

I stand before you this morning as one who lives this ordeal every day in Congress. My heart is heavy with the pain and suffering endured by Israelis as together we struggle to make sense of the turmoil that is gripping the region. And yes, I grieve for the Palestinians, too, who have been deceived by their leaders into believing that a terror organization like the PLO can ever bring peace. It can't. And the reason is simple. Terror and the ways of the gun are an integral part of the PLO's identity, a past it can never leave behind.

The Palestinian community has yet to produce leaders whose commitment to peace is more than simply a means of seeking tactical advantage. It is a community which continues to be dominated by revolutionaries, guerrilla fighters and scoundrels of every stripe—and not true statesmen who understand the art of compromise, are committed to a true reconciliation, and tolerate dissent.

I wish this were not so, but the record of the last four years speaks of different reality. While Israel has demonstrated a willingness to retreat from some of its most cherished sites like Hebron and Shechem (Nablus), to accept the presence of armed Palestinian militia at checkpoints around the country, and to concede that a final status talks will include Jerusalem, the PLO has only shown increasing reticence to carry out its side of the bargain.

The PLO has answered Israel's deeply rooted security concerns with provocation after provocation, even questioning whether there will even be room for a sovereign Jewish State in the Middle East once the Oslo process is concluded. If you doubt what I am telling you, you need look no farther than the maps which the PLO uses at countless functions, both official and unofficial, on its monuments, on its stationary letterhead and on its television broadcasts.

It is a map showing a sovereign State of Palestine stretching from the Mediterranean to the Jordan River and from the Banyas to Eliat, encompassing all of the present day State of Israel. If this were not bad enough, the President's own Special Coordinator for the Middle East, Mr. Dennis Ross, has been photographed with Yasir Arafat sitting beneath these maps apparently unmoved by the implication of their sinister message.

I believe that at no time during the Cold War would an American diplomat ever have been found posing beneath a map of the Baltic States, festooned in the colors of the former Soviet Union. The same might be said for Berlin and Afghanistan—for South Korea and Hong Kong in the case of China—and for South Vietnam when it came to claims made by the Hanoi Government before our withdrawal from the War.

My friends, I am deeply concerned that Israel and the United States are now living an Alice in Wonderland existence, where up is down and down is up—where is good is bad and bad is good. It is a contradiction that has bedeviled me for the past four years about which I refuse to remain silent.

As the principal House sponsor of the Middle East Peace Compliance Act of 1995, I tried to bring some sense to our nation's Middle East policy. I asked my colleagues to consider the folly of providing the terrorist PLO with \$500 million in U.S. Government assistance while making virtually no provision for the accountability of the funds and providing no honest mechanism to assess whether the PLO was in fact complying with the spirit and the letter of Oslo.

For this I was widely chastised by many Members as well as by Administration officials: for attempting to bar all funding to the PLO, for insisting that no funds go to individuals alleged to have killed or injured

Americans or for trying to prevent projects and activities that were not strictly humanitarian in nature.

Well, time has vindicated my position. Just two weeks ago an audit conducted the PLO itself found that \$350 million dollars in international aid has been stolen from the Palestinian coffers or misused by their leaders—many of them took money to buy grand villas and fancy automobiles. At the same time we see that incidences of PLO-inspired violence are continuing to increase with not only Israelis being killed, but also Palestinians who dare to sell land to Jews.

Yasir Arafat continues to undermine Oslo by praising Palestinian suicide bombers as martyrs and heroes and by paying homage to Hamas leader Sheikh Yassin. Arafat calls upon his public to unite around the cause of Jerusalem—all of Jerusalem—as the capital of a Palestinian state.

Would you believe that a senior Arafat official recently leveled the absurd accusation that Israel sells gum in the West Bank and Gaza laced with an aphrodisiac! Unfortunately, this is but a mild version of the anti-Israel vitriol which regularly pours out from the Egyptian Press and is frankly indistinguishable from the anti-Semitic diatribes of medieval European demagogues or Der Stuermer, the Nazi propaganda paper.

