

is a lot of oil for one little field. The footprint is just that much, probably 20 acres.

This particular picture down here shows some polar bears, but they do not indicate where that picture was taken. This picture was not taken in ANWR. It was taken way over on the Arctic area known as Barrow, probably 600 or 700 miles west. But the point I want to make with regard to the polar bear—and it is legitimate—is the greatest contribution we made to the polar bear is the Marine Animal Act because you can't take polar bear as a trophy. You can't hunt them. You can in Russia or Canada, but you cannot do it in the United States; so they are protected. To suggest somehow that a mild amount of activity associated with development of ANWR is going to jeopardize the polar bear—the greatest jeopardy to the polar bear is somebody going out and shooting them. I hate to be so crass, but that is the factual reality.

What we have here, again, is America's extreme environmental community using this, lobbying it very heavily. At a time when clearly we have a lot of unrest in the Middle East, the New York Times is proposing Congress hasn't done anything to relieve our dependence, and there is the recognition that now we are starting a debate, very soon, on the issue of opening ANWR.

I encourage Members to try to sort out fact from fiction, as this debate goes on; recognizing that America stands to gain an awful lot from opening this area up.

There would be significant job creation. It is in the interest of our economy. It is estimated that somewhere in the area of 250,000 jobs would be created. America's unions are virtually 100 percent behind opening up this area because they know it can be done safely. They know it is a jobs issue. Not only are they convinced it is in the interest of our economy, but America's veterans are virtually unanimous in support of opening it. The reason the veterans support it is quite obvious to all. It would forestall the possibility that American troops would have to go overseas and fight a war over oil in a foreign land.

In conclusion, I hope Members really relate to doing what is right for America, what is right for jobs, and what is right for the veterans. I might add that the Israeli lobbying group is virtually 100 percent supportive of developing the Coastal Plain and relieving our dependence on Mideast oil.

When you start looking down the list of supporters on the other side, it is the environmental groups. There is no sound science to support their contention because we can do it safely. It is an extraordinary resource available for this country. It can be developed in a relatively short period of time. It can be done without jeopardizing animal life. For those who claim to be experts, I suggest they go up there, talk to the people, take a look at it, and recognize

the significance of the dreams and aspirations of those people who have to depend on this kind of living when there are alternatives that you and I take for granted. This is the hard reality of the lifestyle of some of my people who want a better lifestyle, and they expect that the Senate will protect their interests.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. FEINGOLD are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### THE MIDEAST

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I have sought recognition to comment briefly about a trip I made to the Mideast and to the efforts being made at getting a cease-fire and a truce.

Two weeks ago yesterday, I arrived in Jerusalem and met with General Zinni, and then with Israel's Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, and then with the Palestinian Authority's Chairman, Yasser Arafat.

On that day, I was told by all three of those men that they were very close to finding agreement on security arrangements under the so-called Tenet Plan put forward by CIA Director George Tenet.

Then the next day there was the massacre, the suicide bomber at the Passover Seder where 22 people were killed and several hundred were wounded. Then the whole situation in the Mideast exploded.

The Israelis then undertook a military operation to try to root out the suicide bombers. And following the initiation of that military operation, the suicide bombers stopped for a few days. Then they started again yesterday.

I am glad to say that Secretary of State Colin Powell has gone to the Mideast at the President's direction. I know the Secretary would have preferred to have gone after all of the arrangements had been worked out and it could be a triumphant tour, but I do believe it is necessary to make an effort even where success is not assured. Nobody hits a home run, we can't expect someone to hit a home run every time they go to bat.

The risks for the United States of doing nothing are much greater than the risks if we try, even if there is not immediate success.

On the wave of the suicide bombings, it is very difficult to ask the Israelis to stop their efforts in self-defense to root out the terrorists and to stop the sui-

cide bombers. It is very hard to do. We cannot allow, the world cannot allow suicide bombings to become an epidemic. What happened to the United States on 9-11 involved suicide bombers, just a little bit more sophisticated. They hijacked airplanes that they crashed into the trade towers. One was headed to the White House which hit the Pentagon, and another was headed to the Capitol which went down in Somerset County, PA.

If suicide bombers are not stopped, they are going to become an epidemic and a way of life; no one is going to be safe. It is very difficult to expect Israel not to act in its own self-defense in rooting out the suicide bombers.

The evidence came to light last week, or the purported evidence, that documents were found which bore the signature of Chairman Arafat on paying money to terrorists who were involved against the State of Israel. It seemed to me that when that evidence came to light, we had to check it out thoroughly to see if in fact it was true. There has not been conclusive authentication, although from all appearances it seems to be accurate.

