

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 275 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Abraham	Durbin	Mack
Akaka	Edwards	McConnell
Allard	Enzi	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Miller
Baucus	Frist	Moynihan
Bayh	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Graham	Murray
Biden	Gramm	Nickles
Bingaman	Grassley	Reed
Bond	Gregg	Reid
Boxer	Hagel	Robb
Breaux	Harkin	Roberts
Brownback	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bryan	Hollings	Roth
Bunning	Hutchinson	Santorum
Burns	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Byrd	Inhofe	Schumer
Campbell	Inouye	Sessions
Chafee, L.	Jeffords	Shelby
Cleland	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kohl	Snowe
Conrad	Kyl	Specter
Craig	Landrieu	Stevens
Crapo	Lautenberg	Thomas
Daschle	Leahy	Thompson
DeWine	Levin	Thurmond
Dodd	Lincoln	Voinovich
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Dorgan	Lugar	Wyden

NAYS—3

Feingold	Kerrey	Wellstone
----------	--------	-----------

NOT VOTING—7

Feinstein	Kennedy	Torricelli
Grams	Lieberman	
Helms	McCain	

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to change my vote to “no.” It does not change the outcome, most definitely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I cannot think of a stronger message that we as a body of the U.S. Government—the legislative body—can send to the men and women of the armed services in this hour of need throughout the uniform ranks, the reserve ranks, and the Guard ranks than this strong vote. It is a salute to each and every one of them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I join the chairman in that sentiment. This is an extraordinarily strong vote for a Defense authorization bill. I think there were 90-plus votes for it.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). Under the previous order, the clerk will read H.J. Res. 111.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 111) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the joint resolution.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) would vote “aye.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 276 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Abraham	Enzi	McConnell
Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Allard	Fitzgerald	Miller
Ashcroft	Frist	Moynihan
Baucus	Gorton	Murkowski
Bayh	Graham	Murray
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Biden	Grassley	Reed
Bingaman	Gregg	Reid
Bond	Hagel	Robb
Boxer	Harkin	Roberts
Breaux	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bryan	Hollings	Roth
Bunning	Hutchinson	Santorum
Byrd	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Campbell	Inhofe	Schumer
Chafee, L.	Inouye	Sessions
Cleland	Jeffords	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kerrey	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerry	Snowe
Craig	Kohl	Specter
Crapo	Kyl	Stevens
Daschle	Landrieu	Thomas
DeWine	Lautenberg	Thompson
Dodd	Levin	Thurmond
Domenici	Lincoln	Voinovich
Dorgan	Lott	Warner
Durbin	Lugar	Wellstone
Edwards	Mack	Wyden

NAYS—1

Leahy

NOT VOTING—9

Brownback	Grams	Lieberman
Burns	Helms	McCain
Feinstein	Kennedy	Torricelli

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 111) was agreed to.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thank Senator WARNER and Senator LEVIN for the fine work they have done on critical issues before us and, of course, on the DOD authorization bill.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

A COUNTRY UNITED

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I want to take 5 minutes at this time to speak on the events occurring in the world today.

I stand here with the melancholy that any Senator would feel as a result of the loss of lives of our U.S. military men and women due to a despicable act of terrorism.

I say to the terrorists: You underestimate the United States. Right now we are in an orderly constitutional process to begin the transition of the executive branch to a new leader. Do not think because we are beginning a transition that we are weak.

I say to the terrorists anywhere in the world: When any American is under attack, all Americans are under attack. We will check our party hats at the door. We will be united as one nation. I believe the Congress and the American people will stand as one behind President Clinton to aggressively pursue and punish the terrorists who have engaged in this despicable act. You might have gotten away with this one, but do not think again about the next hour, the next day, or the next week. The United States of America is coming after you, and we are all together on this.

In addition, to our friends in the Middle East: We are deeply troubled by the violence that is ongoing. A peace agreement was within reach. Indeed, it was fragile. We say now, please, take a timeout, end the violence, let's step back to see if we cannot come forward under the leadership of the United States as an honest broker to move ahead. We are plunging into chaos. Chaos only means further retreat. It means that maybe for years violence will continue.

