

As a Congress we need to speak as one voice in our support for Secretary of State Powell. The task before him is immense, but it is necessary. If we do not counter the escalating violence with diplomacy we lose the moral legitimacy of our leadership.

The best way to secure the continued existence of the State of Israel is to simultaneously give hope and voice to the aspirations of the Palestinian people. A safe, secure, economically prosperous, and truly democratic Palestinian state is the only way to attain this peace.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this resolution, and commend Majority Leader TOM DELAY and Representative TOM LANTOS for their work. Israel should know that this House, this President, and the American people support her while she wages a war against terrorists who would mercilessly kill her citizens. Israel is fighting for nothing less than her right to exist, and today we express our solidarity with them in that fight.

I believe that Prime Minister Sharon, along with his united government and the Israeli Defense Forces, is taking the steps necessary to weed out the nest of terrorists that have attacked their citizens for so long. Suicide bombers have no place among people who wish to join the community of nations. Leaders who tolerate their existence should have no welcome and no seat at the table with world leaders. Real peace can only be achieved when the brutality of those who murder innocent men, women and children is halted completely.

I encourage all Members to support this resolution, Israel, the President, and all others including the courageous men and women of our own Armed Forces who are together waging the global war against terrorism.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 392, a resolution expressing solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism that was introduced by Congressman TOM DELAY, the distinguished Majority Whip from Texas. Unfortunately, due to a family illness, I was unable to be present when the House voted on H. Res. 392, however, had I been here, I would have voted "Aye."

Is it important for the House of Representatives to support H. Res. 392? You bet it is and let me tell why I believe so. The atrocities committed daily in the Middle East make us all sick and there's not a member in this body that doesn't want to see an end to it. We are confronted daily with scenes of carnage and destruction. Can we understand such violence? Yes we can. The facts, all too often forgotten, reveal the truth as to why peace has eluded the Middle East.

Today, Israel is the only democracy in the region. Israel is smaller than the state of New Hampshire and is surrounded by nations hostile to its existence. When the United Nations proposed the establishment of two states in the region—one Jewish, one Arab, the Jews accepted the proposal and declared their independence in 1948. The Arab states rejected the UN plan. In 1948, five Arab armies invaded Israel. Again, in 1967, Arab armies amassed on Israel's borders with the clear intention to invade the state. Rather than suffer a bloody ambush, Israel rightfully took the necessary steps to defend its citizens and homeland, a right obliged to every Nation. It

was during the Six Day War of 1967 that the West Bank and Gaza came under Israeli control.

Israel has returned most of the land it captured during the 1967 war, and right after the war offered to return all of it in exchange for peace and normal relations. Unfortunately, the offer was rejected—another missed opportunity for peace in the Middle East. As a result of the 1978 Camp David accords—in which Egypt recognized the right of Israel to exist and normal relations were established between the two countries—Israel returned the Sinai desert, a territory three times the size of Israel and 91 percent of the territory Israel took control of in the 1967 war.

Israel has conceded that the Palestinians have legitimate claims to the disputed territories and is willing to engage in negotiations on the matter, and in return they only ask that they be allowed to live in peace. Seventy-three percent of Israelis agree to a Palestinian state that will live peacefully alongside Israel.

In 2000, a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza was offered to the Palestinians at Camp David, by Israel and the U.S., in return for peace. The U.S. said yes, Europe said yes, the U.N. said yes, and the Arab countries said yes. Why didn't it happen? Arafat said No. Chairman Arafat and the other Palestinian leaders said no because they demand a Palestinian state in place of Israel, not alongside of it.

Instead, the Palestinian Authority sanctioned an intifada, which the world is witnessing today. This has included twenty months of terror, shooting, and the bombing of innocent civilians.

Simply describing the situation as a "cycle of violence," although it may be accurate, ignores the distinctions in tactics and motivations of the two sides. Palestinian militants kill Israeli civilians, using bombs detonated by teenage suicide bombers who are promised wealth and pleasure for their martyrdom. Israeli troops kill Palestinians in self-defense of their lives and that of their countrymen.

The list of disturbing facts about Palestinian terror is long. Israeli troops recently discovered large quantities of counterfeit Israeli currency in the basement of Chairman Arafat's Ramallah headquarters, along with the printing machines that made it. They also found an invoice for \$8,500 to cover bombing supplies in the office of Arafat's chief financial officer—it was on the letterhead of the Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade, an offshoot of Arafat's Fatah Party. The invoice specifically requested \$150 to build each bomb, saying the group would need five to nine bombs per week.

The Al Aqsa Brigades, which are forces directly under Chairman Arafat's control, have been designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by our government. Indeed, Yasser Arafat wears the map of the entire area of Israel on his uniform.

Mr. Speaker, the national Palestinian goal is Jihad. All Palestinian organizations—political, military, cultural and commercial, along with the whole Palestinian school system, advocate the annihilation of Israel and educate generations of school-age children to become terrorists.

Furthermore, Palestinians who have voiced an objection to the practice of blowing up innocent Israeli civilians are labeled traitors.

