

A full reduction of the 27 percent rate to 25 percent is much more stimulative than a reduction that is deferred to 2007, as called for under the Democrat plan.

In closing, let me say who really loses when the Senate loses its right to vote on the White House-Centrist stimulus package. Why? Because it would pass. We have a majority of Senators who support this package.

The Senate Democrat Leadership will not allow an up or down vote on our bipartisan White House-Centrist stimulus package. Why? Because it would pass. We have a majority of Senators who support this package.

Instead, the Senate Democrat Leadership has created a "make-believe boogey-man" over the issue of how health care benefits should be delivered to unemployed. But the majority of this Senate does not agree with them.

But voting on this issue and helping the economy recover is not really what is on their minds. It is not their political objective.

The Senate Democratic leadership is playing political brinkmanship, hoping that the American public buys into their excuses for inaction.

The Senate Democratic Leadership keeps their fingers crossed, hoping that our economic difficulties will last until next fall so they can blame it on the President in their campaign ads.

But the blame doesn't go to the President. He has bent over backwards to accommodate their demands. And it still is not enough. The Senate Democratic leadership would rather move the goal post than agree to a solution.

This is not what we were elected by to do. This is not in service of our country. It is in no one's best interest.

We are at war. Our economy is in crisis. And the only impediment to recovery is the refusal of the Senate Democratic leadership to allow this Senate to pass this economic stimulus package. A majority of our members will vote for this bill.

I hope the Senate leadership hears the pleas of the American people and stops blocking this bill through procedural technicalities. The Senate should be allowed to do its job.

#### EXHIBIT 1

*Median income for 4-person families, by state,  
2001*

United States .....	\$62,098
Connecticut .....	78,170
New Jersey .....	78,088
Maryland .....	77,447
Massachusetts .....	74,220
Alaska .....	72,775
Minnesota .....	69,031
Hawaii .....	68,746
Illinois .....	68,698
New Hampshire .....	68,211
Delaware .....	67,899
Michigan .....	67,778
Rhode Island .....	66,895
Virginia .....	66,624
Wisconsin .....	65,675
California .....	65,327
Colorado .....	65,079

*Median income for 4-person families, by state,  
2001—Continued*

Washington .....	64,828
District of Columbia .....	64,480
EXHIBIT 2	
New York .....	61,864
Pennsylvania .....	61,648
Nevada .....	61,579
Indiana .....	60,585
Iowa .....	60,125
Georgia .....	59,835
Vermont .....	59,750
Maine .....	59,567
Utah .....	59,272
Kansas .....	59,214
Missouri .....	58,674
Ohio .....	58,222
North Carolina .....	58,096
South Carolina .....	57,954
Nebraska .....	57,659
Wyoming .....	57,588
Florida .....	57,540
Oregon .....	55,812
Texas .....	55,172
Arizona .....	54,913
Alabama .....	54,255
Oklahoma .....	54,106
South Dakota .....	54,090
Kentucky .....	54,028
Tennessee .....	53,835
North Dakota .....	52,802
Montana .....	52,765
Louisiana .....	51,191
Mississippi .....	49,606
Idaho .....	49,387
Arkansas .....	48,318
West Virginia .....	46,798
New Mexico .....	46,534

Source: Census (inflated from 1999 date by GDP deflator).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

#### TO EXTEND THE AVAILABILITY OF UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE IN THE CASE OF THE TERRORIST ATTACKS ON SEPTEMBER 11

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 274, S. 1622.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1622) to extend the period of availability of unemployment assistance under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act in the case of victims of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I alert the Senator from New York and the Senator from Virginia; we can get this unanimous consent if they save their speeches for much later.

I ask unanimous consent the bill be read the third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1622) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1622

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

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.

Notwithstanding section 410(a) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5177(a)), in the case of any individual eligible to receive unemployment assistance under section 410(a) of that Act as a result of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the President shall make such assistance available for 52 weeks after the major disaster is declared.

#### TERRORIST VICTIMS' COURTROOM ACCESS ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Judiciary Committee be discharged of further consideration of S. 1858, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1858) to permit closed circuit televising of the criminal trial of Zacarias Moussaoui for the victims of September 11th.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2691

Mr. REID. I ask consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the Allen amendment that is at the desk, the amendment be agreed to, the bill be read the third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. ALLEN, proposes an amendment numbered 2691.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify the requirements of the trial court)

On page 2, line 5, strike "including" and insert "in".

On page 2, line 6, after "San Francisco," insert: "and such other locations the trial court determines are reasonably necessary."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the various requests of the Senator from Nevada?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2691) was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1858), as amended, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1858

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Terrorist Victims' Courtroom Access Act".

#### SEC. 2. TELEVISIONING OF THE TRIAL OF ZACARIAS MOUSSAOUI FOR THE VICTIMS OF SEPTEMBER 11TH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to the contrary, in order to permit victims of crimes associated with the terrorist acts of September 11, 2001 to watch criminal trial proceedings in the criminal case against Zacarias Moussaoui, the trial

court in that case shall order closed circuit televising of the proceedings to convenient locations, in Northern Virginia, Los Angeles, New York City, Boston, Newark, and San Francisco, and such other locations the trial court determines are reasonably necessary, for viewing by those victims the court determines have a compelling interest in doing so and are otherwise unable to do so by reason of inconvenience and expense of traveling to the location of the trial.

