

that national forest which has been destroyed? Is that the kind of legacy that we want to leave? I think not.

We have to reduce immigration into this country. We have to reduce legal immigration to a manageable number; 300,000 a year is plenty. We have to put the same amount of effort into the protection of our borders as we put into the prosecution of the war in Afghanistan and around the world. We have to put the same degree of resources and the same degree of commitment into the defense of our own borders as we do to the prosecution of the war halfway around the world.

That may mean, as a matter of fact, troops on our border and demands to our neighbors, Canada and Mexico, to help us patrol it. It is incumbent upon us to do it, Mr. Speaker. It is our responsibility and no one else's. The States cannot do it. The Congress and the President must provide the leadership that the American people are demanding. We and the administration have to stop turning a deaf ear to the pleas of our countrymen to protect and defend our borders.

□ 2130

MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the very serious problem that exists in the Middle East and to report back to the House with several colleagues this evening on a trip taken to Israel the weekend before last to express solidarity with the people of Israel and with the government of Israel in light of the campaign of terror that has been directed against them by the Palestinians. We will be joined later this evening by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), who has organized, or attempted to organize, this evening an Oxford style debate between those of us who voted in favor of a resolution to express solidarity with the people of Israel and those few Members of the House who voted in the negative on that question. Unfortunately, those that opposed the resolution of solidarity with Israel have chosen not to participate in the debate this evening.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. We are missing an opportunity, I think, to have a good debate and a good discussion regarding the right of Israel to defend herself and the position of America that in my view should be not to try to limit Israel's right of self-defense. But I am happy to report that the gentleman from Florida has arrived, the organizer of the discussion this evening and the man who tried to organize this Oxford style debate to his great credit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. We had scheduled it for 9:30. It is about 9:30. As you described, we made an offer and we actually had an agreement this evening to have an Oxford debate about the resolution. As many people who are watching and obviously as Members, we know that our normal debate that we have is not really debate. People almost read statements and they read them to each other and there is no discourse. I think those of us who supported the resolution, many of us sat through literally several hours of debate and at some level a great deal of frustration, because people say things that there really is no opportunity to ask them to respond to try to clarify their position or really even ask them to defend their position. So we had set up this where under the House rules there is an opportunity for an Oxford style debate to interact with Members. We offered that opportunity and again, I guess there were 21 Members that voted against the resolution and 29 that did not vote. It is less than 15 percent of the membership of the House, but a sizable number of people.

We had the opportunity to cancel this evening or go forward, and what we thought we might do is in a sense maybe try to even literally re-read some of the arguments that the opponents of the resolution made and really in an attempt to maybe flesh out what their thoughts were. I think those of us who will be here this evening defending the resolution obviously find it hard to articulate their positions. Maybe they are in fact positions that cannot be articulated.

I would like to start maybe this evening and read one and I have a number of quotes from opponents of the resolution and there is no point in mentioning names but you might remember this one. It was in a poem that was spoken by a good friend and a good colleague of ours whom I respect on so many issues but I was extraordinarily disappointed with his comments.

By poem he stated, "Oh, little town of Bethlehem, we witness and we cry, Israelis and Palestinians, both practice eye for eye."

Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania would want to respond to that statement.

Mr. HOEFFEL. What struck me as off-target with that statement was the notion that there is some kind of equivalence here between the behavior of the Palestinians and the behavior of the Israelis. Our colleague who said that, who is a fine Member of this House, seems to feel that there is some moral equivalence between the actions of the two sides that he stated. That does not persuade me, Mr. Speaker, because what we are seeing on the side of the Palestinians are acts of terror directed intentionally against innocent, unarmed Israeli civilians, men, women and children. What we are seeing from the Israeli side are acts of self-defense, military acts by the armed forces of

Israel, but acts that are not designed to kill Palestinian civilians in some kind of retribution but acts by the Israeli army to defend Israel.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If the gentleman will yield, I think there are so many parallels between what the Israelis did with their incursion into the West Bank areas and what the United States did with our incursion into Afghanistan. This poem, I think, would in a sense give the same moral equivalency to the murderers who attacked the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and the plane that crashed in Pennsylvania with the United States military action in Afghanistan and really trying to set up a moral equivalency of that. There is a fundamental difference.

Again, these are different Members that spoke during the debate. I am going to quote another Member: "I thought there was one thing that might turn the tide in this struggle and it was a horrible tragedy in the end of March." And he showed a picture that actually was on the cover of Newsweek magazine, I believe, of two young girls.

"Look at these two young women. They look like sisters. One, Ayat al-Akhras, 18, was a suicide bomber who killed Rachel Levy at the grocery store, age 17. I thought that both sides would be so appalled by this unbelievable tragedy and see the hopelessness of this that they might turn toward peace. But, no, that has not happened there."

If we can, maybe if the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) can respond.

Mr. WEINER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield, what is interesting, I would say to the gentleman from Florida, that that dynamic has been portrayed several times in the media, that there are so many parallels between the 17-year-old that straps dynamite to his or her chest and the 17-year-old that might have been taken as an innocent victim. But the fact of the matter is that that suicide bomber, that homicide bomber, is bringing the Palestinian people further, not closer, to their objective of having a homeland. I do not think any of us would agree in this body that if the Palestinians announced and did more than announce, they actually began to operate without violence and to sit down and really negotiate for a Palestinian homeland, if they would have done that arguably years and years ago, it would be a reality today.