The Palestinian Authority did not directly deny the accuracy but said, somewhat tangentially, that Israel sometimes concocted the documents and said further that Israel was using this issue for propaganda purposes. Both of those responses are really beside the point. The point is, are those documents authentic?

There yet ought to be a determination, perhaps made by a U.S. official, perhaps by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or perhaps by the CIA or some impartial agency, to see for sure if that is in fact Chairman Arafat's signature and his handwriting.

When I saw him 2 weeks ago yesterday, I asked him a great many questions. One of the questions I asked him involved the Iranian shipment of arms to the Palestinian Authority which was documented. At that time, there was not conclusive proof linking Arafat personally, but there was conclusive proof that it went to the Palestinian Authority. When I talked to Chairman Arafat and his advisers in the face of their denials that it ever happened, it seemed to me not credible and not worthy of belief.

When I saw Chairman Arafat, I conveyed General Zinni's message that Chairman Arafat ought to make an emphatic, unequivocal statement in Arabic to stop the suicide bombings. Chairman Arafat refused to do that.

If it turns out that these documents do in fact bear Arafat's handwriting and if it is conclusive that Arafat has paid off terrorists, then it seems to me very difficult to deal with Arafat or to ask Israel to deal with Arafat.

I am not unmindful of the grave difficulty as to how we negotiate with the Palestinian Authority if we do not negotiate with Arafat. But the ultimate question is, what is an arrangement, what is an agreement with Arafat,

worth if in fact he has been paying off terrorists? You have a sequence of events that would be most damning. The Iranian arms deal is very problematic. His refusal to make an unequivocal statement in Arabic to stop the suicide bombings is also obviously very problematic.

I am glad to see Secretary of State Powell talking to moderate Arab leaders first. The reports were that when he met with Mohamed VI, the leader in Morocco, Mohamed VI challenged the Secretary on why he had waited so long to come to the Mideast and why he had gone to Morocco instead of going to Jerusalem where the war problem existed. I think Secretary of State Powell was correct in going to Morocco first and then talking to the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia who happened to be in Morocco as well, then proceeding to Egypt, and then to talk to King Abdullah of Jordan—to go to the moderate Arabs first.

I frankly like King Mohamed VI's spunk in challenging the United States. I think that kind of independence and that kind of directness is very refreshing, even though I believe Secretary of State Powell is correct and had a good answer for Mohamed VI. I have had a chance to meet him on prior trips to the Mideast. He is a man in his late thirties. I think it shows great promise of leadership in the moderate Arab world. He follows his father who had good relations with Israel and had an open mind. He has the real potential for leadership.

On the trip to the Mideast a week ago last Thursday, I had a chance to talk to King Abdullah of Jordan. There is another young moderate leader of the Arab world who has real potential.

I have been a little disappointed lately in what President Mubarak has had to say and a little surprised to see in the morning's press that it is the Egyptian Foreign Minister who had a press conference with Secretary of State Powell as opposed to President Mubarak.

When President Mubarak was visiting here a few weeks ago and a number of Senators met with him in the Foreign Relations Room downstairs in the Capitol, the question was raised about an editor of a newspaper reportedly very close to President Mubarak who had spread false rumors or printed a false report that the United States was engaged in providing tainted food in Afghanistan which is totally untrue. The question arises as to why that is going on. It may be that it can't be controlled by President Mubarak. But when that question was posed, there was not a satisfactory answer given to it.

President Mubarak has been a strong moderate leader for many years. The United States has responded with \$2 billion a year since the late 1970s, or in the range of \$50 billion in United States aid to Egypt in recognition of their leadership.

It may be that what we will have to look for ultimately is some other rep-

resentative, if Chairman Arafat is disqualified because of what he has done, it may be that the moderate leaders such as Mohamed, or Abdullah, or Mubarak, will have to step forward. It is very troublesome as to what may be accomplished. I am hopeful that Secretary of State Powell will be able to broker a truce. As I said, 2 weeks ago yesterday they were very close to security arrangements and to an agreement among Chairman Arafat, General Zinni, and Prime Minister Sharon. But beyond the truce, I think Secretary of State Powell is correct. As he commented yesterday, there has to be an immediate action toward a political settlement.

There has been agreement that there will be a Palestinian State. Prime Minister Sharon has acknowledged that, and that is understood in Israel. Those are the terms of the Oslo agreement President Bush talked about. I do think there are ways to move ahead to see to it that the issues of boundaries, the issues of settlements, and all the other issues in the political mixture can be worked out.

During our trip, we also had an opportunity to meet with President Bashar al-Asad of Syria, another young man—a new generation—in his thirties. He is 36 years of age. I had occasion to get to know his father, Hafez al-Asad. I have been traveling to Syria almost every year since 1984 and had many meetings—more than a dozen—with President Hafez al-Asad, and I had an opportunity to meet President Bashar al-Asad when I attended the funeral in June of 2000.

