

revenues would not be invested in Treasuries. That is not the case in this bill. In this bill, CBO estimates that approximately \$16 billion currently invested in Treasuries by the Federal Government would be sold and instead invested through an investment trust in private-sector assets. Again, the amount is \$16 billion and they would be free to invest it in other ways. I support that.

But we have to be straight with people. It costs \$16 billion to the Federal Government in the fiscal year 2002 under the accounting rules that apply to every program of the Federal Government. It doesn't cost \$250 million; it costs \$16 billion. The money moves out of Government Treasuries and moves into a railroad investment trust, with the ability under a board, to invest those moneys in higher rate of return assets. I support that basic notion.

But the hard fact is that it costs the Federal Government \$16 billion. It means the fact is the Federal Government will have to borrow \$16 billion more in fiscal year 2002 than it was otherwise going to borrow.

Mr. CARPER. If the Senator will continue to yield, I have two glasses of water here. We will say one is the railroad pension fund as it currently exists, and it is full of U.S. Treasury obligations. There is another glass here and we will pretend it is empty for our purposes. What I think we are talking about doing is taking some of the moneys invested in these Treasury obligations in this one pension fund and, presumably, the railroad retirement fund would have to sell those obligations and then use the money from the sale of those obligations to put in their new pension fund. When they sell those, they are going to sell them to somebody—individuals, funds, banks, corporations. It is difficult for me to understand how that transaction I have just described should cost the Treasury \$16 billion. A lot of us are struggling on this one.

Mr. CONRAD. Let me say it as simply as I can state it. The reason it costs the U.S. Treasury \$16 billion is because the money moves out of U.S. Government Treasuries and moves over to the control of a board that is run by private sector representatives to be invested in non-governmental assets. That is about as easy as I can make it.

The fact is that the Federal Government is going to have to borrow, as a result of that transaction, not \$250 million more, but \$16 billion more in 2002. For us to have our colleagues say "but it really doesn't mean that" is not accurate and it is not factual. To say to our colleagues, by direct scorekeeping, by legislative fiat, that it won't cost \$16 billion, that it won't mean the Federal Government has to borrow \$16 billion more in 2002, that it is only going to cost \$250 million more, is just not the truth. I don't know how more direct I can be.

Mr. CARPER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following the statement of Senator INHOFE, Senator STABENOW be recognized for up to 15 minutes, and the time be charged against the 30 hours.

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

Under the previous order, the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 40 minutes.

#### AN ABSOLUTE VICTORY

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Chair. First, I say to the leadership how much I appreciate the fact you are allowing me to bust in on a different subject. I think it is very significant at this time because something happened yesterday that I think makes it worthwhile to talk about this and maybe to do so at some length.

Willie George was right. Lest some of you do not know who Willie George is, some people consider Willie George a preacher, but he is also a very able historian. As I listened to him and added some perspectives on what the attack on America was all about, I realized the inside-Washington mentality is sometimes and often flawed and that mentality that comes from Oklahoma reflects more of real America.

The Apostle Paul gave us our marching orders in Ephesians 6, verses 10, 11, and 12. He said:

Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the rulers of this darkness—

About which we are talking—against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in high places.

Make no mistake about it. This war is first and foremost a spiritual war. It is not a political war. It has never been a political war. It is not about politics. It is a spiritual war. It has its roots in spiritual conflict. It is a war to be fought to destroy the very fabric of our society and the very things for which we stand.

Many of the wars in history have been fought because of human desire or greed, to have that of a neighboring country—to have mineral deposits, to have what some other country has. But this war is of a different nature.

It is not just simple greed that motivated these people to kill. This war has been launched against the United States of America. It is a spiritual attack. It is an attack that was created in the mind and heart of Satan. It is a demonically inspired attack. It is not just the selfish ambitions of an egotistical leader. It is not just someone wanting to hold on to power. This is nothing more than a satanically inspired attack against America created by demonic powers through the perverted minds of terrorists.

One may ask: What is it about our Nation that makes them hate us so

much? Three things. First, in our country, we have the freedom and the right to choose the kind of worship we want. I am a born-again Christian. I have accepted Jesus Christ as my virtual Lord and Savior. I believe it is through Him that we will reach the Father. I believe every American has a right to choose whether or not to believe that.