We have to recognize one thing that some of my colleagues did not recognize in the debate. Someone who blows themselves up and anyone around them blows them to bits is not engaged in political speech. They are not engaged in debate. They are not furthering the cause of bringing the two sides together. What they are doing is murdering people.

We have to recognize what sometimes often gets overlooked is this notion that someone who is engaged in

suicide bombing is acting out of desperation that was created by another set of instances. There are all kinds of circumstances in the world that have been resolved without suicide bombing. In fact, most political conflicts in the world, thank God, do not result in one group of people attacking the civilians of the other side.

Mr. HOFFFEL. Would the gentleman agree that the whole phrase of suicide bombing is also missing the point here? When I hear the phrase "suicide bomber," I think one person committed suicide. I think the gentleman used a separate phrase a minute ago that is a lot more illustrative of what is actually happening here.

Mr. WEINER. Let me give an example and the gentlemen in their most recent visit, I am sure, visited some victims in the hospital. I had the opportunity to visit a 15-year-old girl who was the victim of a homicide bomber. She was not killed, thank God, but she showed me her x-ray that included in it 18 hexagonal nuts that were packed around dynamite that were used as projectiles projected into her young body. This is savagery. This is not something that brings the debate any closer to closure. It is not something that brings the two sides closer.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If I could interject, again I am trying to bring quotes in from the debate against the resolution and this is again from a very esteemed colleague of ours, someone whom all three of us I know respect a great deal, but his statement was, and I am quoting, "Generations of Palestinians and Israelis have suffered in the region, but the violence of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict cannot be examined or addressed in isolation of decades of occupation of millions of Palestinians."

I think it ties directly to what you are saying, that in some way occupation justifies suicide bombings.

Mr. WEINER. We heard similar language throughout some quarters of the Arab world in reaction to September 11, is that this is what happens if you do not have an energy policy we like or a foreign policy or an agricultural policy, we send 15 suicide bombers to murder 3,000 Americans. We have to recognize, and we have to be able to separate. This is at its fundamental element a complex and gut-wrenching dispute over land. It is difficult. We have difficult political subtexts. We have biblical subtexts. We have historical subtexts. But these things cannot be resolved in an environment where one side is attacking the other side in the most savage and most despicable ways.

Mr. DEUTSCH. I think one of the interesting things, just in response to that exact point is that at the Camp David negotiations the Israelis were willing to give up and, in fact, offered 97 or 98 percent of the West Bank and Gaza and if you include some of the transfer of land in the Negev, effectively 100 percent of the land mass that is in a sense occupied. That was offered and it was rejected. So if the cause of

the disturbance is occupation, the Israelis offered to end the occupation.

Mr. WEINER. I would go even further than that. You do not need to go to Camp David at September of 2000. You can go to the Oslo process that began in 1993 that had the Israeli government entering into an agreement to end the occupation, to not only begin to foster democracy in the Palestinian region but to fund it. Many of the guns being used against Israeli soldiers today were provided by the Israelis because the Palestinians said we need a police force. The Israelis not only gave them uniforms and gave them funding but gave them the actual guns. You can go back to 1948, the birth of the Jewish state, where it was the Israelis who were prepared to say, listen, we will take a divided neighborhood, essentially, if it guarantees us peace. You can look at the Wye River agreement. You can look at the Mitchell plan. You can look at the Tenet plan. You can look at plan after plan where it was the Israelis who said yes, and it was the Palestinians that said no. But they said no because the only thing that it really was predicated on was peaceful coexistence, which leads one to believe that ultimately the Palestinian people themselves have to make a decision. They have to make a decision, do they want to continue to cross swords or do they ultimately want their own state?

I think the Members who are here on the floor would agree that if this was a peaceful struggle, it would have resulted in a Palestinian state generations ago.

Mr. DEUTSCH. It is funny, not funny but tragic, that if it was a Martin Luther King instead of a Yasser Arafat or a Gandhi instead of an Arafat, I think you are absolutely correct because the majority and even with the vote by the Likud Central Committee, which I think was a political statement, I as recently as today read polls of the Israeli public. The vast majority of Israelis support a two-state solution because they understand that is a solution, that there is a puzzle fit that works. That will happen at some point in time when there is a partner to engage in that solution.

□ 2145

The chart that I have up now, one of the things, had we been in an Oxford debate and had the other side showed up, was really the first chart that I was going to put up for today, and it is hard to read and hopefully the television camera is focusing in on it. But the Israeli incursion occurred on March 31. Prior to March 31, as many of my colleagues remember, starting literally 11 days or 12 days or 13 days before, there was a series of suicide bombings actually starting in March: March 2, March 5, March 7, March 9, March 17, March 20, March 21. March 27 was the so-called Passover bombing in Netanya where 27 Israelis were killed; and then the 29th, and then actually on the 31st was in Haifa, the restaurant that the

gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFFEL) and I visited or, actually, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and I visited. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFFEL) was actually at another place in that period when we were in Israel, but that we visited on that trip that occurred on the 31st. Then after that series of suicide bombings, killing over 100 people, I could count them up, close to 100 people, maybe 150 people during that amount of time, one of the numbers that I have talked about on several occasions, and I will put this chart up just to reiterate that, Israel in terms of population is about one-sixtieth, one-fiftieth, one-sixtieth the size of the United States of America. We are about 300 million plus people, 5 million plus, and the equivalent, just in terms of population, when 50 Israelis are killed, it is the equivalent of 9-11 to the United States of America. I am describing March. It was the equivalent of three September 11ths.