In a meeting I had with President Asad a week ago Saturday, we talked about a great many subjects. It is my hope, as matters evolve, that President Bashar Asad will present a new image for Syria. I know in today's press it is reported that Vice President CHENEY has contacted President Bashar Asad about not opening up a second front in Lebanon. It is my hope that Syria will be cooperative in that respect.

When I talked to President Asad a week ago Saturday, I raised a number of issues with him. He had been quoted at the Arab summit, saying it was acceptable to target civilians. I commented to him that I thought that was not appropriate, that you simply cannot target civilians. Civilians might be injured and they might be casualties, as civilians were injured when the United States bombed Yugoslavia, but to target civilians is unacceptable. We had a discussion about that. He responded there were thousands of settlers in the Golan who were armed, and I replied that if that situation was unsatisfactory to Syria, President Asad should pick up what his father did and try to negotiate a settlement on an arrangement brokered by President Clinton back in the mid-1990s, when Syria and Israel were very close to agreement, with Prime Minister Rabin and President Hafez al-Asad.

I commented about President Asad's speech last summer where he equated

Naziism with Zionism. I told him that that not only was unacceptable and problematic for the international Jewish community, but for the international community generally. President Asad responded that if you talked to the man in the street in Damascus, he or she would not know very much about Naziism, but they would be very unhappy with Israel. I said equating Zionism and Naziism is very repugnant, that the principal reason for the Jewish nation in Israel was the Holocaust and the incineration of 6 million Jews, and that kind of equation is unacceptable.

In conclusion, I see colleagues coming to the floor, so I will not take up any more floor time. I think we have to pursue new avenues. I think we have to look to moderate Arabs such as Mohamed of Morocco, Abdullah of Jordan, and Mubarak of Egypt to lead the way. And if we find this evidence as to Yasser Arafat's complicity in paying terrorists, we have to face up to that head on.

President Bush has been very emphatic that you can't deal with terrorists, you can't deal with anybody who harbors terrorists. In moving forward with negotiations, before there is a truce, there is a real problem there on the appearance of rewarding terrorism by having negotiations before there is a truce. Prime Minister Sharon had insisted on 7 days of quiet before he would negotiate, and in the interest of trying to move the process forward, he has abandoned that precondition. But we have to be very careful in our dealings here that we do not reward terrorists, which will only encourage more terrorism.

I ask unanimous consent that my trip report be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER, REPORT ON FOREIGN TRAVEL, ENGLAND, NETHERLANDS, GREECE, SAUDI ARABIA, ISRAEL, JORDAN, SYRIA, MARCH 22-APRIL 1, 2002

#### ENGLAND

We arrived in London on the evening of Friday, March 22, 2002. On Saturday morning, Glyn Davies, Deputy Chief of Mission (Charge d' Affairs), and Mr. Ethan Goldrich, First Secretary, of the U. S. Embassy staff provided a briefing. We discussed the British reaction to a host of issues, including Iraq, Iran, Russia, China, steel, anti-terrorism coalitions, NATO, England's Jewish population, and embassy security.

The U.S. decision imposing tariffs on steel imports has been of great concern to British officials. The issue appears to be less of a bilateral one between the U.S. and the U.K., and more of a concern about increased dumping of steel from countries excluded from U.S. markets that could affect the British steel industry.

Domestically, Mr. Davies noted that the political landscape is dominated by Prime Minister Tony Blair. Tory power is low currently. Domestic problems such as crime and health care remain unsolved. England's bureaucratic structure is very powerful, and is about equal to the political establishment. Mr. Davies shared a story about the bureaucratic heads preparing separate memos immediately before the election outlining different initiatives depending on who won.

I asked about the solidity of the U.S.-led coalition. The embassy staff noted that five nations have troops on the ground in support of the Afghanistan action and that fourteen countries are members of the assistance force. There is a general feeling that even Great Britain's support for the U.S. has somewhat diminished. Immediately after the September 11, 2001 attacks, the British people showed an outpouring of support through letters, telephone calls and acts of kindness. Many people drove to Heathrow Airport to take home stranded Americans. Further, over 50,000 people came to the Embassy to sign condolence books in the rain. Despite this overwhelming support, the British people and officials are often concerned about the use of their troops. They fear an "overstretch problem" with commitments around Europe and elsewhere and are skeptical of further military actions, including one against Iraq.

