

8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

PALESTINIAN ANTI-TERRORISM ACT OF 2006

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4681) to promote the development of democratic institutions in areas under the administrative control of the Palestinian Authority, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4681

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States—

(1) to support a peaceful, two-state solution to end the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians in accordance with the Performance-Based Roadmap to a Permanent Two-State Solution to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict (commonly referred to as the "Roadmap");

(2) to oppose those organizations, individuals, and countries that support terrorism and violence;

(3) to urge members of the international community to avoid contact with and refrain from financially supporting the terrorist organization Hamas or a Hamas-controlled Palestinian Authority until Hamas agrees to recognize Israel, renounce violence, disarm, and accept prior agreements, including the Roadmap;

(4) to promote the emergence of a democratic Palestinian governing authority that—

(A) denounces and combats terrorism;

(B) has agreed to and is taking action to disarm and dismantle any terrorist agency, network, or facility;

(C) has agreed to work to eliminate anti-Israel and anti-Semitic incitement and the commemoration of terrorists in Palestinian society;

(D) has agreed to respect the sovereignty of its neighbors;

(E) acknowledges, respects, and upholds the human rights of all people;

(F) implements the rule of law, good governance, and democratic practices, including conducting free, fair, and transparent elections in compliance with international standards;

(G) ensures institutional and financial transparency and accountability; and

(H) has agreed to recognize the State of Israel as an independent, sovereign, Jewish, democratic state; and

(5) to continue to support assistance to the Palestinian people.

(b) AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2351 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second section 620G (as added by section 149 of Public Law 104-164 (110 Stat. 1436)) as section 620J; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 620K. LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.

"(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subsection (e), assistance may be provided under this Act to the Palestinian Authority only during a period for which a certification described in subsection (b) is in effect.

"(b) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this subsection is a certification transmitted by the President to Congress that contains a determination of the President that—

"(1) no ministry, agency, or instrumentality of the Palestinian Authority is controlled by a foreign terrorist organization and no member of a foreign terrorist organization serves in a senior policy making position in a ministry, agency, or instrumentality of the Palestinian Authority;

"(2) the Palestinian Authority has—

"(A) publicly acknowledged Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state; and

"(B) recommitted itself and is adhering to all previous agreements and understandings by the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Authority with the Government of the United States, the Government of Israel, and the international community, including agreements and understandings pursuant to the Performance-Based Roadmap to a Permanent Two-State Solution to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict (commonly referred to as the 'Roadmap'); and

"(3) the Palestinian Authority has taken effective steps and made demonstrable progress toward—

"(A) completing the process of purging from its security services individuals with ties to terrorism;

"(B) dismantling all terrorist infrastructure, confiscating unauthorized weapons, arresting and bringing terrorists to justice, destroying unauthorized arms factories, thwarting and preempting terrorist attacks, and fully cooperating with Israel's security services;

"(C) halting all anti-Israel incitement in Palestinian Authority-controlled electronic and print media and in schools, mosques, and other institutions it controls, and replacing these materials, including textbooks, with materials that promote tolerance, peace, and coexistence with Israel;

"(D) ensuring democracy, the rule of law, and an independent judiciary, and adopting other reforms such as ensuring transparent and accountable governance; and

"(E) ensuring the financial transparency and accountability of all government ministries and operations.

"(c) RECERTIFICATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the President transmits to Congress an initial certification under subsection (b), and every six months thereafter—

"(1) the President shall transmit to Congress a recertification that the requirements contained in subsection (b) are continuing to be met; or

"(2) if the President is unable to make such a recertification, the President shall transmit to Congress a report that contains the reasons therefor.

"(d) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Assistance made available under this Act to the Palestinian Authority may not be provided until 15 days after the date on which the President has provided notice thereof to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 634A(a) of this Act.

"(e) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the following:

"(A) ASSISTANCE TO INDEPENDENT ELECTIONS COMMISSIONS.—Assistance to any Palestinian independent election commission if the President transmits to Congress a certification that contains a determination of the President that—

"(i) no member of such commission is a member of, affiliated with, or appointed by a foreign terrorist organization; and

"(ii) each member of such commission is independent of the influence of any political party or movement.

"(B) ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS.—Assistance to the Office of the President of the Palestinian Authority for non-security expenses directly related to facilitating a peaceful resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict or for the personal security detail of the President of the Palestinian Authority if the President transmits to Congress a certification that contains a determination of the President that—

"(i) such assistance is critical to facilitating a peaceful resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict;

"(ii) the President of the Palestinian Authority is not a member of or affiliated with a foreign terrorist organization and has rejected the use of terrorism to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict;

"(iii) such assistance will not be used to provide funds to any individual who is a member of or affiliated with a foreign terrorist organization or who has not rejected the use of terrorism to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and

"(iv) such assistance will not be retransferred to any other entity within or outside of the Palestinian Authority except as payment for legal goods or services rendered.

"(2) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Assistance described in paragraph (1) may be provided only if the President—

"(A) determines that the provision of such assistance is important to the national security interests of the United States; and

"(B) not less than 30 days prior to the obligation of amounts for the provision of such assistance—

"(i) consults with the appropriate congressional committees regarding the specific programs, projects, and activities to be carried out using such assistance; and

"(ii) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a written memorandum that contains the determination of the President under subparagraph (A).

"(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

"(A) the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

"(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATION.—The term 'foreign terrorist organization' means an organization designated as a foreign terrorist organization by the Secretary of State in accordance with section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)).

"(2) PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.—The term 'Palestinian Authority' means the interim Palestinian administrative organization that governs part of the West Bank and all of the Gaza Strip (or any successor Palestinian governing entity), including the Palestinian Legislative Council."

(c) APPLICABILITY TO UNEXPENDED FUNDS.—Section 620K of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by subsection (b), applies with respect to unexpended funds obligated

for assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to the Palestinian Authority before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a review of the proposed procedures by which United States assistance to the Palestinian Authority under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 will be audited by the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and all other relevant departments and agencies of the Government of the United States and any recommendations for improvement of such procedures.

(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should be guided by the principles and procedures described in section 620K of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by subsection (b), in providing direct assistance to the Palestinian Authority under any provision of law other than the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2351 et seq.), as amended by section 2(b)(2) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 620L. LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA.

“(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subsection (d), assistance may be provided under this Act to nongovernmental organizations for the West Bank and Gaza only during a period for which a certification described in section 620K(b) of this Act is in effect with respect to the Palestinian Authority.

“(b) MARKING REQUIREMENT.—Assistance provided under this Act to nongovernmental organizations for the West Bank and Gaza shall be marked as assistance from the Government of the United States unless the Secretary of State or the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development determines that such marking will endanger the lives or safety of persons delivering or receiving such assistance or would have a material adverse effect on the implementation of such assistance.

“(c) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Assistance made available under this Act to nongovernmental organizations for the West Bank and Gaza may not be provided until 15 days after the date on which the President has provided notice thereof to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 634A(a) of this Act.

“(d) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the following:

“(1) ASSISTANCE TO MEET BASIC HUMAN HEALTH NEEDS.—The provision of food, water, medicine, sanitation services, or other assistance to directly meet basic human health needs.

“(2) OTHER TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—The provision of any other type of assistance if the President—

“(A) determines that the provision of such assistance will further the national security interests of the United States; and

“(B) not less than 25 days prior to the obligation of amounts for the provision of such assistance—

“(i) consults with the appropriate congressional committees regarding the specific pro-

grams, projects, and activities to be carried out using such assistance; and

“(ii) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a written memorandum that contains the determination of the President under subparagraph (A) and an explanation of how failure to provide the proposed assistance would be inconsistent with furthering the national security interests of the United States.

“(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.”

(b) OVERSIGHT AND RELATED REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) OVERSIGHT.—For each of the fiscal years 2007 and 2008, the Secretary of State shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 30 days prior to the initial obligation of amounts for assistance to nongovernmental organizations for the West Bank or Gaza under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 that procedures have been established to ensure that the Comptroller General of the United States will have access to appropriate United States financial information in order to review the use of such assistance.

(2) VETTING.—Prior to any obligation of amounts for assistance to nongovernmental organizations for the West Bank or Gaza under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Secretary of State shall take all appropriate steps to ensure that such assistance is not provided to or through any individual or entity that the Secretary knows, or has reason to believe, advocates, plans, sponsors, engages in, or has engaged in, terrorist activity. The Secretary shall, as appropriate, establish procedures specifying the steps to be taken in carrying out this paragraph and shall terminate assistance to any individual or entity that the Secretary has determined advocates, plans, sponsors, or engages in terrorist activity.

(3) PROHIBITION.—No amounts made available for any fiscal year for assistance to nongovernmental organizations for the West Bank or Gaza under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be made available for the purpose of recognizing or otherwise honoring individuals or the families of individuals who commit, or have committed, acts of terrorism.

(4) AUDITS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall ensure that independent audits of all contractors and grantees, and significant subcontractors and subgrantees, that receive amounts for assistance to nongovernmental organizations for the West Bank or Gaza under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 are conducted to ensure, among other things, compliance with this subsection.

(B) AUDITS BY INSPECTOR GENERAL OF USAID.—Of the amounts available for any fiscal year for assistance to nongovernmental organizations for the West Bank or Gaza under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, up to \$1,000,000 for each such fiscal year may be used by the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development for audits, inspections, and other activities in furtherance of the requirements of subparagraph (A). Such amounts are in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should be guided by the principles and procedures described in

section 620L of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by subsection (a), in providing assistance to nongovernmental organizations for the West Bank and Gaza under any provision of law other than the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

SEC. 4. UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS.

(a) REVIEW AND REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall—

(A) conduct an audit of the functions of the entities specified in paragraph (2); and

(B) transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing recommendations for the elimination of such entities and efforts that are duplicative or fail to ensure balance in the approach of the United Nations to Israeli-Palestinian issues.

(2) ENTITIES SPECIFIED.—The entities referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) The United Nations Division for Palestinian Rights.

(B) The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

(C) The United Nations Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and Personal Representative to the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Authority.

(D) The NGO Network on the Question of Palestine.

(E) The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories.

(F) Any other entity the Secretary determines results in duplicative efforts or funding or fails to ensure balance in the approach to Israeli-Palestinian issues.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations shall use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to seek the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report required under subsection (a)(1)(B).

(2) WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS.—Until the President certifies to the Congress that such recommendations have been implemented, the Secretary of State should withhold from United States contributions to the regular assessed budget of the United Nations for a biennial period amounts that are proportional to the percentage of such budget that are expended for such entities.

(c) GAO AUDIT.—The Comptroller General shall conduct an audit of the status of the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report required under subsection (a)(1)(B).

(d) WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS WITH RESPECT TO THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.—

(1) ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary of State should withhold from United States contributions to the regular assessed budget of the United Nations for a biennial period amounts that are equal to the amounts of such budget that are expended by any United Nations affiliated or specialized agency for assistance directly to the Palestinian Authority.

(2) VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary of State shall withhold from United States contributions to the voluntary budget of the United Nations for a biennial period amounts that are equal to the amounts of such budget that are expended by any United Nations affiliated or specialized agency for assistance directly to the Palestinian Authority.

(3) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this section, the term ‘‘amounts of such budget that are expended by any United Nations affiliated or specialized agency for assistance

directly to the Palestinian Authority” does not include—

(A) amounts expended during any period for which a certification described in section 620K(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by section 2(b)(2) of this Act) is in effect with respect to the Palestinian Authority; or

(B) amounts expended for assistance of the type of assistance described in section 104(c), 104A, 104B, or 104C of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b, 2151b-2, 2151b-3, or 2151b-4) and which would, if provided by the Government of the United States, be permitted under such sections, or under chapter 4 of part II of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.) to carry out the purposes of such sections, by reason of the application of section 104(c)(4) of such Act.

SEC. 5. DESIGNATION OF TERRITORY CONTROLLED BY THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY AS TERRORIST SANCTUARY.

It is the sense of Congress that, during any period for which a certification described in section 620K(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by section 2(b)(2) of this Act) is not in effect with respect to the Palestinian Authority, the territory controlled by the Palestinian Authority should be deemed to be in use as a sanctuary for terrorists or terrorist organizations for purposes of section 6(j)(5) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(j)(5)) and section 140 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (22 U.S.C. 2656f).

SEC. 6. DENIAL OF VISAS FOR OFFICIALS OF THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A visa shall not be issued to any alien who is an official of, affiliated with, or serving as a representative of the Palestinian Authority during any period for which a certification described in section 620K(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by section 2(b)(2) of this Act) is not in effect with respect to the Palestinian Authority.

(b) WAIVER.—Subsection (a) shall not apply—

(1) if the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees, on a case-by-case basis, that the issuance of a visa to an alien described in such subsection is important to the national security interests of the United States; or

(2) with respect to visas issued in connection with United States obligations under the Act of August 4, 1947 (61 Stat. 756) (commonly known as the “United Nations Headquarters Agreement Act”).

SEC. 7. TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS ON OFFICIALS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY AND THE PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION STATIONED AT THE UNITED NATIONS IN NEW YORK CITY.

The President shall restrict the travel of officials and representatives of the Palestinian Authority and of the Palestine Liberation Organization who are stationed at the United Nations in New York City to a 25-mile radius of the United Nations headquarters building during any period for which a certification described in section 620K(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by section 2(b)(2) of this Act) is not in effect with respect to the Palestinian Authority.

SEC. 8. PROHIBITION ON PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall be unlawful to establish or maintain an office, headquarters, premises, or other facilities or establishments within the jurisdiction of the United States at the behest or direction of,

or with funds provided by, the Palestinian Authority or the Palestine Liberation Organization during any period for which a certification described in section 620K(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by section 2(b)(2) of this Act) is not in effect with respect to the Palestinian Authority.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall take the necessary steps and institute the necessary legal action to effectuate the policies and provisions of subsection (a), including steps necessary to apply the policies and provisions of subsection (a) to the Permanent Observer Mission of Palestine to the United Nations.

(2) RELIEF.—Any district court of the United States for a district in which a violation of subsection (a) occurs shall have authority, upon petition of relief by the Attorney General, to grant injunctive and such other equitable relief as it shall deem necessary to enforce the provisions of subsection (a).

(c) WAIVER.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—The President may waive the application of subsection (a) for a period of 180 days if the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such waiver—

(A) is vital to the national security interests of the United States and provides an explanation of how the failure to waive the application of subsection (a) would be inconsistent with the vital national security interests of the United States; and

(B) would further the achievement of the requirements outlined in the certification described in section 620K(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by section 2(b)(2) of this Act).

(2) RENEWAL.—The President may renew the waiver described in paragraph (1) for successive 180-day periods if the President makes the determination and certification described in such paragraph for each such period.

SEC. 9. INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) UNITED STATES POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States that the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution shall use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to prohibit assistance to the Palestinian Authority unless a certification described in subsection (b) is in effect with respect to the Palestinian Authority.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this subsection is a certification transmitted by the President to Congress that contains a determination of the President that the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)(A), (B), (C), and (E) of section 620K(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by section 2(b)(2) of this Act) are being met by the Palestinian Authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “international financial institution” has the meaning given the term in section 1701(c)(2) of the International Financial Institutions Act.

SEC. 10. DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS WITH PALESTINIAN TERROR ORGANIZATIONS.

It shall be the policy of the United States that no officer or employee of the United States Government shall negotiate or have substantive contacts with members or official representatives of Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade, or any other Palestinian terrorist organization, unless and until such organiza-

(1) recognizes Israel’s right to exist;

(2) renounces the use of terrorism;

(3) dismantles the infrastructure necessary to carry out terrorist acts, including the dis-

arming of militias and the elimination of all instruments of terror; and

(4) recognizes and accepts all previous agreements and understandings between the State of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Authority.

SEC. 11. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(2) PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.—The term “Palestinian Authority” has the meaning given the term in section 620K(e)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by section 2(b)(2) of this Act).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) opposed to the motion?

Mr. LANTOS. No, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On that basis, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) will control the time in opposition to the motion.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this matter be extended by 80 minutes, equally divided.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield half of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this resolution to the floor and to the gentleman from California for his support for this resolution. It is incredibly important that we bring this resolution to the floor today, and I rise in strong support

of the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act which reaffirms America's support for our allies in Israel and protects American interests.

It also brings an end to the dangerously infantilization of the Palestinian people, who through this legislation will finally be held responsible for their political decisions.

In and of itself, January's Palestinian election was a victory for the civilized world in the war on terror. The elections were fair, nonviolent, and added further evidence in support of democracy's fundamental compatibility with Middle Eastern culture.

The outcome of that election, the ascendancy of the unrepentant terrorist organization Hamas, was another story all together. The Palestinian people have made their choice; and while we must respect their God-given right to self-determination, the choice they made has consequences, chief among them the immediate end of foreign assistance to the Palestinian Authority.

American aid to the Palestinian people must be predicated on their rejection of terrorism. And as long as Hamas seeks the destruction of Israel and the murder of innocent Israelis, the United States cannot financially support the Palestinian Authority.

When the day comes that Palestinian leaders reject violence, break apart their terrorist infrastructure, embrace freedom, and seek membership in the civilized world, we will welcome them. Until that day, not a dime.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Everybody on this floor wants to send the same loud and clear message: that Congress is united in its opposition to terror and we are all deeply concerned about the future and security of our close friend and ally, Israel.