In July 2001, these are the words of Chairman Yasser Arafat himself addressing his

people at a public event, "Kill a settler every day. Shoot at settlers everywhere. Do not pay attention to what I say to the media, the television or public appearances. Pay attention only to the written instructions that you receive from me."

The Palestinian terror attacks are not spontaneous acts of desperation. They are the product of a deliberate, well-planned, state-sponsored education and incitement program. Its product is to turn a whole people into a nation of terrorists. Since the Oslo Accords in 1993, when the Palestinian Authority gained control over 98% of the Palestinian population, it has been hard at work building this kind of terror system.

A fair and balanced portrayal of the current Middle East situation reveals that one nation stands head and shoulders above the other in its commitment to human right and democracy, as well as in its commitment to peace and mutual security. Mr. Speaker, that nation is Israel. That's why H. Res. 392 is so important. I, for one, don't want the greatest nation on earth, the United States, to weaken our resolve in the all-important fight against terrorism. Nor should we ask it of our only true friend and ally in the Middle East region, and that is clearly Israel.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, this legislation could not have come at a worse time in the ongoing Middle East crisis. Just when we have seen some positive signs that the two sides may return to negotiations toward a peaceful settlement, Congress has jumped into the fray on one side of the conflict. I do not believe that this body wishes to de-rail the slight progress that seems to have come from the Administration's more even-handed approach over the past several days. So why is it that we are here today ready to pass legislation that clearly and openly favors one side in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?

There are many troubling aspects to this legislation. The legislation says that "the number of Israelis killed during that time [since September 2000] by suicide terrorist attacks alone, on a basis proportional to the United States population, is approximately 9,000, three times the number killed in the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington on September 11, 2001." This kind of numbers game with the innocent dead strikes me as terribly disrespectful and completely unhelpful.

It is, when speaking of the dead, the one-sidedness of this bill that is so unfortunate. How is it that the side that loses seven people to every one on the other side is portrayed as the sole aggressor and condemned as terrorist? This is only made worse by the fact that Palestinian deaths are seen in the Arab world as being American-inspired, as it is our weapons that are being used against them. This bill just reinforces negative perceptions of the United States in that part of the world. What might be the consequences of this? I think we need to stop and think about that for a while. We in this body have a Constitutional responsibility to protect the national security of the United States. This one-sided intervention in a far-off war has the potential to do great harm to our national security.

Perhaps this is why the Administration views this legislation as "not a very helpful approach" to the situation in the Middle East. In my view, it is bad enough that we are intervening at all in this conflict, but this legislation strips any lingering notion that the United

States intends to be an honest broker. It states clearly that the leadership of one side—the Palestinians—is bad and supports terrorism just at a time when this Administration negotiates with both sides in an attempt to bring peace to the region. Talk about undermining the difficult efforts of the president and the State Department. What incentive does Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat or his organization have to return to the negotiating table if we as “honest broker” make it clear that in Congress’s eyes, the Palestinians are illegitimate terrorists? Must we become so involved in this far-off conflict that we are forced to choose between Arafat and Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon? The United States Congress should not, Constitutionally, be in the business of choosing who gets to lead which foreign people.

Many people of various religious backgrounds seem determined to portray what is happening in the Middle East as some kind of historic/religious struggle, where one side is pre-ordained to triumph and destroy the other. Even some in this body have embraced this notion. Surely the religious component that some interject into the conflict rouses emotions and adds fuel to the fire. But this is dangerous thinking. Far from a great holy war, the Middle East conflict is largely about what most wars are about: a struggle for land and resources in a part of the world where both are scarce. We must think and act rationally, with this fact clearly in mind.

Just as with other interventionism in other similar struggles around the world, our meddling in the Middle East has unforeseen consequences. Our favoritism of one side has led to the hatred of America and Americans by the other side. We are placing our country in harm’s way with this approach. It is time to step back and look at our policy in the Middle East. After 24 years of the “peace process” and some 300 million of our dollars, we are no closer to peace than when President Carter concluded the Camp David talks.

Mr. Speaker, any other policy that had so utterly failed over such a long period of time would likely come under close scrutiny here. Why is it that when it comes to interventionism in the Middle East conflict we continue down this unproductive and very expensive road?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the resolution.

This resolution expresses the solidarity of the Congress and the American people with Israel in its struggle against the forces of hatred and violence. It is both fitting and appropriate for us today to declare our support at a time when Israel has been subjected to repeated acts of terror. When 125 people in a small country die in one month, when a 17-year old girl cannot make a simple trip to the grocery store without fear of being blown up, or when 28 Jews at prayer during a Passover Seder are killed in cold blood by a suicide bomber, it is time for us to speak out and speak up.

Israel is our most reliable friend in the Middle East. It is the only democracy, a beacon of hope, in a region of the world where the freedoms we all take for granted—freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom to challenge your government non-violently without fear of retribution—simply do not exist. Israel is the only country in the Middle East that guarantees all these freedoms.