We say: Please, Mr. Arafat, do not work behind the scenes; work on the front lines; end your violence.

To the people of Israel: We know that the first act is the act of self-defense. We understand that. It is human. Please, we ask restraint, and we ask all to come back to the bargaining table. Let's put down the stones. Let's put down the guns. Let's see if we can move forward.

I come back to what has occurred on the Senate floor today. I say to people

around the world: This is democracy. Good people who have been good friends differ. We can conduct ourselves with civility. We can have intellectual arguments. We can quote our lawyers and our National Academy of Sciences, and so on. Ultimately, the Congress will work its will. This is democracy. We invite the whole world to participate in it. War only leads to more war. Violence only leads to more violence. But democracy leads to more democracy, and democracy means ultimately peace and prosperity.

We invite the world: Please, constitutional governments, treaties, rules of law are what this 21st century should be all about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague for her very eloquent statement. I know she and others and all of us extend our deepest sympathies to the families, the loved ones of those sailors who were killed in the cowardly act in the Gulf of Aden today. The cause of peace and international security is one that is worth a major effort, and it is not without sacrifices, as we saw today.

I share the concerns and I share the strong commitment that we shall do everything in our power to identify the people behind this cowardly deed and take appropriate responsive action. We do not intend as a democracy committed to freedom and human rights to be deterred from our continuing efforts by these acts of terrorism. These do nothing but bring sorrow and heartache to the families and loved ones left behind, and they strengthen the will of the rest of us to say that we will not bow to the terrorists acts. They will not deter us. They only strengthen us not only in our prayers for those who have given the ultimate sacrifice but in our commitment to ensure it does not deter our activities.

A TRAGIC ACT OF TERRORISM ON THE U.S.S.
COLE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, we are all now aware of a terrible tragedy, an act of despicable terrorism has taken place on the U.S.S. *Cole* and American lives have been lost.

All of us are appalled. On behalf of all of us, our thoughts and prayers go out to the family members of those on the U.S.S. *Cole*. We hope we can get all the information as quickly as possible.

The United States has the ability to find out who perpetrated this outrage. We will find those people. There will be a heavy price to pay. We cannot allow these kinds of acts of terror to take place. I am confident the President of the United States will ascertain who these individuals and organizations are, and the heaviest price must be paid for this outrage. In the meantime, our thoughts, hopes, and prayers go out to those who were injured, those missing in action, and those killed in this tragedy.

TERRORISM

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, first, let me concur with the remarks of my col-

league, Senator MCCAIN. I join him in expressing concern for those families who have lost Americans in connection with the terrorist attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*.

I call upon my colleagues who are holding up my antiterrorism legislation to stop holding up this important piece of legislation and allow us to get it passed this year and sent to the President for his signature. The National Terrorism Commission made some very important recommendations about how we should deal with terrorists attacks, and the only response has been the legislation that Senator FEINSTEIN and I have proposed. I hope those who are holding this legislation as a result of this attack will recognize we can't wait for the next terrorism attack. We need to act now.

MIDDLE EAST TENSIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, my heart is so heavy this morning as we learn of the increasing tensions in the Middle East.

I join my friend from Arizona, Senator KYL, in expressing our condolences to those American families who are grieving at the loss of their children by an unprovoked attack on one of our ships off the coast of Yemen. We are not exactly sure who did this. We suspect that it was terrorism.

But, as Senator MCCAIN said on one of the shows this morning as I listened to him, we will find out, and we will respond. The world should make no mistake about that.

This morning I also want to call on Yasser Arafat to take control of the situation in the Middle East. There has been an incident where four Israeli soldiers were in Ramallah—the Israelis say that they had taken a wrong turn. They certainly weren't provoking anything. They were captured, and taken to the Palestinian authorities and to a detention center. Then a mob overtook the center and killed at least two of them. The reports vary. One report I heard said there was a lynching. I don't know that is accurate, but one report said that. You have now no rule of law. It is very difficult to negotiate a peace agreement when there is no rule of law on one side of the equation.