This debate is not about our shared revulsion at those who would murder innocent citizens or sow terror for political purposes.

□ 1915

It is not about current law, which prohibits any assistance to Hamas or a Hamas-controlled government, which Congress unanimously reaffirmed earlier this year. For many people, we will find tonight that this is a very personal issue. For anyone who has visited Israel, you understand.

When I first visited Jerusalem, I couldn't help but be struck by how close the holy sites of the three great religions are, less than the distance of a Tiger Woods 5-iron shot. I will always cherish the opportunity in a more optimistic time, to visit a security checkpoint outside Ramallah, jointly manned by Israelis and Palestinians. The possibility of that moment, its fragility and the ramifications of failure, have been brought home to me repeatedly in recent years.

I was and am impressed by the diversity of opinions in Israel, by its vibrant tradition of democracy and heated de-

bate. But I am also struck by how we are seeing elements of that vibrant debate within the American pro-Israeli community over the bill that is before us this evening.

As someone committed to Israel's security and to the vision of the two states living side by side in peace, I reluctantly oppose the legislation this evening, despite my deep respect for my colleagues who are bringing it forward on both sides of the aisle.

The bill before us is one that the administration does not need nor want. It sets permanent and inflexible limits on the United States, whether or not Hamas is in power. It could potentially limit the United States' ability to help our friend Israel if Israel decides in the future that working with a non-Hamas-controlled Palestinian Authority is in their best interests.

Remember in 1995, Israeli Prime Minister Itzhak Rabin asked the United States to support a flawed Palestinian Authority because he felt it was important for Israel's security. Had the stringent conditions in this bill been in place, we would have had to have said no.

In 2003, Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon asked the United States to support the Palestinian Prime Minister, Mahmoud Abbas. Had the stringent conditions in this bill been in place, we would have had to say no.

Should a future Israeli leader come and ask us to support the Palestinian Authority, after Hamas is forced from power, we shouldn't allow the conditions in this bill to force us to say no.

Unfortunately, this bill defines the Palestinian Authority to include the Palestinian legislative council, as long as members of Hamas are in the Palestinian Parliament. We would have to say no to Israel's request.

As has been pointed out with Libya, the debate over Libya, sometimes we allow diplomatic relations with imperfect regimes because progress can best be made through engagement instead of isolation. This bill goes far beyond the ramifications of January's election and Hamas' rise to power.

It would restrict relations with and support for Palestinian groups and institutions that have nothing to do with terror or rejectionism. It places sanctions on the Palestinian leaders and parts of Palestinian civil society who support peace with Israel, oppose terrorism and who, if the two-state vision comes to pass, will form the backbone of a democratic society.

There is, in this legislation, no recognition that Palestinian society is deeply divided, and that it makes no sense to put sanctions on President Abbas, reformers, even activists for democracy, peace and coexistence. The bill would prohibit the assistance we give to schools that teach peace, to democratic and peaceful political organizations, to groups promoting cooperation with Israel on shared environmental challenges.

It would even punish the democratic opposition by prohibiting visas for

moderate Palestinian legislators or government officials who oppose Hamas. It would prevent the PLO, of which Hamas isn't a member, and which was not impacted by the election of Hamas, from having representatives in Washington or at the United Nations. I am afraid that this legislation may well backfire by actually strengthening the hands of extremists.

Remember, this past winter, the House, in our wisdom, voted to demand that the Palestinians prevent Hamas from running in the legislative elections, telling the Palestinian people to reject them. I don't think it was any accident that Hamas election banners had: "Israel and America say 'no' to Hamas. What do you say?"

I can't help think that any objective appraisal would suggest that the United States Congress, telling them what they could do, may well have provided that extra boost for Hamas' prospects at the election.

This bill provides no diplomatic horizon, no sunset. It is in perpetuity. It does little to prioritize on the basis of our strategic interest and provides no prospect for Palestinian reform coming through the process of negotiations. In so doing, it weakens the hands of those who advocate for peace negotiations and supports those extremists who believe in violence.

Democracy is a complex process in the Middle East and all too rare in the Middle East. The election of Hamas shows that for the kinds of democracies we want to see, elections aren't enough. We need to promote the kinds of democratic institutions, free civil society, conducive to sustainable, liberal democracy in Palestinian territories.

The President needs to be free to do just that, with congressional oversight, not congressional prohibitions and micromanagement. I understand the sincere concern that many people who support this legislation have, but it is too onerous and burdensome on an administration that needs to practice diplomacy.

Democracy is a continuing process that helps transform those who practice it. I agree with the rabbi from my district who wrote that, "change is everything in politics, no matter how bleak the situation currently is," in expressing his opposition to this legislation. We cannot support Hamas or other terrorist groups, but neither should we close the door on change.

Most of the Members of this body consider themselves to be strong friends and supporters of Israel. So do I. That is why I will urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

During the course of this debate, I will rebut point-by-point the items raised by my good friend from Oregon,

for whom I have great respect and great affection. But let me just say that while I am convinced that his position is motivated by the best of intentions, he totally misrepresents the nature of our legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to join my friend and distinguished colleague, LEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, in introducing the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act. It has also been an honor to work with the chairman of the committee, HENRY HYDE, in bringing the bill to the floor in its present form. I would like to thank all 295 of my colleagues who are cosponsors of this bill, which was reported out of the International Relations Committee on a bipartisan vote of 36-2. I repeat, the legislation was reported out of the International Relations Committee representing the broadest spectrum of views and positions by a vote of 36-2. This is a bill that enjoys the broadest bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, a little more than a month ago, a 16-year-old boy from Florida, Daniel Wultz, arrived in Israel with his family. They were celebrating Passover, which commemorates Jewish liberation from brutality long ago. On a pleasant evening in Tel Aviv, Daniel met his father for dinner at a popular falafel restaurant in a working-class neighborhood.

Moments later, a Palestinian terrorist detonated 30 pounds of explosives just a few feet from the father and son. Daniel suffered severe internal injuries, and his leg had to be amputated.

After a valiant struggle for survival, Daniel died last week. As for his father, he faces a long and painful recovery physically; the psychological repercussions one can only speculate on.

This tragedy was compounded several times over, Mr. Speaker. In this one terrorist incident, perpetrated by Hamas, 10 people were murdered, more than 60 were injured, and hundreds of loved ones are suffering the atrocities, the effects of these atrocities for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, during the murderous Intifada, orchestrated, planned and perpetrated by Hamas, more than 1,000 Israelis were killed in incidents like this recent one, barbarous, random, sneak attacks on men, women and children, just going about their lives. Given its comparatively small population, less than 6 million, the loss of 1,000 innocent lives in Israel is the equivalent of losing 50,000 here in the United States. I wonder how many of our colleagues would stand up for the terrorists if we had lost 50,000, not 3,000 on 9/11.

What was the response of the Hamas government to the restaurant bombing? The spokesman for Hamas said that it was, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, "legal." This monstrous act, the most recent terrorist attack, killed 10 people, and Hamas leadership says, it's legal. No condemnation, no promise of pursuing the perpetrators of this vicious crime; just a blanket endorse-

ment of suicide attacks on both American and Israeli citizens.

Now, despite the pathetically naive hopes of some that Hamas would change its stripes upon assuming power, if anything, the anti-Israel rhetoric has only been stepped up. The foreign minister of the terrorist government, Mahmoud al-Zahar, recently told the world that he dreams of, and I am quoting again, Mr. Speaker, "hanging a huge map of the world on the wall at my Gaza home, which does not show Israel on it, because there is no place for the State of Israel on this land."

So much for moderation.

Mr. Speaker, such statements by Hamas government officials make crystal clear the rationale for our legislation. We must isolate the new terrorist authority in the West Bank and Gaza. The situation in the Middle East is alarming. The Palestinian Authority is now governed by a group of killers, like Iranian President Ahmadinejad, who believes that Israel, quote, should be wiped off the map.

It is therefore incumbent upon us, Mr. Speaker, as the ally and long-time supporter of the democratic State of Israel, to do everything we can to demonstrate the bankruptcy of Hamas' vision and to ensure that Hamas receives no help from the United States in implementing its evil plans.

Our bill does exactly that. We will end all assistance to the Palestinian Authority with exceptions for humanitarian aid. We will also end all contact between U.S. diplomats and the Hamas-controlled Palestinian Authority.

□ 1930

Our goal, Mr. Speaker, is not to punish the Palestinian people. Our goal is to demonstrate to them, and to their government, that hatred, murder, assassination and non-recognition of neighbors is unacceptable in a civilized world. Accordingly, we want to make sure that the U.S. taxpayer will not supply one penny of aid for which the Hamas government can claim any credit, and we want to make sure that Hamas and its government are accorded absolutely no legitimacy by the United States or our diplomatic representatives.

Our bill, of course, recognizes that humanitarian emergencies will arise and that we should be supportive of appropriate NGO activities. Just to cite one example, Mr. Speaker, I wrote Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice recently asking that the United States provide funding to assist the Palestinians in dealing with the serious outbreak of avian flu in the Gaza Strip, and I am pleased that our government has been responsive to my request. I think we would all agree on continuing the U.S. tradition of dealing with the humanitarian needs of any people, including the Palestinian people.

I am sure that all of my colleagues will join me in praising the government of Israel for the plan it an-

nounced just yesterday to release \$11 million and let these funds be used for medicine and equipment for Palestinian hospitals, bypassing entirely the terrorist government of Hamas.

Mr. Speaker, representatives of the United States have been meeting with their counterparts from Russia, the United Nations and the European Union to discuss the financial crisis that Palestinians have faced since Hamas came to power. Our bill is fully consistent with the positions and policies of the so-called quartet.

Mr. Speaker, we in this Congress are sickened by the fact that the Palestinians chose Hamas as their leader, and we are sickened and appalled by everything that Hamas stands for. Our bill, H.R. 4681, demonstrates that America will stand firm in the fight against terrorism, while remaining true to the hope for a peaceful Middle East. Our legislation will serve as a model for the right policy to take against terrorists, however they take power, and on behalf of the democratic ally that is the target of suicide bombings by a governmentally-organized campaign.

Allow me a personal word, Mr. Speaker. As all of my colleagues know, I am the only Holocaust survivor ever elected to the Congress of the United States. My family was wiped out by a government that systematically sought to eliminate an entire people.

I am here today to tell you that what Hamas has in mind is a holocaust on the installment plan. I repeat, I am here today to tell you that what Hamas has in mind is a holocaust on the installment plan. It is being done one atrocity at a time. As long as support continues to flow to Hamas, this holocaust on the installment plan will continue, and ultimately, it might succeed. But our bill will stop it.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important, vital, bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, tonight we should be working to ensure security and peace for Israel and for more hope, opportunity and peace for the Palestinian people.

Among our colleagues in the U.S. House, there is unanimous intolerance and condemnation for the current Hamas-led government of the Palestinian Authority. The refusal of the political leadership of Hamas to recognize the State of Israel, renounce violence and terrorism and agree to previous agreements and obligations of the Palestinian Authority is unacceptable, and, therefore, they must continue to be isolated by the international community.

Congress should be here tonight unanimously passing a bill that supports Secretary of State Rice as she leads the international community to keep firm pressure on Hamas until

they agree to internationally recognized and civilized standards of conduct. At the same time, Congress should be working to support the Bush administration and the international community to avoid a serious humanitarian crisis among the Palestinian people.

On May 9, 2006, Secretary Rice said as she announced \$10 million of medical assistance to the Palestinian people, "We will continue to work and look for ways to assist the Palestinian people and will encourage other countries to join us in this effort." She goes on to say, "We will not, however, provide support to a Hamas-led government that refuses to accept the calls of the Quartet and the broader international community to renounce terror and to become a partner for peace."

I strongly support her efforts, and it is unfortunate that the bill tonight could not have been drafted to come to the floor that would be supported by the State Department. The State Department's comment regarding H.R. 4681 is, "this bill is unnecessary."

Instead of advancing the U.S. interests, H.R. 4681 does not recognize the three criteria set forth by President Bush, demanded by President Bush and the international community, for Hamas to commence any form of engagement and to work with the U.S. and the international community.

H.R. 4681 sets an elevated threshold which makes U.S. leadership for peace in the Middle East nearly impossible, even if Hamas does agree to recognize Israel, does renounce terrorism and does agree to abide by all previous agreements.

The outcome of this bill, if it were to become law, would be to isolate Palestinian leaders who have been committed to advancing the peace process, isolate leaders who have denounced terrorism and isolate leaders who are working with Israel for peace and a permanent two-state solution. How does this advance the U.S. goals in the region? It does not.

This bill's real result will be to isolate the U.S. among the members of the international community that are working for peaceful solutions between Israel and the Palestinians.

One of our partners in isolating Hamas and delivering humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian people is the United Nations. A section in this bill calls for the withholding of a portion of the U.S. contribution to the United Nations, as if this valuable partner were an enemy. For this bill to target the United Nations, a member of the quartet, in such a fashion is a clear signal that this bill's intent is to undermine the Bush administration's multilateral leadership.

This bill places extreme constraints on the delivery of humanitarian assistance by non-governmental organizations to the Palestinian people. This bill's unnecessary obstacles have the potential for very negative human consequences and would exacerbate a human crisis.

Palestinian families and children must not be targeted. They must not be deprived of their basic human needs by this Congress. Instead, this House should assure that Palestinian families and children will be treated in a fashion that reflects our values and the belief that their lives are valuable.

NGOs with significant experience in delivering humanitarian assistance have expressed serious concerns with the lack of flexibility in this bill. On April 6, 2006, a letter from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops to Chairman HYDE expressing concerns regarding this bill states, "The legislation provides for the urgent needs of the Palestinian people. A further deterioration of the humanitarian and economic situation of the Palestinian people compromises human dignity and serves the long-term interests of neither the Palestinians nor of Israelis who long for peace."

In its present form, this bill will not allow NGOs to properly carry out the very assistance determined to be necessary by Secretary Rice, ensuring suffering and misery to the Palestinian people.

Later this week in this Chamber, we will be honored by the presence of Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert. In an interview last week, Prime Minister Olmert said the Palestinians "are the victims of their own extremist, fundamentalist, religious, inflexible and unyielding leadership, and we will do everything in our power to help these innocent people."

I strongly associate myself with the honest and courageous comments of the prime minister and his desire for security and peace. I oppose this bill because it is a missed opportunity to keep pressure on Hamas.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the chief deputy majority whip.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to salute the gentlelady from Florida on her unbelievable leadership in bringing this bill to the floor and her tireless efforts in the promotion of freedom and the rejection of terror around the world. I thank her for that.

I also would like to salute and thank Chairman HYDE for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor, and certainly the gentleman from California for his dedication to the rejection of terror and the promotion of freedom in such a tireless way and such an articulate manner here on the House floor. I thank the gentleman as well.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today in strong support of H.R. 4681, the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act. The policy behind this piece of legislation is identical to that which undergirds the Bush doctrine. It is simple: Terrorism is evil and will not be tolerated. Murderous acts carried out by the terrorists must be stopped, and those who perpetuate this evil deserve nothing less than condemnation and destruction. That is why this legislation must pass.

Israel has been fighting a war on terror for more than 60 years. Presently, Israel finds itself in the unique position of facing a terrorist organization that is hiding behind the legitimacy of the Palestinian Authority. Some have chosen to recognize Hamas, a terrorist organization, as a legitimate governing body for the Palestinian Authority. We in the United States Congress find this unacceptable.

Hamas believes that terrorism is a legitimate tool of political negotiation. Hamas does not hide from its endorsement of homicide bombings or its desire to use this tactic to achieve its goal of destroying Israel.

Make no mistake about it: Hamas kills. It murders. It maims. It orphans, and it robs. It blunts the future of innocence. It takes away the happiness of children, and it tears apart families. Hamas believes that this behavior is somehow acceptable.

Today, we must send a message to Hamas and President Abbas that the free nations of the world reject their desire to be recognized as legitimate leaders of their people. Both Hamas and Fatah's al-Aksa Martyrs Brigade have a record of terror and their leaders have a demonstrated lack of humanity by allowing these murderous activities.

Mr. Speaker, today the United States House of Representatives sends a strong message that our government does not and will not deal with terrorists, nor in this Congress should we or will we allow American taxpayer dollars to fund the terrorist activities.

Israel is engaged in a war on terror. It is a war that is part of that which is worldwide and in which we find ourselves engaged as well.

□ 1945

Make no mistake about it, the very freedoms that we hold dear are at stake, and we must never stop fighting this war until the last terrorist on Earth is in a cell or a cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I stand before you as the violence and pain of Palestinian terror was felt by my family. As Mr. LANTOS, the gentleman from California has said, last week, Daniel Wultz died of wounds he suffered in a homicide bombing in Tel Aviv in April. Daniel was my cousin. He and his family were visiting Israel celebrating the Jewish holiday of Passover.

Daniel and his father were eating lunch at a cafe in Tel Aviv, when a homicide bomber blew himself up at the restaurant. For 27 days Daniel fought for his life, but last Sunday he died as a result of his wounds. Daniel was passionate about his family, friends and the community around him. He was an excellent student and a member of the varsity basketball team at the David Posnack Hebrew Day School in Plantation, Florida.

He was active in the Chabad Lubavitch of Weston and hoped to pursue his religious studies further after

high school. He was a handsome, witty and compassionate young man, and did not hesitate to speak out against any injustice he encountered in his daily life.

