinian leadership has run its course. American policy is clear that our enemies are terrorists everywhere and all governments that support them. This resolution says once and for all to Chairman Arafat, what side are you on? Do you support terror, or will you immediately and permanently dismantle the terrorist organizations that act freely within your territory?

Hamas and other terrorist organizations operate with a free hand because Arafat allows them to. If Arafat cannot control these terrorists, then why are we propping him up and pretending that he has the ability to negotiate with Israel for peace? If Chairman Arafat fails to act, then it is time to regard the Palestinian Authority as supporters of terror and deal with them as such. The choice, as it has always been, is Chairman Arafat's to make.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, Yasar Arafat says that he cannot control the terrorists. It seems that we have a relatively easy decision to make. Why do we not take him at his word? If he cannot control the terrorists, then he should not pretend that he can bring peace, and we ought to stop negotiating with him. We need to look elsewhere among the Palestinians for negotiating partners. If Yasar Arafat is responsible, then terrorists under his control over the weekend killed 26 Israelis. If he is responsible, he needs to be held accountable for his actions. We need to remember that Arafat has never outlawed Hamas, he has never confiscated its weapons, he has never shut down its training camps, and he has never even publicly condemned it by name.

In 1997, then Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said that Arafat had a

revolving door justice system when it came to handling terrorists. Things have not changed.

Again, the U.S. simply needs to determine, is Arafat in control, or is he not? I would suggest that, in either case, we ought to stop negotiating with him.

Further, there are better uses for taxpayer dollars than to prop up terrorists and their regimes. If we find that he is not in control, stop negotiating with him. If he is in control, hold him accountable. We ought to begin the post-Arafat era.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution and not, obviously, because it condemns violence. We all condemn the violence. But there is more to this resolution than just condemning the violence. I have a problem with most resolutions like this because it endorses a foreign policy that I do not endorse, and it does that by putting on unnecessary demands. So the demands part of this resolution is the part that I object to, not the condemnation of violence.

By doing this, we serve to antagonize. We hear today talk about having solidarity with Israel. Others get up and try in their best way to defend the Palestinians and the Arabs. So it is sort of a contest: Should be we pro-Israel or pro-Arab, or anti-Israel or anti-Arab, and how are we perceived in doing this? It is pretty important.

But I think there is a third option to this that we so often forget about. Why can we not be pro-American? What is in the best interests of the United States? We have not even heard that yet.

I believe that it is in the best interests of the United States not to get into a fight, a fight that we do not have the wisdom to figure out.

Now, I would like to have neutrality. That has been the tradition for America, at least a century ago, to be friends with everybody, trade with everybody, and to be neutral, unless somebody declares war against us, but not to demand that we pick sides in every fight in the world. Yet, this is what we are doing. I think our perceptions are in error, because it is not intended that we make the problem worse. Obviously, the authors of the resolution, do not want to make the problem worse. But we have to realize, perceptions are pretty important. So the perceptions are, yes, we have solidarity with Israel. What is the opposite of solidarity? It is hostility. So if we have solidarity with Israel, then we have hostility to the Palestinians.

I have a proposal and a suggestion which I think fits the American tradition. We should treat both sides equally, but in a different way. Today we

treat both sides equally by giving both sides money and telling them what to do. Not \$1 million here or there, not \$100 million here or there, but tens of billions of dollars over decades to both sides; always trying to buy peace.

My argument is that it generally does not work, that there are unintended consequences. These things backfire. They come back to haunt us. We should start off by defunding, defunding both sides. I am just not for giving all of this money, because every time there are civilians killed on the Israeli side or civilians killed on the Palestinian side, we can be assured that either our money was used directly or indirectly to do that killing.

□ 1345

So we are, in a way, an accomplice on all of this killing because we fund both sides. So I would argue we should consider neutrality, to consider friendship with both sides, and not to pretend that we are all so wise that we know exactly with whom to have solidarity. I think that is basically our problem. We have a policy that is doomed to fail in the Middle East; and it fails slowly and persistently, always drawing us in, always demanding more money.

With the Arabs, we cannot tell the Arabs to get lost. The Arabs are important. They have a lot of oil under their control. We cannot flaunt the Arabs and say, get lost. We must protect our oil. It is called "our oil." At the same time, there is a strong constituency for never offending Israel.

I think that we cannot buy peace under these circumstances. I think we can contribute by being more neutral. I think we can contribute a whole lot by being friends with both sides. But I believe the money is wasted, it is spent unwisely, and it actually does not serve the interests of the American people.

First, it costs us money. That means that we have to take this money from the American taxpayer.

Second, it does not achieve the peace that we all hope to have.