I had been closely following this. I was very hopeful yesterday. Things looked as if they were going in a better direction. The word was that Yasser Arafat was, in fact, calming his people down. But it is time for him to do this now publicly. It is one thing to quietly work behind the scenes; it is another thing to come out publicly and say enough of mob rule.

As I say, I come here with a very heavy heart, but always hopeful that the goodness in people will overcome everything else.

My heart is with the American families who will be grieving. My heart is with all the families in the Middle East who are suffering so much.

I believe Dwight Eisenhower once said—I may stand corrected—that people want peace so much that one of

these days governments had better get out of the way and let them have it. I think people want peace. The vast majority of people want peace. How tragic it is that we can't seem to grasp that.

I praise President Clinton and Vice President GORE for doing everything they can. I give them my best. I offer myself as someone who will do what I can. I am on the Foreign Relations Committee. This is an area that we know is always a tinderbox. Yet we have faith that the peace process can get back on track.

BREAKDOWN OF CAMP DAVID PEACE PROPOSALS

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the news from the Middle East is deeply painful to all who pray for the peace of Jerusalem. Three months ago at Camp David the State of Israel offered the Palestine Authority unprecedented concessions in an effort to end the cycle of violence and hatred. The rejection of these proposals has tragically led to the loss of numerous lives and the resumption of the cycle of violence and hatred. Our Government must tell the Palestinian leadership that the destruction of holy sites and mob violence have no place in civilized society.

EVENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to offer my sincere condolences to the families of the U.S. Navy personnel killed in what appears to have been a terrorist attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*, and to express my outrage at this cowardly act of murder. This deplorable incident is a tragic reminder of the risk and sacrifice assumed by all of our men and women in uniform, and by their families. I know that the administration will be using all of the resources at its disposal to discern who is responsible for the attack, and that the U.S. will resolutely take appropriate action in response to this incident.

My certainty about that last point is based on a simple and irrefutable truth. No country would stand by while its soldiers and sailors are targeted and killed. The U.S. will certainly not stand for it and will not be intimidated in the wake of the cowardly attack on the *Cole*. By the same token, it should surprise no one that Israel retaliated in response to the brutal murder of Israeli soldiers at the hands of a mob in Ramallah.

But as difficult as it is, as raw as emotions are right now, we cannot afford to lose sight of one fundamental fact. All of us—we Americans, the rest of the international community, the Israelis and the Palestinians—know that there is no military solution to the terribly difficult issues that have made the Middle East a region of tension and violence for far too long. In recent days the promise of peace has been obscured by terrible violence in Jerusalem and elsewhere. Nearly 100 lives have been lost, including the lives of children. For the Israeli and Palestinian children who remain, in the name of providing them a future free from these horrors, I hope that the Israeli and Palestinian people will find

the courage and the strength to stop the violence, and that they will find their way back on a path toward peace.

SITUATION IN ISRAEL

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, the United States commitment to Israel is strong. It has stood the test of time, and has only strengthened. It is strong because it is grounded in our shared principles of freedom and democracy. It is also strong because we respect and appreciate Israel's commitment to preserve and protect those religious sites considered by all people of the world to be holy.

I am very disturbed over recent events in the Middle East. America's response to Israel must be clear and reflect our total support. What we are witnessing is not, as it is often called, an "outbreak of violence." What we are witnessing is a concerted attack against Israel; and this is occurring on the heels of the Israeli government taking the most conciliatory stance ever toward the Palestinians.

After the Camp David summit, President Clinton correctly blamed Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat for rejecting the compromises that Israel was willing to consider. Since Camp David, Arafat has compounded his rejection of peace proposals with an embrace of violence. The United States must maintain its pressure on Arafat and the Palestinian leadership, and avoid retreating into the moral swamp of "evenhandedness." We must stand with Israel.

I am deeply disappointed in the shameful U.S. abstention on a UN Security Council resolution that our own ambassador called "unbalanced, biased, and really a lousy piece of work."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Jerusalem Post editorial of October 10, 2000 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jerusalem Post News & Feature Service, Oct. 10, 2000]

BETRAYAL AT THE U.N.