He was devoted to the laws and teachings of Judaism and Tikun Olam, the Jewish ideal that we must work to make the world a better place. Daniel was a young man with a bright future. Now he is gone, robbed of his bright and promising future.

Daniel is survived by his parents, Sheryl and Tuly Wultz, and his sister, Amanda. I join my colleagues in sending our deepest sympathies.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again salute the gentlewoman from Florida and her efforts on this bill and want to say that I wholeheartedly supported her bill in its original form as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would draw the House's attention to page 8 of the bill and section 2 in which we speak about the exceptions to the prohibition of assistance in the Palestinian Authority, especially to section 620K of the law in which the bill provides for an exception to fund the President of the Palestinian Authority for nonsecurity expenses.

It is this provision, Mr. Speaker, that I hope that we will be able to limit and remove in the conference with the Senate. Hamas must renounce terrorism, destroy all terrorist organizations that are allowed to operate in the Palestinian Territory, and it must recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state. Hamas and the Palestinian President, Mr. Abbas, must understand that we in the United States Congress are serious about this policy.

We must make it clear to the world that the U.S. does not see terrorism as a viable tool for negotiations. This is a first step in the process. And I would like to bring to the attention of the House that I strongly disagree with one of the speakers from the opposition who stated that this bill does not provide for humanitarian efforts for emergency aid for the people in the Palestinian Authority. It does.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the gentlewoman, to working with Chairman HYDE and the gentleman from California to strengthen this bill. I urge passage of this bill, and note that we all must stand for the absolute rejection of terrorism and absolutely no U.S. taxpayer dollar being spent for terrorist activities.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, invoking the Bush doctrine, the previous speaker talks about humanitarian assistance. One of the concerns that the Bush administration has in not supporting this bill is that it is too narrowly drawn, talking about "health," and not broader humanitarian assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I will discuss that later in the course of the evening. Due to the mandatory nature of the bill, its lack of a general waiver, the executive branch thinks it is unnecessary. It al-

ready has ample authority to impose all its restrictions, and constrains the executive branch's flexibility to use sanctions as appropriate as tools to address rapidly changing circumstances.

These are the words of the administration. And I think the Congress would do well to consider them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly a year ago, I joined a bipartisan group of Members in visiting the Hope Flowers School in the Palestinian village of al Khader, just outside of Bethlehem on the West Bank.

Hope Flowers teaches its students a curriculum promoting tolerance, non-violence, democracy and peaceful coexistence. Our bipartisan delegation witnessed the signing of a USAID agreement to renovate several classrooms and other key facilities at the school.

Projects like this are supported by the United States throughout the Palestinian territories. Other projects are paying for modern school books to ensure that fundamentalist propaganda has no place in Palestinian schools; potable water projects to prevent the spread of disease, economic development to improve job prospects for Palestinian youth, and construction of hospitals, schools, sewers, power grids and business centers.

These types of projects are critical to our interests, to Israel, and to the prospects for peace. They help prevent humanitarian crises and diminish popular discontent, and they also inculcate values like those taught at Hope Flowers.

They train peacemakers; they improve America's standing in the Middle East. Why would we want to eliminate programs like these? Are they not needed now more than ever? And yet that is exactly what H.R. 4681 would do. It would cut off U.S. assistance to the West Bank and Gaza.

Mr. Speaker, I stress, despite the way some proponents are trying to frame this debate tonight, the issue is not aid to Hamas or to the Hamas-controlled Palestinian Authority. Nobody on this floor tonight has any tolerance for Hamas.

The issue is rather the bill's ban on aid to all nongovernmental groups, private groups, and organizations, many of whom are diametrically opposed to Hamas's philosophy. Let me clarify some further misconceptions about this legislation. I am not speculating here, Mr. Speaker; I am referring to page 12 of the bill. I invite colleagues to read it.

Mr. Speaker, some have suggested the bill contains sufficient exceptions to allow humanitarian assistance to pass through. Not so. The bill makes an exception for health-related humanitarian aid, such as food, water and

medicine. But it makes no provision for other forms of humanitarian assistance, such as aid for the homeless or displaced families and orphans.

Mr. Speaker, some have pointed to Presidential waiver authority in the bill and suggested that it would allow critical assistance to reach Palestinians. Not so. Unfortunately, all aid beyond health-related humanitarian assistance would be prohibited unless the President, on a case-by-case basis, were to certify that assistance is required by U.S. national security.

And then he would have to consult with Congress 25 days in advance and submit a written memorandum explaining why such assistance benefits U.S. security. How many projects would survive such a gauntlet? Think about the kinds of aid programs that would be cut off, projects that focus on building democratic institutions and civil society, projects that promote economic development to stabilize the territories, projects that ensure that school curricula provide students with a progressive education rather than fundamentalist propaganda, curricula that teach tolerance and conflict resolution skills. Surely programs like this are in our interest.

Mr. Speaker, they are exactly what we need to reduce violence, to build the capacity of Palestinian civil society, and make progress toward a peaceful resolution; and yet they are exactly the programs that would be eliminated in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are other problems with the bill as well. It would significantly handicap any effort to engage the moderate elements in the Palestinian Authority, such as Palestinian Authority President Abbas, by opposing restrictions on visas, travel, and official Palestinian Authority representation in the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, because of these fundamental flaws in the legislation, it is opposed by several leading voices for Israel and Middle East peace, including the Israel Policy Forum, Brit Tzedek, Americans for Peace Now, Churches for Middle East Peace, a broad Protestant coalition, and the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops.

The Bush administration also opposes this bill. In a paper delivered to the House International Relations Committee, the State Department calls the bill unnecessary and says it unduly constrains the Executive's flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that Hamas's election victory was a significant step backward in the quest for a peaceful resolution to this conflict. There is no disagreement here tonight that we should send Hamas a strong message that the world will not tolerate its violent and irresponsible behavior.

But this bill goes far beyond sending that message. Instead, it sends the message that the U.S. wants to punish the Palestinian people for Hamas's action, a message that serves no good purpose.

We can unanimously support, and that is what we should be doing tonight, my colleagues, we can unanimously support legislation blocking assistance to Hamas, and to a Hamas-controlled Palestinian Authority.

But if we adopt legislation that punishes the Palestinian people, instead of isolating the terrorists, we lose the moral high ground. Let us reclaim the moral high ground, signal our resolute opposition to terrorism and also our support for those Palestinian individuals and groups who are working for a peaceful and democratic future.

Mr. Speaker, we should defeat this bill and ask the IR Committee to bring back a bill truly reflective of American interests and values.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to my good friend and our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, first the criticism of the procedure. This is a difficult and complex bill. It has no business being before us under suspension of the rules. It ought to be subject to amendment and unrestricted debate. It's not like we didn't have enough time.

And to show our commitment to democracy by muffling it here serves no good purpose. But we do have the bill before us. I plan to vote for it after some conversation in which I hope I can be joined by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain my basic reason. We were told when Hamas won that election, tragically, when the majority of the people of Israel were ready to make significant concessions, had already begun to do that, an historic moment when Israel was ready to make significant concessions for peace, they were totally repudiated. We were told, well, don't overinterpret that election, because the victory of Hamas, which in percentage terms wasn't as great as in the Parliament for a variety of reasons, but we were told that victory for Hamas was not simply from people who agreed with their rejectionist, hateful philosophy; but it was probably because they were so much better than Fatah at delivering services.

To some extent, we got the explanation, frankly, for congressional earmarks. Why do Members here like to earmark? Because they can go deliver the goods to people back home and then get votes from people who don't agree with them. That is, we all know, why we have earmarks.

Well, I don't want Hamas getting any more earmarks. I don't want to contribute to a situation where Hamas can deliver the goods because they are well funded, and then can convert the good will they earned with that money into votes for rejection.

That is why I fully support a strict refusal to fund Hamas. And people say, well, you will be punishing the Palestinian people. I have heard the argu-

ment before. There are a lot of differences, but there is one common thing.

When this House helped override the veto of Ronald Reagan against sanctions against the hateful, racist regime of South Africa, we were told by many that we would be hurting the people of South Africa, and that was true. The average South African, the average black South African who was victimized by apartheid was, in the short term, victimized by sanctions. And we did not apply sanctions only against the racists who ran the government; we applied sanctions against the whole country.

It is sometimes the case that appropriate public policy will have short-term negative effects. But here is our problem, as I say. We have been told that Hamas won that election in part because of its skill at delivering goods and services. That means if you support peace, it is very much in your interest not to aid Hamas's ability to deliver goods and services.

So I fully support the part of the bill that says, no aid for Hamas. I have to say to some of my friends, I do also want to warn the President, as some of my liberal friends have come here to defend his right for flexibility in the foreign policy, please be warned that that is a very temporary alliance.

□ 2000

Mr. President, please don't assume that your allies here arguing for your flexibility will last much longer than tonight. But I also am very skeptical of those who say, well, let's give the money so they can have better schools. Let's give the money so they can learn reconciliation, et cetera. No, I don't think a Hamas government is going to allow that. So I am very much in favor of this bill insofar as it says, no, we will not contribute to the further political growth of Hamas. I want that government to fail and fall. And that does mean, as it did with sanctions in South Africa, some short-term pain, although this bill, more than it has been described by its opponents, does allow for humanitarian aid.

Let me say for those of my liberal friends who mourn for the President's flexibility: Don't you know that whenever we grant waivers, no matter how complicated the process, they are waived? There is nothing about a requirement of a Presidential waiver that ever stops the President from doing what he has done. The President can certify that Abbas was pregnant if he had to to get the bill through, and he would do it. The history of waivers is they have been no obstacle to what policy is.

But here is my problem, and I would ask the gentleman from California to respond in this way, I agree that we shouldn't aid Hamas. But this bill says we should only aid any entity if it becomes democratic or has taken steps to become democratic and to become transparent. Now, I am all for democ-

racy and transparency, although their immediate benefit is a little unclear in the Middle East right now. But I believe that if there were a strict interpretation of this criteria, we could not have helped the Camp David Peace Agreement with Egypt which was neither democratic nor transparent, nor is Jordan, nor was the PLO and the PLA before Hamas.

Let me put it this way: If Abbas' team had won instead of Hamas, I believe there might have been an argument that they don't meet the criteria. So I would ask the gentleman from California, how strictly are we going to interpret these criteria? Can he give me some assurance that these criteria will not be so strictly interpreted that you would make it impossible to deal with the very imperfect regimes that we are going to have to deal with?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. If I may take the floor, I fully agree with the interpretation of my friend from Massachusetts. We are not looking for protection from Hamas. There is no perfection in any of the governments with which we have diplomatic relations and which we support with huge amounts like the government of Egypt. We are merely asking for minimal standards of civilized behavior, the termination of suicide bombings and the acceptance of their neighbor in peace.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. Reclaiming my time, I hope as this process goes forward in the less restricted other body that we can clarify that and sharpen it. I will say that with regard to the international financial institutions over which the committee on which I serve has jurisdiction, we struck from the bill the requirement of democracy as a prerequisite for peace in the Middle East.

Let me also note, by the way, I was struck, the gentleman from Virginia lamented the inclusion in the provision in this bill which some of the opponents have denied existed. It is kind of an odd thing. The poor provision is attacked by people who don't like it and denied by people who do. That is the provision allowing aid to the president of the Authority. The bill does provide that the aid can go to President Abbas to make peace, not just for his personal security.

So I disagree with the gentleman from Virginia. It is that amendment and some of the other amendments that we have had in there. So I will be voting for the bill at this point in the spirit the gentleman from California has mentioned, namely that, yes, we say "no" to Hamas because we have no interest in funding Hamas so it becomes more politically popular in support of its rejectionism. But we do not interpret this bill as being an obstacle to negotiations of the sort that we have with Egypt, with Jordan, with

Arafat, certainly no winner of the civil liberties award from anybody.

With that assurance of the gentleman and the hope that we can refine this as it goes forward, I will vote for this bill.

Mr. LANTOS. We appreciate the gentleman's support.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York). The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair, not the President.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), a member of the International Relations Committee.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and more to the point, I thank Representative ROS-LEHTINEN for her extraordinary leadership of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia where it is my privilege to serve. My heartfelt appreciation to Chairman Henry Hyde to demonstrate that the lion still roars. His leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor is meaningful and of global significance. And to my mentor and friend, the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) I rise with gratitude for your moral leadership again demonstrated on this floor this evening with your eloquent and powerful words.

I rise today in strong support of the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act. As an original co-sponsor of the act, I come to this floor tonight saddened. I am saddened at what seems to be a diminishing opportunity for peace. In the wake of a world hopeful with the election of President Abbas, we saw it followed with the election of a legislative majority within the Palestinian Authority of a terrorist organization known as Hamas. I am saddened tonight by the story of Daniel whose family's loss will be remembered, not just as it was poignantly this evening by Congressman CANTOR on this floor as he spoke of his own flesh and blood, but will be remembered later this week as the Prime Minister of Israel comes with some of Daniel's family at his side.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) reminded us of the human cost about which we debate tonight, and the policies and the messages that we will send from this well to a waiting world will speak to real human loss, a loss of opportunity, a loss of promise, to the loss of Daniel. It has been said many times tonight, and I take my colleagues at their word, that the State Department has said that this legislation is "unnecessary."

But let me say, as one of 435 Representatives in the United States House of Representatives, that the world waits for the leadership of this Congress and this Nation, and they wait for moral leadership that is clar-

ion, and this serious debate tonight about which there are serious differences that I deeply respect, this debate tonight about the future of American financial assistance to the Palestinian Authority is such a debate.

Let us say plainly, Hamas is a terrorist organization that advocates for its political ideology the murder of innocent civilians. This Congress, this President, his administration and the American people have been clear, the United States does not support, negotiate or fund terrorist organizations, even those that have won a majority of a legislature. Tonight we will say clearly in this Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act: Not one penny for Hamas.

The Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act promotes, however, a democratic Palestinian Authority that denounces and combats terrorism, de-arms and dismantles terrorist agencies, networks and facilities, and works to eliminate anti-Israel and anti-Semitic incitement and the commemoration of terrorists; one that agrees to respect the sovereignty of its neighbors and acknowledges, respects and upholds the human rights; and one at its very core that has agreed to recognize our cherished ally, the State of Israel, as an independent, sovereign, Jewish, democratic state.

Now, there are criticisms tonight well spoken and no doubt well intentioned that say that the administration and our country will lack the flexibility to meet the humanitarian needs on the ground. But I must say, Mr. Speaker, with the clear language of this legislation that I would argue otherwise; that this legislation excludes funding for "basic human health needs." There is also the allowance of security for President Abbas, and then perhaps the broadest exception that has even met with some criticism tonight, an exception for nonsecurity expenses that are "related to the facilitation of a peaceful resolution of the conflict between the Palestinian people and Israel."

Back in southern Indiana, we call that a hole that you could drive a truck through, and it is precisely the kind of flexibility that we need in these uncertain days. In these days, even in the last 24 hours, where we have seen nascent evidence of even a civil war emerging within the Palestinian Authority, as much as I might like a much more narrowly construed bill, I am prepared to endorse this legislation, carefully crafted for the exigencies of our time. I pray for the peace of Jerusalem and for all the people that live there.

Mr. Speaker, the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act sends a clear signal once again that the United States will not tolerate terrorism, and we take a critical stand at this moment in history in advocating for meaningful reform to the very center of the Hamas charter. I salute my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican, for bringing this critical and moral legislation to the floor

of this Congress, and I speak my heartfelt condolences to Daniel's family. May we act in such a way that Daniel and his loss will soon, some day soon, be simply a part of a history of a time gone by, a history that will be remembered as other violent pages of the history of mankind have been remembered, with respect, with grief but representative of a time that is past. And that will be my prayer.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the Dean of the House.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this legislation should be considered under an open rule with lengthy debate and full opportunity to discuss it, not at 8 o'clock at night with the corporal's guard here on the floor.

I yield to no man in my support for Israel. I have voted for hundreds of billions of dollars for it over the years I have served here. And I yield to no man my position to terror and terrorism and terrorists. But that is not what is at issue here tonight.

The administration says this bill is not necessary. It points out that this bill constrains the administration in delivering meaningful diplomatic effort to resolve the problems of the Middle East. The Middle East's problems and the problems of the Palestinians and the Israelis will not be resolved by starving the Palestinians or by creating additional hardship. They are desperate people, incarcerated in walls, afflicted with high unemployment, suffering from health and other problems. The non-governmental organizations point out that this will strip them in substantial part of contributing to this. It will in large part almost totally strip the United States from the ability to address the needs of the Palestinian people and to address the humanitarian concerns which we have about them.

Peace in the Middle East is not going to be achieved at gunpoint. It is going to be achieved by negotiations, by people working together; and that process may be ugly, dirty and slow, but it is the only process that will work. To create additional hardship and suffering for the Palestinians is simply going to guarantee more desperate, angry men who are fully determined that they will go forth to kill Israelis or Americans or anybody else. Our purpose here tonight should be to look to the well-being of the United States, craft a policy which is good for this country. And that policy can only be one which is good for Israel and for the Palestinian people, one which is fair to all, one which puts the United States as a friend and an honest broker of peace to both parties where we can be so accepted.