Now, we know what the United States did after September 11. We went 6,000 miles to a country and appropriately, and I do not think there is a Member of this Chamber who did not support, I do not think effectively as Americans we did not support what we did. Can we expect anything less for the Israelis to do, when three September 11ths occurred in the month of March in their country. I think that is the justification. I mean if a country is not protecting its citizens from death, from terrorism; I mean that is our fundamental role as government, and that is what they did. In a sense, they did not have a choice. The Israelis do not want to be in Bethlehem or Nabulus or Jenin any more than the United States wants to be in Afghanistan. We do not want to be in Afghanistan, but we are there for the reason that we have to be there, the same way they have to be there.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, something else that is important to keep in mind, in that period from October 2000 to today the Israeli government and the Israeli people have not only been fighting terror by military means, almost at the same time and, frankly, almost in a counterintuitive way, given the way we have handled our attack since September 11, is that they have continued to keep the doors open to negotiation.

For example, when former Senator George Mitchell, who has some experience in negotiating peace in difficult parts of the world, when he traveled there, he came up with some principles of a plan, essentially to start a framework to get back to peace. It was the Israelis who said, although it asked for very difficult concessions from the Israelis, including lifting up the roots of many Israeli families and moving them out of their homes, the Israelis said yes. The Palestinians, who had to do essentially one thing, which was to stop bombing and stop firing, they said no.

Then we sent CIA Director Tenet over to the area to see if they could perhaps get the wheels started to the Mitchell plan. Once again, asked tough things of the Israelis, including loosening up border crossings at a time when they knew terrorists were coming through those borders, Israelis said yes and the Palestinians said no. Even when Vice President CHENEY and Secretary of State Powell visited the area to try to negotiate peace, it was the Israelis who expressed a willingness and the Palestinians who would not relent in their violence. In fact, some of the worst violence in the area on the part of the Palestinians have come when U.S. emissaries, trying to negotiate peace, have been there.

So at the same time, while a great deal of attention has been called to the fact of Israel going door to door trying to rout out terrorism, it should not be ignored that even in that context, even in the context of all of the carnage over the last 18 months, the Israeli people and their government have still said, do you want to make peace? We are ready to do it. I think that is to their great credit.

Imagine for a moment if bin Laden or Mullah Omar presented himself next week and said, you know what? I want to negotiate. I want to negotiate the peace here. Maybe if the United States gives up Texas and Louisiana, I will leave you alone, and I do not just say that because they are Republican areas, I would say to the Speaker, we are prepared to have a negotiation. We would laugh at it. Yet, in Israel, despite the carnage that they have had, they have been negotiating at the same time, hoping against hope that the Palestinian people would choose peace over violence.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, if I could give the gentleman an individual example of that spirit of the Israelis, that willingness to remain positive and to maintain their humanity in the face of this horror, let me tell my colleagues about Gila Weiss, a former constituent of mine who graduated from high school in my district in 1988 when she was known as Jennifer Weiss. Her parents still live in my district, Fred and Susan Weiss. Jennifer moved to Israel, changed her name to Gila, and is making her life there. On April 19, 2002, she was shopping at the Jewish market the Friday before Sabbath, finished making her purchases, walked to the bus to get the bus back to her apartment and, as she was approaching the arriving bus, a woman stepped off the bus and blew herself up. She killed 6 people, wounded 40, Gila among them, using a suicide vest such as is pictured in the photo of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) that I know he wants to talk about in just a minute. But let me just tell my colleagues about Gila.

She survived that blast, shredded with shrapnel; her eyesight is still in jeopardy today, but the doctors are optimistic that she will make a full re-

covery and she will recover from the wounds that the shrapnel caused. When the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and I visited the hospital on our trip to Israel, Gila was there to greet us, showing incredible spirit, and indicated, without even being prompted, that in the face of this terror that she had faced and incredibly survived, that she did not harbor hatred herself toward her attackers; the individual, now dead, or the Palestinian people or leaders that sent that bomber to that bus stop in Jerusalem.

When I returned from my trip, I gave a report to my district and asked Mrs. Weiss, Susan Weiss, to be with me. She talked about the injuries and the terrible ordeal that Gila had been through, and her parents, and then Susan Weiss, unprompted, told the assembled press corps in the suburbs of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania that she harbored no animosity, that she felt that we had to move forward and try to figure out some way someday, somehow to return this process to peace. Recognizing the need for defense now, recognizing the need for safety now, the security of Israel being paramount, but both Gila and her mother were prepared, even though they have suffered the worst kind of experience with terror, prepared to move forward to try to reach peace.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that is important about the story that the gentleman has just told, the Israeli people, because of their fundamental belief in democracy, something that our country shares and something that over 373 Members of Congress recognized when the resolution passed, on the other side of this debate is a group of people, the Palestinians who, in their schoolbooks, in their classrooms, even on their television screens, are preaching hatred.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) made the mention of Nelson Mandela as a peacemaker. One does not have to go that far. One can look in that same region of the world not so long ago and look at the courageous stand of Anwar Sadat. One of the first things he did when preparing the Egyptian people who had been in a hateful, passionate war with the Israelis, one of the first things that he did as a sign of his courage that ultimately led to his death, is he turned to his own people in Arabic on Egyptian television and said, look, it is in our interests to make peace. We do not do it because we like them. We do not do it because we like their presence in the area, but it is because it is in our interests.