(Editorial)

The United States made a grave mistake in failing to veto what Secretary of State Madeleine Albright called a "one-sided" U.N. Security Council resolution condemning Israel. The U.S. abstention was a mistake, despite the three seemingly cogent arguments used to explain it: that a worse resolution was blocked, that Israel was consulted all along, and that "U.S. interests" dictated the move.

The U.N. resolution deplored "the provocation carried out at al-Haram al-Sharif in Jerusalem on 28 September 2000, and the subsequent violence there and at other holy places, as well as in other areas throughout the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, resulting in over 80 Palestinian deaths and many other casualties." The resolution, which passed 14 to 0 with the U.S. abstaining, also condemned "acts of violence, especially the excessive use of force against Palestinians." An innocent observer reading the resolution might reasonably conclude the

Palestinians were quietly minding their own business when, out of the blue, Israeli forces decided to throw seven years of talks out the window and attack their negotiating partners. The opposite is the case.

After weeks of official Palestinian broadcasts encouraging violence and lionizing martyrs, and after attacks against Israelis in which both soldiers and civilians were killed, Yasser Arafat took advantage of Likud leader Ariel Sharon's visit to the Temple Mount to turn the flames on full burner.

In any case, the twisted nature of the resolution is not at issue—U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Richard Holbrooke called it "unbalanced, biased, and really a lousy piece of work." This recognition begs the question, which was leveled at Albright and Holbrooke repeatedly over the weekend: If the resolution was so lousy, why did the U.S. not exercise its right to veto?

Standard answer No. 1—that a worse resolution was blocked—does not wash, because it is a truism. The Arab lobby at the United Nations always asks for the moon, in the hopes of passing a slightly less outrageous version after negotiations. According to Holbrooke, the U.S. would have vetoed an "operational" resolution, but it could oppose what was watered down to "just empty rhetoric." Far from "empty," the Security Council resolution was exactly what Arafat needed: an international judgment saddling the blame for his attack against Israel squarely on Israel's shoulders. Now the international commission of inquiry that Arafat fought for in Paris is redundant. The inquiry is over and the verdict is in: Israel is guilty.

The next line of defense used by Albright and Holbrooke was that Israel was closely consulted and "understood" the U.S. position. That the Israeli government "understood" this failure of American will and judgment is itself unfortunate, but in no way excuses U.S. behavior.

Having taken every "risk for peace" expected by the U.S. and more, Israel is now a victim of U.S. weakness, even betrayal. As a tactical matter, Israel may have had to choose its battles with the U.S., and therefore decided not to more openly resist the U.S. position. But an Israel under siege should not have been forced into giving the U.S. a pass in the Security Council, one of the few arenas where the U.S. has a decisive voice.

Albright argues that "our role in the Middle East is to try to be the negotiator, the mediator, the honest broker." Could Albright mean that the U.S. must be an "honest broker" in the face of a wholesale attack by the party that has rejected their peace proposals on the party that accepted them? An "honest broker" that cannot differentiate between aggressor and victim is not doing the peace process any favors. An "honest broker" role makes sense in the context of negotiations, not when the negotiating track has been unilaterally tossed out the window by one party.

Finally, Albright alludes to America's "larger responsibilities within the whole region" in explaining the U.S. abstention. This is veiled allusion to the risk of riots against American embassies and relations with the Arab world, but again the logic is backwards and dangerous.

A U.S. veto would have signaled to Arafat and the Arab world that this round of blaming the victim is over. Now Arafat, Hizbullah, Saddam Hussein (who just called again for Israel's destruction), and anyone else who wants to jump on the absurd bandwagon that Israel is threatening al-Aksa Mosque can see that Israel's great ally, the United States, is unwilling to come to her defense. This can only be bad for Israel, bad for the United States, and bad for peace.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, we must speak the truth and stand on principle, so that Arafat cannot continue blaming Israel for the completely unjustified attack that he initiated. There is a word for a policy of rewarding violence, and that word is "appeasement."