□ 2015

To take some other course is simply to assure continuing hardship and a

continuing poisonous, hateful relationship amongst the parties in the area. When this Congress realizes that and when we, this Congress and the others here, will recognize that that is the way peace is achieved, then there will be a real prospect for peace. We can expect that the Palestinians will receive the justice that they seek. We can expect that the Israelis will achieve the security that they need and they want and they deserve and that we want them to have.

This legislation will do none of that. This legislation promises further angry men, more bitterness, more hate, more ill-will; and it assures that the thing which we must use to bring this miserable situation to an end, honest, honorable, face-to-face negotiation, will either not occur or will be moved many years into the future.

Think about it. The needs of Israel are not served by this resolution. The needs of the United States are not served by this resolution. The needs of the Palestinian people are not served by this resolution.

Let us vote it down and get something which makes sense and which serves the interests of all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution on the floor. I oppose Hamas. I oppose what they stand for. I oppose their use of violence, their targeting of civilians; their vision for the Palestinian people; their rejection of Israel; and most of all I deplore their rejection of peaceful reconciliation.

For all these reasons, and many more, I do not think that Hamas is a true partner for peace. But while Hamas may not be, the Palestinian people are. The vast majority of Palestinians want peace. The vast majority value peace, follow the law, oppose violence—and legislation like this only hurts the vast majority we need for peace.

I understand the House's desire to ostracize Hamas. But I do not understand how we keep making the same mistakes by punishing the very people we all say we want to help. The restrictions on aid in this bill will not hurt Hamas, they will receive plenty of money from Iran, but this will hurt the Palestinian people.

Under this bill assistance will be limited only to "basic health", a restriction we reject for almost every other nation. This bill would stop economic development assistance, sanitation assistance, environmental assistance—and most ironically, at a time when we are criticizing their choice of government—democracy assistance.

Make no mistake about it; their vote was to get back at our own repeatedly misguided attempts to punish rather than cajole, to batter rather than build trust, and to impoverish rather than to uplift. When we provided Mahmoud Abbas no deliverables and only hardships, it made Hamas's promises hard to ignore.

Our actions emboldened the Hamas, and we are about to do it again. My friends, passage of this legislation will create yet another failed state and humanitarian catastrophe in the Middle East. However, this one, unlike Iraq, will be surrounded by our staunchest ally in that region. If we destabilize Palestine we will destabilize Israel. If we help create chaos we weaken the chance for finding peace between Israel and her neighbors—and even threaten the very viability of the Jewish state.

If this legislation is signed into law we will lose once and for all the Palestinian people. Our rejection of them will create one clear victor—the government of Iran. If we pass this legislation, Iran will win by default. Instead of textbooks for Palestinian children being written by USAID they will be written by the Iranian Revolutionary Council. Schools will be built with Iranian oil money and our ability to influence peace will be weaker as a result.

What I find so strange is that this legislation is being championed by people who believe themselves to be the staunchest supporters of Israel. Mr. Speaker, in order to strengthen Israel peace needs to prevail in the region. In order to guarantee Israel's survival the Palestinians need to find prosperity and view the United States as a friend. This bill will only stymie those efforts. I ask my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL), my good friend.

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

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

I am going to support this resolution when it comes to a vote tomorrow. I want to take this opportunity, if I may, to speak about some of the issues that have been raised during this very important debate, very critical debate. We have lowered our voices, really, and raised our commitment on all sides of this issue.

I represent one of the most diverse districts in the United States of America. When I was mayor of the city that was the center of my district, Paterson, where I have lived all my life, Jews and Arabs and Muslims and Palestinians, we worked together, we prayed together, and we still do.

The conflict is very serious, we know that. Building bridges is part of my bone marrow. You learn that when you are a mayor.

The conflict in Israel is the axis on which much of the Middle East and much of the Middle East politics spins, but let us not forget that what we do and say here has major implications across the globe. This is true in the Congress, as well as when the President speaks.

The United States is strongly committed to the security of Israel as a Jewish state. There is no question that our friend and ally has every right to defend itself against those who oppose freedom and democracy.

The record will show very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that I have not put my signature on every one of those pieces of legislation over the past 10 years, but I think this is different. Many of those pieces of legislation I think exacerbated the situation in the Middle East. The ranking member and I have talked about that many times. Not this time. This is a clear denunciation of Hamas, an organization motivated by hate, not pride.

The world community harbors deep trepidation regarding the rise of

Hamas. Having taken over the government of the Palestinian Authority, Hamas has reiterated its commitment to violence and the destruction of Israel. The charter of Hamas is quite clear about this. I have read that charter time and time again. It is unacceptable, and it is the duty of all nations to keep pressure on Hamas to renounce terrorism and recognize the State of Israel.

The resolution before us today is an effective and noteworthy vehicle for the Congress of the United States to send this message. The United States will not give assistance, financial or otherwise, to Hamas or any Hamas-controlled entity. Terrorism cannot be tolerated. We will not treat this government as legitimate as long as their current dangerous policies and rhetoric remain in place.

Many of us in the House are in favor of a peaceful, two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but this will be unattainable while Hamas refuses to renounce terror.

We do not want to punish the Palestinian people. We know that the overwhelming majority of Palestinians and the overwhelming majority of American Palestinians and Palestinian Americans do not adhere to the destructive philosophy of Hamas. Hamas must reject its charter which calls for the destruction of Israel. Nothing less is acceptable.

The United States must encourage the meeting between Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and Palestinian Authority Chairman Mahmoud Abbas, planned for next week, a very critical time for this legislation, as an important way to keep a dialogue going between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

I will vote for this legislation because I feel strongly that the loudest message practicable must be sent to Hamas.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by paying special tribute to Chairman HYDE. This may be his last year of service in this House, but his legacy of trying to bring peace to Israel and the Palestinians will live on for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I must rise in opposition to this bill.

Let there be no mistake, Hamas is a ruthless terrorist organization. Unless Hamas recognizes Israel's right to exist and renounces terror, the Palestinian Authority should receive no direct U.S. assistance. Direct aid to the Hamas-controlled PA has been cut off. The basic goal of this bill has already been accomplished.

But H.R. 4681 goes well beyond this objective. It is a punitive measure aimed at punishing the Palestinian people. It will undermine U.S. national

interests. It will do nothing to strengthen Israel security.

I have two main objections with this bill. First, it places nearly insurmountable efforts to future U.S. efforts to engage Palestinians and Israel in peace-making. It lacks the normal Presidential national security waiver; and unbelievably, it would limit United States diplomatic contact with moderate, non-Hamas Palestinian officials. Why is this? These are the very leaders who recognize Israel and who support peace, and it makes absolutely no sense for us to undercut them at this critical time.

Second, except for very limited circumstances, this bill will cut off humanitarian aid to the Palestinian people at the very moment when a horrendous humanitarian disaster is looming.

The United States, our Quartet partners, and Israel are all hard at work at present to avoid catastrophe and to deliver assistance around Hamas to credible and transparent NGOs. H.R. 4681 goes in the opposite direction.

I simply cannot see how denying chemotherapy treatment for Palestinian children increases Israel's security or advances U.S. national interests.

Mr. Speaker, there is significant opposition to this bill in the pro-Israel community, and I highlight again, respected national groups like Americans for Peace Now, Israel Policy Forum, and Brit Tzedek strongly oppose this legislation. They tell us voting "no" on this bill is a pro-Israel vote.

Groups like Churches for Middle East Peace and the Conference of Catholic Bishops, with decades of experience providing humanitarian relief, they oppose it as well.

The State Department also opposes the bill, calling it unnecessary and criticizing its provisions as objectionable.

On Wednesday, we will welcome Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert to this Chamber. Yesterday, this is what he told his Cabinet: "We have no intention of helping the Palestinian government, but I say we will render such assistance as may be necessary for humanitarian needs." He also dispatched his top two ministers for a substantive meeting with Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas.

If this policy of shutting the door on Hamas but opening it to Palestinian moderates and the Palestinian people themselves is good enough for the Prime Minister of Israel, it should be good enough for the U.S. House of Representatives.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 4681.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before yielding time, I would like to just say a word about the avalanche of misrepresentations which we have heard on this floor.

This legislation does not in any sense provide any punishment for the Palestinian people, just the opposite. It is

carefully crafted and aimed at the terrorist organization called Hamas.

I did not know, Mr. Speaker, when I spoke about the 16-year-old young American citizen who was killed by Hamas that he is the cousin of one of our colleagues, and I would like to extend my condolences to my friend from Virginia who suffered this personal loss.

The avalanche of misrepresentations can only be ascribed to a sloppy reading of this legislation. It is extremely carefully crafted, and if, in fact, the issue would not be as serious, I would find it ludicrous that some of the sharpest critics of the Bush administration have suddenly found great affection for the Bush administration because, like all other administrations, it wants total flexibility.

It is ludicrous that the most virulent critics of the Bush administration suddenly find themselves in bed with the Bush administration. This is, to say the least, unseemly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip, my good friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. LANTOS and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for bringing this legislation to the floor.

The premise of this bill is eminently reasonable, in my opinion, and one with which the American people, I think, strongly agree. In short, the United States of America should not, indeed it must not, provide assistance to a government run by terrorists whose very policy and purpose is the destruction of another nation.

All of us are concerned about the plight of the Palestinian people, who have suffered tragically for decades under the leadership of Arafat and now Hamas.

I share those concerns. I have been to Gaza. I have been to the West Bank. I have met with President Abbas and other Palestinian officials, and I have seen the deprivation, the frustration, and the lack of opportunity in the Palestinian territories.

I think there is not one of us on this floor who is not concerned about their plight, as we should be. However, our legitimate concerns for the Palestinian people must not obscure the fact that the Palestinian Authority is now controlled by Hamas, an organization designated as a terrorist entity by the United States and by the European Union. No one here, I understand, stands to defend Hamas; but it is a movement that is committed to the destruction of another nation, in this case our ally Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this balanced legislation is warranted.

□ 2030

Among other provisions, it prohibits direct financial transfers to the Palestinian Authority. That is our policy; until the President certifies that

Hamas recognizes Israel's rights to exist, renounces terrorism, agrees to abide by previous PLO and PA agreements with Israel and the United States, and does not have a member of a foreign terrorist organization in a senior policy-making position.

And despite the prohibition of direct assistance, the bill includes exceptions, as it should. For example, the President still may provide assistance for nonsecurity expenses directly related to facilitating a peaceful resolution of the conflict. Furthermore, the bill restricts indirect assistance through non-governmental organizations unless the certification described above is made by the President.

However, let me add, this provision contains an unqualified exception for basic human health needs, such as food, water, medicine and sanitation services. I tell some of my friends, if that were not in here, I would have reservations, but those basic services are fully excepted in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is, I think, measured and balanced and demonstrates the refusal of the United States to reward terrorists for terrorism. It should not be, and I think it is not, punitive as it relates to the Palestinian people. It provides, as I said, for health needs, food, water, medicine and sanitation services. They are in need of those services, and we ought to provide them.

But what we ought not to do and what we ought never to do is to give aid and comfort to terrorists or to terrorist organizations or to terrorist governments. Because if we do so, that will encourage others to commit heinous acts of terrorism, as were done here, as are done in Israel, and have been done around the world.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD). (Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time. I think this is not a carefully crafted bill. I think this is, as much as I respect the chairman and the ranking member, and I do respect the chairman, I have known the chairman for the 20 years I have been in politics, and I respect the ranking member, but I think the approach that is offered in this bill is what I would characterize as a meat-axe approach.

This does not help common ordinary citizens. What it does is it hurts common ordinary citizens. There is no other way around it. You can protest as much as you want about Mrs. CAPPS and what she said, but she is right. Common ordinary citizens, common ordinary Palestinians are going to be hurt by this, because the funding is going to be cut off for educational services, for health services, for the services that these people need very badly.

And what we have now, it looks to me like at least a couple hundred Secretaries of State, as reflected in this

bill. Do you all know more than the Secretary of State? Do you know more than the President? Do you think your policy is better than the administration's policy? Yes, you do. Well, I don't happen to agree with that. I really don't.

And I ask Members, I may be the only Republican to vote against this. I am obviously going to be the only Republican to speak against it, but I ask Members who represent large Arab populations in their districts to think about this. This hurts the Palestinian people. There is no other way to put it. And I do not know why you are doing this. In the name of protecting Israel? I just think this is a bad idea, and I don't understand why it is being done.

I would say this: The new prime minister of Israel is in this country. In a day or two, he will be walking down this middle aisle. And if he were able to vote and have a card that would allow him to vote as he walks down, he would vote against this bill. He has recognized that it is a bad bill. And if he had the opportunity to put his voting card as he walks down, he would vote against it, as would a large part of this administration. Why? Because it hurts common ordinary people. That is why.

If you are going after Hamas, go after them, but don't restrict the funding that helps people. The reason that Hamas won the election is the Palestinians didn't have the right people on the ballot and didn't work the ballot in order to do it. And Hamas has gone out into those communities and provided services, and they have endeared themselves to the Palestinian people while the leadership of Palestine has been pocketing a lot of money. That's the reason they won the elections. They ran better elections. But why fault the people for that? And why take this kind of funding away from common ordinary citizens?

Now, for all of you that come out on this floor all the time and talk about what we should be doing and what we are cutting and what we are not cutting, this is an opportunity to say to common ordinary citizens in Palestine: We care about you. We care about your health care. We care about education. We care about your opportunity for jobs and to really be able to do the things you want to do.

But if you vote for this, we say: The heck with you. We care more about sending a message to Hamas leadership than we do about the people of Palestine. I think that is what the message is. This will not hurt the leadership of Hamas. It will not. Because they are going to have the money and the resources that they need, and they will say what they want, but it will hurt common ordinary people.

Vote "no" on this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this matter be extended by 60 minutes, equally divided. Perhaps the opponents of the bill would have an opportunity to read the legislation. And I would

like to yield half of my time to Mr. LANTOS, and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, the chairwoman of our committee, and I want to applaud her and Congressman LANTOS, two Members who cut through the partisan rancor of this institution to act with clarity against murderous intolerance.

Mr. Speaker, we sometimes may ask the question: If I was alive in 1939, what would I have done? If I was alive in 1939, would I have recognized the coming danger to America? If I was alive in 1939, would I have seen the seeds of genocide? But we do not live in 1939. We live in 2006, and many of the dangers we see today have parallels in history.

Across the sea now, there is an intolerant dictator rising who says that one Holocaust is not enough. The people in Israel rightly fear a new intolerant Islamic mullah who might say that another 6 million should be murdered.

The Iranians have many allies in the world. None of their allies are better than Hamas, leaders trained by tyrants, funded by murderers and utterly clear in their political program. One of the lessons of history is that dictators say what they are going to do and then do what they said. And Hamas has told us that they are for killing innocent civilians, and they have done that. They tell us that they support international terrorist attacks, and they have done that, too. Hamas has told us that they wish to drive our democratic allies in Israel into the sea, and we cannot let them do that.

Democracies are best when they defend each other, and the best way to defend our allies is to support moderate Arabs willing to join in peace. So we did that. The United States, the Congress, this House over the last many fiscal years, provided hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars to support moderate Arabs.

We in this House funded the rise of Yasir Arafat. We created the Palestinian Authority. We embraced the ineffective government of Mahmoud Abbas. And each of these efforts, at a cost of hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars from the United States, have failed. And so now we see Hamas taking power, a Hamas that what it does not get politically is taking militarily. Yesterday, Hamas tried to assassinate a top key official who works for President Abbas. A civil war is breaking out on the West Bank because Hamas does not have enough power yet and is willing to kill anyone in their way.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support this bill just because I support our allies in

Israel. I support this bill because Hamas has claimed responsibility for the murder of 26 American citizens. Those American citizens include: David Applebaum of Ohio; Nava Applebaum, also of Ohio; Alan Beer of Ohio; Marla Bennet of California; Benjamin Blutstein of Pennsylvania; David Boim of New York; Yael Botwin of California; Dina Carter of North Carolina; Janis Ruth Coulter of Massachusetts; Sara Duker of New Jersey; Matthew Eisenfeld of Connecticut; Tzvi Goldstein of New York; Judith Greenbaum of New Jersey; David Gritz of Massachusetts; Dina Horowitz of Florida; Eli Horowitz of Illinois; Tehilla Nathanson of New York; Malka Roth of New York; Mordechai Reinitz of New York; Yitzhak Reinitz of New York; Malka Roth of New York; Leah Stern of New Jersey; Goldie Taubenfeld of New York; Shmuel Taubenfeld of New York; Nachshon Wachsmann of New York; Ira Weinstein of New York; and Yitzhak Weinstock of California.

My colleague from New York talked about the common people that this would hurt. Common Americans have been killed by Hamas, and their blood is on the fingers of Hamas leaders. It is time for us to call it as we see it: intolerant murderous leaders, people who in other uniforms at other times we have seen before; and for us to cut off their funding, to say that the only Hamas moderate is a Hamas radical out of money and bullets, and for us to say that we wish this government, this Hamas government to fail, that in its place a more moderate government will rise, and at that time, it will be the time for the United States to support it and not a minute before that.

And I want to take one more personal privilege to say to the gentleman from California, Mr. LANTOS: Thank you. Thank you for your leadership. Thank you for your history. And thank you for cutting through all of the rhetoric and giving us clear direction to use your eyes and your experience to teach us of how the past can inform the future so that it does not happen again.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the gentleman from Ohio, I would yield myself 5 minutes, because I have been sitting here reflecting on my good friend from California's comments about people who suddenly are the best friend of the administration who have been critical of them.

