

Carrie Lehman, and Jerry Ritter. They have done a magnificent job.

If I left anybody off the payroll, I apologize.

I congratulate my good friend, Senator BINGAMAN, and Senator REID for making this possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for a period not to exceed 5 minutes each, with the exception of Senator BIDEN, who wishes to speak for 20 minutes.

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

The Senator from Delaware.

SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, today the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia, Prince Abdullah, met with President Bush in Crawford, TX. Based on the reports from that meeting, there were several items on the agenda, one of which was the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians, and the other was the nature of the Saudi-U.S. bilateral relationship.

A report this morning in the New York Times said that the Crown Prince intended to deliver a "blunt message" to President Bush. Apparently, a Saudi official indicated after that meeting that oil would not be used as a weapon. Earlier, an unnamed Saudi official said that we, the United States, may face a "strategic debacle" unless we alter our relationship with Israel.

There is nothing wrong with blunt messages and blunt talk between friends. I am confident the President of the United States was equally blunt in the message he delivered. No doubt the Crown Prince discussed ways to advance his initiative with regard to Israel, a breakthrough that I publicly stated several times in recent weeks has not been fully appreciated by the world.

The Saudis had endorsed unanimously at the Arab League meeting last month in Beirut a plan that holds out hope for normal peaceful relations between Arab States and Israel. However, laying down that plan is not enough. It is time for more mature leadership.

We have been asked by the rest of the world and the Crown Prince to take an active role in supporting this plan. That is fine. However, I add, I hope the President discussed what active role the Saudis should take in dealing with peace in the Middle East. When the Crown Prince goes home, what concrete steps will he take to move the process forward, to create a new environment that builds trust and hope for a political settlement?

I am troubled by the apparent disconnect between the initiatives for

peace taken by the Crown Prince and his nation and the contradictory behavior that is prevalent in Saudi Arabia and its policies. For example, in March the Saudi newspaper, Al-Riyadh, carried a vile, anti-Semitic article by someone claiming to be a professor. The article resurrected the centuries-old blood libel that civilized people would have thought was a thing of the past. This Saudi professor, in a leading Saudi newspaper, wrote for the Jewish holidays: "Blood must be taken from a non-Jew, dried, and mixed with dough to make pastries." It goes on to say that using human blood in pastries was a "well-established fact historically and legally throughout the history of mankind and that this was one of the main reasons for the persecution of Jews and the exile of Jews in Europe and Asia at different times."

Finally, the article says: "The needles enter the body extremely slowly causing immense pain that gives the Jewish vampires extreme pleasure and they closely monitor this bloodletting in detail with pleasure and enjoyment that is beyond comprehension."

That is printed in a leading Saudi newspaper. The editor of that paper says that he was out of town when this article appeared, and later wrote that it was unworthy of publication.

Forgive me if I have a hard time believing that the article simply slipped through the cracks and that it was a fluke. I can believe many things about Saudi Arabia, but freedom of the press is not one of them. This article was published because no one who saw it believed that it contained anything offensive or untrue.

Imagine the outrage in Riyadh, in Cairo, in Amman, in the United Nations, and elsewhere if a Jewish professor published an article in an American paper saying that Muslim holiday feasts were prepared with the blood of ritualistically sacrificed Jews? Can anyone imagine what the Saudis would expect of the President of the United States, what the Saudis and the rest of the civilized world would rightly expect of all United States Senators who had nothing to do with it being published, but saw it published? The civilized world would demand of us, as they would have a right to, that we, the leaders of this country, stand up one at a time and disavow these vile, vile diatribes.

What did people expect of us, and what did our President do, when a group of mostly Saudi citizens killed thousands of Americans on the 11th? The President did the right thing. He stood up and he said: This is not about Saudi Arabia, this is not about Muslims. He did the right thing.

I wonder what would have happened had it been the reverse. I wonder what would happen.

It is time for some mature leadership here. It is not enough just to lay down a good plan—and it is a good plan the Saudi Crown Prince laid down and which was adopted in Beirut. What

would the Saudis expect us to say, though, were the roles reversed? What action would they demand of the President if in fact such vile lies were printed about Muslims and Saudis in an American paper? And what would the rest of the world have us say about such slander, in a country where there is freedom of the press, the United States?