Appeasement is not just wrong; it also does not work. Events of recent days have led many Israelis to conclude that their government's generosity toward the Palestinians has—far from being reciprocated—been taken as weakness and invited the beating of war drums against Israel throughout the Arab world.

As Israel begins to rethink its course, the United States must not push Israel towards appeasement. We must help Israel find the strength to stand up to aggression and continue the principled fight for justice.

As citizens of a democracy that desperately wants peace, Israelis are as pained as anyone by the heart-wrenching pictures of Palestinian children caught in the crossfire. Israel can be counted on to search its soul as to whether she could have defended herself and claimed fewer Palestinian casualties. The result of such an inquiry, however, will not shift the overarching burden of responsibility from the party that chose to abandon the negotiating table and open a shooting war—Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Natan Sharansky in today's Washington Post appear in the RECORD immediately following my statement.

Now is the time for us to publicly reaffirm our commitment to the freedom-seeking people of Israel. During Israel's time of need, we know that they will make the right choices—take the right actions for peace with freedom. And we will stand with Israel.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 12, 2000]

AFRAID OF THE TRUTH

(By Natan Sharansky)

JERUSALEM.—Nearly 20 years ago, confined to an eight-by-ten cell in a prison on the border of Siberia, I was granted by my Soviet jailers the "privilege" of reading the latest copy of Pravda, official mouthpiece of the Communist regime. Splashed across the front page was a condemnation of Ronald Reagan for having the temerity to call the Soviet Union an "evil empire."

Tapping on walls and talking through toilets, prisoners quickly spread the word of Reagan's "provocation" throughout the prison. The dissidents were ecstatic. Finally, the leader of the free world had spoken the truth—a truth that burned inside the heart of each and every one of us.

For decades, with few exceptions, the moral authority of the Soviet Union had rarely been challenged. Some, particularly those who saw in communism's egalitarian ideals the antidote to all the ills of capitalism and democracy, were simply duped by a totalitarian society that could so easily manipulate the picture it presented to the outside world.

But sadly, most were not blind to the truth—they were just frightened by it. They understood what the Soviet Union represented but, knowing the price of confrontation, preferred to close their eyes to it.

Rationalizing their cowardice with morally comforting words such as "peace" and "co-existence," they pursued the path of appeasement.

Today the nations of the free world also prefer to close their eyes to the truth in the Middle East in general and the Arab-Israeli conflict in particular. While in practice the Arab states do not pose the threat of a belligerent superpower, the West's attitude toward these authoritarian regimes is all too familiar. Some, who see Palestinian stone throwers as David to Israel's Goliath, are again duped by the manipulations of a brutal dictator who sends children to the front lines to achieve through tragedy what he cannot achieve through diplomacy.

But most people are not so easily duped. They simply choose to blindfold themselves rather than confront a discomfiting truth. Instead of pressuring Arab tyrants to free their own peoples from the yoke of oppression, the West prefers to view them as a "stabilizing" force.

When the peace process began, Israel and the West had a remarkable opportunity to use their influence to ensure that the emerging Palestinian society could evolve into a liberal, democratic state. Instead they spent the better part of 10 years subsidizing tyranny.

The goal was to strengthen Yasser Arafat and his PLO, supposedly a force for modernization and compromise. With his 40,000-man armed police force, Arafat was supposed to serve as Israel's proxy in the war on terror, and would do it, as the late prime minister Yitzhak Rabin said, "without a Supreme Court, without human rights organizations and without bleeding-heart liberals."

This policy, support by the West, was not designed to solve a genuine Palestinian human rights problem but to export it.

In the past two weeks we have seen the consequences of this folly. The man who promised at Oslo to renounce the violent struggle against the Jewish state once again uses violence as an instrument of negotiation. His police have turned their guns against the state that armed them, while his kangaroo courts have released dozens of Hamas terrorists drenched with the blood of his "partner" in peace.