Israel, like the United States and every other country, has a right and obligation to de-

fend its citizens when under attack. One of the reasons I have always been so supportive of Israel is that even when it acts to defend itself, it also continues to reach out its hand in peace to its neighbors.

This is a country, who against all odds, made peace with Egypt. It made peace with Jordan. It withdrew its forces voluntarily from Lebanon. And a year and a half ago, under the guidance of President Clinton, this same country offered a historic peace proposal to the Palestinians that many thought was too risky. Unfortunately, peace was rejected by Chairman Arafat and he chose to return to a path of violence and terror.

The Congress stands here today to condemn and reject this path of violence led by the Palestinian leader. Instead, we must return to the path of peace. Israel must have a partner who is willing to say “no” to those who would use terror and violence. Chairman Arafat must take action against those Palestinians who would block the path to peace. There is no other choice. The time has come for Yasir Arafat to make a decision: will he write a page of history by pursuing the path to peace or will he be a mere footnote for leaving behind a trail of terror.

Today we stand by Israel but we also stand for peace. As my friend and mentor, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. observed just before his death: “I see Israel, and never mind saying it, as one of the great outposts of democracy in the world and a marvelous example of what can be done, how desert land almost can be transformed into an oasis of brotherhood and democracy. Peace for Israel means security and that security must be a reality.”

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I supported H. Res. 392, however I would have favored a more balanced resolution. As one of 435 members of Congress and one who does not serve on the International Relations Committee, I offered my views beforehand by respectfully suggesting that my colleagues incorporate into their views portions of a similar measure put forward by my colleague from Oregon, Representative PETER DEFAZIO, H. Res. 394. While I do not agree with every provision of Mr. DEFAZIO’s resolution, I think each one of us can agree this Congress should:

Unequivocally condemn acts of violence against Israeli and Palestinian civilians, urge all parties to recognize that continued military attacks and terrorist activities will only lead to escalating violence and the potential destabilization of the Middle East and neighboring regions, and urge all parties to stop using state-controlled media to incite hatred and violence.

These are reasonable provisions, and should have been included in the text of H. Res. 392.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote “yes” on H. Res. 392. Although I have grave concerns that passing this resolution will further inflame tensions in the Middle East, I am voting for the resolution in part to dispel any notion that I am anti-Israel or that I am not sensitive to Israel’s right to self-defense. I strongly support Israel, but I also strongly support efforts to bring about peace in the region, which will allow the Israeli and Palestinian people to live together side by side without having to endure an endless cycle of violence. In the past, the House has passed similar resolutions that I believe have been counterproductive to the peace

process. I fear that we are doing that again. Our own Secretary of State and National Security Advisor have expressed reservations with moving forward with this resolution because of the delicacy of the situation in the Middle East. I agree with them. We should not be bringing up this resolution at this time. That is why I intend to vote “no” on the rule governing debate over H. Res. 392.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of House Resolution 392, in which we express America’s solidarity with Israel in its fight against terrorism. The truth is, the United States and Israel are engaged in a common struggle against terrorism. It is a war that neither nation sought; it is a war that both nations must win.

The resolution also calls upon the Palestinian leader, Yasir Arafat, to choose peace and to fulfill his commitment to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure that threatens the Israeli people. If we had a dollar for every time a U.S. official had sent this message to Mr. Arafat we would be able to fully fund the war on terrorism. It is my prayer, for the sake of Israel and all the Palestinian people who would like nothing more than to live in peace, that Mr. Arafat finally honors the pledge to peace that he has repeatedly made. The recent Israeli incursions into the West Bank have occurred only because Mr. Arafat has not lived up to his responsibilities. This resolution we are considering today places the obligations to ending terrorism where it belongs—on the shoulders of Mr. Arafat.

All reasonable people begin their discussions of the violence that shatters the Middle East from the same position—it is horrible and many people on both sides have suffered greatly. The question revolves around how it can be resolved so that the people of the region can live in peace and build a secure future based on democratic principles. The burden has always been placed on Israel to do something for peace. For example, it has often been said that if Israel would simply move back to its pre-1967 borders there would be peace. But history shows there were wars against Israel in 1948, 1956 and 1967—and during that time Israel was within the borders that we are today told hold the key to peace. Absent a clear, forceful and enduring commitment on the part of Mr. Arafat to end terrorism there is no reason to believe those borders would produce peace today anymore than they did in the past.

All this being said, I am not convinced that today’s resolution will have much of an effect on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In fact, it may bring other members in this body to this very House floor with resolutions in support of Mr. Arafat. That is their right. However, America must speak with one single voice and that voice should belong to the president, not members of Congress. It is my hope that we can stop the resolutions and allow the administration to work toward establishing an atmosphere in which Israel and the Palestinians can begin learning how to live side by side in a land where they both have long-standing interests.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Israel, its people, and its future as a vibrant and stable democracy. I also rise in support of the Palestinian people and their rights to a homeland and to live in peace and security with their Israeli neighbors. I rise in support of a future for the Middle East