My friends, I can go on and on listing the PLO violations of Oslo and Arafat's incendiary rhetoric. This is a matter of public record and the record is indisputable. That is, unless you hail from the U.S. State Department, which continues to insist in report after report to the Congress that Arafat and the PLO are in virtual compliance with their Oslo commitments.

Though the New York Times has only recently acknowledged that the PLO has not changed its covenant calling for the destruction of Israel, the State Department continues to cling to the vain notion that Arafat's word is his bond. The Administration still insists that the promise of the Palestinian National Council (PNC) to change the covenant is an adequate substitute for actually changing the covenant.

We cannot ignore the challenge that has been placed before us if we are to see Israel survive as a free and flourishing state.

To the extent that the United States is complicit in helping Arafat achieve his objectives, we are obliged as citizens, as friends of Israel, as Americans concerned with the moral, political and strategic posture of our own country, to act soon to restore common sense to our otherwise misguided Middle East policy.

These are the actions which I am now talking, and which I intend to pursue in the weeks ahead, toward this goal:

First, I have notified the Foreign Operations Appropriations subcommittee, of which I am a member, of my desire to suspend U.S. aid to the PLO until it meets the compliance standards laid down in the Oslo Accords. Last month I added my name to a bi-partisan letter co-signed by 15 House members urging the president to cut aid to the PLO;

Second, I do not endorse the current effort by the Administration to cut \$50 million from Israel's aid package for next year—aid which is sorely needed to maintain Israel's strong defense posture in the face of renewed threats by Syria and Iraq and vote to ensure that adequate funds are made available to facilitate the eventual move of the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem as directed by Congress in legislation last year;

Third, I am continuing to support efforts to bolster counter-terrorism cooperation between the U.S. and Israel. To this end, I urge the Justice Department to conduct a review of all cases in which current or past mem-

bers of the PLO are alleged to have harmed Americans or their property. I want to know the level of cooperation that U.S. law enforcement agencies have received from the PLO in their investigation and in requests for extradition; and, urge the Administration to examine the threat to U.S. security posed by the increasing numbers of weapons pouring into the Palestinian controlled areas. In particular, I am concerned by reports that the PLO has acquired surface-to-air missiles which have the potential to down civilian air traffic transiting through the Middle East and elsewhere. With the cause of the TWA disaster still unknown, I feel it is prudent to keep a spotlight on this critical national security issue.

Dear friends, let me conclude by saying that I feel privileged to be able to lead the fight for a cause in which I believe so deeply. For me, the U.S.-Israel relationship is more than just a slogan, it is an historic commitment of two nations to the cause of peace, freedom, and security, I don't have to tell you we are living through difficult times. They are difficult times for many nations around the world, particularly for Israel, which continues to live under the threat of war.

Just last week Israel's Chief of Staff spoke publicly of the increasingly menacing military build-up along the border with Syria. Likewise, countries from Egypt to Saudi Arabia, and Iraq to Iran, continue to acquire advanced long-range weaponry, capable of striking anywhere in Israel, despite the region's supposed move toward peace. Therefore, it is all the more important that we not forget the history which brought us to this point in time—and the lessons learned—as we begin to build a new future.

It was exactly 30 years ago this week that the Jewish State found itself caught in a life or death struggle as the Arab armies of Egypt, Jordan and Syria, backed by the Soviet Union and its allies sought to destroy her. I remember those terrifying hours of the 1967 war well, as do most of you in this room. They are seared into our collective consciousness.

Many of you probably can recall in vivid detail what you were doing at precisely the moment when news flashed across our television sets that the fledgling was now fighting for its life against seemingly unsurmountable odds. Today, as we recall those fateful hours, we must renew our pledge to fight for Israel's survival, in our homes, in our places of worship, in our State and on Capitol Hill.