Needing an external enemy to justify internal repression, he continues to incite against Israel. With new textbooks depicting a map of Palestine that stretches from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea but does not include a Jewish state, he is educating the next generation of Palestinians that they will soon take up arms in a holy jihad.

In response to all this, the world can summon sufficient courage only to condemn a democratic Israel for defending itself against enemies within and without who seek its destruction. It is assailed for provoking the Palestinians by visiting our people's holiest site, when the real provocation is not our sovereignty over a Temple Mount that is the soul of the Jewish people but our sovereignty, period.

No doubt a government that is prepared to make far-reaching and dangerous concessions will soon be pressed to make more, so that the free states can remain safely behind their blindfolds. The only free state in this vast region to tyranny will be asked to concede more in the name of "peace" and "co-existence" to an Arab world that wants nothing of the sort.

Thirty years ago, Democratic Sen. Henry Jackson of Washington state courageously stood against the bipartisan forces of appeasement and issued a moral challenge to an immoral state. By speaking the same truth a decade later, Republican President Ronald Reagan helped free hundreds of millions of people around the world, and sparked

a democratic flame that continues to engulf and threaten tyrannies. Who will speak the truth today and allow freedom to reach this region where only one nation carries its torch?

The writer, a former Soviet dissident, is a member of the Israeli parliament and formerly served as interior minister in the Barak government.

CURRENT SITUATION IN ISRAEL

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, over the past two weeks, the Middle East has been in a state of grave turmoil and violence. With almost 100 people reported dead, Israel is dangerously close to internal war between the Jews and Palestinians. Even this morning, two Israeli soldiers were brutally murdered in Ramallah in connection with this ongoing violence. Although there are some reports of a decrease in violence, this conflict demonstrates how complex and difficult it will be to have real peace for the people of the Middle East.

Throughout the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and even Arab towns inside Israel proper, Palestinians have taken to the streets. They are demanding Israeli capitulation and withdrawal of Israel troops from Arab regions. Although the Palestinian Authority has claimed that the flashpoint for the violence was a visit to the Temple Mount by Israeli political leader Ariel Sharon, the violence's widespread and intense nature of the violence, along with Palestinian reaction, indicates that the violence may not be a simple and uncoordinated reaction.

Since the initial incident, the violence has rapidly spread with incredible fervor. According to published reports, "The internal riots stunned Israeli police officials by their size and intensity." A simple incident was radically and almost instantaneously transformed into a dire situation that threatens the entire Middle East peace process. Although this outrageous reaction may appear isolated, Mr. Arafat has threatened over the years to cross out the peace accords and unleash a new uprising against Israel. He has often described the peace accords as simply a temporary truce.

Mr. Arafat's response to the recent situation raises many concerns. It appears he has done little to nothing to quell the violence. The Palestinian Authority's official media arm, the Palestinian Broadcasting Corporation, has consistently broadcast incitement against Israel, including a children's program where martyrdom as "suicide warriors" is glorified. Palestinian television is also running a story about an alleged brutal killing of a Palestinian by Jewish settlers. The audience is told that the 40-year-old man's skull was crushed, his bones broken and his body burned by the settlers. Pictures of a charred and mutilated body are being used continually to incite already combative protesters and mourners. Although Israeli officials have stated that the man, Isam Hamad, 36, died in a car crash north of Ramallah and that the Palestinians chose to exploit the

terrible condition of his body, Palestinian officials have refused to investigate the real cause of death and instead some have stated that the killing justifies an "open season on settlers."

Hassan Asfour, a Palestinian cabinet minister, told the Reuters News Service that, "The settlers must now be a target by every Palestinian in order to stop their terrorism and they must be uprooted from our Palestinian occupied lands." These are not the words of a leadership that wants peace.

Mr. President, we must continually remember that Israel is in one of the most dangerous and unstable regions of the world. Since the beginning of the Oslo process in 1993, Israel has lost more than 280 of its citizens to terrorist violence (a portion of the Israeli population comparable to 15,000 Americans) in over 1,000 terrorist attacks. That death toll is worse than in the 15 years prior to Oslo. Rather than eradicate terrorist infrastructure in Palestinian territory, the Palestinian Authority apparently has maintained its revolving door policy in detaining terrorists. Over 20 prominent terrorists have been released since President Clinton's visit to Gaza in December 1998. Israeli reaction to violence must be seen in this context.