On the other hand, despite the requirement in the Oslo Accords that they stop teaching hate in their schoolbooks, they stop teaching hate to their children, the seeds of hate keep getting planted every day. This morning, if you flip on Palestinian TV during the cartoon hour, you will see commercials aimed at young children that have a playful song that says, put down your books, take up your arms, directed at

young children. We see protests in Nabulus. We have parents with their children on their shoulders, children like in all of our districts, except in these cases they have pretend suicide bomb belts around their waists.

The thing that I fear the most is irrespective of our intentions, irrespective of the feelings of the people of Israel and irrespective of even the best instinct of the Palestinian people, the seeds of hate that we are planting today among Palestinian children will take a generation to eradicate. That is the fundamental difference here. Someone should be held responsible for that, and I think that person should be that of the Palestinian Authority, Yasser Arafat.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman can yield for a second, trying to keep this in somewhat of a debate without another side being here, which I almost feel we should have an empty chair like they sometimes do in political debates when the other side does not show up. But it is interesting, much has been made in terms of who voted against it, why they voted against it, but there were Democrats and Republicans. Again, less than 15 percent of the Congress, but I am going to quote from one of our Republican colleagues and the quote is, "If we are going to bring peace to that troubled region, we must be scrupulously honest. There are piles of bodies in the Middle East, many of the victims of noncombatants, and both sides of the conflict have engaged in the slaughter of innocents."

Someone said that from the floor of this Chamber not that long ago, a week and a half ago. I see the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) shaking his head no. Now he has an opportunity to respond.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Florida, and this is something that is easily verified, there has not been a single instance in the history of the conflict where, with the possible exception being the preemptive strike in the war of 1967 that the Israelis have initiated violence. When we see these images on television of kids throwing stones at Israeli soldiers and Israeli soldiers responding, invariably those are organized efforts by Palestinian protestors to engage in a highly publicized exchange.

There is not anyone who believes, for example, that the Israeli military had any interest in going into Ramallah, for example, knocking on doors looking for terrorists, had it not been for the fact that there had been horrific slaughters of innocent victims, including those observing the Passover holiday.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, one of the things that I guess is frustrating, having sat on this floor and listened to the debate is the simple distinction that the gentleman is making. It is so frustrating that these are well educated, well

thought of, thoughtful colleagues who have made these statements that I am reading word for word out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the debate. When the Israelis went into Jenin or for that matter Ramallah or for that matter other locations, because I talked a couple of minutes ago about the reason for the incursion, that there was this horrific activity occurring at monumental levels in their society.

One of the things that we witnessed in our visit to Israel was in a sense the proof on the other side, and this is one of many pictures that we have. One of the opportunities we had was to view just a fraction of the weapons that were seized during the incursion, about 10 percent of the weapons. In this Chamber, if we added all the weapons that we saw, it would probably fill this entire Chamber. Weapons of mortars, and I will show some additional pictures of machine guns and sniper rifles. But I think the most evil was literally witnessing suicide vests, and they are not kids creating suicide vests. I mean as we saw them, and my colleagues can see in the picture, they are commercially made. We actually saw different versions, summer versions, winter versions, autumn versions so that they would not be seen. But, in a sense, that is the proof of why.

I guess the frustration that an intelligent person could make a statement like that or make some of the other statements that I have read, not to distinguish; in the United States, we call it collateral damage. In our military action, in fact our ongoing military action in Afghanistan, there have been innocents who have died. We did not go house to house in Tora Bora. We bombed, as we should, absolutely as we should, as was appropriate and with the knowledge that there would be some collateral damage because of the risks involved and the morality involved in terms of doing it, it was absolutely appropriate. The Israelis could have attacked Jenin the way we attacked Tora Bora. They could have bombed from the air without risking lives. There is no question that a number of Israelis, a significant number of Israeli soldiers died because of the effort that they made. I do not doubt, and in fact I am sure, there were innocents who were killed in the action in Jenin. But I think not to understand there is a fundamental difference between someone being killed in that action where, by all accounts, the Israeli defense forces' efforts to make sure that civilians were not killed are minimized. I mean there are just so many specific accounts. In fact, before the soldiers went into the battle, their orders were to do everything possible, put their own lives at risk in terms of avoiding collateral damage. One thing also, I mean there is a whole different viewpoint when it does occur. The attitude of the Israeli defense force is not just remorse, but it is a horrific situation. It is tragic. There is no words that can possibly compensate.

□ 2200

But the entire attitude is a totally different attitude. The efforts of a megaphone to tell people to get out. Give them another chance to get out. Give them a third chance to get out. Tell them what is going to happen if they do not get out and give them every opportunity to get out. And yet we are hearing colleagues say that is the same as a murder bomber.

Mr. HOEFFEL. If the gentleman would yield, what our colleague is missing is the intention behind the actions. The actions of the Palestinians when they commit terror, they are intending to kill innocent civilians and the Israelis are intending to defend themselves. That is the fundamental difference.

The action that the gentleman describes and both gentlemen have referred to, the military incursion into Jenin and other areas of the West Bank first was designed to stop the terror from continuing to come against Israel. It certainly was taken at great risk to members of the Israeli defense forces and 22 Israeli soldiers died in Jenin and had the Israelis chosen to bomb I doubt any Israeli soldiers would have died. But it also uncovered an extraordinary number of weapons, as the gentleman has mentioned, most of them in complete violation to the Oslo Accord that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) described.