We must do everything in our power to see that the insecurity of those years do not return. For my part, I am committed to do whatever is necessary to perpetuate a strong Israel and a strong U.S.-Israel relationship. It is my hope that during the difficult weeks and months ahead I will be able to call upon each and every one of you, your rabbis and synagogue leaders, to guide me through the thicket of Middle East politics so that I can better serve the cause of peace and U.S.-Israel friendship. Together, we can achieve miraculous things.

Thank you for the opportunity to share a few thoughts with you this morning. May the coming festival of Shavuot pass peaceful for Israel. May you all know peace. Shalom.

## FREE TRADE AND THE G8 SUMMIT

### HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1997

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to alert my colleagues to

the upcoming challenges and opportunities of the G8 Summit in Denver. Anticipating the economic boost from this week's G8 Summit, Denver area merchants hope to rake in big revenues from the thousands of visitors expected. Yet how well Colorado fulfills its role as gracious host will be but one measure of the State's achievement during the historic event.

More important than the short-term economic surge associated with the summit, success in advancing the Nation's trade objectives will have a far greater impact on Colorado's long-term economy and job growth. Among the leaders assembled, the most pivotal exchange to watch is the one between President Clinton and Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto.

Hashimoto's visit will highlight the close alliance the United States and Japan have established throughout the cold war years, and maintain today. However, while United States interests remain tightly linked with those of Japan on many fronts, such as containment of North Korea, the Hashimoto visit may serve as a springboard for talks on other issues that divide us.

Despite the close ties we have forged, the bilateral relationship between the United States and Japan has been marred by a series of ongoing trade disputes that are of major concern to United States interest—especially the interests of Colorado.

Specifically, the United States Trade Representative is challenging 30 years of Japan's Government-supported market barriers that have prevented, and continue to prevent international competitors from gaining fair access to the Japanese market for consumer film and paper products. The massive array of evidence reveals for the first time, an elaborate system designed to exclude foreign competitors from Japanese markets.

So what does film and paper have to do with Colorado? In a word, Kodak. Eastman Kodak Co. employs over 2,700 people in northern Colorado. Their photographic products are sold all over the world.

Much of what Kodak sells overseas is manufactured at their plant in Windsor, CO. where Kodak exports color paper and medical x-ray film directly to Japan. Expanding this market share would certainly create more jobs in Colorado and expand economic prosperity.

One year ago, the United States Government determined that Japan has engaged in unreasonable trade practices in the lucrative market. Rather than retaliating directly, the United States filed a case with the newly formed World Trade Organization [WTO]. The case is regarded as the most comprehensive well-documented trade case in history—the resolution of which could substantially change the way America does business with Japan. The case is expected to be decided in October, this year.

For those of us who are WTO skeptics, the episode is the first real test of the panel's capacity to address structural and access barriers. The precedent that could be set might have a profound impact on literally hundreds of Colorado-based exporters seeking broader markets in Japan.

George M.C. Fisher, Kodak CEO expressed optimism about the case against Japanese protectionism. "We believe that the WTO, upon examination of the evidence, will conclude that the laws and measures exacted by

the Government of Japan to restrict foreign competition in its consumer photographic produce market, are inconsistent with the country's international obligations under the GATT," he said. "The ramifications of this historic case are potentially of landmark proportions."

Still, it is unfortunate that Kodak must go to such exhausting lengths to gain fair market access in Japan. An assertive United States President would have dealt more firmly with Japan rather than defer the Kodak case to the WTO as Clinton chose to do.

If Prime Minister Hashimoto is any less stubborn, the G8 meeting right here in Colorado might prove to be the perfect place to announce the loosening of trade restrictions, to allow greater competition in the Japanese market, to allow Japanese consumers the advantage of lower prices, and to shore up the otherwise good relationship between the United States and Japan. It would be a Kodak moment, that all of Colorado could take to the bank.

#### FREEDOM FOR ALL

#### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1997

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there is an alarming trend that has occurred the past several months, led by some social conservative organizations in Washington who have called for the revocation of China's most-favored-nation [MFN] status. They argue we should revoke this status, which is simply normal trade relations between countries, to retaliate against the Chinese Government for interfering with the practice of religion.