During this current situation, President Clinton has failed to stand firm with our long-time friend and ally, Israel. Although I appreciate the President's interest in bringing about peace in the Middle East, his desire to play the role of the "honest broker" is sadly misguided. Until Mr. Arafat begins to demonstrate otherwise, it appears clear that the Palestinian Authority is simply not an "honest player".

Mr. President, it is time to stand with Israel in the effort to find real and lasting peace. We must continue to work with our friends and allies around the world, including moderate Arab countries, to bring the Palestinian Authority into line with appropriate international behavior that will contribute to the process of peace, not to war. I call on Prime Minister Barak and Chairman Arafat to honestly work towards an end to this latest violence and come back to the negotiating table with the goal of reaching a workable and lasting peace.

MIDDLE EAST TRAGEDY

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, there is a tragedy ongoing in the Middle East, and the first thing I want to do is express heartfelt sorrow for the families of those who have lost their lives.

The events of the last two weeks are deeply disturbing, and the clear first step is to find a way to calm the violence. The onus is on Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian Authority to call a cease fire. If the Palestinian leadership and the Palestinian people are in the midst of a quest for a state, and are trying to prove they have the maturity to lead more than a terrorist organization, the moment of truth has come

and gone. What many have long suspected about the Palestinian leadership is being confirmed: They are not committed to peace, they are committed to victory.

Unfortunately, the reaction of the international community to the violence in the Middle East has only emboldened Yasser Arafat. For proof we need look no further than the one-sided, dishonest U.N. Security Council resolution that passed last weekend. The resolution ignores the role of the Palestinians in the violence now taking place. It unfairly blames Israel for sparking the violence, forgetting that it is the right of any person of any religion to visit the Temple Mount. The United States' failure to veto this resolution is an embarrassment—a sell-out of our friends, a sell-out of the peace process.

Arafat insists on an international inquiry into the violence before he will call for its cessation. But is it any wonder that Prime Minister Barak is reluctant to accept such an inquiry when the international community has ranged itself so clearly on one side. Condemn first and ask questions later.

The actions of Arafat and the Palestinian Authority on the question of treatment of holy sites are equally troubling. First, the use of Ariel Sharon's visit to the Temple Mount and the use of that holy site to incite violence: How can we believe any commitment to allow access to all people of all faiths when the Palestinians believe it is their right to sow mayhem after one visit?

Second, the sacking of Joseph's Tomb. Palestinian police stood by as a mob of Palestinians destroyed Joseph's tomb in Nablus—a location from which Israeli forces had retreated in an attempt to calm the situation. They ripped apart Torah scrolls and desecrated a holy place. I have heard it said that the authenticity of the site has been questioned. I can just picture the mob looking for that certificate of authenticity before they went ahead and destroyed a holy book of the Jews.

There is no excuse—no excuse—for the behavior of the Palestinians or their leadership. Prime Minister Barak has offered concessions previously through taboo by most Israelis. Chairman Arafat has responded by demanding yet more and using violence to get it when negotiations failed. He has broken every agreement made in the past months and years, and has released dozens of notorious Hamas and Islamic Jihad terrorists in recent days. Perhaps Israel's intensified reaction following the mob killing of three Israeli soldiers will convince Arafat that he cannot win with violence. But I wonder.

And for the United States, being an honest broker does not necessitate our staying neutral. It should mean embracing a policy of honesty and telling one side when enough is enough. Instead, the Clinton-Gore Administration has shied away from the kind of frank-

ness needed from our nation, and has stood aside in the face of an international political assault on our most important friend in the Middle East.

That lack of resolve is noticed. It has been noticed by those who defy sanctions on Iraq. It has been noticed by the Palestinians. And it was surely noticed by those who attacked the U.S.S. *Cole* and murdered six, maybe more American servicemen. When will this nation show the resolve needed to crush the cowards and criminals who threaten us and our allies?