Some people have the notion that if you are a Christian who believes in the Bible, you are totally intolerant; you do not allow other people to have a choice. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In nations of this world where Christianity is the dominant way of worship, we also find Jewish synagogues, Islamic mosques; we find freedom of worship. But we will not find the same kinds of freedom in the militant Islamic nations of this world. They do not allow Christian churches and Jewish synagogues to operate freely. They do not allow people the freedom of choice. In Sudan, they sell Christians into slavery.

So one of the reasons America is hated so much is that we have allowed people through the years to choose what they are going to do. It is choice.

The second reason we are hated is that we have opened the door for people to achieve their God-given place on this Earth. We have not restrained people. We have allowed people freedom of expression, the freedom to pursue dreams, the freedom to pursue goals. This is not true around the world.

Freedom did not come cheap. One of my memories that I consider an advantage for me and that I hold over many others is when I first started my education in first grade, it was in a country schoolhouse. Not many people here know what they are. They are eight grades in one room out in the country. It was called Hazel Dell. In fact, I remember three brothers who rode on a workhorse to school every morning.

We had a different sense of history at that time. I remember so well reading and learning history as a very young child in that environment. Keep in mind, that was the environment at the beginning of World War II when we had a sense of patriotism that is comparable to today.

I remember my teacher said the Pilgrims did not come to this country for adventure; they did not come for excitement; they were not adventurous people. They came to this country to escape tyranny, to pursue freedoms—freedom of religion and economic freedom. Half of them died the first year. They knew it was going to happen. It was worth it to get these freedoms.

They had freedom of religion and economic freedom. Each was given a piece of property to do with as they wanted, and he could work his land and reap the benefits of this property. And he prospered mightily, so mightily that in one of his letters back to England, Smith said: Now one farmer can grow 10 times as much corn as the previous farmers could.

They were prospering so mightily. I normally tell young people when you have a good thing going, quite often someone is going to try to take it away from you. That is exactly what happened. The British came across the sea. They wanted in on this prosperity, and they started imposing laws, rules, and regulations so that the trapper on the frontier could not make a hat of the pelt he caught. He had to sell it to British merchants at British prices to be shipped to Great Britain on English ships to be made into a hat by English laborers to be shipped back and sold to the trapper, who caught it in the first place, at English prices. Guess what happened. God bless him, the trapper kept right on making his own hats.

That was treason in those days. So they sent this great army to this country, the greatest army in the world at that time, to stop these things from occurring. They started marching up toward Lexington and Concord.

I remember so well sitting in that little one-room schoolhouse and having this vision of what it was really like. Farmers and trappers and frontiersmen were up there. They were not well educated, but they were ready to stop this resistance, the greatest army on the face of this Earth. Most of them could not read or write. As the saying goes, they did not know their right foot from their left foot, so they would put a tuft of hay in one boot and a tuft of straw in the other boot and marched to the cadence of "hay foot, straw foot."

While they were not greatly educated, they knew freedom, and they were going to keep that freedom. As they stood there knowing they were signing their death warrants, those soldiers, listening to the thundering cadence of the largest army in the world going towards Lexington and Concord, waited until they saw the whites of their eyes and fired the shot heard round the world, not knowing at that very moment a tall redhead stood in the House of Burgess and made a speech for them, made a speech for us today:

They tell us, sir, that we are weak; unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it be the next week, or the next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? Sir, we are not weak if we make proper use of those means which the God of nature hath placed in our power. The millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us.

This is critical.

Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles with us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. . . . Gentlemen may cry, Peace, Peace—but there is

no peace. . . . Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. . . . but as for me, give me liberty or give me death.

He got both.

These freedoms are not found in every nation. America is a great nation because we have magnified the rights of individuals, protected the rights of individuals in our culture. We are careful to allow people to have expression in our society, and we are hated for it.

The third reason we are hated is because we are a nation of laws. We are a people ruled by laws. Lest one thinks that is common, do a careful study of the history of the world. Most of the world's countries do not have a 200-year-old Constitution. They are ruled by dictators. They are ruled by the whims of those leaders or by political parties as they change. The rule of law is what makes civilization possible. The rule of law is what makes an orderly society work. If there is no rule of law, the strongest, toughest bully is the one who runs the country.

America is a country of law and order because of the philosophies of the people who founded this Nation. They believed in the rule of law because of what they knew from the Bible. Our Constitution and the constitutions of most of the governments in the world are similar and are indeed based upon the Ten Commandments. Our fathers knew that the Ten Commandments and the laws of God were a basis for all laws. They understood the concepts of absolute right and absolute wrong. There were not many who believed in what we today call situational ethics where things change according to our needs. They believed in absolute right and absolute wrong. America was founded on those principles. That is a reason we are hated so much as a nation. We are hated because of the fact we are a beacon of light, a beacon of freedom all the way around the world. We know contemporarily what this means.