Another example of this disconnect that baffles me is the recent telethon, ordered by King Fahd, which, according to press reports, raised over \$85 million for families of so-called Palestinian martyrs. According to the Saudi Government, these people are defined as people "victimized by Israeli terror and violence." But in the common parlance of the region, this term often refers to suicide bombers.

In the aftermath of September 11, in which 15 Saudis engaged in the most deadly suicide attacks in history, one would hope the Saudi Government might think twice before offering financial incentives for so-called martyrdom.

Imagine if the President of the United States and the Members of the Congress contributed to a telethon for someone who walked into a hotel in Riyadh and killed 100 Muslims. What would we say? What would we be expected to say? What would we think? What would happen if the President of the United States said: We condemn it, but we understand the frustration of the Saudi people, in having no democracy? We understand the frustration of the Jewish people, being victims of suicide bombing? It would be an outrage, an outrage. And the whole world would say: Where is the moral leadership of the United States?

But the Saudi support for the cult of martyrdom is not restricted to offering financial incentives. Recently the Saudi Ambassador to the United Kingdom wrote a poem entitled "The Martyrs." The poem appeared in Arabic language newspapers and praised Palestinian suicide bombers, particularly a young deranged Palestinian woman from a refugee camp who killed herself and two Israelis on March 29. The Ambassador refers to her as "the bride of loftiness."

This is written by the Saudi Ambassador to the United Kingdom.

She embraces death with a smile
while the leaders are running away from death . . .

He goes on to say:

We complained to the idols of a white house
whose heart is filled with darkness.

Given the opportunity to renounce this poem, a Saudi spokesman said on United States television:

The ambassador is a very well known poet . . . he was expressing the anger and frustration people feel.

Give me a break. That is not good enough. I personally met with this spokesman, who is a fine man. I expected more from a man as educated and sophisticated as Mr. Al-Jubeir. If an American diplomat wrote a poem—

if the Ambassador from the United States to England wrote a poem extolling terrorism and attacking the leader of an ally, the President of the United States would have his or her head on a platter the next day. They would be fired.

What would happen if an ambassador of the United States to another great country wrote a poem that extolled the virtues of some Saudi citizen who—like bin Laden—attempted to assassinate or was engaged in a plot to do harm to the royal family? What would the Saudis expect of us? What would the Saudis, or any civilized nation, expect the United States President to do? They would expect him to do exactly what he would do: Fire the person on the spot, and vocally, in more than one language, disavow the poetry.

Since September 11, we have become all too familiar with the term “madrassa,” a term probably few had ever heard of in the United States. We have learned that madrassas are religious schools. We have learned the extent to which funds from Saudi Arabia have supported madrassas, over 7,000 of them in Pakistan and in Afghanistan. We have learned that many madrassas indoctrinate children with distorted and hateful ideas.

But now we have learned that the problem with education is not simply outside of Saudi Arabian borders, but within the kingdom itself. According to an article in last October's New York Times, 10th grade textbooks in Saudi Arabia warn students to “consider the infidel their enemy.”

Saudis claim such quotes are taken out of context, but in what context is religious prejudice acceptable?

Of course, hateful diatribes and words of incitement also are found in Palestinian textbooks.

While Arafat is talking about peace in Oslo, the textbooks in the West Bank talk about “the hated Jew.” And they have long been accompanied by schoolroom maps in the Middle East that pointedly do not show, even on a map, Israel as a state. When our Saudi friends argue their support and funding for Palestinian causes is for humanitarian and educational purposes, I think it is fair to ask why they continue to turn a blind eye toward this fomenting of hate that exists in their region and their country.

I mention these examples to illustrate why there is a disconnect when we hear Saudi leaders talk of making peace with Israel.

Peace will not happen by itself. It has to be nurtured. Certainly those Arab nations we put in the moderate camp ought to prepare their people for the “normal, peaceful relations” they espoused in Beirut. If the Crown Prince means what he says about normal, peaceful relations with Israel—and I believe he does—then it is time for his government to prepare Saudi Arabia and the rest of the Arab world for this new day. No responsible leaders want to see bloodshed continue in the Middle

East. We all want for it to end immediately. All of us would like to see a peaceful settlement. To make it happen, everyone—everyone—must shoulder responsibility.