I, too, am very concerned about the persecution of anyone who practices religion in China. It is for this very reason that I have the firm conviction that MFN must be renewed. In fact, missionaries in China, who are closest to the issue, say that MFN is essential for maintaining the positive work they do. As a conservative, as a Christian, and as the chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade I am absolutely convinced that by bringing the influence of the outside world into China, free trade will create opportunities for freedom of religion to take root.

Trade has helped to expose millions of the Chinese people to values such as human rights and religious freedom by opening a door to the People's Republic of China. In the June 11, 1997, edition of the Wall Street Journal, Rev. Robert A. Sirico addressed many of these concerns and concluded that "Just as religious freedom offers the best hope for Christian social influence, economic freedom is the best hope for spreading that influence around the world." I applaud his thinking and submit his article into the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to consider the points he raises here and to vote to renew China's MFN status.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 11, 1997]

CHINA AND THE TRADE WARRIORS

(By Robert A. Sirico)

Despite occasional tensions between social conservatives and economic conservatives, most social and cultural goals have an economic dimension about which the two camps

are generally in agreement. But now a leader of the socially conservative camp has proposed that there is an issue that pits morality and prosperity irreconcilably against one another—U.S. trade with China, a nation known for human-rights violations, and particularly for religious persecution.

Gary Bauer of the Family Research Council is demanding that the U.S. government wage economic war against China with sanctions, boycotts and embargoes. In his campaign for trade restrictions with China, Mr. Bauer and a few other conservative leaders are working hand in glove with labor unions and other left-liberal protectionists, normally die-hard opponents of the religious right.

#### BARRICADES HAVE COLLAPSED

The usual political barricades have collapsed as Mr. Bauer's comrades join forces to oppose congressional attempts to continue normal trading relations with China. In a recent letter, Mr. Bauer compares the urgency of imposing sanctions to issues such as ending slavery and defeating Hitler.

How restricting trade with China will help strengthen American families, faith and morality is unclear. What is clear is that Mr. Bauer finds China's treatment of Christians morally objectionable. I do, too. And he is to be commended for his efforts at raising the public's awareness of Chinese persecution. Christians are threatened, jailed, expelled and even killed in China. Whether this occurs more or less today than in decades past is in dispute. But one human-rights violation is one too many.

That's why I, along with many others, signed an open letter from the Family Research Council to Vice President Al Gore that appeared in major newspapers. It objected to Mr. Gore's failure to emphasize China's poor human-rights record during his March visit. The letter particularly highlighted China's vicious suppression of rights of Roman Catholics to worship in freedom. The letter said nothing about a broader trade agenda.

I would have signed a similar letter about the appalling treatment of Christians in Egypt (which receives U.S. aid), Saudi Arabia (which the U.S. has defended militarily) and Iraq (where a Kurdish convert to Christianity, Mansour Hussein Sifer, was recently martyred). Friends of freedom should oppose restrictions on worship and religious speech anywhere they may appear, including the U.S.

When I signed the letter on China, however, I did not know that it was a prologue to a full-blown political campaign that would seek to curtail commercial ties between China and the rest of the world. Mr. Bauer's position has evolved from a strong moral stand in favor of religious freedom to waging total trade war.

A charge often leveled against the Christian right is that it is not sensitive to the difference between urging certain moral ends and using government coercion to bring them about. It's usually a canard: In the case of the arts, for example, the religious right seeks not censorship but an end to taxpayer subsidies for blasphemy and obscenity. I regret having to say that this time, however, the Family Research Council has lived up to the stereotype. It is attempting to enlist government power, at the expense of everyone who benefits from U.S.-Chinese commercial relations, thus choosing an inappropriate means to achieve a moral end.

What's more, trade sanctions would be counterproductive. Sanctions won't bring freedom for religious expression in China. They won't end China's cruel policies limiting family size. They won't stop the horrific policy of forced abortions. They won't bring