One of the greatest speeches of all times was "A Rendezvous with Destiny" made by Ronald Reagan before he was into politics. He talked about the atrocities committed in Castro's Communist Cuba and about the little boat that escaped and washed up on the southern shores of Florida. When the boat came up, a man who escaped talked about what was happening in Communist Cuba. When he was through talking about the atrocities, a woman said: I guess we in this country don't know how lucky we are.

He said: No, no. It is how lucky we are because we had a place to escape to.

What he was saying was, we were that beacon of freedom. Many, including the Senator sitting to my right, will remember 15 years ago when the Communists, then the Soviet Union, were trying to get a foothold in Nicaragua and the freedom fighters were

fighting for their freedom. I remember going down there, watching them fight against impossible odds. There is no way they could win, by normal concept. They were fighting.

There was a hospital tent in Nicaragua. It was half the size of this Senate Chamber. I remember so well, this is where the freedom fighters from Nicaragua would come in and get taken care of medically. There was an operating table in the middle of this giant tent. All they did was amputations. The problem was, of course, the mines. They had the beds of all the patients around the perimeter of this hospital tent.

I went around and talked to the individuals. The average age of the fighter in Nicaragua at that time was 19 years old. All the older ones were either maimed or killed. I used to be a pilot in Mexico and I communicate well.

I asked each one: Why is it you are doing this against impossible odds? Why are you doing this? Why are you fighting?

I got to the last bed. Her name was Maria Gonzalez. I asked her that question. She was 18 years old, weighed 90 pounds, and this was her third trip back to the hospital tent. They amputated her leg that morning. Blood was coming through the bandages. That little girl said: We are fighting because they have taken everything we have, our farms, our houses, all that we have. Surely you in the United States don't have to ask that question because you had to fight for your freedoms against the same odds that we are doing today. And with God's help, we will win, as you, with God's help, won.

That little girl didn't know whether our Revolution was fought 25 years ago or 150 years ago. But she was brilliant in her knowledge of freedom. We were the beacon of hope. We were the beacon of freedom.

Do you know the outcome? We are hated because we are the beacon of freedom for the rest of the world. We are hated because in America we have freedom of choice and freedom of worship, we have freedom of expression, and we are a nation of laws.

Now, why was America attacked on September 11? Why did they single us out? America was attacked because of our system of values. It is a spiritual war. It is not just because we are Israel's best friend. We are Israel's best friend in the world because of the character we have as a nation. We came under attack and we are Israel's best friend.

One of the reasons God has blessed our country is because we have honored his people. Genesis 12:3 says: I will bless them who bless you. I will curse him who curses you. This is God talking about Israel.

Madam President, on the table where you sit is a Bible. You can look it up. He said: I will bless them who bless you. I will curse him who curses you. God is talking about Israel.

One of the reasons America has been blessed abundantly over the years is

because we as a society have opened our doors to Jewish people. Jewish people have been blessed in the United States of America. When the tiny State of Israel was founded in 1948, we stood in the beginning with Israel. We were the first country to stand up for Israel. Because we took a stand, other nations in the world followed after very quickly. The United States made it possible for there to be an Israel. We stood with Israel again and again and again in its fight to survive.

Make no mistake. It is not just because of our support of Israel. It is what we believe as a nation that caused us to come under attack.

Recently in the city of Durban, South Africa, there was a conference called the World Conference on Racism. African Christians are being slaughtered by the thousands today by Islamic fundamentalists in Sudan. You didn't hear a lot about that in the reports of this conference; you didn't hear about racism in South Africa. I have a mission in west Africa and have become pretty familiar with some of the atrocities and the ethnic cleansing going on in the world today.

I can remember standing at this podium when we were under a different President. He was trying to get us to send troops into Kosovo, and used in his arguments in Kosovo all the ethnic cleansing and the difficulty going on. I said at that time, for every one person who is killed, who is ethnically cleansed in Kosovo, on any given day there are over 100 who are killed and ethnically cleansed in west Africa alone. Do we hear about that? No, we didn't hear about that at the Conference on Racism. What you heard was how the nations of the world came together and decided all the attention should be focused on the tensions in the Middle East. They were appeasing the terrorists.