The Palestinian police under Oslo were allowed to maintain handguns, rifles and AK-47s.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If the gentleman would yield, this is as he witnessed himself, and this is just a very small cache of mortars which obviously are illegal under the Oslo Accord.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Exactly right. That is a very good picture illustrating the point.

What the Israelis seized were anti-tank missiles, rocket-propelled grenades, mortars, rockets, all in complete violation of the Oslo Accord. All there, as our friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), said, who identified himself as a sportsman, not there for sporting purposes, not there for hunting game during the doe season with a license from your local State government, but they are to kill people. That was the purpose of those weapons.

And the suicide vest that the gentleman identified a few pictures ago was the exact type of vest used in an attempt to kill Gila Weiss and that did kill six of the people that she was standing around with, total strangers.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Again, I will try to use some of these posters today, but this again is a sample of literally weapons, just a fraction of the weapons collected that could fill this Chamber, machine guns, sniper rifles, mortar guns, anti-tank weapons, none of which were allowed under the Oslo agreement.

Mr. WEINER. If the gentleman would yield for a question. Perhaps you can offer a little bit more explanation.

One of things that came up frequently on the floor among the opponents of the resolution was that we have to foster an environment where the moderate Arab nations could help a peace take hold in the Middle East. Perhaps the gentleman could explain to the Members where those weapons came from. Did they not come from a so-called moderate Arab state? And I am curious as to whether it seems like the export of someone who is interested in peace in the region.

Mr. DEUTSCH. As we reviewed them, we asked exactly those questions. Some of them were stolen Israeli weapons. Some of them were American weapons stolen or gotten through a third party. A lot of them were smuggled either through the tunnels from the Sinai into Gaza. Some of them, Israelis have very good information to believe that they were actually smuggled in Yassar Arafat's helicopter. So the weapons came from a variety of different sources.

Mr. WEINER. What about the Karin-A?

Mr. DEUTSCH. The Karin-A is a totally different issue which we can talk about. I think it is a significant issue as well. As the gentleman is well aware, the Karin-A was a ship that Israeli commandos captured that had \$20 million of weapons in it and had some very sophisticated weapons right off the shelf from Iran, including rocket launchers, rockets, not just mortars but rockets. The equivalents of our TOW missiles.

I actually have some pictures because we reviewed not just the weapons, these were weapons that were seized in the West Bank up to this point; they were weapons that were literally seized during the military incursion. And that in a sense, just these weapons are success or proof of the right and the necessity of the incursion because the suicide belt we saw in the previous picture, that suicide belt was not made to be put in a museum. It literally was made to be used. And the capture of that one belt prevented that one belt from being used, and we do not know how many lives and how many tragedies, and literally the tragedies are each one is as painful as we can possibly imagine in terms of human condition.

Did the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) want to add something to that?

Mr. HOEFFEL. Well, the enormity of this, it is hard to appreciate unless you see the weapons. And the great variety, from brand-new modern weapons never used before seized from the Karin-A with an attempt to smuggle them in from Iran, to old battered, well-worn weapons that the Palestinians have obviously been using for years and years to homemade weapons, weapons made with sections of water pipe and slingshots for the firing pins to set off the ammunition put in these homemade weapons. An absolutely staggering

commitment to mayhem, to using violence means to try to win their political goals.

The enormity of the terror is hard to grasp unless you see the weapons, unless you talk to the families of the victims, unless you see the locations of the terror bombings in Jerusalem as we did on our walking tour. And when we hear the stories of the families and the human tragedies of innocents dying, not soldiers dying in combat for their country but innocents.

We have heard the story of Michal and Malka, two 15-year-old friends, inseparable, went to school together, lived next door to each other, had known each other since both were babies, 15 years old. They snuck off to get some pizza last August at the Sbarro restaurant in downtown Jerusalem and got blown to kingdom come. Their parents buried them side by side where they will rest forever.

That is hard to understand. It is hard to appreciate the horror for those families and hard to understand how anybody can justify such action. You can have the world's most difficult grievance; you can be really ticked off about something, and feel that the other guy is causing you a lot of aggravation, but how can you ever justify murdering innocent civilians?

Mr. WEINER. If the gentleman will yield, there is a broader political point here as well. And that is the Israelis have arguably tried everything under the sun to deter these kinds of attacks. That did not work. Now they are doing what they can to respond.

Some in the Chamber last week or 10 days ago in arguing against the resolution said perhaps we should recognize the grievance of the suicide bomber, sit down at the table and negotiate with them.

What lesson does that send to the next guy who is going to fly a plane into a tall building in the United States? What lesson does that teach the person who is sitting at home in Nablus or in Jenin about whether or not they should go and take up violence, not only against Israel but against the United States or anyone else with whom they might have a grievance.

We have to be very careful when we do what sometimes happens in the State Department here in the United States and we offer this sense of we kind of understand where they are coming from when they blow up a bunch of children in a shopping center. I believe we embolden further attacks. I believe we make it steadily, piece by piece, part of the political debate. It was truly mindboggling for me to listen to it. And we should stress very few Members of this Chamber, the gentleman showed pictures of his visit to Democrats, to Republicans, overwhelmingly from all regions of this country, this House and stood up and said we understand what Israel is facing. We support her in perhaps one of the strongest pro-Israel resolutions this House has ever passed.