On the issue of Iran, there appears to be a real divergence between the U.S. and U.K. positions. England opened an Embassy in the hopes of improving communication between the two nations. They are appealing to the moderates in Iran, who are known to exist, but are not in positions of power yet. President Bush's inclusion of Iran in the "Axis of Evil" is reportedly viewed as inappropriate and the British are treading lightly with regard to Iranian issues.

We discussed the security of the U.S. Embassy. Protective actions have been taken, but more work is reportedly warranted.

That evening, we had dinner with the Rt. Hon. Geoffrey Johnson Smith, a former Member of Parliament who recently retired. Geoffrey and I debated in November 1949 when he represented Oxford and I was on the University of Pennsylvania team. We discussed the wide range of U.S./British relations, including our 1949 debate topic: "Resolved that the British Empire is Decadent."

#### NETHERLANDS

From London, we traveled to The Hague, Netherlands, and met, dined and stayed with U.S. Ambassador Clifford M. Sobel and his wife Barbara with whom we discussed a wide range of issues.

On Monday, March 25th, we met at the headquarters of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY). The attendees at the meeting were Carla Del Ponte, Chief Prosecutor; Mark Ierace, Senior Trial Attorney; Gavin Ruxton, Senior Legal Advisor; Mark B. Harmon, Senior Trial Attorney; Michael Johnson, Chief of Prosecutions; Anton Nikifozov, Special Advisor; Jean Jacques Joris, Diplomatic Advisor; and Graham Blewitt, Deputy Prosecutor.

The Tribunal has six ongoing trials in two types of cases: leadership and criminal. There are three courtrooms with morning and afternoon sessions. The U.N. has provided a budget of \$200 million for two years, which forced the ICTY to eliminate two full trial teams. The ICTY now has six trial teams. Efficiency has been reportedly questioned by the U.N., but Ms. Del Ponte and her staff feel that these criticisms are unfounded. The workload for the ICTY is immense, with one case producing a quarter of a million documents, which require translation into three languages. Overall, twenty-five cases have been completed.

We had planned to view the Slobodan Milosevic trial; however, it was postponed due to Milosevic's having the flu. That trial has attracted much international attention, and the ICTY staff is concerned that the trial is an opportunity for Milosevic to make political statements. The prosecutors are confident that another view will be taken by the public once the prosecution has a chance to expose Milosevic's weaknesses.

Former Ambassador Holbrooke has been called to testify. We were told that the U.S. Government has invoked Rule 70 for any Americans testifying, which would require a closed session. Ms. Del Ponte fears that this may provide Milosevic an opportunity to announce through the media his version of the closed sessions. Ms. Del Ponte said she discussed the likelihood of the U.S. waiving the rule with Secretary of State Colin Powell who said he would consider it.

I asked about the status of the Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic cases. Karadzic has been sought for six years with reports that he travels with impunity. Two raids have been made recently related to his case. Similarly, Mladic is not the type of person who is able to hide in his country. There are reports that Mladic has been seen in a Belgrade Park with 60 guards. The Tribunal's work is hampered by the fugitive status of these two men.

I asked for an update on the Rwanda prosecutions. On the cases, the Tribunal has 53 detainees, including 17 on trial and 32 awaiting trial. Ms. Del Ponte frequently visits Rwanda as a part of her oversight duties. Each Tribunal—for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda—has roughly the same staff of 70 attorneys each, although the vacancy rate is high in the Rwanda office.

#### GREECE

En route to Saudi Arabia, we stopped briefly in Souda Bay, Crete in Greece. We met with U.S. Ambassador Thomas Miller and discussed many issues. First, we spoke about Greek support of the U.S.-led war on terrorism, as well as threats in Greece by a group known as November 17th. They have reportedly killed twenty-two U.S. and other foreign personnel in Greece since 1975. We also discussed trade, which balances fairly heavily in favor of the U.S., primarily through military equipment sales.

We touched on the Cyprus issue, which the Ambassador thinks is close to being resolved. On U.S. action in Iraq, the Greeks urge diplomacy over military action. The Ambassador recommends the U.N. as the best forum to discuss Iraq with Greece and other hesitant nations. Moving onto the Israeli-Palestinian crisis, the Greeks appear to be supportive of the Saudi plan. Further, the Greeks see potential in Iran as part of the solution to tensions in the Middle East, as evidenced by the Greeks hosting Iranian President Khatemi recently.

#### SAUDI ARABIA

From Greece, we continued on to Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. Before leaving Washington, D.C., we were told we would meet with Crown Prince Abdullah Monday night or Tuesday morning. Upon arriving there, we were told to await a call setting the meeting time on Monday evening. Shortly thereafter, we were advised there would be no meeting because the Crown Prince was preparing for the Beirut summit and would be departing for Beirut early the next morning.