Therefore, the policy of foreign non-interventionism, where the United States is not the bully and does not come in and tell everybody exactly what to do, by putting demands on them, I think if we did not do that, yes, we could still have some moral authority to condemn violence.

But should we not condemn violence equally? Could it be true that only innocent civilians have died on one side and not the other? I do not believe that to be the case. I believe that it happens on both sides, and on both sides they use our money to do it.

I urge a no vote on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I was appalled by the suicide bombings in Israel over the weekend. I am appalled by all acts of violence targeting noncombatants. The ongoing cycle of violence in the Middle East is robbing generations of their hopes and dreams and freedom. The cycle of violence ensures economic ruin and encourages political extremism; it punishes, most of all, the innocent.

The people of the Middle East must find a way to break this cycle of violence. As Secretary of State Colin Powell told the House International Relations Committee in October, "You have got to find a way not to find justifications for what we are doing, but to get out of what we are doing to break the cycle."

Mr. Speaker, I agree with our Secretary of State. The Secretary also said that we need to move beyond seeing the two sides there as "just enemies." I agree with that too. But I don't think this piece of legislation moves us any closer to that important goal. While it rightly condemns the senseless acts of violence against the innocent, it unfortunately goes much further than that—and that is where I regrettably must part company with this bill. Rather than stopping at condemning terrorism, this bill makes specific demands in Israel and the Palestinian areas regarding internal policy and specifically the apprehension and treatment of suspected terrorists. I don't think that is our job here in Congress.

Further, it recommends that the President suspend all relations with Yasir Arafat and the Palestinian Authority if they do not abide by the demands of this piece of legislation. I don't think this is a very helpful approach to the problem. Ceasing relations with one side in the conflict is, in effect, picking sides in the conflict. I don't think that has been our policy, nor is it in our best interest, be it in the Middle East, Central Asia, or anywhere else. The people of the United States contribute a substantial amount of money to both Israel and to the Palestinian people. We have made it clear in our policy and with our financial assistance that we are not taking sides in the conflict, but rather seeking a lasting peace in the region. Even with the recent, terrible attack. I don't think this is the time for Congress to attempt to subvert our government's policy on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Finally, the bill makes an attempt to join together our own fight against those who have attacked the United States on September 11 and Israel's ongoing dispute with the Palestinians. I don't think that is necessary. We are currently engaged in a very difficult and costly effort to seek out and bring to justice those who have attacked us and those who supported them, "wherever they may be," as the president has said. Today's reports of the possible loss of at least two our servicemen in Afghanistan drives that point home very poignantly. As far as I know, none of those who attacked us had ties to Palestine or were harbored there. Mr. Speaker, I think we can all condemn terrorism wherever it may be without committing the United States to joining endless ongoing conflicts across the globe.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I thank him for his leadership.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and, again, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for the work they have done.

I rise in strong support of this resolution to express solidarity with Israel

and the fight against terrorism. We have had leadership on the Committee on International Relations that has helped us to ensure our support for Israel, and I want to thank them all for their leadership.

The citizens of Israel know too well the threat of terrorism. This past weekend was another brutal example: 26 Israeli citizens were murdered and 175 were wounded by the terrorist group Hamas and the Palestinian jihad, all within 14 hours. This bloody weekend was part of an ongoing campaign aimed at youth and families, unacceptable acts of terrorism.

To bring an end to terrorism in Israel, Chairman Arafat has to live up to his agreements, including commitments made to stop this violence against civilians. That means fulfilling promises of prosecutions. His ability to maintain the rule of law would finally demonstrate a Palestinian interest in engaging in discussions of peace.

Without serious action to eliminate, even harness terrorism, Arafat cannot expect any opportunity for negotiations.

So the United States stands united with Israel in the effort to eliminate the terrorist attacks against our citizens. Our continued unification with other nations on this issue must not cease to be heard around the world. Our Arab allies, indeed, must understand our position and encourage Chairman Arafat to take the necessary steps against known terrorist organizations, and support him publicly when he does.

I encourage all my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 280 to express our support and solidarity for the citizens of Israel.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Middle East subcommittee of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged by the statement of one of the previous speakers who has now left the floor who said, with his unique sense of justice, that we should treat everybody equally; that we should treat the terrorists and victims the same; that we should treat Hamas the same way and look at them in the same way that we treat little girls going to a disco, or grandmothers taking their grandchildren out for pizza for lunch. That is not justice; that is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution. I would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for their outstanding efforts in crafting this resolution and getting it to the floor in so timely a fashion.

I believe it is critically important at this moment, this moment of truth, for the House of Representatives to speak