Imagine for a moment if we did it. Imagine if we were a little more lukewarm and said, maybe we see the beef that the Palestinians have when they engage in suicide bombings. That creates more violence. I remember distinctly in June of 2001, Tel Aviv discoteque bombing. Horrific event. Someone gets in line at a discoteque on a Saturday night, teenagers all around, blows themselves up, blows up over a dozen young people around them. Quickly the United States, even the European community, which has never been very friendly to Israel, editorial pages everywhere said how outrageous, how disgusting it truly was. What happened? Israel did not respond immediately, and the Palestinians also recognized, you know what, we have gone too far. We are no longer getting sympathy and now people are recognizing how bloodthirsty we appear to be. It created a week, maybe 10 days of quiet.

When we strongly condemn these things, when we do not prevaricate, when we do not equivocate, when we do not draw these lines of equivalency that somehow justify the lines of terrorism, we save lives. That is something people have to understand. When they stand here, it almost sounds as if they are justifying the violence. In the quotes that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) read, I think it really does embolden some 15-year-old young person to say, maybe this is the way I will get my meaning; and they will be the next homicide bomber. As we have seen from these weapons, and I have said it on this floor before, this is a problem for Israel, true. But just the way a katusha rocket can shoot down an El Al plane, it can shoot down a Continental Airlines plane, God forbid, or a U.S. Airlines plane, God forbid.

The same people who are getting these weapons, because they think murder is a way to get their means, believe me, we are not miles and miles away as we learned on September 11.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Let me read, these are different Members, every quote so far this evening has been from a different Member. I will read from another Member: "We in this body have a constitutional responsibility to protect the national security of the United States. This one-sided intervention in a far-off war has the potential to do great harm to our national security."

I think that is exactly the point that the gentleman is making. That if someone is saying that, what is the implication, that there really is a duality, that there is both sides? And I think what was said is that for an act of terror, an act of killing innocents there are no two sides.

This is just a follow-up. Literally just another pick of weapons seized and there are more and there are more and there are more. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) asked just a comment on the Karin-A issue, and I thought since it is a relevant event, in a sense it was not directly tied to the

incursion, but it gives a sense of the context to the Palestinian Authority and Yassar Arafat personally.

The weapons on the Karin-A were \$20 million of weapons but literally weapons off the shelf of munitions factories in Iran. Mortars, as we see, large mortars of different dimensions for different distances, rockets, the equivalent of the United States TOW missiles, which are missiles that can be shot and steered after they are shot, anti-tank weapons that were made out of plastic so they cannot be detected, a very sophisticated operation that the United States and the Israelis and the world has not denied that Yassar Arafat's direct involvement in the purchase and the logistics of these weapons.

The sophistication of the weapons in a sense is highlighted by this container. All of the weapons that were seized on the Karin-A were actually in containers like this, which are watertight containers. In fact, some of the weapons were actually modified so that they could fit inside these containers. And the containers themselves were very sophisticated in that they had a specially built compressed-air-water compartment that would actually be able to have the containers set at a certain depth in the Mediterranean Sea so they could then be picked up later on with this buoy attachment. And that in fact could have escalated the conflict dramatically. Every weapon there was in violation of Oslo. Every weapon that was there was in violation of Oslo.

Mr. HOEFFEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I could not agree more. The violation of law and the agreement represented by these weapons really goes a long way towards showing the attitude of the Palestinians toward the agreement that they made and their intention for their future use in the Middle East.

The other thing that was quite persuasive to our group were the documents that the Israelis seized from the Palestinian Authority offices in the West Bank during the military incursion. Documents were seized in Arabic showing how the terrorists are funded, showing how the Saudis make payments to the terrorists and the families of terrorists, showing how Yassar Arafat's organization submits memos to him recommending that payments be made to a list of what they euphemistically call "freedom fighters." That would be in American English "terrorists." And how Yassar Arafat signs off on those memos asking for certain levels of funding.

□ 2215

In most cases he reduces the payments to be made to each individual, but there are signed documents showing to my satisfaction certainly, that Arafat has been directing terror. Certainly through the Fatah organization, the Tanzim and Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigades that he commands as head of Fatah, and these documents and the

gentleman has a picture up, and I would yield back to the gentleman in just a second, the documents plus the seized weapons certainly make clear to me that Yasser Arafat has been directing terror in the Middle East.

I am happy to yield back to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I think the issue of the day and I think in a sense maybe if we move beyond the resolution and I think in a sense we have debated against the empty seat and we have debated successfully.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Would the gentleman agree we won the debate?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I think in the environment we are at we won when we entered the Chamber and I think it is important, and I hope there is a discourse because clearly a number of our colleagues, again less than around 10 percent or so, articulated a position which I am just disappointed, and I think it is by lack of information, it is a lack of thought, lack of really thinking through the actual conditions of what occurred.

We would not talk about moral equivalency with the United States war in Afghanistan, and the similarity parallels are very real in terms of what the Israelis are doing, and as we both have said, there should be a Yasser Arafat exemption to the war on terrorism?

I would like to follow up though, and really, the issue of the day is should the Israelis continue to negotiate with Yasser Arafat? Is he the negotiating partner to try to get to the resolution of the conflict, and as the gentleman said, not only did the Israelis seize a huge amount of sophisticated weapons in their incursions and suicide belts and other things, but a huge amount of documents, which at this point in time no one is refuting the authenticity.