(b) PROCEDURES.—Except as provided in subsection (a), the terms and restrictions of section 235 of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 10608) shall apply to the televising of court proceedings under this section.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the bill (H.R. 2506) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2506), making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report can be found in the House proceedings of December 19, 2001.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, with American troops on the ground in Afghanistan, with an uneasy coalition of nations confronting an unprecedented war on terrorism, and with the possibility of all-out war looming over the Israelis and the Palestinians, the Foreign Operations Appropriations conference report before us today comes at a pivotal moment in our nation's history. Given the volatility of the situation in the Middle East in the midst of America's war on terrorism, it is vital that Congress and the Administration present a united foreign policy front to the rest of the world. For that reason, I will vote for the FY 2002 Foreign Operations conference report, I do so reluctantly and with reservation—and I do not often vote for Foreign Operations appropriations bills.

I believe it is time—I believe it is past time—to rethink our foreign aid policy and how relates to our national security priorities. September 11 was a wake up call on many fronts. As a result of the attack on America, we have made sweeping changes in our concept of national security. We have learned that national security also means

homeland defense. We have learned that airplanes can be bombs and that letters in the mail can be lethal. We have learned that we must change our definition of defense to encompass defending our domestic infrastructure as well as defending against ballistic missile threats.

These changes reflect the realization that the September 11 terrorist attacks on U.S. soil may not be an isolated incident. At this moment, there may be people planning other terrorist acts against our homeland. We have already experienced three terrorism alerts in the U.S. since September 11. Almost daily, we hear grim predictions of what the future may bring. We are living in an age of global instability, disenfranchised and desperate peoples, and widespread proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The volatility of the current world situation is without precedent.

And yet, in many ways, the major instrument of our foreign policy—the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act—reflects a distressing attitude of business-as-usual. I do not fault the authors of this bill. Senator LEAHY and Senator MCCONNELL have done an excellent job in balancing the priorities of the Administration with the concerns of Congress and the needs of our allies throughout the world. They have done so with care and skill, and they are to be commended for their work.

No, the fault, I believe, lies with our inability as a nation to relinquish long held conventional wisdom about foreign aid and recognize that the changing global environment requires a re-vamping of our foreign policy. We must move away from using dollars to symbolize the strength of our relations with other countries, and instead focus our energies—and our resources on promoting a new understanding of foreign policy that complements and enhances our global war on terrorism.

Nowhere is this more true than in the Middle East, where renewed violence and antipathy have brought Israel and the Palestinian Authority to the brink of open warfare. Since September 29, 2000, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, fueled by generations of hatred, has claimed nearly 1,000 lives. For the past 15 months, the unending cycle of violence has pitted the home-made bombs and deadly suicide missions of the Palestinians against the heavy armor and missile attacks of the Israelis. Many, perhaps most, of the victims have been young people barely on the cusp of adulthood. The sad fact is that the next generation of leaders of the Israelis and the Palestinians are being sacrificed to the blood feud of their elders.

The United States, like the rest of the world, has looked on this ceaseless carnage in horror. We have expressed dismay, regret, sorrow, and anger. We have wrung our hands in despair. We have condemned the violence in the strongest terms. But we have not suited our words to any meaningful action.

In this bill, our foreign assistance to the Middle East virtually ignores the spiraling violence in the region. This bill provides \$5.1 billion dollars in foreign assistance to the Middle East, primarily Israel and Egypt, a level almost identical to last year's funding. It is as if nothing has changed. There are no strings on the money. There is no requirement that the bloodshed abate before the funding is released. There is no motivation for Egypt to step up its effort to mediate between the sides, and there is no incentive whatsoever for Israel and the Palestinians to make meaningful progress toward a peaceful settlement of their differences.

In short, we are doing little more than offering a tacit acknowledgment that the United States is powerless to stop the bloodshed. We are sending the wrong signal to the Middle East. By not using our foreign assistance dollars as an instrument to effect change in the Mideast, we are inadvertently helping to fuel the continued cycle of violence. And what has this hands-off policy produced? Empty promises, escalating violence, and the prospect of war instead of peace between Israel and the Palestinians.

Now what? Where does the so-called peace process go from here? Can we really expect the Israelis to exercise restraint following the most recent escalation of violence against their citizens? Is there any point in urging Yassar Arafat to seize and punish the terrorists within his control when he is obviously unable to live up to his promises? Is there any hope that the Israelis and Palestinians will be able to re-engage in meaningful discussions in the foreseeable future?

In the current poisonous environment, neither side has any incentive to resume peace talks. To give his expressions of dismay any credibility, Mr. Arafat will have to conduct a swift and sweeping crackdown on the leaders of the Palestinian terrorist cells—something he has never been able to accomplish in the past. And even if Mr. Arafat could deliver on his promises, it will take masterful leadership on the part of Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon to restrain his military options and to place Israel's settlements in disputed areas on the negotiating table—two difficult but necessary prerequisites for peace.

The Israelis and the Palestinians, riven by generations of hatred, cannot hope to accomplish these goals on their own. It is time for Egypt—with the assistance of Saudi Arabia and Jordan—to exercise its considerable influence in the region and place long term security interests over short term internal political costs. Such leadership will not be easy. President Mubarak will have to make hard choices and steel himself and his government against the predictable political backlash from the more radical elements of his own country. But President Mubarak's leadership is necessary to temper the emotions of his fellow members of the Arab League.