#### ISRAEL

We left Saudi Arabia on the morning of Tuesday, March 26th and stopped briefly in Amman, Jordan, as required by Saudi regulations, on our way to Tel Aviv, Israel.

That afternoon, we met with General Anthony Zinni, U.S. envoy to the Middle East. General Zinni said the Israelis and Palestinians were very close to an agreement on the Tenet plan. He had been in negotiations with the leaders of both sides and reported progress at every meeting. The plan proposed by Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet in June 2001 was Zinni's working draft. That plan is focused on security issues. The process would then lead directly into the George Mitchell plan on political matters and end with resolving final status issues.

General Zinni stressed that a plan would have to be given time to work on the ground. He believes Israelis will be satisfied if they believe Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian Authority are making a 100% effort to end the violence. He suggests the use of outside monitors, including some U.S. personnel, to evaluate the situation after an agreement is reached. Under the Tenet plan, they would monitor arrests, including the use of proper procedures; weapons confiscation, including disposal; and actions of incitement of violence.

When I asked about his reaction to the Saudi proposal, the General said it was a remarkable plan, because of the mere fact that it was offered and that it appears to have strong Arab support from around the region. He said the Saudi plan could further political discussions.

There is a great deal of speculation as to whether Yasser Arafat can control the violence. His forces have been weakened by Israeli attacks. Upon learning of my meeting later that evening with Arafat, General Zinni asked me to make a few points. First, Arafat needs to sign and follow the Tenet agreement. Second, Arafat must make a clear declaration to end the violence in Arabic and English. Chairman Arafat has been accused of saying one thing in Arabic and the opposite in English.

General Zinni told me that the Israelis are very concerned about the Syrian connection to Hezbollah in Southern Lebanon, which reportedly has about 8,000 rockets that could be used against Israel. We discussed the need for more pressure on countries to stop funding terrorism. These countries allow organizations to operate, exploit children as suicide bombers, and funnel cash for arms. The General suggested that an Arab non-governmental organization or cooperation with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and other humanitarian groups from around the world could help address the poverty from which terrorist groups recruit young terrorists.

Late that afternoon, I met with Prime Minister Sharon and U.S. Ambassador Daniel Kurtzer. Prime Minister Sharon was generally upbeat and in a good mood notwithstanding the pressures and problems. He asked our Ambassador what had happened on his (Sharon's) request to attend the Beirut Arab summit. The Ambassador replied that the inquiry had, not unexpectedly, been turned down. Prime Minister Sharon expressed appreciation that an effort had been made.

There was then an extended discussion over the U.S. request to let Chairman Arafat attend the Beirut summit. Sharon said Arafat shall not be rewarded since he had done nothing to stop the violence. At least, Sharon said, Arafat should have made some statement about ending the violence.

Sharon then asked the U.S. Ambassador if the U.S. would back up Israel in refusing to allow Arafat back in if violence occurred in his absence. As events developed, Arafat was not permitted to leave Ramallah and nothing came of the issue.

I asked Sharon what would occur if the suicide bombings continued after Arafat made an adequate statement for terrorists to end the violence. Sharon replied that all Arafat could do was give 100% of his best efforts. It was apparent from Sharon's tone that he did not trust or expect anything positive or productive to come from Arafat.

At 7:00 p.m., Joan and I had a pre-Passover Seder dinner with my sister and brother-in-law Hilda and Arthur Morgenstern who live in Jerusalem.

At 8:30 p.m., we embarked in an armored car for the 40-minute drive to Ramallah. Our security officer advised that many weapons

commonly used by Palestinian terrorists could destroy our vehicle. To say the least, it was an uneasy ride.

When we came to the line of demarcation between Israeli and Palestinian territory, we noted a tall cement barrier to shield Israeli soldiers from Palestinian snipers. We were advised that there were Israeli snipers a block away in a high-rise abandoned hotel.

Starting at 9:30 p.m., we spent about an hour and a half with Chairman Arafat at his compound in Ramallah. Also attending were Sa'eb Erekat, Minister of Local Government; Nabil Abu Rudeinch, Chief of Cabinet; and Jeff Feltman from the U.S. Consulate.

Chairman Arafat said he thought General Zinni was correct that a deal was close. He said the most recent meeting was very positive. Mr. Erekat stated that they are one-hundred percent committed to the Tenet plan. Generally, we were told that the deal is acceptable, with some specific items still in negotiation.

I told Arafat that General Zinni is asking for his public denouncement to end the violence to be in English and Arabic. Arafat said he has made these statements in the past, sometimes at the request of American officials like Secretary of State Colin Powell, and that he will agree to do it again. Arafat said, confirmed by Erekat, that he will follow the precise script agreed to with Zinni and Israeli officials in Arabic as well as English.