Well, I have only been here 10 years, not as long as my distinguished friend, but one of the things I have tried to do with Republican and Democratic administrations alike, when it comes to foreign policy, is to attempt to be supportive when I agree but to be clear that when I disagree, when I think they are wrong, to stand up.

I take a back seat to no one in terms of my opposition to this administration's reckless conduct in Iraq. I have been consistent on that from the beginning. One of the concerns I had about this administration was their disdain

for nation-building. You will recall the rhetoric of then Governor Bush.

But part of our obligation as Members of this chamber is to be supportive when we can. Because in the conduct of foreign policy, it would be nice if it did stop at the water's edge. I appreciate that the administration has changed its position on nation-building and has actually requested more assistance than it looks like this Congress is going to give them for foreign aid.

□ 2045

When they were willing to work with us in water and sanitation, I embraced that. I think we should reinforce positive things that we can agree on. That is what the American public wants. I do not think we should be reflexive and negative.

The administration has raised a legitimate concern about flexibility, about being able to implement it, and these are consistent with Republican and Democratic administrations in the past in terms of not wanting sanctions to go on forever and wanting to have the flexibility to respond, not after 25 days of consultation according to very, narrow little channels, but to be able to act responsibly to practice diplomacy.

The history of this House of Representatives is not very illustrious when it comes to many of these questions. Congress has sort of flitted around and has been subjected to the pressures of the moment and has not always been a constructive ally.

As we know, this House passed a draft by only one vote immediately before World War II. Lots of simple, commonsense straight-ahead solutions that we have been involved with have not always been the best and most carefully crafted.

I come forward not being a fan of this administration in many areas, in many areas, but in this one, as I listen to them, as I look at the requested flexibility, as I look at independent experts, as I hear from religious leaders back home and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, I see a wide range of people that support the concerns that the administration share with us.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. I appreciate my good friend yielding, and allow me to point out the fatal flaw in your logic. We are not discussing the fact that some of us occasionally support the administration, and you just expressed great delight that on this issue you find yourself on the side of the administration.

The issue logically is flexibility. The people who have criticized this administration most vigorously over the years have claimed that the administration is riding roughshod over the Congress, not asking for more flexibility. This is a spurious argument. This is a phony argument. This administration, as do all administrations,

wants flexibility. They do not want congressional restraints.

Our legislation provides for restraints because we are a co-equal branch of government, and we wish to express the policies that we want to see our government pursue.

To claim that on this issue the administration should have total flexibility is contrary to the interests of the Congress as a body.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, to respond to my distinguished colleague, nowhere here have I said I want the administration to have unrestrained flexibility. Not once. And I am not expressing delight that we are on the same side.

What I said was when I find I am in agreement, I look forward to ways to work with them. When I see them move in directions I wish they had done with Afghanistan and Iraq, for heaven's sake, I am going to move in this direction with the stakes so high. With all due respect, it is not a question of giving unlimited flexibility to the administration. I have never said that, am not interested in it.

There is a framework here in terms of the sanctions that we are talking about, things like extending beyond the narrow definition of health to deal with humanitarian assistance and environmental cleanup. There are a whole host of things that could have been dealt with here in the ambit of this legislation.

I share with my good friend an interest in having this administration be more accountable to Congress and come forward and answer our questions. I would like oversight about what is going on in Iraq and what is going on in Afghanistan. Heaven knows I would.

But that does not mean that we ought to have unnecessarily restrictive and burdensome activities that are going to work against what I think are the interests of the Israeli people, the Palestinians and citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I include for the RECORD a statement by Americans for Peace Now relative to H.R. 4681 and also a statement by Brit Tzedek v'Shalom, the Jewish Alliance for Justice and Peace.

[From Americans for Peace Now]

H.R. 4681: GRANDSTANDING ABOUT PALESTINIANS, AT THE EXPENSE OF U.S. AND ISRAELI INTERESTS.

Tomorrow the House is expected to suspend the rules and take up H.R. 4681, the "Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006." This legislation would impose sweeping sanctions against the Palestinians in response to the victory of Hamas in the January Palestinian legislative elections.

Hamas' victory in the elections for the Palestinian Legislative Council (PLC) was

regrettable. It is imperative that the international community (including the U.S.) make a concerted and coordinated effort to pressure Hamas. However, H.R. 4681 represents a case of Congress using a blunt instrument where a surgical tool is needed. In doing so, the bill risks undercutting such efforts, harming U.S. national security, and undermining those Palestinian officials and activists who recognize Israel, reject terror, and support a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

This legislation is fundamentally flawed and deserves to be rejected by the House. APN urges Members—including those who have cosponsored and/or plan to vote for the measure—to speak out on the House floor and submit statements for the record drawing attention to the many serious problems with H.R. 4681.

APN talking points on H.R. 4681:

H.R. 4681 unnecessarily risks U.S. national security. The U.S. can maintain a tough line against Hamas without compromising our own national security or unreasonably tying the President's hand in the conduct of foreign policy. Rejecting terrorism is not incompatible with ensuring that U.S. national security interests remain the primary concern of U.S. foreign policy.

H.R. 4681, however, irresponsibly and unnecessarily subjugates U.S. national security interests to political grandstanding. It does so by eliminating the President's authority to waive sanctions in the interests of U.S. national security—a waiver that is a standard component of virtually all U.S. sanctions legislation. This waiver, which has only rarely been invoked, represents minimal flexibility for the President to waive sanctions on assistance when U.S. national security interests are at stake. It is unfathomable that Congress would decide that, in the wake of the Hamas election, the President no longer needs or can be trusted with such authority. Indeed, it is not difficult to imagine scenarios under which U.S. national security might clearly call for direct, quick assistance—for instance, following new Palestinian elections or in the wake of a natural disaster. Moreover, the Bush Administration has already put in place tough new restrictions on aid to the Palestinians, clearly indicating the uncompromising stance this Administration is taking in response to the Hamas victory. APN urges Congress to demand that a real national security waiver be added to this bill, enabling the President to waive the various sanctions if he deems it to be in the national security interests of the U.S. to do so.

H.R. 4681 risks undermining Palestinian moderates and strengthening extremists. In response to the Hamas victory, we should seek to strengthen those Palestinians who reject violence, recognize Israel, and support a two-state solution. In doing so, we put pressure on Hamas to reform, and we strengthen those Palestinians who, we hope, will replace Hamas if it fails to reform.

H.R. 4681, however, undermines these positions and the Palestinians who hold them, by providing no political horizon for an alternative leadership to strive to reach. Under this bill, the PA—even if replaced by more welcome leadership—will likely be unable to meet the reform requirements in the short- or medium-term, especially outside the context of progress towards a peace agreement. Thus, even if new elections were held and won by a different party, all sanctions would remain in place until the other reform requirements had been met. APN urges Congress to demand that a "sunset clause" be added to H.R. 4681, providing a political horizon for moderate, reasonable Palestinian political leaders and activists, and sending a

signal of real support and hope to the Palestinian people. [A sunset clause is like an "expiration date" for legislation, stipulating a date or event after which Congress will either let the legislation lapse, renew the legislation, or amend it in some way.]

H.R. 4681 loses sight of the real priorities. H.R. 4681 seeks to precondition U.S. relations with the PA—and impose sweeping sanctions—based on the demand that the PA meet a list of requirements that include wide-ranging reforms unrelated to the election of Hamas. Important as these reforms may be, neither the U.S. nor Israel has ever considered them a prerequisite for engaging with the PA (or, for that matter, the PLO, Jordan, or Egypt, in the context of their agreements with Israel). Adding these reforms as preconditions for engagement loses sight of real priorities—like saving lives—and undermines the incentive for the most critical demands to be taken seriously. For example, under this bill, if Hamas renounced terror, changed its charter, acted decisively against other terrorist organizations, disarmed its own militants, and recognized Israel, but had not yet made substantial progress toward replacing all textbooks with "materials to promote tolerance, peace, and coexistence with Israel," all sanctions would remain in place. APN urges Congress to reject preconditioning U.S. relations with the Palestinians on requirements that are unrelated to the specific issues raised by the Hamas election; rather, Congress should set focused, meaningful performance benchmarks.

H.R. 4681 loses sight of U.S. strategic interests. A serious response to the Palestinian elections should clearly target Hamas and its control of the Palestinian Authority. Effective sanctions should clearly differentiate such targets from, for example, elected members of the Palestinian Legislative Council (PLC) who are not affiliated with Hamas or any other terrorist organization—political leaders and activists who, running on platforms that included rejection of terror, recognition of Israel, and support for a two-state solution, beat Hamas candidates in the January election.

However, H.R. 4681 not only fails to distinguish between Hamas and the PA, and the non-Hamas members of the PLC, it explicitly defines the PA as including the entire PLC—extending sanctions to longtime supporters of peace with Israel (like PLC member Salam Fayyad). Moreover, the bill includes extraneous sanctions that, while ostensibly aimed at Hamas, will in fact have zero impact on Hamas, but only serve to punish Palestinians who recognize Israel and reject terror, and make it difficult or impossible for the U.S. to talk to them. These include restrictions on visas (Hamas members are already barred by law from obtaining visas), limits on freedom of movement for officials of the PLO in the U.S. and sanctions on PLO representation in the United States (Hamas is not a member of the PLO a group that recognizes and has signed agreements with Israel), and an entirely superfluous attack on the United Nations that does not even make the pretense of having anything to do with Hamas. In the interests of U.S. national security, including our concern for Israeli security, it is vital to open the door for dialogue and engagement with alternative leaders and representatives of the Palestinians. APN urges Congress to reject provisions of this bill that will have no real impact on Hamas—except, perversely, to strengthen them while undermining moderate Palestinian political leaders and activists, and making it more difficult for the U.S. to engage with alternatives to a Hamas-led government, like President Mahmoud Abbas or the PLO.

APN urges Congress to reject this bill's misguided effort to attack the UN, especially at a time when Israel is asking the UN to play a greater role in providing services to the Palestinians. This attack has nothing to do with the Hamas election or UN activities in the West Bank and Gaza, and instead risks sending the message that the real goal of this bill is to assail Palestinians in every possible forum. APN is the premier Jewish, Zionist organization working to enhance Israel's security through peace. APN believes that strong U.S. leadership is the best hope for reducing Israeli-Palestinian violence and bringing about a political process that can eventually pave the way for security and peace for Israelis and Palestinians.

Brit Tzedek v'Shalom—Jewish Alliance for Justice and Peace

Brit Tzedek v'Shalom urges representatives to vote no on H.R. 4681. Brit Tzedek v'Shalom, the Jewish Alliance for Justice and Peace, is the nation's largest Jewish grassroots peace organization with a network of over 34,000 supporters who are committed to Israel's well-being through a negotiated two-state resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

H.R. 4681, the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006, fails to serve the long-term interests of either the United States or Israel. Despite improvements over the original version, H.R. 4681 weakens moderate pro-peace Palestinians and emboldens extremists, ties the President's hands in dealing with emergency security crises, and drastically cuts critical US assistance to the Palestinian people. While there is international consensus that Hamas must renounce terrorism, recognize Israel, and abide by all previous agreements, this legislation goes well beyond those demands and undermines the U.S. role in bringing Israelis and Palestinians back to the negotiating table towards the end of achieving a two-state resolution of the conflict.

Specifically, H.R. 4681: Obstructs a return to negotiations. H.R. 4681 requires an impossible-to-achieve Presidential certification, composed of an overly extensive number of requirements, in order to bypass the bill's many sanctions. This standard of certification goes well beyond the Quartet's demands, setting unprecedented preconditions for U.S. engagement with the Palestinians. Because these demands are unachievable in the near term or outside the context of a peace process, they prevent a return to negotiations and provide little incentive for Hamas to moderate its stance towards Israel.

Without the Presidential certification, whose requirements as noted above are nearly impossible to meet, this bill prohibits all direct aid to the Palestinian Authority (PA), with the small exception of a very limited Presidential waiver for funds to support independent elections and the peace process. Current law already forbids direct U.S. funding to the PA but allows the President much broader discretion in waiving this prohibition in the interests of national security. Limiting this waiver undercuts the Administration's ability to offer the PA incentives in addition to sanctions or to respond to unexpected security or humanitarian crises.

At a time when the UN is reporting an impending humanitarian disaster in the West Bank and Gaza, H.R. 4681 restricts U.S. assistance to the Palestinian people delivered through non-governmental organizations (NGOs). While the bill makes a small exemption for "basic human health needs," it still creates onerous pre-notification requirements for all other NGO assistance to the Palestinian people. These NGOs address pressing humanitarian needs and help de-

velop Palestinian civil society. A humanitarian crisis in the Palestinian territories will only increase support for extremism, thereby endangering Israel and further destabilizing the region.

H.R. 4681 restricts US diplomatic relations by prohibiting visas and travel (with limited waivers) for all members of the PA and the PLO regardless of whether or not they have connections to Hamas. In this respect, the bill prevents the US from fully engaging and bolstering moderate Palestinian leaders, such as President Mahmoud Abbas, who recognize and support peace with Israel. Existing US law already forbids members of Hamas and other foreign terrorist organizations from obtaining visas or having diplomatic relations with the United States.

As American Jews, we share profound dismay at the election of Hamas to the Palestinian Authority. Yet in this challenging hour, we urge you to maintain a cautious approach to the new Palestinian government, so as to preserve the future possibility of bringing Israelis and Palestinians back to the negotiating table—which is the only path to achieving true peace and security for both peoples.

Vote No on H.R. 4681.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to extend my condolences to the family of our colleague Mr. CANTOR and also thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for her leadership and her commitment to attempting to create peace, as well as to speak directly to my dear friend, Mr. LANTOS.

I think it is fair to say Israel has no greater champion in the Congress, and the American people have no greater champion for human rights than Mr. LANTOS. His escape from the Holocaust is a story worthy of being taught in all of our schools.

I am here to ask: Is the past prologue? Is war and violence inevitable, or do we have the ability to create a new future where nonviolence, peace and reconciliation are possible through the work of our own hearts and hands?

I would not take issue with my friend Mr. LANTOS' informed experience, and I join him in defense of Israel's right to survive. Mr. LANTOS is my brother. The Israelis are our brothers and sisters. The Palestinians are our brothers and sisters. When our brothers and sisters are in conflict, when violence engulfs them, it is our responsibility to help our brothers and sisters end the violence, reconcile and fulfill the biblical injunction to turn hate to love, to beat swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks.

These are universal principles that speak to the triumph of hope over fear. We must call upon Hamas to renounce terror. We must call upon Hamas to disavow any intention for the destruction of Israel.

This ought to be a principle of negotiation with Hamas, not separation from the aspirations of the Palestinian people to survive.

I think we can speed the cause of peace by calling upon Israel to accept the Palestinians' right to self-determination and economical survival and humanitarian relief, for food, medical care, for jobs.

I ask, how can we arrive at a two-stage solution if we attempt to destroy

one people's government's ability to provide? A two-state solution, I believe, can be achieved with our mutual, thoughtful patience and support.

At a time when the U.N. is reporting a pending humanitarian disaster in the West Bank and Gaza, I believe this legislation would restrict U.S. assistance to the Palestinian people delivered through nongovernmental organizations. We know that, today, up to 80 percent of all Palestinians, particularly in parts of the Gaza strip, live at or below the poverty line. Unemployment stands at 53 percent of the total workforce.

Just as I join my good friends on both sides of the aisle in speaking out against violence against Israel, I object in the strongest terms to any measure that will increase the humanitarian crisis of the Palestinian people. It is true that the recent Palestinian legislative elections have created a tense situation in the international community. It is a situation that demands thoughtful and deliberate action in pursuit of peace. Despite the best intentions of those who wrote this legislation, I do not believe this legislation will advance peace between the Palestinian and the Israeli people.

There are people in this Congress of goodwill and good intention who want to see both the Palestinian people and the Israeli people survive. Let us continue to work towards that end.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), my good friend and a distinguished senior member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and the chairman of the subcommittee for bringing this measure to the floor.

As for Mr. LANTOS, the distinguished ranking member, I have to say I absolutely marvel at his eloquence in the opening statement that he made.

The very fact that he is, is important. The very fact that he is and is here is proof positive that if people of goodwill are determined to stand up to the forces of evil, that the forces of good can win out, and not unless that happens.

And those forces of evil, whether they be called the Nazi Party or the Hamas Party, each of which came to power in uncontested democratic elections, each of which have in common the destruction of an entire people and were uncompromising in their attitude, in their philosophy, in their belief; how do we compromise with the notion of administrations and evil forces whose goal is the destruction of another people? Where do you begin to compromise unless they denounce those goals, which has not happened in either case?

Mr. Speaker, with 295 cosponsors of this bill, there is not really much of a question about how the House is going to act. The bill will pass overwhelmingly. The only question is how many Members will be lured into opposition

to this measure by good intentions, false claims and by shrill prophecies of doom.

A "no" vote on this bill will not benefit the Palestinian people. Read the bill. The bill already allows humanitarian aid to flow under congressional scrutiny. And with the President's judgment, it can continue to go to nongovernmental groups.

A "no" vote will not benefit Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas. The bill already creates a clear opening to keep him relevant and involved to becoming a channel for pursuing peace.

