

and progress made toward the overall objectives of the activities to be carried out under the grant or contract.

On page 886, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

TITLE VIII—IMPACT AID

SEC. 801. ELIGIBILITY UNDER SECTION 8003 FOR CERTAIN HEAVILY IMPACTED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 8003(b)(2)(C) (20 U.S.C. 7703(b)(2)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clauses (i) and (ii) by inserting after “Federal military installation” each place it appears the following: “(or the agency is a qualified local educational agency as described in clause (iv))”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) QUALIFIED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—A qualified local educational agency described in this clause is an agency that meets the following requirements:

“(I) The boundaries are the same as island property designated by the Secretary of the Interior to be property that is held in trust by the Federal Government.

“(II) The agency has no taxing authority.

“(III) The agency received a payment under paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2001.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Secretary shall consider an application for a payment under section 8003(b)(2) for fiscal year 2002 from a qualified local educational agency described in section 8003(b)(2)(C)(iv), as added by subsection (a), as meeting the requirements of section 8003(b)(2)(C)(iii), and shall provide a payment under section 8003(b)(2) for fiscal year 2002, if the agency submits to the Secretary an application for payment under such section not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, we are at a critical juncture in the Middle East. If words are followed by deeds, yesterday's acceptance by the Palestinians of a U.S. plan brokered by CIA Director Tenet—which Israel had previously signed off on—may open the door for an end to the violence of the past eight months, a cooling off period, and new peace talks.

The violence in Israel following the collapse of the Camp David talks has been profoundly disturbing to those of us who are both friends of Israel and strong supporters of Arab-Israeli peacemaking.

With a cease-fire now in effect, the Israeli and Palestinian people have an opportunity to start moving back in the right direction, towards peace and security for the region.

If the peace process is to gain momentum, both sides must make a commitment to the right of the other to exist, in peace and security.

If leaders on both sides are able to muster the political will necessary for this commitment, then I believe that it will be possible for the cease-fire to

hold, for a cooling-off period to have effect, and for confidence building measures to once again give momentum to a new peace process.

I was a supporter of the Oslo process when I first came to the Senate, and worked to build peace in the region in the years since, believing a commitment by both sides existed.

I was thus saddened that the unprecedented concessions that former Prime Minister Barak offered last summer—which many felt met the needs and aspirations of the Palestinian people—was not accepted.

Not only was the Palestinian response to that offer “no,” but PLO Chairman Yassar Arafat walked away from the negotiations and the Palestinians began a campaign of violence which, in turn, led to Israel resorting to violence to try to protect its security and safeguard the lives of its people.

In walking away from negotiations, Mr. Arafat raised questions about his commitment to peace, and whether there are some in Palestinian society who are unwilling to accept the existence of Israel under any circumstances.

With this cease-fire, these questions are again on the table.

As I stated on the floor of the Senate earlier this year, the new Intifadah was characterized by a level of hate and violence that I did not believe possible in view of the nature of concessions Israel had offered to make.

Particularly tragic—coming on top of over 400 Palestinian and 100 Israeli deaths since last September—was the murder of 20 young Israelis at a night club in Tel Aviv on June 1. Israel's restraint in response to this bombing—looking for the path of peace, not continued bloodshed—has been nothing short of heroic.

No one—Israeli or Palestinian—should have to worry about the possibility of attack as they put their child on a school bus, go to work, go shopping, sit at a cafe, or go to a night club.

We can all remember the images from last Fall of the Palestinian child hiding behind his father, caught in the cross-fire—and, just a few days later, the pictures of the Israelis lynched by a Palestinian mob, their bloody bodies thrown from the second floor window of the police station.

There are countless other such images that each side can point to in the 8 months since.

It is easy to understand how passions can run high, and fear and frustration can drive violence in the current environment.

It is also easy to see how these feelings can get out of control and lead to ever deeper, and never-ending, cycles of violence.

The cease-fire and cooling off period that has been agreed to provides both parties the opportunity to end the provocation and reaction.

Palestinian acceptance of the cease-fire agreement brokered by Director

Tenet is a crucial step in the right direction, and carries with it an acknowledgment of the special responsibility incumbent on the Palestinian Authority to end the violence.

Much more will need to be done, however, to show the international community that Mr. Arafat and the Palestinian people are committed to peace and willing to coexist with Israel.

Mr. Arafat's call for a halt to the violence will only yield results if he follows his words with deeds.

With the cease-fire now in effect, Mr. Arafat must follow-up on the agreed-to elements of the deal. He must re-arrest those terrorists he inexcusably released last fall, stop anti-Israel incitement in the Palestinian media, and make sure that the Palestinian police strictly enforce his cease-fire orders.

He must also follow up on information supplied by Israel about imminent terrorist attacks. He must move to confiscate weapons that are being held by many in the West Bank and Gaza illegally. And he must take action to prevent his aides and other Palestinian officials from defending terrorists.

Mr. Arafat must also understand that if he fails the test, again, that there will be very real consequences for him and for the Palestinian people.

The Government of Israel, for its part, must continue to show its commitment to peace by exercising the admirable restraint it has shown in the wake of the June 1 tragedy.

Israel must also take steps to ease the restrictions on Palestinians, including travel, and pull its forces back from Palestinian populations centers.

The events of recent days also strengthen the case for more active American involvement in the Middle East.

I applaud the recent stepped-up role of the Bush administration and urge the President and Secretary Powell to continue their engagement at this critical juncture in Israeli-Palestinian relations.

I also extend my praise to Director Tenet and Assistant Secretary of State Burns, both of whom have been in the region for the past several days shuttling between Israeli and Palestinian offices.

Director Tenet, in particular, has played an important role bridging Israeli and Palestinian security concerns, and I am confident that he will continue to do his utmost to bring the sides together—without jeopardizing Israel's security.

Lastly, I believe that we owe a debt to our former colleague, Senator Mitchell, for his work in developing the Mitchell Commission report and recommendations.

The administration's endorsement of the Mitchell Commission report as the basis for restoring peace to the Middle East is a sign it understands the role it must play in order for the violence in the region to subside and for the parties to eventually return to the negotiating table.