Regarding Arafat's control of terrorist groups, he said he could control them if he has help to rebuild his forces, buildings, and infrastructure. He said that with every Israeli strike, his power to stop the violence is diminished.

I brought up the subject of the Iranian arms shipment destined for Palestinian groups that was seized recently. Chairman Arafat became very animated, denied that the Palestinian Authority had received arms from Iran, claimed he did not need weapons and said the Iranians have called for his death, so he questions why anyone would think he would be dealing with them. His denials of dealing for Iranian arms were totally unpersuasive in view of the conclusive evidence to the contrary.

I also asked his opinion on possible action against Iraq. He urged extreme caution, arguing that it would greatly strengthen Iran. He warns that the Shiite Muslim areas, accounting for as much as half of Iraq's total population, would be taken over by Iran, and that Iran's borders would expand. Further, he claimed that Iran and Turkey would argue over control of the Kurds.

On Wednesday, March 27th, we met with Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres. He said the Tenet plan must be expanded to deal with political issues. He is not convinced that a solution is close. He stated there are a number of items that he feels are necessary for a successful peace proposal, including: recognition of a Palestinian state; determining borders; no "right of return" for Palestinian refugees; Jewish settlements; Jerusalem as a holy place without sovereignty; and security.

He has urged General Zinni not to ask Arafat for things he cannot do and recommends making private requests of Arafat, instead of open demands. It is Peres' sense that Arafat feels he is winning and wants to be seen as a moderate ruler to the world and as a popular leader with his people. He reiterated concerns that Arafat delivers different messages for different audiences and is careful not to issue orders, so as to protect himself. He thinks the Saudi plan is psychologically significant, because it recognizes the Israeli state and pulls the whole Arab world together.

On potential U.S. action against Saddam Hussein, it is Peres' opinion that the Arab

leaders would publicly condemn the action, but be relieved privately.

We spoke of the future of the region and Mr. Peres believes that Arab nations must realize that poverty does not create terror; terror creates poverty. They must also realize that nobody can help them transition into modern states but themselves. Scientific and technological research and advances provide the key to a stable, prosperous future. However, a major impediment to these activities is a closed society. He said there are no more excuses for backward societies now that empires and foreign rule are over. Only an open, free society will allow for this innovation.

Threatening the future of the region is the close association with religion and terrorism. He said that so many people in the Arab world consider attacks on civilians a religious obligation to attain justice. This Machiavellian idea that the end justifies the means, is very difficult to reverse and leaves no room for compromise. Groups such as Hezbollah threaten Israel, but they also threaten countries like Lebanon, which has been a supporter of the group.

#### JORDAN

On the afternoon of Wednesday, March 27th, we traveled from Tel Aviv, Israel, to Amman, Jordan. On Thursday morning, March 28th, we met with U.S. Ambassador Edward "Skip" Gnehm and his staff who briefed us on the regional issues.

The U.S. provides annual foreign aid to Jordan in the amount of \$150 million for water, health care, and economic assistance, as well as \$75 million in military assistance. The Ambassador was pleased that the President's Fiscal Year 2002 supplemental appropriations request includes \$100 million for economic assistance and funds to help Jordan purchase a \$60.5 million radar system.

The Ambassador noted that Jordan has a "warm peace" relationship with Israel. Many Jordanians visited Israel regularly before the violence erupted 18 months ago. Many businesses also participate in the Qualifying Industrial Zone program, which provides exports to the U.S. of products produced by Jordan with Israeli input. The U.S. is Jordan's top importer.

Further, Jordanian intelligence is seen as a partner with the Israelis and has helped foil many terrorist attacks. There is a geographical interest for Jordan, because Israel provides an outlet to the Mediterranean. However, there is an internal Jordanian effort to end the relationship with Israel.

We next met with Jordan's King Abdullah bin Hussein at his residence. We talked about the ongoing Arab summit and he confirmed that there were security concerns for himself and President Mubarak. They have many enemies, including Hezbollah and al-Qaeda. He stated that the Lebanese were making things difficult at the summit. He expressed surprise at Syrian President Asad's speech that called on Arab nations to sever ties with Israel.

The King has been working closely with Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah on the peace plan and emphasized the importance of a general proposal that would offer peace from the Arabs to Israel and send a message to Arab populations on the street that it is time to change. He expected the peace plan to be passed at the summit.

He expressed concern about Arafat's not attending the summit. The King did express optimism that General Zinni will get something accomplished, but did note that Arafat's control on the ground has diminished.

With regard to Iraq, the King was much more hesitant and argues that the timing is important. He feels the region is too unstable to handle the Israeli-Palestinian crisis

and a move against Saddam Hussein in Iraq. However, he could not give a timetable for such an action and questioned the ability of the U.S. to form a coalition. He does believe that Saddam is pursuing weapons of mass destruction.