A "no" vote will not support the peace camp in Israel. Israelis just went to the polls and put Prime Minister Olmert into power with a government that strongly supports congressional efforts to sanction and block assistance to the Hamas-led Palestinian Authority.

□ 2100

I sat here in amazement as my good friend from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) said things that were absolutely unbelievable. The politician people, what do they have to do with Hamas? Duh. They elected them.

Elections have consequences. People have to live with that. They can't elect a terrorist government whose purpose is to destroy another people and then say they have nothing to do with it.

That makes no sense at all. A "no" vote will not impress our allies in the Quartet either. The United States and other members of the Quartet remain in lock-step in rejecting any funding for the Hamas-led PA and are working, as this bill does, to find alternative approaches to assist the Palestinian people, and that is who we intend to help.

For someone to say that the Prime Minister of Israel is going to walk down this aisle, and if he had a voting card would vote for Hamas is an absurdity. It defies the imagination.

It is one of the many things that opponents of this legislation carefully, carefully constructed, have been saying mischaracterizing this bill. If you think that the Prime Minister of Israel would vote to give aid to Hamas, then you must be on another planet, and you should vote "no."

A "no" vote will do only one thing. It will give hope to the terrorist Hamas. It will give them hope that the wall of opposition in the West is cracking. It will give them hope that their embrace of terrorism will not have to be abandoned in order to govern. It will give them hope that support for Israel is not as strong as it seems. It will give them hope that with tenacity and will their terrorist objectives will succeed.

No Member of this House wants to send that message. No Member of this House supports Hamas. But make no mistake. A "no" vote will be used again and again to show that the path of Hamas is correct and that compromise will come only from the West, and there is no price to be paid by those who espouse terrorism. We can-

not afford to send that message, even in the smallest, most unintentional way.

Let us recall for a moment just what the international community has demanded of Hamas, three words. All Hamas has to do is to say three words: Israel, peace and agreement. Israel, Hamas has to accept the existence, just the existence, of a U.N. member state.

Peace, that there has to be two states for two people and that they will live side by side in peace and agreement. Hamas has to accept the resolution of the conflict, which will only be achieved by peaceful means and that agreement will be honored.

This is not a difficult list, three words. Hamas could win the international community over. Hundreds of millions of dollars would begin to flow to the Palestinian people. Salaries could be made, projects could be started, roads could be built, schools could be constructed. Before you say no, those few people in the House who will, ask yourself why they will not say those three words. Why won't they?

The answer is that Hamas thinks that their religion forbids it. They believe that they are engaged in a holy war that can only be resolved with the destruction of Israel and the Jewish people and to put their population in exile or subjugation.

There can be no compromise, according to them, of their view. Cease-fires, temporary borders, negotiations for Hamas or just way stations on their path to the ultimate destruction of Israel and the Jewish people. They will not waiver, and we must not waiver.

Hamas has made clear again and again that they will not be held answerable for the hundreds of innocent civilians they slaughtered with bombs. They will not be held accountable for their overt racism and vile anti-Semitic bigotry. They will not be punished for all the times they shatter the fragile peace or destroy a nascent trust.

All they have to do is say those three words. A "no" vote tells them they don't have to. A "no" vote says hold fast. A "no" vote reassures them that they will not have to say Israel, peace and agreement.

Until they do, we must assure that they bear the full brunt of responsibility forever the condition of the Palestinian people. Not a humanitarian crisis, but a firm sanction of the United States against the government born of terror, bred on violence, and bound for ruin. Contrary to this leading report, this bill absolutely cannot and will not be used to deny humanitarian aid.

The bill will not allow, with proper oversight, the Presidential confirmation that it serves our national security interest, continued assistance through properly screened and audited nongovernmental organizations. The

bill provides a clear channel for President Mahmoud Abbas to show our continued appreciation for his vocal support for the peaceful two-state solution. This bill constitutes a carefully crafted balance.

Some wanted it stronger; others wanted it more flexible. But the bill is strong enough to prevent American money from subsidizing a government run by terrorists and flexible enough to allow the administration to engage with Palestinians who are willing to seek peace.

Members will have a choice. Let the perfect be the enemy of the good, and in doing so undermine the peace they seek, or stand firm against doing business as usual with a governing entity controlled by a terrorist organization.

I know some Members are conflicted. There have been mixed signals, even misleading information about this legislation. I want to be perfectly clear. The pro-Israel vote is "yes." The pro-Palestinian vote is "yes." The pro-peace vote is "yes." The pro-engagement vote is "yes." I thank the House for their attention.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, as I yield the gentleman from New York 4 minutes, I would give myself 30 seconds to make two observations.

One, there will be no aid to Hamas, whether this bill passes or not. It is against United States law to give assistance to a terrorist organization.

Second, I would reference the exact language of the word where the exemption is assistance to meet basic human health needs, not broad humanitarian. The language of the bill is actually quite clear.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend, Mr. HINCHEY, for 4 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Oregon for yielding me this time.

I also want to express my admiration, respect and affection for the gentleman from California, who is the sponsor of this legislation. But I do disagree with him on the effects that this legislation would have.

I am a strong supporter of the State of Israel. As such, I believe it is important to maintain independent and principled positions on Middle East issues. I believe that that requires a "no" vote on resolution 4681.

Hamas' victory in the elections for the Palestinian legislative council was indeed regrettable, and Hamas government's failure to condemn, much less take steps to prevent acts of terrorism is abhorrent. It is appropriate that the international community, including, of course, the United States, make a concerted and coordinated effort to pressure Hamas.

However, H.R. 4681 risks undermining such efforts, harming United States national security and undermining those Palestinian officials and activists who do recognize Israel, who do reject terror, and who do support a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

H.R. 4681 subjugates U.S. national security interests to political grandstanding. It does so by eliminating the President's authority to waive sanctions in the interests of United States national security, a waiver that is a standard component of virtually all U.S. sanctions legislation.

H.R. 4681 risks undermining Palestinian moderates and strengthening extremists by providing no political horizon that an alternate Palestinian leadership can strive to reach.

H.R. 4681 preconditions U.S. relations with the Palestinian Authority and imposes sanctions based on criteria that are unrelated to the issues raised by the Hamas elections, and 4681 makes it more difficult for the United States to engage with alternatives to a Hamas-led government like President Mahmoud Abbas or the PLO. This proposal, unfortunately, is itself extreme, and as such, I believe, would do no good.

Rather, it will strengthen the position of extremists and increase the violence and destruction which has become more prevalent as the result of the expression and implementation of policies such as those contained in H.R. 4681.

I believe that we should defeat this proposed legislation and instead focus on something that would be more productive to achieve the kinds of solutions that we need to the problems that exist in the Middle East.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, Hamas' political victory in the January election presented an opportunity for this Islamic jihadist group to lay down its arms, to renounce terrorism, to recognize the State of Israel, and to dismantle its militant infrastructure, to become an entity that could lead the Palestinian people to peace, to prosperity, to security with the Jewish nation.

But, unfortunately, much like its predecessor, who never missed an opportunity to miss an opportunity, Hamas has instead continued its violence, has aligned itself with pariah states and with state sponsors of terrorism that seek to extend their extremist, hateful ideology throughout the region and, indeed, throughout the world. Hamas has chosen to dedicate its resources and its energy to supporting continued terrorist attacks against Israel rather than to helping the Palestinian people.

It is its choice, so Hamas can spend its money on suicide and homicide attacks; but it is up to the United States to support and provide for the needs of the Palestinian people. It is our responsibility, instead of Hamas'.

Previous speakers in opposition to the bill have said, Madam Speaker, that this bill will deny chemotherapy to cancer victims. It is preposterous; it does not. That it would hurt the common Palestinian citizen. No, it does not. That it would undermine the Pal-

estinian reformers by denying democracy. No, quite the opposite. That it has unbearable roadblocks to non-government organizations to provide assistance to the Palestinian people. Absolutely not.

The bill requirements are to ensure that humanitarian aid goes to the intended recipients for the intended purposes, oversight. The United States must make it unambiguously clear that we will not support such a terrorist regime, that we will not directly or indirectly allow American taxpayer funds to be used to perpetuate the leadership of an Islamic jihadist group that is responsible for the murder of hundreds and the wounding of scores of innocent Israeli civilians, of U.S. citizens and other foreigners throughout the years.

It has been almost 4 months, Madam Speaker, since this Islamic jihadist extremist won a majority of seats in the Palestinian parliamentary elections. We have made our conditions clear, but Hamas' commitment to bloodshed has remained unabated.

□ 2115

Hamas' leaders have expressed their support for rockets being launched from Gaza into Israel, and stated that the recent attack, a bombing that killed nine innocent people and wounded 60 at a Tel Aviv restaurant, was "justified." Their words, not mine.

Since the elections, the leaders of Hamas have officially expressed their refusal to change a single word in its charter. Their hate-filled covenant is Hamas' most valued document. It focuses on killing Jews and destroying Israel.

I would like to read some of the words that are included in the charter of Hamas and that accurately depict the group's violent views: "The time of Muslim unity will not come until Muslims will fight the Jews and kill them; until the Jews hide behind rocks and trees, which will cry, 'O Muslims, there is a Jew behind me. Come on and kill him.'"

The Islamic extremists running the Palestinian Authority have made it very clear, crystal clear, that they do not intend to moderate their vicious views nor seek a peace agreement with Israel. They may speak of a long-term cease-fire, but this is only a temporary means to regroup and rearm for yet more terrorism.

A two-state solution envisioned and proposed by the Quartet is not part of Hamas' agenda, because it runs contrary to the core principles of this terrorist group that says, "The land of Palestine from the river to the sea is considered an Islamic endowment, and no Muslim has the right to cede any part of it."

So our actions here tonight and the vote tomorrow must be clear and it must be firm. We must work toward eradicating such Islamist jihadist hatred and the extremist ideology that feeds it, or we will compromise our own

immediate as well as long-term security interests and the stability and the security of our allies in the region.

In an effort to promote U.S. national security and foreign policy priorities and to help ensure that U.S. taxpayer dollars do not reach the hands of Hamas and other Palestinian terror groups, I introduced, with my good friend the ranking member of the House International Relations Committee, Mr. TOM LANTOS, this bill that is before us tonight, Madam Speaker. It has 295 cosponsors, and it opposes the provision of assistance or political recognition to any entity under the tutelage of a terrorist organization such as Hamas.

This bill does prohibit direct assistance to the Palestinian Authority, but it has exceptions, and we have talked about them. Many of the people who have spoken here tonight want to overlook those exceptions. It does seek to prohibit travel to the United States by members or associates of terrorist entities, it provides for the United States to withhold contributions to the United Nations proportional to the amounts the United Nations provides to these duplicative Palestinian-related entities that are directly tied to the Palestinian Authority, and it calls for the Palestinian Authority to be designated as a terrorist sanctuary under the 9/11 bill.

But it is not just about what is right for the U.S. in terms of our priorities and our allies, Madam Speaker. It also is about honoring the memory of all who have died at the hands of Hamas and other Palestinian jihadist groups.

That is why tonight we have spoken about and we have given our condolences to our good friend from Virginia, Mr. CANTOR, whose 16-year-old cousin, Daniel Wultz from South Florida, close to my congressional district, died 2 weeks ago after suffering these fatal injuries caused by an April 17 suicide bombing in Tel Aviv while he was having lunch with his father. Daniel fought courageously for 27 days for his life, but the injuries were far too severe.

Our thoughts and our prayers go not just to Daniel, but also to all who have lost family members and friends to Hamas and other jihadist groups, and the list is, unfortunately, too long for us to mention all of their names. We want to pass this legislation to help ensure that we in Congress have done everything possible to prevent another Daniel Wultz from dying at the hands of these extremists.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to render their full support to this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. BLUMENAUER, for yielding me this time, and to thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, a staunch supporter of human rights, for coauthoring this legislation with our dear, dear and respected colleague from the State of California, Congressman TOM LANTOS, who is the once and future chair of this committee, I am sure, some day, and to say, as many others have stated this evening, we respect your life. Many of us love you and love your family.

Perhaps some of us have a deeper understanding of some of the tribulation that you have faced in your own life because our families have faced the same. We had relatives in what is now the nation of Ukraine, but in the Soviet Union, our uncles, who were sent to the gulag for over 20 years by Joseph Stalin. One died and one survived, miraculously, after 20 bitter years. So I think our family shares a deep personal understanding of what despotism and terror is.

I rise this evening because I have to say that this act, the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act, I fear will result not in less terrorism, but in more. I do not really believe it is in the interest of the United States, of Israel or the world to further radicalize elements in the Palestinian population, and I do believe this bill will do exactly that.

It is not in the interest of the government of the United States nor Israel nor the world to make it impossible for Palestinians to become more educated and to learn how to govern an emerging nation. Indeed, if our current policies as a world were so intelligent, they would not have yielded a Hamas to the point where it actually won an election and other elements of Palestinian society were so crippled and so inept and so disorganized that they were not able to govern in a way that an emerging nation state would.

I have asked myself during the gruesome Soviet period, what glimmers did we have, what connections did we have, what elements were we able to nurture that even provided a road forward?

I think of our family's East European heritage in Poland and enduring the most repressive times in Poland. This country found a way to support a non-governmental organization in the form of Solidarity, and there were church groups working and there were other groups that provided just small glimmers of light.

I remember a dear, dear friend, Reverend Martin Hernati born in the homeland of Congressman LANTOS, who said to me, "MARCY, I am walking through a tunnel. It is very dark in the tunnel and I see no light at the end of the tunnel, but I must keep walking."

I remember Cardinal Mindszenty in the nation of Hungary, locked up in the U.S. embassy for many years, as a sin-

gle man, a single individual, as a symbol to the West.

I thought about the "Refuseniks" in the Soviet Union, how we connected with them, helping them to publish their works, helping to hear a voice from inside a closed society, and I asked myself, in this situation, what are the parallels? What are the parallels?

In this bill, no one wants to support Hamas. All we are asking for is the right to amend this bill to find other non-governmental groups that we can help to support, to help educate, to help inform, to help teach, in the hope, even though we are all walking through the tunnel and we see no light at the end of the tunnel, that we give the ordinary person, the moderate, and there are some moderates, some hope, some ability to connect.

I read from the statement of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, who say in opposition to the current form of this bill, "A further deterioration of the humanitarian and economic situation of the Palestinian people compromises human dignity and serves the long-term interests neither of Palestinians nor of Israelis who long for a just peace.

"Non-governmental organizations have a long history of helping the world's most vulnerable people. Their humanitarian role should be respected. While this work is not easy," and surely the gentleman from California knows it is not easy, surely the gentlelady from Florida knows it is not easy, "it is essential. It deserves Congress' continued support."

I would hope that with the Prime Minister of Israel coming here this week, that we would have a proposal that would take the Quartet and actually somehow have discussions, even a resolution, to try to restart the failed peace process between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. Wouldn't that be a great moment? Wouldn't it be worth being here and serving here? We need resolutions that will not radicalize, that will not divide, that will make peace possible.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, before yielding, I want to thank my good friend from Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, for her thoughtful and very serious comments, as I want to express my appreciation to all of my colleagues who have spoken against this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to my good friend the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the distinguished senior member of the International Relations Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me, and I would say that all the compliments that have been heaped upon him and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN during this debate are certainly well-deserved.

Madam Speaker, some of our colleagues here who say they are voting "no" also tell us that they are good friends of Israel. Well, to Israel, I would say that with friends like that, she certainly doesn't need any enemies.

Israel and the civilized world and the United States do have enemies. The enemy is called terrorism. And in the Middle East, terrorism has another name. It is called Hamas.

We have to deal with things, Madam Speaker, as they are, not as what we wish them to be. The Palestinians elected a terrorist organization, Hamas, to run their government and be their leaders. We are told by people who oppose this bill, oh, the poor Palestinian people. This legislation hurts the poor Palestinian people.

Well, let me tell you what hurts the poor Palestinian people: The government they elected, Hamas. That is what hurts the Palestinian people.

This bill has been called inflexible and stringent and other such nonsense. Not true at all. And I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill. This bill is flexible. Humanitarian aid is allowed. Some of us have some questions about that, quite frankly, because money is fungible and can be moved around, and we don't want money that is being given under the guise of humanitarian aid to be transferred and used for other things, and we know Hamas is capable of doing that.

We are told by some of the opponents that the bill has consequences. Sure it does. Elections have consequences. Nobody denies that the Palestinian people went to the polls and voted for Hamas. But when you vote for someone, there are consequences, and this is the consequence of electing a terrorist organization as your leadership.

□ 2130

Now we are asking Hamas to do three things, it has been said many times here before. I want to repeat them. Three things. They have to say that they are opposed to terror, that they are ending their support for terror.

They have to recognize Israel's right to exist. They have to recognize previous agreements that were signed by previous Palestinian governments. What is so difficult about that? How can we ask Israel to sit and negotiate with a group that does not recognize their right to exist, with a group that wants to destroy them and kill them, and have another Holocaust? This is nonsense.

All this bill does is simply say that we will be cutting off aid to Hamas. And for my colleagues who say that the administration does not want it now, we should not do it because the administration does not want it, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and I were sponsors of the Syria Accountability Act.

The administration at first opposed it. Do you know why? Administrations always oppose bills like that because administrations do not think that Congress should play any role in the conducting of foreign policy.