It is time for big nations and serious leaders to stand up, to stand up and speak the truth. It is time for nations with the ability to directly influence events to exercise simply mature leadership.

I am not expecting the Saudis to all of a sudden take a pro-Israeli position. But I am expecting, I do demand of them as a civilized nation and a mature country, to do the right thing.

The United States must do its part, too. I have urged the administration to increase its involvement, not only in resolving the current crisis but also convening an international peace conference that would move the parties quickly to a political solution or at least provide a political horizon.

The Arab world must demonstrate mature leadership as well. It cannot simply demand that the United States abandon Israel, something we will never do.

Let me say that again: Something we will never do. Over my dead physical political body will we ever abandon Israel. But that does not mean we believe everything Israel does is right. It does mean, though, we will fight for Israel's right to exist within secure borders.

Mature leadership means taking risks and confronting those forces that hinder progress—not abetting those forces.

Mature leadership means condemning terrorism—not extolling the virtues of “martyrdom.”

Mature leadership means halting the flow of funds to terrorists—not providing financial incentives for more terror.

Mature leadership means creating an educational system that provides the foundation for future progress—not text and textbooks that promote religious bigotry.

Mature leadership means being responsive to the legitimate demands of one's citizen for political openness and transparency—not stifling dissent and exporting your problems elsewhere.

Mature leadership means sitting down with the Israelis and talking peace—not treating them as pariahs.

I find it fascinating that the President was criticized for authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to sit down with the person who many Israelis consider a pariah—Yasser Arafat. The Saudis thought that was essential. Why will they not sit down? Why will they not sit down with a man who is the elected leader of Israel, regardless of whether or not they think on the West Bank he is a pariah as many Israelis and Americans think is the case with Mr. Arafat?

The President has shown mature leadership. I may disagree with his approach, but why is it expected of us and not of them?

As the birthplace of Islam and the land of the holiest Muslim sites, Saudi Arabia has a critical role to play in resolving one of the most intractable conflicts of our time.

This is an opportunity for the Saudi Royal Family to make a real contribution to peace. They have taken the first steps with bold action that holds out hope for peace as they presented their peace plan.

Now let them take the next step of mature, consistent leadership. Let them denounce the Palestinian leadership that uses terror to gain political leverage. Let them denounce hateful language. Let them denounce the incitement to violence in textbooks and in the media.

I hope they will take the next step so the Saudi initiative will not become just another missed opportunity—an interesting footnote in history.

I hope our relationship with the Saudis can improve. I hope the Saudi Arabian citizens can begin to enjoy the freedom they deserve.

But these things can only occur with farsighted, mature leadership.

There has never been a time when we have needed such leadership more than it is needed now. I hope that kind of leadership will enable our two countries to move forward together to achieve progress and peace—not just for the Israelis and Palestinians but for all the people of the Middle East.

I urge the administration to increase its involvement—not only in the present circumstance but beyond.

Let us be honest. This is a historic opportunity. The Saudis have made a significant proposal. I beg them, do not squander the opportunity to be remembered for the century as the party and the force that was the catalyst for bringing an end to the suffering of the people in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL DAN L. LOCKER, COMMANDER, 81ST MEDICAL GROUP AND LEAD AGENT, TRICARE REGION IV

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment today to recognize one of the finest officers in the U.S. Air Force, Brigadier General Dan L. Locker. On July 31, 2002, General Locker will retire from the Air Force and his positions as Commander of the 81st Medical Group, Keesler Medical Center, Keesler Air Force Base, MS, and Lead Agent for Department of Defense TRICARE Region IV. During his time at Keesler Air Force Base, General Locker has exemplified the Air Force core values of integrity, service before self, and excellence in all endeavors. Many Members and staff have enjoyed the opportunity to meet with him on a variety of Department of Defense health care issues and have come to appreciate his many talents. Today it is my privilege to recognize some of Dan's many accomplishments since he