#### SYRIA

On Thursday, March 28th, we left Amman, Jordan, and arrived in Damascus, Syria, where we were briefed by U.S. Ambassador Theodore Kattouf, a native of Altoona, Pennsylvania, and his staff.

We discussed Syrian President Asad's statement at the Arab summit, in which he justified attacks against civilians. The Ambassador said the Syrians charge the U.S. with using a double standard on U.N. Resolutions by urging strict enforcement on Arabs and being lax on Israelis. He also said the Syrians feel they have no hope for leverage against Israel and its military might without Arab cooperation. Further, Syrian leaders do not see any U.S. action to resolve the issue of most concern to them, the Golan Heights. Vice President Cheney did not visit Syria, which was seen as a slight.

On March 30th, we met with Syrian President Bashar al-Asad and Deputy Prime Minister/Foreign Minister Farouk al-Shara. I had previously met President Bashar al-Asad at his father's funeral.

President Asad told me that dialogue with Americans is very important to him. He said he met with the American media in Beirut two days prior. I thanked him for condemning the September 11th attacks by al-Qaeda.

He said the war in Afghanistan will not solve the problem, rather a need for moderation is called for. Terrorism is built on ideological extremism. He was sharply critical of U.S. support for Israel and claimed that the terrorism experienced by Israel is merely a reaction to terrorism inflicted by Israel on the Palestinians.

After praising President Asad's support for the Saudi proposal to normalize relations with Israel, I expressed disagreement with his speech at the Beirut summit where he condoned terrorist attacks against Israeli citizens. He sought to justify that approach saying there are thousands of armed settlers holding Syrian territory in the Golan.

I responded that he should resume negotiations with Israel over the Golan Heights issue, which his father had pursued and had come very close to resolving in negotiations brokered by President Clinton. I said I thought President Bush might well be willing to help on that matter.

I urged President Asad to come to visit the U.S. with his wife who has received significant public acclaim. I noted King Abdullah's successful visit to the U.S. where the King and his wife had made a public impact with their views.

In the course of our one hour fifteen minute meeting, I told President Asad that his 2001 speech at the Arab summit equating Zionism with Nazism was offensive to a much larger audience than the international Jewish community. I emphasized that reference to Nazism was especially repugnant since the Nazis had murdered six million Jews in crematoria during World War II, which has been a major factor in world Jewry's determination to establish Israel as a Jewish state and homeland.

President Asad replied that if the average citizen in Damascus was asked about "Nazism" he would not know much about it, but if asked about Israel, he would be very opposed.

Moving to Iraq, I told him of my concerns about Saddam's weapons of mass destruction and his refusal to comply with UN inspections. He said that it would be impossible for

Iraq to obtain nuclear weapons. He said Arabs would strongly oppose U.S. action against Iraq and believes the matter should be handled by the UN.

He said that President Bush's inclusion of Iran in the "Axis of Evil" was a mistake and was not acceptable to the region.

I told President Asad that I would like to see Syria take action to warrant removal from the U.S. terrorism list. He defended Hezbollah and other terrorist groups in Damascus and was clearly disinclined to take any action against them. He expressed the hope that the U.S. would deal with Syria on matters other than only Israel. I replied that I would explore the possibility of more U.S. trade and Syrian membership in the World Trade Organization to the extent that was not precluded by Syria's being on the U.S. terrorist list.

I brought to the President's attention the case of a U.S. woman who had married a man from Lebanon who abducted their two children to Syria after their divorce. President Asad expressed his concern and advised that he would personally look into the matter to try to determine the whereabouts of the children.

Following our meeting with President Asad, we departed for Rome, Italy on the afternoon of March 30th where we were hosted and met by Ambassador Mel Sembler and his wife Betty. At each stop, we were greeted, briefed, and taken care of by very competent and hospitable Ambassadors and their staffs.

We remained in Rome on March 31st for an interview on "Face the Nation" and departed Rome on April 1, 2002, for the U.S.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his usual erudition which spans many topics. I enjoyed listening to him on this subject, and on Syria in particular, which remains quite an enigma to many of us. Bashar Assad, as he said, is untested at this point.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my colleague for his kind comments. He and I have worked on many subjects together.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I want to speak for a brief time about the Middle East as well. I guess I am addressing my speech, in a certain sense, to the President and the Secretary of State because many of us—certainly I and many of my constituents in New York and many colleagues in the Senate—are confused. I believe that in making this war on terrorism the No. 1 goal America faces, our President has done a great job. I support not only his concept but the execution. He has just been fabulous in this regard.