Israel is under attack in the Middle East because it is the only true democracy that exists in the Middle East. There are more than 20 Arab nations in north Africa and in the Middle East. Virtually every Arab nation is run by either a king or a dictator. Israel is the only true democracy that exists in the Middle East.

Madam President, did you know if you are an Arab and have an Israeli citizenship, you can vote in the country of Israel? Did you know the Arabs have parties in the Knesset, the Congress of Israel? Israel is the only true democracy that exists in the Middle East. It has a Western form of government based on the laws we see in the Bible. The laws of God that our country is based on are the same laws from which Israel gets its law. It represents the laws of God. That is the reason it is under attack.

We ought to be Israel's best friend. If we cannot stand for Israel today, can we ever again be counted on as a beacon of hope, a beacon of freedom for oppressed nations? You may ask what does this have to do with the attack on

America? We are under attack because of our character and because we have supported the tiny little nation in the Middle East. That is why we are under attack. If we don't stand for this tiny country today, when do we start standing for tiny little countries in the world that are right?

Yasser Arafat and others do not recognize Israel's right to the land. They don't recognize Israel's right to exist.

I will discuss seven things I consider to be indisputable and incontrovertible evidence and grounds to Israel's right to the land. You have heard this before, but it has never been in the RECORD. Most know this. We are going to be hit by skeptics who are going to say we are being attacked all because of our support for Israel, and if we get out of the Middle East all of the problems will go away. That is not so. It is not true. If we withdraw, it will come to our door and will not go away. I have some observations to make about that in just a minute, but first the seven reasons that Israel has the right to the land.

Israel has a right to the land because of all the archeological evidence. This is reason No. 1. It all supports it. Every time there is a dig in Israel, it does nothing but support the fact that Israelis have had a presence there for 3,000 years. They have been there for a long time. The coins, the cities, the pottery, the culture—there are other people, groups that are there, but there is no mistaking the fact that Israelis have been present in that land for 3,000 years.

It predates any claims that other peoples in the regions may have. The ancient Philistines are extinct. Many other ancient peoples are extinct. They do not have the unbroken line to this date that the Israelis have.

Even the Egyptians of today are not racial Egyptians of 2,000, 3,000 years ago. They are primarily an Arab people. The land is called Egypt but they are not the same racial and ethnic stock as the old Egyptians of the ancient world. The Israelis are in fact descended from the original Israelites. The first proof, then, is the archeology.

The second proof of Israel's right to the land is the historic right. History supports it totally and completely. We know there has been an Israel up until the time of the Roman Empire. The Romans conquered the land. Israel had no homeland, although Jews were allowed to live there. They were driven from the land in two dispersions: One was in 70 A.D. and the other was in 135 A.D. But there was always a Jewish presence in the land.

The Turks, who took over about 700 years ago and ruled the land up until about World War I, had control. Then the land was conquered by the British. The Turks entered World War I on the side of Germany. The British knew they had to do something to punish Turkey and also to break up that empire that was going to be a part of the whole effort of Germany in World War I, so the British sent troops against the Turks in the Holy Land.

One of the generals who was leading the British armies was a man named Allenby. Allenby was a Bible-believing Christian. He carried a Bible with him everywhere he went and he knew the significance of Jerusalem.

The night before the attack against Jerusalem to drive out the Turks, Allenby prayed that God would allow him to capture the city without doing damage to the holy places.

That day, Allenby sent World War I biplanes over the city of Jerusalem to do a reconnaissance mission. You have to understand that the Turks had at that time never seen an airplane. So there they were, flying around. They looked in the sky and saw these fascinating inventions and did not know what they were and they were terrified by them. Then they were told that they were being opposed by a man named Allenby the next day, which in their language means "man sent from God" or "prophet from God." They dared not fight against a prophet from God, so the next morning when Allenby went to take Jerusalem, he went in and captured it without firing a single shot.

The British Government was grateful to Jewish people around the world and particularly to one Jewish chemist who helped them with the manufacture of niter. Niter is an ingredient which goes into nitroglycerin, necessary to the war effort. They were getting dangerously low of niter in England at that time, so the chemist, who was called Weitzman, discovered a way to make it from materials that existed in England.