In fact, we met the parents of a soldier who actually downloaded some of the documents and was killed in a subsequent action, and he told his parents about it. So I do not think there was a scam of him telling his parents about what he did.

No one at this point is really questioning literally the authenticity of the document that is blown up on this chart and in Yasser Arafat's handwriting, which again no one is questioning at this point in time, is exactly what the gentleman described. It is a request to Yasser Arafat from a senior Fatah activist, Hassan al Sheikh, for payments of \$2,500 for three known terrorists. I mean, people who are on Israel's most wanted list who the Israelis knew were involved in previous terrorist actions, in fact, through the Israelis, subsequently eliminated, and a request for \$2,500. Chairman Arafat, as my colleague had mentioned, says allocate \$600 to each of them in his own handwriting directly involved in that payment.

There are other documents. This is a longer list of 12 people who were involved in terrorist activities and for

this group, I do not see the exact amount, but again, with Arafat's signature, it is a \$350 payment for terrorist activities.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman, does he think those payments are for putting a roof on Arafat's house?

Mr. DEUTSCH. I think what is clear is they are what they are.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Can there be any question about what those payments are authorized for, what the purpose behind them is?

Mr. DEUTSCH. They are what they are. Arafat, he was not a terrorist 10 years ago or 5 years ago or a year. He is still a terrorist. He was engaged in terrorist activity continuously, and his words might sound nice at this point in time, but it is not ancient history to go back.

Here is a document, a request from the Al Aqsa Martyr troops for money to the Palestinian Authority, and as shocking as each of the things are in terms of weapons, in terms of posters for suicide bombers, there is a specific request for 700 shekels, and I am reading it directly, this is for detonators for suicide bombers. We need every week five to nine explosive charges. Five to nine explosive charges every week, 700 shekels per week, directly to the PA by Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade, people who are literally perpetrating the suicide bombs.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, the documents do indeed speak for themselves and leave one just no choice but to conclude that Yasser Arafat has directed terror, that he has in the past and he presently is, and the question is for this House, for this country what needs to be done in order to stop this activity.

It seems to me, I know the gentleman and I have discussed this, that there must be a recognition that Arafat, other Palestinians and the leaders of the Arab league must declare that terror must be renounced, that violence must be renounced and they must do this in word and deed. They have done it in word, but the documents that the gentleman has and the photographs of the weapons indicate that indeed they are still involved in terror and in financing terror.

Mr. DEUTSCH. This is going to be the last document and there is more, but this is dated March 24, 2002, and during the stage of these operations, and this is a copy of minutes of a meeting at the Ramallah headquarters, and Chairman Arafat is in attendance at this meeting along with Hamas, and the statements in the minutes of the meeting in Arabic are such that Chairman Arafat is upset that there was a bombing inside the green line when General Zinni was in Israel, and the inference is they would have preferred the bombing outside the green line and not when General Zinni was in Israel.

The Israelis did not write this. No one is questioning the authenticity. This is Arafat inside his own meetings,

meeting with Hamas, talking about terrorist activity, not trying to prevent them at any level in any way, and we could ignore this if we want to ignore it, but the weight is so overwhelming at this point that it is unignorable.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is entirely correct, and it seems to me that we need to make clear that both the United States and the government of Israel need to have someone to talk to representing the Palestinians that clearly renounces violence, that renounces violence and terror and that does so in word and deed and who, secondly, clearly recognizes the right of Israel to exist as a Jewish state, not as a state that someday may have a Palestinian majority because of the demographics, but a state that is recognized as a Jewish state with a full right to exist in peace and security.

Until we get those two commitments, a complete renunciation of violence and terror and a recognition of Israel to exist as a Jewish state, I do not see how we can go forward. I do not see how the Israelis can go forward in furthering the peace process when there is literally nobody to talk to presently on the other side that has any credibility whatsoever.

Mr. DEUTSCH. The gentleman is so on point with that comment. That is one of the tragedies going on right now. In fact, one of the tragedies I think as we both saw is as horrific and awful and inhumane the Palestinian attacks on Israelis have been, both Jews and Arabs, and we made a point as we have talked about to visit Arab dictums of terrorist bombings. In fact, the restaurant we talked about in Haifa was owned by an Arab Israeli and about half the victims were Arabs, not Jews, Arabs and Jews. The screws and the nuts and the ball bearings do not discriminate and, too, they are going to maim and kill.

The reality of how bad and awful that is, Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian Authority have been as bad and maybe even worse to their own people, indiscriminately killing people in just no type of civil process at all, destruction of an economy, corruption at levels which is untold, probably unmatched almost maybe anywhere in the world the level of corruption, and that in a sense is the entity that the United States is supporting.

What we have talked about on this floor previously, there is no, and we use the expression, there is no daylight between any Members of this Congress and the President and the war on terrorism and the efforts in Afghanistan, the efforts to stop terrorists with global reach whether they be in Iraq, in Syria or North Korea. There is no daylight between us, but I think there are many in this Chamber, in this country unfortunately who disagree with some of the President's actions in terms of trying to say, well, Yasser Arafat and these activities really are not as evil as they are.

One of the great things about President Reagan was when there was an evil empire he called it an evil empire and the Palestinian Authority is an evil empire, and we can call it white and we can call it black. If we call black, white, it does not make it white, and the same thing by saying, the leadership and these other things, the entity itself is evil, is corrupt beyond comprehension. We both heard stories that I would not say on this floor of some of the activities of the Palestinian Authority in terms of some of the behavior of some of the leaders that were beyond human discussion.