My enthusiasm was not simply limited to the area of Afghanistan, southern Asia, and central Asia, but also to the Middle East because I have spent time talking to the President on numerous occasions about the Middle East. I have carefully followed his statements. What he has stated has been crystal clear, and that is that terrorism is terrorism is terrorism—whether it be in Afghanistan, or Iraq, or directed at Israel.

The President has stated unequivocally that Yasser Arafat is engaged in terrorism and that until he is able to curb terrorism, we are not going to

have peace in the Middle East. This administration even had the courage to put the Al Aqsa Brigade, a part of Fatah controlled by Yasser Arafat, on our Nation's terrorism list. Documents that were subsequently made public showed that Al Aqsa was engaging in terrorism and Yasser Arafat was fully aware.

So the last few days have come as a shock, and so many of us are just totally perplexed. So this is an open question to both Colin Powell and the President because sending Colin Powell to the Middle East I don't have a problem with, if someone can help make peace. I think it is difficult, and I think the tone in the Palestinian territories is decidedly against peace. I think the nihilism is enormous. I think the failure to deal with truth throughout the Arab world, with no free press, is incredible when an American Ambassador is vilified for asking that people stand up and remember it is not only Palestinian victims but also Israelis. For Colin Powell to come into the area and to try to bring the sides together, I do not have a problem with that.

What is totally perplexing is this: Given the President's strong stands against terrorism wherever it rears its ugly head, given his view—and I say this as someone who, as you know, Madam President, has been pretty much up and down the line a supporter of the President's policies thus far, in Afghanistan, in the war against terrorism, and in the Middle East; I have said some very laudatory things—all of a sudden it seems the President's previous statements are being ignored.

For instance, we are doing two things at once: Yasser Arafat, whom we acknowledge as an aider and abettor of terrorism—I believe he perpetrates terrorism—is going to meet with Colin Powell. Despite the fact that both the President and the Secretary of State have said repeatedly that they will not meet with Yasser Arafat until he renounces terrorism and takes some steps to end the violence, now we are meeting with him without any preconditions and, at the same time, Israel, which is acting defensively to prevent the kind of suicide bombings which no society can endure, is being restrained. Arafat, the terrorist, the perpetrator of terrorism, is given a pat on the back and a green light—"We will meet with him"—which is a reversal of administration policy because they were not going to meet with him until he did something—not just words but did something.

Secretary Powell himself asked him to say things in English and Arabic which is a basic statement saying: You do not tell the truth; you talk with forked tongue. At the same time, we are telling Israel, which is simply trying to defend herself: Pull back.

It seems as if the policy in the Middle East has had a 180-degree turn without any explanation, without understanding its inconsistency with even the President's speech last week, which

I thought was a tour de force, without letting us understand as Americans who support the war on terrorism how we can sit down with someone who perpetrates terrorism, and at the same time chastise and put handcuffs around the country trying to defend itself against terrorism. It is very perplexing.

I would like the administration to explain itself. What has brought about the 180-degree turn? Why is Colin Powell now meeting with Yasser Arafat without any preconditions? Why isn't America giving Israel the chance to get these suicide bombers, to take their weapons away? We all know we are not going to have peace if in a democracy its leaders can do nothing when a bomb goes off every day in a hotel or a pizza parlor or on the street or in a bus.

The policy seems to be muddled, confused, and inconsistent with what seemed to be a crystal clear direction which I think the vast majority of Americans, whatever one's views are on other issues, supported.

I fail to understand how we can reverse policy so quickly and so dramatically without any change. Has Yasser Arafat renounced terrorism? Has he arrested any of the suicide bombers in the last few days? What has changed? Is the word of what we say not to be believed, that we will change our views on a dime?

This speech pains me because I was so enthusiastic about the President's policy in the Middle East until this past week. I would like to be enthusiastic again. I would like to believe there is something that none of us knows that justifies this reversal, but so far silence.

I urge the Secretary of State and I urge our President to reconsider what they are doing. Make Yasser Arafat come clean; make him renounce the violence—the very same violence that we are fighting in Afghanistan and that we must fight in America has to be fought in Israel as well—and give Israel a little bit of the space that it needs—a week—to get after these engineers—terrorist if there ever was one—who make these evil bombs filled with explosives, nails, and ball bearings that are exploded amid innocent men, women, and children—civilians. Give them a chance to curb them. Then Colin Powell should come into the area and cause the sides to sit down and create peace. Maybe we will have a chance to succeed.

I yield the floor.

#### NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 3047

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time between now and 2 p.m. is to be equally divided and controlled before a vote in relation to the Craig amendment No. 3047.

Who yields time? The Senator from Idaho.