Well, we do. We are here. We have a right to pass laws that express the desires of this Congress and the desires of the American people. So it is nonsense to say that the administration opposes

it and therefore we should go along. The administration opposed the Syria Accountability Act, and ultimately we persuaded it to go along and support the bill.

This bill passed, as was pointed out, in the International Relations Committee 36-2. I was proud to be one of those 36 people. And I think that tomorrow this bill will pass overwhelmingly. This Congress has got to send a strong message that it opposes terror. It opposes terror whether it is Hamas, it opposes terror whether it is al-Qaeda, it opposes terror whether it is Hezbollah. All terrorist groups must be opposed. That is what this legislation does. That is what this legislation says.

The United States and Israel are strong allies in the fight against terror, and this legislation will go a long way in saying to Hamas, we will not do anything with you or help you in any way as long as you do not renounce terror.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) 5¾ minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I want to also express my gratitude to Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, my very dear friend on the other side of the aisle, and of course my very special friend and mentor, Mr. LANTOS. His eloquence was almost matched today by Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. ENGEL. They did a remarkable job. And I do not believe I can equal theirs, but I would like to speak on behalf of this piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill and I am hoping for its immediate passage. Like some of my colleagues, I also want to express my sincerest sympathy to my colleague and good friend on the other side of the aisle, Mr. CANTOR, for the unnecessary loss of his 16-year-old cousin, Daniel. I am heartsick about that, and did not know until this evening that he had died.

This bill, Madam Speaker, is not about punishing the Palestinian people. This bill is about reasonable demands for United States assistance. There are three requirements on the Hamas-led PA to receive and to continue to receive financial aid from the United States.

You must recognize Israel's right to exist. They must denounce and combat terrorism, and they must accept the roadmap and other past agreements. These are the three simple requirements that must be met in order to receive continued financial aid from the United States.

The problem the Palestinians have, as I have said so many times before is not money, the problem has been and continues to be a complete failure of leadership.

If one was tuning in tonight and listened to some of my colleagues, they would think that the United States has been rather stingy with the Palestinians. But I would like to enlighten those that do not know, that since the

1993 Oslo Accord, the United States has given more than \$1.8 billion to the Palestinians. In that same time we have given over \$130 million directly to the Palestinian Authority.

After decades of aid and billions of dollars, it boggles my mind that there is no economic self-sufficiency and no improvement to the quality of life for the Palestinian people. Why is this? Because the desperation of the Palestinian people is not about money, it is about the Palestinian Authority failing to do what any responsible government would have done with several billion dollars, provide security for its people, build infrastructure, improve health care, provide economic opportunities, improve education and move their people into the 21st century.

The money is not going to housing. Palestinians continue to live in wretched conditions in refugee camps with corrugated roofs in dilapidated ramshackle huts. The money is not going to schools. If it was, the Palestinian children would be sitting in classrooms being trained as the next generation of doctors and engineers who would lead their people in the 21st century.

The money is not going to security. Rather than imposing security, the Palestinian Authority forces first attacked the Israelis, now they are attacking each other as Gaza is close to civil war.

The Palestinian Authority under Fattah was corrupt and morally bankrupt. Is there any wonder that the Palestinian people turned to Hamas, the most dangerous terrorist organization operating today, to have their basic needs met?

Year after year, we have given hundreds of millions of dollars to the Palestinians despite no accountability, no modern financial controls, no transparency, and no actual knowledge of where our tax dollars are going, and the continued attacks on innocent Israeli women and children.

I am an original cosponsor of this legislation. However, it is substantially weaker than the one that I originally authored. In my opinion, we should be eliminating all aid to the Palestinian Authority, not granting the administration broad-based exemptions to continue to fund this regime.

The legislation grants direct aid to Abu Mazen for nonsecurity expenses. It also grants direct aid for his personal security detail. Abu Mazen is a powerless and ineffective leader. Since being elected president, he has had every opportunity to create peace with the Israelis and establish a Palestinian State.

When he had the power he would not or could not take the first step to disarm the terrorists and end the violence against Israel. Now he is the President of nothing. Why is the United States continuing to prop him up? Why are our tax dollars being used to support this guy in the first place?

This bill also grants a broad-based exemption for indirect aid through the

NGOs within the West Bank and the Gaza. Why should Americans be forced to foot the bill when the PA is unable to provide us an accounting for literally billions of dollars that we have spent?

Madam Speaker, it is time for the Palestinian leadership and the Palestinian people to stop blaming Israel and the United States for their utter failure to provide for their own needs. Yassar Arafat stole millions of dollars from his own people.

If Hamas needs money to provide basic services for the Palestinian people, let them hunt down Yassar Arafat's widow and get the millions of dollars that her husband stole from his own people. The problem is a lack of leadership, a lack of vision, a lack of hope for the future, lack of civilized behavior, not a lack of money.

Until Hamas agrees to recognize Israel's right to exist, denouncing and combating terrorism and accepts the roadmap and other past agreements, not only should we not be giving one more dime, we should be asking for a refund from the Palestinian Authority.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as I prepare to conclude my presentation and yield back my time this evening, I truly have enjoyed the give and take that we have had this evening under the leadership of our subcommittee chair, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, the work that has been done by staff members on both sides of the aisle, the passion, the emotion, the concern, and the professionalism that we have witnessed.

I personally have appreciated it. I think it is a healthy give-and-take that we have had. I think it is an important debate. It is not the last word that we are going to enjoy. I would simply make a couple of points in closing. I continue to be concerned that we not talk past one another. There is going to be, under existing United States law, no aid for Hamas. It is illegal to give assistance to a terrorist organization. Hamas certainly is.

And they are not going to be entitled to aid regardless of what happens with this bill. I continue to be concerned that the language of the bill is not, as some of my friends who have spoken on the other side of the aisle refer to, talking about how humanitarian aid can go through. That is not what the bill says. It is health that is the automatic pass-through.

Education, as has been referenced, is not a part of the automatic exemption. This lack of flexibility is one of the reasons why this bill is opposed by Americans for Peace Now, the Israel Policy Forum, Brit Tzedek, Shalom, Churches for Middle East Peace, and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

The bill sets permanent and inflexible limits on the United States's ability to be involved with Israel and Palestine, whether or not Hamas is in

power. And that is a mistake. It goes far beyond dealing with the ramifications of January's elections, and Hamas's rise to power, essentially Palestinian moderates and institutions that have nothing to do with Hamas.

Most independent observers feel that that is counterproductive and it may well end up backfiring and actually providing further strength to the extremists. I listened to the delightful exchange between Mr. LANTOS and Mr. FRANK on the floor earlier. I always marvel watching two parliamentary masters go back and forth. I listened to Mr. FRANK's argument tying it back to earmarking. And it was a thoughtful and amazing argument.

But one of the concerns I have, given the nature of Hamas, and listening very carefully to Mr. FRANK's words, is they are going to claim credit any way they can for anything that happens, much as we see political processes generally do that.

It is important that in our desire to stop Hamas from either assistance or a foothold for claiming credit, that we are very surgical about what we do for the Palestinian people, and the ability to move forward with peace.

Madam Speaker, I think it is important for us to review the administration's concerns. They have stated that they feel it is unnecessary, as the executive branch already has ample authority to impose all its restrictions. It does constrain the executive's ability in the flexibility to use sanctions as appropriate to address rapidly changing circumstances, which we all sincerely hope happen for the positive in this troubled area of the world.

Their concerns about the mandatory nature of the bill's sanctions, the relative absence that relates to activities absent an unachievable certification, a lack of a general waiver authority on its key ban on assistance, and that these limitations should be time limited.

The administration has also raised the concern that the exemption for "basic human health needs" is too narrow and should be broadened to "basic human needs". Indeed both sides on the floor this evening often used those two terms interchangeably, but they are very different under the bill.

But I do think we have reached the point where both my leg and my store of information here has been exhausted. I wanted to make one last point, because there has been reference this evening to the joy of serving with Mr. LANTOS.

I never cease to marvel, when we are in the midst of this, that he adds a dimension to the debate that I think is very important. I never cease to learn something in the course of what happens in the committee or here on the floor. Reference has been made to him as the only Holocaust survivor who has walked these halls.

And it adds a dimension, not just to this debate, but one that carries through in activities in Asia, in Africa, in the bigger picture across the world.

□ 2145

But there is one other accolade because Mr. LANTOS is a professor, and I appreciate the scholarly approach he brings that tempers his experience and his emotion that makes this a learning experience. And I truly believe that as a result of his input this evening that this has been a valuable learning experience for me, and I think it has enriched the record. Whatever happens with this legislation as it goes through the course of the legislature, as I do not doubt that it will pass tomorrow, that we will all be a little more knowledgeable as a result of this, and I think, in the long run, we will be able to do our jobs better, and for that, I thank him.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, before yielding the balance of our time to my good friend from Texas, let me express my deepest appreciation to my friend from Florida, who has done her usual extraordinary job, for her principled statement and impeccable logic. We are all in her debt.

I want to express my deep appreciation to my very good friend from Oregon for his unduly gracious comments which I deeply appreciate. And I want to thank all of my colleagues who have spoken on all sides of this issue. This has been an excellent debate, and it is appropriate that it should be wound up by one of our best debaters, my friend from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE. I yield her the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 3¼ minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. The gentleman is very kind. Before I start, may I ask for additional time from the distinguished gentlelady from Florida, 1½ minutes. I thank the distinguished gentlelady very much.

Madam Speaker, let me thank Mr. LANTOS for his extreme kindness to yield to, in essence, a non-member of this great committee this time. Let me acknowledge my good friend from Florida for her leadership, and also I might add my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon for bringing his vast perspective to this debate. I believe this is what democracy is all about.

Certainly I could not stand here tonight and not add my appreciation for Chairman HYDE who I believe has worked over the years to seek a level and a plateau and a place of, if you will, harmony and bipartisanship.

Tonight is a very difficult time for many of us. And, in fact, I think we have had an enormously thoughtful debate. We find ourselves this evening, as I offer my sympathy to the family of Congressman CANTOR for his loss, we find ourselves on the piercing horns of dilemma, and they are piercing outside. That is that we find ourselves fighting for peace between the Palestinian Authority and Israel, and we find ourselves fighting for the existence and recognition of the State of

Israel and the acceptance by the world of a two-state position that has been authored and supported by so many, including the now ailing former Prime Minister Sharon.

I was in Israel just a few months ago visiting Prime Minister Sharon at the Hadassah Hospital, listening to a variety of individuals pontificate about the pending election and having some small iota of hope that Hamas, if elected, would assume the realm of leadership and stand up and acknowledge we want two states, we reject terrorism, and we reject any idea that Israel should not exist. Unfortunately, this did not happen.

This reminds me of the time that Dr. King led as he moved into the time when more groups began to circle and intervene in "the movement" as we called it; and he welcomed the youngsters and those who had provocative and different thoughts. He knew that the ultimate end was what they all cherished, and that is the elimination of the shackles of segregation and racism and the divide of this country that was then black and white. But Dr. King had to make a very important decision, whether or not this movement required his standing firm on denouncing violence. So he had to reject some of the groups who came to the circle of the movement. He had to stand for non-violence. He had to stand for the movement being one that we could seek the plateau of freedom without violence. And so I stand here today because I want to at least express the fact that those of us who argue for the opportunities around the world, for the peace around the world, for the elimination of the shackles of the Sudanese people and who claim that we want that kind of fierce and absolute pressure on government, have to be able to understand this legislation. I want divestiture and sanctions in Sudan. And so, clearly, I have to understand that there are times when we must intervene in order to make the point so that freedom might live.

I hope President Abbas will meet with the prime minister, the new prime minister of Israel. I hope that they will find a common ground and a way to promote peace. But at the same time, I think it is important that we make a firm stand to find in our hearts and our minds the ability to stand up to Hamas and ask them to reject violence but also to say these three words: Israel can exist. That is what we are asking for tonight.

I guess I speak as one who has a great kinship and friendship with many Muslims around this Nation and this world. Particularly, I speak tonight to those Palestinian Americans who are frustrated and confused by legislation such as this. I beg of them to link arms with all of us and demand of the Hamas that they rid themselves of this violence so their children can learn, so the sick and the feeble can be taken care of. But I do thank the authors of this legislation for putting these exceptions in,

and they can be read clearly that health and humanitarian needs can be taken care of and educational needs can be taken care of with the consultation of this Congress. This is a very difficult time. There are hard choices to make and I would argue that the Arab League has been, if you will, absent from the team. The Arab League has been absent from this process.

So as I close, let me say that there is fault everywhere. We can blame anyone and everyone. But it is clear what has to be done. That is the denouncing of violence. I want to say to our friends here in America, Palestinian friends and others, you can be part of this solution. We are not here to undermine the children of Palestine or the women or the families or those who are sick, but we are here to heal the land and to cause an opportunity for peace so that two states can live along with each other.

I cannot be a hypocrite tonight, and as I cry out for Sudan, I must cry out for peace between Israel and the Palestinians. I hope this legislation will begin the debate, and I hope the Arab League and others will join us in this fight for freedom.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support, and express my views, on H.R. 4681, the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act.

For the last few months, we have watched the Middle East transform once again, and every day, we have witnessed history in the making.

Israel experienced the end of an era when the Honorable Ariel Sharon was disabled by a powerful stroke. Israel also resurrected its government into an entity focused on stability and the necessity of safety. The Palestinian Authority successfully elected a new government in the spirit of democracy.

I had the opportunity this past January to visit Israel, to once again tread the soil of the Holy Land, and meet with state officials to discuss the ramifications of Mr. Sharon's illness, and prospects of peace in the Middle East. At the time, apprehension toward the upcoming Palestinian elections was tangible, and the Israeli elections were not too far in the future. All of Israel and the Middle East knew that this was a turning point.

Now, however, we have a conundrum. Where we want to encourage and celebrate a democratic election, we are dismayed that the party elected has a history that disappoints hopes of peace and a mutually beneficial resolution in the near future.

Until we can achieve a two-state solution with lasting peace, we must address the fact that the government now in power has not met the baseline requirements for returning to the discussion table.

Over the last few months, we have seen the Palestinian people elect a government that promised more organization and resilient public administration, as well as less corruption and abuse of its citizens. However, the charter of Hamas remains committed to the destruction of the nation of Israel, and the supremacy of the Islamic faith around the world. The Palestinian Authority is struggling to deliver the stability it promised on the campaign trail.

H.R. 4681 states that it shall be U.S. policy to promote the emergence of a democratic

Palestinian governing authority that denounces and combats terrorism, upholds human rights for all people, and has agreed to recognize Israel as an independent Jewish state.

The Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006 would freeze aid to the Palestinian Authority (PA) and nongovernmental agencies (NGOs) unless for educational needs and overridden by the President, operating in the West Bank and Gaza so long as Hamas, or any other terrorist group, is a part of the Palestinian government. The Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act puts in place a stringent benchmark that must be met by the PA before America resumes aid. The aid will not be resumed until the President certifies that the PA is not controlled by and does not include terrorist groups and that the PA has demonstrated substantial progress towards a number of specified goals. I know we can have peace if people of good will—no matter what their faith help denounce violence and begin to work for two peaceful states.

I hope that this bill will not be misinterpreted as stifling the Palestinian Authority or harming the Palestinian people. This bill has been carefully written to make a compelling statement against any government that would challenge the sovereignty of another nation, and yet preserve the international aid and support to a people in need of stability.

We welcome Prime Minister Ehud Olmert this week to address a Joint Meeting of Congress. I hope that, while he is here, we may discuss actions that will serve to dissuade stakeholders from violence, and actions that will be a catalyst toward peace and stability in the Middle East.

One event occurred this week that fills me with hope: Deputy Prime Minister Shimon Peres and Foreign Minister Tzipi Livni met with Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas on the sidelines of the World Economic Forum in Sharm el-Sheik, Egypt, achieving the highest-level public talks between Israel and the Palestinian Authority in months. While the discussion focused on ideas for alleviating Palestinian humanitarian problems, both sides said it could lead to a first Olmert-Abbas summit. I am pleased that conversations between the governments continue, and I hope that we do, indeed, see such a summit in the coming months.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues who have participated in this debate and most especially my dear friend from California (Mr. LANTOS). He is always on the right side of all of these issues. Thank you, Mr. LANTOS, for your friendship and your leadership.

Madam Speaker, Hamas has a choice to make. It can be part of our broader post-9/11 policy of being with peace-loving, freedom-loving, democratic nations, or it can be with the Islamic terrorists. Yet, this is what Hamas' choice has been.

On its commitment to terrorism, the security forces head says, "We have only one enemy, they are Jews. I will continue to carry the rifle and pull the trigger whenever required to defend my people."

On refusing to recognize Israel, the Hamas spokesman says, "I believe that

the question of recognizing Israel will never be at any time on the agenda of the Hamas movement, the PLC or the Palestinian government.”

The foreign minister has said, “Even if the U.S. gave us all its money in return for recognizing Israel and giving up one inch of Palestine, we would never do so even if this costs us our lives. Our right to pursue the resistance will remain as long as the occupation continues over our lands and our holy sites.”

This is the leadership of Hamas. So we have a choice, Madam Speaker. Allow American taxpayer dollars to help support Hamas and other Islamic extremists or prevent such a manipulation of U.S. funds and ensure that they help promote our U.S. interests. I hope that our colleagues make the right decision tomorrow, and I hope that they will help us pass this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to exercise restraint and perspective in our consideration of H.R. 4681.