It was coming from the new world over there, the niter was. But the German U-boats were shooting them down so it was all at the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean. When Weitzman discovered a way to make it from materials that existed in England, it saved the British war effort. Out of gratitude to this Jew and out of gratitude to Jewish bankers and financiers and others who lent financial support, England said we are going to set aside a homeland in the Middle East for the Jewish people. And that is history.

The homeland that Britain said it would set aside consisted of all of what is now Israel and all of what was then the nation of Jordan, the whole thing. That was what Britain promised to give the Jews in 1917.

In the beginning, there was some Arab support for this. There was not a huge Arab population in the land at that time and there is a reason for that. The land was not able to sustain a large population of people. It just didn't have the development it needed to handle all those people, and the land wasn't really wanted by anybody.

I want you to listen to Mark Twain. Have you ever read "Huckleberry Finn" or "Tom Sawyer"? Mark Twain—Samuel Clemens—took a tour of Palestine in 1867. This is how he described it. We are talking about Israel. He said:

A desolate country whose soil is rich enough but is given over wholly to weeds. A

silent, mournful expanse. We never saw a human being on the whole route. There was hardly a tree or a shrub anywhere. Even the olive and the cactus, those fast friends of a worthless soil, had almost deserted the country.

Where was this great Palestinian nation? It didn't exist. It wasn't there. The Palestinians weren't there. Palestine was a region named by the Romans, but at the time it was under the control of Turkey and there was no large mass of people there because the land would not support them.

This is the report of the Palestinian Royal Commission, created by the British. It quotes an account of the conditions on the coastal plain, along the Mediterranean Sea in 1913. This is the Palestinian Royal Commission. They said:

The road leading from Gaza to the north was only a summer track, suitable for transport by camels or carts. No orange groves, orchards or vineyards were to be seen until one reached the Yavnev village. Houses were mud. Schools did not exist. The western part toward the sea was almost a desert. The villages in this area were few and thinly populated. Many villages were deserted by their inhabitants.

The French author Voltaire described Palestine as:

A hopeless, dreary place.

In short, under the Turks the land suffered from neglect and low population, and that is a historical fact. The nation became populated with both Jews and Arabs because the land came to prosper when Jews came back and began to reclaim it. Historically, they began to reclaim it. If there had never been any archeological evidence at all to support the rights of the Israelis to the territory, it is also important to recognize that other nations in the area have no longstanding claim to the country either.

Madam President, did you know that Saudi Arabia was not created until 1913? Lebanon until 1920? Iraq didn't exist as a nation until 1932; Syria until 1941; the borders of Jordan were established in 1946, and Kuwait in 1961.

Any of these nations who would say that Israel is only a recent arrival would have to deny their own rights as recent arrivals as well. They did not exist as countries. They were all under the control of the Turks. So, historically, Israel gained its independence in 1948.

The third reason I believe the land belongs to Israel is because of the practical value of the Israelis being there. Israel today is a modern marvel of agriculture. Israel is able to bring more food out of a desert environment than any other country in the world. The Arab nations ought to make Israel their friend and import technology from Israel that would allow all the Middle East, not just Israel, to become an exporter of food. Israel has unarguable success in its agriculture.

The fourth reason I believe Israel has the right to the land is on the grounds of humanitarian concern. You see, there were 6 million Jews slaughtered

in Europe in World War II. The persecution against the Jews has been very strong in Russia since the advent of communism. It was against them even before then under the Czars.

These people have a right to their homeland. If we are not going to allow them a homeland in the Middle East, then where? What other nation on Earth is going to cede territory? To give up land?

They are not asking for a great deal. You know the whole nation of Israel would fit into my State of Oklahoma seven times. So on humanitarian grounds alone, Israel ought to have the land.

The fifth reason Israel ought to have the land is because she is a strategic ally to the United States. Whether we realize it or not, Israel is a detriment, an impediment to certain groups hostile to democracies and hostile to those things that we believe in, hostile to the very things that make us the greatest nation in the history of the world. They have kept them from taking complete control of the Middle East. If it were not for Israel, they would overrun the region. They are our strategic ally.

Madam President, it is good to know that we have a friend in the Middle East that we can count on. They vote with us in the United Nations more than England. They vote with us more than Canada, more than France, more than Germany, more than any other country in the world.

The sixth reason is that Israel is a roadblock to terrorism. The war we are now facing is not against a sovereign nation. It is a group of terrorists who are very fluid, moving from one country to another. They are almost invisible. That is who we are fighting against. We need every ally we can get. If we do not stop terrorism in the Middle East, it will be on our shores. We have said this and said this and said this.