Let me follow up, though, just in terms of the Palestinian Authority itself. This is a reprint of a New York Times article April 20, 2002, and they interviewed a printer in the West Bank who had an ongoing contract with the Palestinian Authority to, after every suicide bomber who was killed, to automatically within several hours with information about that suicide bomber print up 1,000 posters to then be put up. This is just a sample form. That is the entity, the glorification of the suicide bomber is what we have seen.

Mr. HOFFEL. We face the reality of what to do now. There can be little doubt regarding the complicity of Arafat in the terror. He is continuing to call for martyrdom for the Palestinians, and in the lexicon of the Palestinians, one who is a martyr is one who commits terror and is willing to die in committing that terror against Israelis.

What the gentleman and I need to do is to urge this House and our administration to clearly set out the conditions that need to exist before Israel can be expected to go forward, before the United States government can be expected to go forward.

We all want peace. There is no question about it. Even the Members that voted against this resolution certainly want peace. There is no question about the motivation. The disagreement can be in how to get there, but what conditions do we need to set forth?

I have stated, too, I am sure the gentleman could add, the absolute need for the Palestinian leadership and the Arab league leadership to renounce terror and to recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

I know the gentleman has got additional views on what must happen next before we can go forward. I would be happy to yield back.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I know our time is running out. I want to give both of us a couple of seconds to close, and the last two charts are directly on point on what the gentleman mentioned.

Yasser Arafat in the compound spoke about sending a million, the English translation is as my colleague so ably pointed out, martyrs to Jerusalem. The Arab word is "shaheed." If my colleagues were to ask any Palestinian what shaheed means, they know that it means suicide bombers. It does not

mean martyr. It is not an esoteric, theoretical term. It means suicide bombers, and specifically to the people that is what they hear.

As shocking as that is, the quote from Chairman Arafat's wife, literally that there would be no greater honor than for her son, if she had a son, to be a martyr, to be a shaheed, to be a suicide bomber.

I would close and give the gentleman an opportunity to close and say I wish that we had a discourse this evening with our colleagues who voted against this because I do not think there is any articulated, rational, moral position against the support of Israel that this Congress overwhelmingly and this country has overwhelmingly done.

□ 2230

Their fight is our fight. The attacks against them are attacks against us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOFFEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, Mr. Speaker, and let me make one more comment.

As the gentleman from New York said about the misnomer of suicide bomber, the phrase suicide bomber suggests one crazed person going off into a field and killing themselves with a bomb. We call what is happening in Israel the actions of suicide bombers, but in fact they are better named homicide bombers because they are not just taking out themselves, they are trying to kill as many innocent people as they possibly can.

That is the terror faced by Israel. That is what she has to defend herself against. And we can clearly state that Israel has the right to self-defense. It is not for us to set a limit on that right. It is up to us to support her in her activity, to make sure she survives; and she will survive with our support.

EDUCATION TAX CREDITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to talk about children and the topic of education. I believe it is the most important issue that we have to discuss, especially when we look out into the future of America and where we are headed.

My colleagues who preceded me had a very excellent discussion, the tenor of which I certainly concur with and agree. And I guess I would ask colleagues to consider this same debate or similar debates years and years from now, when the children of today are the leaders of tomorrow and are debating these important matters of international peace and security and all the topics that we deal with here in the Congress.

I would invite my colleagues who may be monitoring today's pro-

ceedings, if they are interested in engaging in this discussion or participating in it, to come join me here on the floor. The topic today is, again, education, and particularly with respect to the proposal of education tax credits. This is something that our President has mentioned frequently. This is a topic that has become well-known in several States that have preceded this Congress in exploring the topic of education tax credits, and it is an innovative idea and a way to try to get new dollars, additional dollars to children for the purposes of expanding and broadening their academic horizons.

I am one who believes here, Mr. Speaker, that if our children really are important, and I believe they are, that this Congress ought to be prepared to spend whatever it takes to give them the kind of quality education that they deserve here in America, an education that is second to none. Unfortunately, we do not have that today, yet we spend almost every dollar we can dream up here in Washington and take from the taxpayers in order to spend on education. We have spent considerable amounts of money on the Federal education system, and that is magnified even to a far greater degree when we consider the billions of dollars, in fact the trillions of dollars that have been poured into education around the 50 States and through local school districts.

At least at the Federal level, for the amount of money that we have spent, about \$125 billion over the last 10 years to be precise, we should have better results, and we should certainly expect those results to be far improved over and above the indications of today. Our President understands this, and that was the basis of the legislation he persuaded this Congress to pass last year. His first major legislative initiative was all about education, and this was the core of his campaign for office. He proposed doing for the country what he managed to accomplish in Texas, and that was to first take into account the huge numbers of dollars that have been spent on education and then start asking questions, like what do we get for the money.

The governor of Texas at the time, our current President, was led to establish a testing strategy for the State of Texas, and that testing strategy has been credited by many with raising the achievement levels of the poorest children in that State. The President touted as a candidate the successes of Texas throughout the country, and the American people seemed to agree with the President. He came to Washington and suggested we should do the same thing for the whole Nation, and the Congress, by a pretty overwhelming margin, agreed with him. Democrats and Republicans joined together to help the President pass what turned out to be a higher set of expectations for the Nation, a system of national testing.