President Bush’s Administration has already stated the bill is “unnecessary as the Executive branch already has ample authority to impose all its restrictions and it constrains the Executive branch’s flexibility to use sanctions, if appropriate, as tools to address rapidly changing circumstances.” With that kind of endorsement, we must ask ourselves what this legislation seeks to accomplish.

Additionally, the so-called Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006 limits diplomatic visas to members of the Palestinian Authority and would tie the hands of the foreign policy community when it comes time to negotiate peace between the PA and Israel. How many times has peace been brokered on American soil? Eliminating dialogue does not help to advance peace in the region. Peace only comes through mutual understanding.

Reasonable, even intelligent people can, and frequently do, disagree on how best to achieve peace in the Middle East, but, peace must be the goal of our foreign policy tools, whether they be by the stick or by the carrot.

Peace cannot come from punishing the Palestinian people. Even Israel’s Foreign Minister knows that. He states in Reuters, that, “Israel is prepared to release Palestinian tax revenues into a proposed aid mechanism being set up by Middle East mediators to avert the collapse of the Palestinian health sector . . .”

Instead, this legislation seeks to accomplish exactly what President Bush’s Administration and the Israeli Foreign Minister realize is counterproductive. I can tell you that after 30 years in Congress, I have seen legislation succeed and fail. This legislation is rigid, and unnecessary.

To put it plainly, when you take from people who already have nothing, you breed trouble, you don’t combat it. How easy will it be for Al-Qaeda to tell a man whose child is dying that the doctors are no longer there because the Americans took them away? How easy will it be to recruit a whole new generation of listless, impoverished youths?

Madam Speaker, I reject the idea that this legislation will combat terrorism. I reject it because we have history as our teacher.

The best nation-building, goodwill act that the United States has ever produced was the

Marshall Plan after World War II. By rebuilding Europe, America continues to be stronger. Yes, there were communist factions that the United States deplored, but we knew the need was real, and punishing the whole for the acts of the few was wrongheaded in the extreme.

Today, our actions must be motivated only by our intense desire to achieve a just and lasting peace. The compassion and charity of the American people should be reflected in this legislation, though sadly, they are silenced.

Madam Speaker, make no mistake, a vote cast in favor of H.R. 4681 is not a vote for peace, it is not a vote for America and it is not a vote that I will cast.

I urge my colleagues to cast their votes against this unwise and unproductive resolution.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Earlier this year we watched as the Palestinian people went to the polls and voted into power a group that has employed car bombings, suicide bombings, mortar attacks, Qassam rocket attacks, and assassinations to achieve its stated goal of destroying Israel.

Last January, Hamas—the radical Islamic Palestinian organization that has sought to expel Jews and destroy the state of Israel to establish an Islamic Palestinian state based on Islamic law—won a majority of the seats in the Palestinian Legislative Council.

This group has been recognized by the United States and the European Union as a terrorist organization, and has committed hundreds of acts of terrorism against Israeli citizens since its creation in 1987.

I fully support the democratic process, but the views of Hamas are at odds with that process and its principles, and I do not believe we should continue providing funding to a group that’s stated purpose is the destruction of another democratic country.

This legislation sends a message to Hamas, but protects humanitarian assistance for the Palestinian people by continuing U.S. assistance through NGOs and USAID.

H.R. 4681 also gives the President authority to waive many of the provisions of the bill if Hamas changes its stance or a new Palestinian Authority government emerges.

We cannot allow U.S. taxpayer dollars to get in the hands of a Hamas-controlled government to be used against Israel, and this bill will prevent that from happening while protecting humanitarian aid to the Palestinian people.

Madam Speaker, we need to send Hamas a message that we will not stand by while it continues to endorse terrorism and violence.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4681.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, in conclusion I reject the claim that our bill does not allow our government to support worthwhile projects for the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. In fact, it makes every possible allowance for such projects, consistent with U.S. national interests.

First of all, our legislation makes an explicit exception for supporting the basic human health needs of the Palestinian people.

Second, it includes a waiver that requires the President only to certify that such assistance furthers our national security interests. That is not an unreasonably high standard to

meet, Madam Speaker, given our need to ensure that such projects do not in any way benefit Hamas, either politically or economically.

Nor, Madam Speaker, is it too much to ask that the consultation period be a bit longer than usual—25 days instead of 15—given this unprecedented situation, in which we would provide aid to a people whose government is controlled by terrorists. This is new territory, and we owe it to the taxpayers to proceed cautiously. Indeed, we cannot be sure that the new Hamas-controlled Palestinian Authority will not exert control over schools and other institutions currently run by non-governmental organizations.

In this unusual and potentially explosive situation, it seems to me the very least we should ask is that our assistance to the Palestinian people clearly further our national security interests. This is our minimal obligation to our constituents.

We will insist on this basic standard, Madam Speaker, and we will give assistance for appropriate purposes—and I am quite sure the level of our assistance will continue to be greater than that of any Arab nation, including those who have been wallowing in ever-increasing windfall profits over the past three years.

Also, Madam Speaker, H.R. 4681 cuts off U.S. contact with those who represent terrorism, not those who represent democracy.

H.R. 4681 establishes a policy that the U.S. should not negotiate or have substantive contacts with terrorist organizations such as Hamas or Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

H.R. 4681 explicitly recognizes that working with Palestinian moderates is in U.S. interest by allowing assistance to be provided to President Abbas to facilitate a peaceful resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

H.R. 4681 allows travel to the UN and gives the President an authority to waive this restriction to allow Palestinian moderates who are in the Palestinian Legislative Council to come to the United States to visit.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 4681.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I attach an exchange of letters between Chairman HYDE and Chairman OXLEY concerning the bill H.R. 4681 “Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006.”

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2006.

HON. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to the consideration of H.R. 4681, the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006. This bill was introduced on February 1, 2006, and referred to the Committees on International Relations, Judiciary and Financial Services. I understand that committee action has already taken place on the bill.

Section 9 of the bill as introduced falls within the jurisdiction of this Committee and could be the subject of a markup. However, in response to a request from this Committee, I thank you for your agreement to support in moving this legislation forward the modification of section 9 to remove from the certification requirement for international financial institutions a determination of the President that the Palestinian Authority has taken effective steps and

made demonstrable progress toward “ensuring democracy, the rule of law, and an independent judiciary, and adopting other reforms such as ensuring transparency and accountable governance.” Given the importance and timeliness of the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act, and your willingness to work with us regarding these issues, further proceedings on this bill in this Committee will no longer be necessary. However, I do so only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Financial Services on these provisions or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future. Furthermore, should these or similar provisions be considered in a conference with the Senate, I would expect members of the Committee on Financial Services to be appointed to the conference committee on these provisions.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record during the consideration of this bill. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call me. I thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, May 15, 2006.

Hon. MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 4681, the Palestinian Anti-terrorism Act of 2006. As you noted, this bill has been referred to both of our committees as well as the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on International Relations has filed its report on the bill (109-462, Part D). I concur that provisions within Section 9 of the bill, as introduced, fall within the jurisdiction of this Committee and could be the subject of a markup in your committee. In order to expedite consideration of the bill by the House, I am willing to modify language in Section 9 relating to international financial institutions.

Based on the agreement to modify the manager's amendment to reflect our understanding, I appreciate your willingness to forgo a committee markup of the bill. I understand that this waiver should not be construed to prejudice the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Financial Services on these provisions or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to your committee in the future. I also agree that, should these or similar provisions be considered in a conference with the Senate, I will request the Speaker to name members of the Committee on Financial Services to the conference committee on these provisions.

As requested, I am inserting a copy of our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record during the deliberation on this bill. I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman.

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, the election of Hamas to a majority within the Palestinian Legislative Council and to the formation of a terrorist organization-led government in the Palestinian Authority poses a serious challenge to the United States and its allies. The Committee on International Relations has crafted an excellent response to that chal-

lenge. The bill which is before the House today is based on a proposal by our colleagues, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN and TOM LANTOS.

The fact that the Palestinians voted, albeit by a plurality and not a majority, to put Hamas in power in the Palestinian Authority does not mean that the United States has to support that government. The Palestinian people must live with their own decisions; the United States need not, and should not, deal with, let alone support, terrorists—whether elected or not.

The legislation we have before us today provides a series of firewalls to prevent funding under the Foreign Assistance Act from flowing to the Palestinian Authority, from which it could support, or be seen to be supporting, the Hamas' terrorist leadership of the Palestinian Authority. It also provides for ways, subject to appropriate findings and consultation with the Congress, to get funding to the Palestinian people through the funding of non-governmental organizations.

We have provided exceptions, subject to certain certification and consultation requirements, for—among other things—assistance to the President of the Palestinian Authority. Mahmoud Abbas, the current Palestine President, is clearly not a terrorist, and having worked with him, we must make it possible for him to be protected, if required, and to be an effective negotiator. He still has a lot of institutional power under the Palestinian constitution, and he should be encouraged and enabled in exercising that power responsibly.

Under the Foreign Assistance Act, it will be possible to provide assistance, even to a terrorist-dominated Palestinian Authority, to deal with health emergencies such as avian flu. That sort of assistance should flow, and indeed flows today.

Finally, we establish, by statute, a policy that officials of the United States should not negotiate with members of terrorist organizations such as Hamas and that our government should oppose funding the Palestinian Authority, under the current circumstances, through International Financial Institutions.

With that brief outline of the bill's key points, Madam Speaker, I would like to express my thanks to Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. LANTOS for their efforts.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill and in support of peace and prosperity for all the people of the Middle East.

For years, the international community has tried to work with Israelis and Palestinians to forge a lasting peace in the Middle East. But the election of Hamas to control the Palestinian Parliament was a shock to all of us, and the announcement that their party would rule alone disheartening.

It remains to be seen whether participation in the democratic process can truly have a moderating effect on organizations that have supported terror. But until we see evidence to that effect, we are forced to deal with the world as it is—and in that world, Hamas is a terrorist organization.

Hamas uses violence against the innocent to further its political objectives. It does not accept the Roadmap, and it does not recognize the right of Israel to exist. Clearly, we cannot support—with our words or with our deeds—such an organization.

At the same time, we must recognize that most Palestinian people voted for Hamas not

because they support terror, but because they were desperate for a better quality of life. Hamas was providing basic services that their existing government was, for whatever reason, unable to provide.

I would like to take this opportunity to say that supporting this bill is not a rejection of the Palestinian people. America's position is clear: we support a two-state solution in accordance with the Roadmap.

And although we cannot and should not support Hamas, we must not abandon the Palestinian people. We must continue to support humanitarian aid—including health, education, and civil society initiatives—to ensure that the next generation of Palestinian children can know something other than violence, desperation, and hatred. Only then will we have any hope of achieving true peace.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4681, the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006. I was deeply concerned when I learned that the Hamas party was elected to take control of the Palestinian Authority. In FY 2005, the United States appropriated \$275 million to the West Bank and Gaza, with \$50 million of that funding going directly to the Palestinian Authority. But now, with Hamas in control of the Palestinian Authority, not one dollar of taxpayer money should go to this terrorist organization. The Palestinian people have every right to elect a terrorist organization to control their government—and the United States has every right to eliminate any financial assistance for it.

Under H.R. 4681, the Hamas-led Palestinian Authority would become eligible for United States foreign assistance only when Hamas renounces violence, dismantles the terrorist infrastructure in the West Bank and Gaza, recognizes Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state and accepts all previous Israeli-Palestinian agreements.

Hamas is responsible for countless homicide bombings that have killed hundreds of Israeli citizens. They have waged a terror war with the sole intent of murdering innocent people. Hamas is responsible for some of the most horrific terrorist attacks in recent years, including the March 2002 Passover Massacre that killed 30 people; the June 2002 Patt Junction Massacre which killed 19 people; and the 2003 Jerusalem Bus attack which killed 23 people. And recently, Hamas backed the April 2006 bombing of a Tel-Aviv restaurant that killed 9 people.

The Hamas Charter reads: “Israel will exist and will continue to exist until Islam will obliterate it, just as it obliterated others before it.”

Hamas' victory further jeopardizes the peace process and creates greater instability in the region. I have no confidence in Hamas as a responsible leader of the Palestinian Authority nor do I believe the terrorist group wants peace with Israel. I urge the new government to proceed with caution and exercise restraint as it assumes power. Any provocation on their part will rightly be met with fierce resistance by the Israeli people.

H.R. 4681 does allow for humanitarian assistance, including providing funds to Fatah party member Mahmoud Abbas, President of the Palestinian Authority. Under this bill, the Palestinian People may be eligible for additional aid on a case-by-case basis. While strong against Hamas, this bill is not need-blind to the people of Palestine. Just recently,

the United States sent \$10 million worth of pharmaceuticals to local clinics in the Gaza Strip on May 10.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, the founding charter of Hamas reads, "Israel will rise and will remain erect until Islam eliminates it as it had eliminated its predecessors." Madam Speaker, when your enemy says he is going to kill you, you better pay attention.

The Hamas victory in Palestinian parliamentary elections is of great concern to me and many others and presents a major challenge to the peace process. Hamas ran a campaign primarily based on cleaning out the corruption of the Fatah party. The Palestinian people responded to this pledge, but sadly in the process elected a terrorist government.

Unless Hamas recognizes the State of Israel's right to exist, ceases incitement and permanently disarms and dismantles their terrorist infrastructure, there is no hope for peace. The bottom line is neither our government nor Israel can meet with or provide assistance to a government led by this terrorist organization.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4681, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5384, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (during debate on H.R. 4681), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-477) on the resolution (H. Res. 830) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5384) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPUBLICANS OFFERING ENERGY SOLUTIONS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, many Americans are concerned about gasoline prices. They can rest assured that

House Republicans are focused on their concerns and are working very hard to lower the costs of gasoline over the mid and long term.

Republicans introduced and passed the Gasoline for America's Security Act which will ban price gouging and increase U.S. fuel supply by encouraging new refineries while at the same time promoting conservation efforts. The bill passed the House but still needs immediate attention in the United States Senate.

Republicans also passed the Energy Policy Act which reduces the cost of energy, reduces our reliance on foreign oil sources, encourages the use of alternative power sources and improves our electricity transmission capability. The bill also provides relief to our hardworking farmers by providing tax incentives and money for research and development by ethanol and biodiesel energy sources.

In addition, House Republicans have repeatedly supported legislation to open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas exploration.

The Democrats, on the other hand, have opposed building new refineries, have opposed drilling in ANWR and, in fact, voted against both of these bills.

Madam Speaker, Republicans have worked hard to address America's energy needs. And the Democrats? They vote "no" on every solution.

□ 2200

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

UNDERAGE DRINKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Madam Speaker, underage drinking flies under the radar screen for most people. Alcohol is legal and widely accepted by adults, and yet many times we do not realize the devastation that this is causing for young people.

The average at which young people begin drinking is 12.7 years of age, and that age is declining annually.

Binge drinking is something that is very common among young people. On average, teenagers drink more by double what adults drink per sitting and per consumption.

Teens who start drinking before age 15 are four times more likely to be-

come addicted to alcohol than someone who starts drinking at age 21 or later.

Prevention efforts have been, I would say, very minimal. The Federal Government currently spends about 25 times more annually to combat youth drug use than to prevent underage alcohol use.

Alcohol is a gateway drug. Usually those who begin to use cocaine, heroin, and methamphetamine do not start with those drugs. They start with alcohol. Television ads for alcohol products outnumber responsibility messages by 32-1. In other words, those ads that promote the consumption of alcohol are 32 times more prevalent than those ads that urge restraint, responsible drinking or discourage underage drinking. From 2001 to 2003, the industry spent \$2.5 billion on television advertising and promoting their product and only \$27 million, a mere fraction, on responsibility programs.

Underage drinkers currently account for 17 percent of all alcohol sales in the United States, and that is a huge margin. In my State, Nebraska, underage drinking accounts for 25 percent of all alcohol sales, and of course, those sales are all illegal.

Recent studies have found that heavy exposure of the adolescent brain to alcohol interferes with brain development. In other words, drinking at age 10 is qualitatively and quantitatively different than drinking at 21 or 25 or 30 or 35 or whatever because of developmental aspects.

This is a brain scan showing a brain scan of two 15-year-old young men. The scan on the right is a 15-year-old male, heavy drinker, a binge drinker, the person who is sober at the time of the brain scan, drinks regularly, binge drinker. The 15-year-old young person brain scan on the left is someone who is an abstainer, someone who does not drink at all. These young people were asked to perform memory tests, and you see the brain scan on the right showing minimal brain activity, as compared to the young person doing the same memory test on the left. So we see what excessive exposure to alcohol does to brain function.

Many young people drop out of school, who do not perform well in school, are simply people who are heavy drinkers. An estimated 3 million teenagers are full-blown alcoholics at the present time, and that is about six times more than those who are addicted to other kinds of drugs.

Alcohol kills six times more young people than all illicit drugs combined, all other illicit drugs. Underage drinking costs the United States roughly \$53 billion annually. So this is something, again, that I mention that oftentimes people are simply not aware of.

The bill that we have introduced in the House that we think is relevant to this problem is called the Sober Truth on Preventing Underage Drinking Act, the STOP Act, and what it would do is create a Federal Interagency Coordinating Committee to coordinate efforts