I hope that the diplomatic efforts underway can lead to a calming of the situation and that the future will see a lasting peace between Israel and the Palestinians. However, for this peace to be truly lasting—and truly be peace—it must come when the parties are ready, on a timetable agreed by them. More important, it can only come when the Palestinians are ready to take upon themselves the mantle of nationhood and abandon their legacy of terrorism. And finally, peace will come when those who stand with the United States know that they have a forthright and loyal ally and those who stand against us fear our resolve.

ALASKAN SLED DOGS

Mr. STEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak about some Good Samaritans.

Recent fish disasters in Alaska have made it extremely difficult for Alaskans along the Yukon River and the surrounding areas of that river.

Dog mushers rely upon protein-rich chum salmon to feed their families, as well as their sled dogs. It takes about 100 chum salmon a year to feed one sled dog.

As a result of the fish disaster, an alarming dilemma has confronted the dog mushers. They watch their sled dogs starve or they shoot them. Now that is a terrible dilemma. Healthy Alaskan sled dogs ought not to lose their lives because of a shortage, but that is the situation that we faced. The alternative to end their misery is not one that a dog musher wants to face. It is totally unacceptable as far as I am concerned. Working with my staff, I have tried to find a solution to this problem.

Villages along the Yukon rely upon sled dogs for the transportation of goods. Use of sled dogs in rural Alaska is equivalent to the use of a vehicle in most of our Nation. Today I am able to announce, thanks to the generosity of Jim von der Heydt, executive vice president of Ralston Purina, 22½ tons of dog food will be donated by that company to Alaska's Native people from Purina's Iowa plant. It is the plant in Clinton, IA.

That food is now going to be shipped to Alaska by Lynden Transport with the assistance from the Totem Ocean Trailer Express, which we call TOTE, and the Alaska Railroad. I am extremely grateful to Jim Jansen of Lynden, Robert McGee of TOTE, and

our former Governor, Bill Sheffield, who is now the head of the Alaska Railroad, for agreeing to deliver this relief to the dog mushers.

The dog food will be distributed to the dog teams by the Alaska Federation of Natives. Julie Kitka, the head of the Alaska Federation of Natives, has agreed to take on this task. I am grateful for her support and cooperation.

Lastly, let me commend James Lee Witt, the head of FEMA, for his personal assistance in this effort.

I think this is good news. I am happy to be here to talk about good Samaritans for a change.

I yield the floor.

TRANSPORTATION RECALL ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY AND DOCUMENTATION ACT

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate took an important and critical step forward to improve our Nation's motor vehicle safety laws by passing H.R. 5164, the Transportation Recall Enhancement Accountability and Documentation (TREAD) Act. The bill is in response to the more than 100 deaths associated with defective Bridgestone/Firestone tires. During the debate, I intended to include a letter from Congressman BLILEY, chairman of the House Commerce Committee clarifying the intent of a provision of the bill relating to the ability of the Department of Transportation to request material from manufacturers. I ask that the letter be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The letter makes it clear that the provisions would not enable manufacturers to conceal or destroy information requested by the Secretary.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, October 11, 2000.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce,
Science, and Transportation, Washington,
DC.

DEAR JOHN: I am writing to clarify the intent of section 3(b) of H.R. 5164, the TREAD Act, as passed by the House last night.

I understand that there are concerns about the Committee's construction of the amendment to section 31066(m)(4)(B) of title 49, United States Code, relating to the Secretary's ability to request information not in possession of the manufacturer. This provision provides, in relevant part, that the Secretary may not "require a manufacturer * * * to maintain or submit records respecting information not in the possession of the manufacturer." This restriction was not intended to provide manufacturers with an easy way to withhold information from the Secretary by destroying or transferring the possession of records; rather, it is intended to ensure that the Secretary does not promulgate requirements that require the manufacturer to submit information not reasonably within its possession or control.

Further, any orchestrated effort to withhold information from the Secretary with the intent to mislead him, whether through