One of the reasons I believe the spiritual door was opened for an attack against the United States of America is because the policy of our Government has been to ask Israelis and demand with pressure that they not retaliate in a significant way against the terrorist strikes that have been launched against them, the most recent one just 2 days ago.

Since its independence in 1948, Israel has fought four wars: the war in 1948-1949; the war in 1956, the Sinai campaign; the Six-Day War in 1967; and in 1973 the Yom Kippur War, the holiest day of the year, with Egypt and Syria.

You have to understand that in all four cases, Israel was attacked. Some people may argue that wasn't true because they went in first in the war of 1956. But they knew at that time that Egypt was building a huge military to become the aggressor. Israel, in fact, was not the aggressor and has not been the aggressor in any of the four wars.

Also, they won all four wars against impossible odds. They are great warriors. They consider a level playing field being outnumbered two to one.

There were 39 Scud missiles that landed on Israeli soil during the gulf war. Our President asked Israel not to respond. In order to have the Arab nations on board, we asked Israel not even to participate in the war. They showed tremendous restraint and did not. And now we've asked them to stand back and not do anything over these last several attacks.

We have criticized them. We have criticized them in our media. Local people in television and radio offer criticisms of Israel not knowing the true issues. We need to be informed.

I was so thrilled when I heard a reporter pose a question to our Secretary of State, Colin Powell. He said, "Mr. Powell, the United States has advocated a policy of restraint in the Middle East. We have discouraged Israel from retaliation again and again, and again because we've said it leads to continued escalation—that it escalates the violence." He said, "Are we going to follow that preaching ourselves?"

Mr. Powell indicated that we would strike back. In other words, we can tell Israel not to do it, but when it hits us we are going to do something. That is one of the reasons I believe the door was opened. Because we have held back our tiny little friend. We have not allowed them to go to the heart of the problem. The heart of the problem—that is where we are going now.

But all that changed yesterday when the Israelis went into the Gaza with gunships and into the West Bank with F-16s. With the exception of last May, the Israelis had not used F-16s since the 1967 7-Day War. And I am so proud of them because we have to stop terrorism. It is not going to go away. If Israel were driven into the sea tomorrow, if every Jew in the Middle East were killed, terrorism would not end. You know that in your heart. Terrorism would continue.

It is not just a matter of Israel in the Middle East. It is the heart of the very people who are perpetrating this stuff. Should they be successful in overrunning Israel—they won't be—but should they be, it would not be enough. They will never be satisfied.

No. 7, I believe very strongly that we ought to support Israel; that it has a right to the land. This is the most important reason: Because God said so. As I said a minute ago, look it up in the book of Genesis.

In Genesis 13:14-17, the Bible says:

The Lord said to Abram, "Lift up now your eyes, and look from the place where you are northward, and southward, and eastward and westward: for all the land which you see, to you will I give it, and to your seed forever. . . . Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it to thee."

That is God talking.

The Bible says that Abram removed his tent, and came and dwelt in the plain of Mamre, which is in Hebron, and built there an altar before the Lord. Hebron is in the West Bank. It is at this place where God appeared to

Abram and said, "I am giving you this land,"—the West Bank.

This is not a political battle at all. It is a contest over whether or not the word of God is true. The seven reasons here, I am convinced, clearly establish that Israel has a right to the land.

Eight years ago on the lawn of the White House, Yitzhak Rabin shook hands with PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat. It was a historic occasion. It was a tragic occasion.

At that time, the official policy of the Government of Israel began to be, "Let us appease the terrorists. Let us begin to trade the land for peace." This process has continued unabated up until last year. Here in our own Nation, at Camp David, in the summer of 2000, then Prime Minister of Israel, Ehud Barak, offered the most generous concessions to Yasser Arafat that had ever been laid on the table.

He offered him more than 90 percent of all the West Bank territory; sovereign control of it. There were some parts he did not want to offer, but in exchange for that he said he would give up land in Israel proper that the PLO was not asking for.

And he also did the unthinkable. He even spoke of dividing Jerusalem and allowing the Palestinians to have their capital there in the East. Yasser Arafat stormed out of the meeting.

Why did he storm out of the meeting? Everything he has said he has wanted all of these years was put into his hand. Why did he storm out of the meeting?

A couple of months later, there began to be riots, terrorism. The riots began when, now Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, went to the Temple Mount. And this was used as the thing that lit the fire and that caused the explosion.

Did you know that Sharon did not go unannounced and that he contacted the Islamic authorities before he went and secured their permission and had permission to be there? It was no surprise. The response was very carefully calculated. They knew the world would not pay attention to the details.

They would portray this in the Arab world as an attack upon the holy mosque. They would portray it as an attack upon that mosque and use it as an excuse to riot. Over the last eight years, during this time of the peace process, where the Israeli public has pressured its leaders to give up land for peace because they're tired of fighting, there has been increased terror.

In fact, it has been greater in the last eight years than any other time in Israel's history. Showing restraint and giving in has not produced any kind of peace. It is so much so, that today the leftist peace movement in Israel does not exist because the people feel they were deceived.

They did offer a hand of peace, and it was not taken. That is why the politics of Israel have changed drastically over the past 12 months. The Israelis have come to see that, "No matter what we do, these people do not want to deal

with us . . . They want to destroy us." that is why even yet today the stationery of the PLO still has upon it the map of the entire state of Israel, not just the tiny little part they call the West Bank that they want. They want it all.

The unwavering loyalty we have received from our only consistent friend in the Middle East has got to be respected and appreciated by us. No longer should foreign policy in the Middle East be one of appeasement. As Hiram Mann said, "No man survives when freedom fails. The best men rot in filthy jails and those who cried 'appease, appease' are hanged by those they tried to please."

Islamic fundamentalist terrorism has now come to America. We have to use all of our friends, all of our assets, and all of our resources to defeat the satanic evil.

When Patrick Henry said, "We will not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who reigns over the destiny of nations who will raise up friends who will fight our battles with us," he was talking about all our friends, including Israel. And that is what is happening, as of yesterday and I thank God for that. Israel is now in the battle by our side.

That is what is happening. As of yesterday, Israel is now in the battle by our side, and I thank God for that. It is time for our policy of appeasement in the Middle East and appeasement to the terrorists to be over. With our partners, our victory must and will be absolute victory.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I was to speak next, but I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont be given 3 minutes and then I have the opportunity to address the Senate after that.

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

The Senator from Vermont.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

Mr. JEFFORDS. Madam President, as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, which is the lead authorizing committee for many of the programs authorized in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, I would like to comment on the pending FY 2002 transportation appropriations conference report.

Overall, this is an excellent bill and I intend to vote for it. However, there are a few provisions in the highway portion of this legislation that concern me. TEA-21 represented a carefully negotiated compromise between many different points of view, numerous committees, and the entire House and Senate. One key provision of this com-

promise legislation was Revenue Aligned Budget Authority—RABA—which ensured that obligations from the Highway Trust Fund would equal revenues into the fund, called TEA-21. TEA-21 determined a carefully negotiated breakdown between the share of RABA funds that would flow to the States through the apportionment formulas and the share that would be competitively distributed through the allocated programs.

Unfortunately, the conference report makes significant changes to the authorization for RABA funding. As it has done in each of the past 2 years, the conference report ignores the authorized distribution of funds for allocated programs under RABA. However, this time, rather than giving the money back to the States through the formulas, this legislation earmarks it for special projects. In addition, the conference report earmarks nearly \$500 million that was supposed to be distributed to States through the apportionment formulas. As a result, some States will lose significant amounts of highway funding. In essence, I am very concerned that the appropriators are rewriting the apportionment formulas that were so carefully negotiated in TEA-21.

I do not mean to begrudge the appropriators their prerogative to earmark funding for specific projects. In fact, I am very pleased that some of the funding is set aside for Vermont. However, at some point we do have to draw the line on earmarking when it threatens the very fabric of a carefully negotiated authorization. Unfortunately, this year we may have finally crossed that line.

I look forward to working with the appropriators next year and throughout the reauthorization process to make sure we do a better job of maintaining the integrity of TEA-21 while providing the appropriators flexibility within the guidelines set forth in that law. TEA-21 is a delicately balanced piece of legislation and we must be careful not to upset that balance.

I yield back any time I have.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

#### PARTISAN ATTACKS ON THE MAJORITY LEADER

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to express great concern about recent events and comments that have been made in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives that I believe are not in keeping with the sense of cooperation and bipartisanship that we have seen since September 11.

I remember, after the horrible attacks that we all grieved about and have focused on, on that day of September 11 we joined together on the Capitol steps, and one of our colleagues spontaneously started singing "God Bless America," and we all joined in.