

place principle over profit and ensure that its weapons stay out of Mugabe's hands. Its track record not just in Zimbabwe, but also in Sudan, has not been a good one, and so, frankly, I would not be that optimistic about China's performance in the future.

This is a good resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me conclude by once again thanking the sponsor of this very important resolution. I think it's been said very clearly that when people stand up, we can defeat tyranny.

I compliment the dock workers who refused to unload the ship. As has been mentioned, the solidarity movement in Poland led to democracy there. And actually, back in the sixties, there was an incident during the height of the Cold War where the dock workers of Newark refused to unload a ship of furs from the Soviet Union.

□ 1345

At that time, Krushchev said they were going to bury the U.S., and the ILA and the dock workers refused to unload that ship, once again showing solidarity. As a person who worked on the docks of Newark for 4 years during my early career, I certainly appreciate the strength of the dock workers and the labor unions and ILA from around the world.

I think we have to work on proliferation of conventional weapons that we see throughout the world. I think we have to really monitor and rein in the People's Republic of China that continues to support the brutal regime in Sudan with the atrocities in Darfur. We have to say that if we are going to be a country living in the community of world nations, then there is a responsibility to act responsibly in this new millennium.

And so with that, I urge the passage of House Resolution 1270.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1270, which commends the efforts of those who sought to block an international arms transfer destined for Zimbabwe, and calls for an arms embargo against the Mugabe regime.

There was a time when Robert Mugabe spoke persuasively about an independent Zimbabwe governed by majority rule and inspired millions.

And when Zimbabwe finally won its independence, Mugabe was hailed as a liberator and a hero.

But at some point over the past 28 years, the vision of a peaceful, democratic Zimbabwe became distant and grossly distorted.

As early as 1982, Mugabe unleashed his infamous North Korean-trained 5th Brigade to crush an uprising in the Matabeleland and Midlands provinces, and slaughtered an estimated 20,000 of his ethnic rivals.

Later in 2005, the regime launched "Operation Clear out the Trash," destroying nearly 100,000 housing structures and depriving an estimated 700,000 people of their homes, livelihoods, or both during Zimbabwe's harsh winter.

The Mugabe regime has become a brutal kleptocracy, content to rule by the barrel of the gun, while the people of Zimbabwe struggle to survive.

Clearly, he has had a lot of practice.

Zimbabwe's disputed elections of 2000, 2002, and 2005, were all marred by substantial levels of state-sponsored violence, political repression, voter intimidation, vote-rigging and other forms of manipulation by the ruling ZANU-PF party.

That pattern not only continued, but also accelerated in the run-up to the elections of March 29th.

According to the State Department's 2007 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, the Mugabe regime, "engaged in the pervasive and systematic abuse of human rights, which increased significantly [in 2007] . . . state-sanctioned use of excessive force increased . . . and security forces tortured members of the opposition, student leaders, and civil society activists."

The Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum documented 586 incidents of torture, 855 incidents of assault, and 19 incidents of politically-motivated abductions and kidnappings in 2007 alone.

On April 19, 2008, Human Rights Watch reported that the Mugabe regime had established a network of informal detention centers to beat, torture, and intimidate political opponents and other civilians.

In the days following the March 29th elections, reports of violent political repression, illegal farm invasions, and other gross violations of human rights by security forces and ruling party supporters increased at alarming rates.

In a report issued earlier this month, Human Rights Watch details the systematic campaign of terror unleashed by the regime "in an effort to destroy the opposition and ensure that Mugabe wins the presidential runoff elections on June 27, 2008."

In one incident, the report quotes soldiers threatening a group of villagers by saying, "If you vote for MDC in the presidential runoff election, you have seen the bullets, we have enough for each one of you, so beware."

So when a Chinese ship arrived at the port city of Durban, South Africa, reportedly carrying 3 million rounds of AK-47 ammunition, 1,500 rocket-propelled grenades, and 3,000 mortar bombs and tubes for the Zimbabwean Defense Force in early April, observers were understandably concerned.

But before the international community even knew about the potential arms transfer, the dock and freight workers of the South African Transport and Allied Workers Union had taken matters into their own hands.

Determined not to contribute to the brutal suppression of opposition voices in Zimbabwe, the dock and freight workers courageously refused to offload or transport the weapons.

The International Transport Workers' Federation, the Congress of Southern African Trade Unions (COSATU), religious leaders and other advocates quickly expressed their solidarity with the workers and launched a campaign calling for an international boycott of the vessel.

Before long, the governments of South Africa, Mozambique and Tanzania reportedly were compelled to deny the ship permission to dock at their ports.

Zambian President and Southern African Development Community (SADC) Chairman

Levy Mwanawasa publically praised their actions and appealed to all 14 SADC member nations to block the shipment.

The heroic efforts of the dock and freight workers, southern African trade unions, religious leaders, advocacy groups and southern African Governments to block the arms shipment deserve recognition and praise of the highest order.

Through their valor and steadfastness, these courageous individuals may ultimately save countless lives from Mugabe's reign of terror.

It is now incumbent upon all responsible nations to stand in solidarity with the governments and people of southern Africa, and to deny this murderous regime the means to continue oppressing its people.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1270, which commends those who boldly acted to block a shipment of weapons from China to Zimbabwe, and calls for an international moratorium on any future transfers until the current political crisis has been resolved.

I particularly call upon my colleagues who support strengthened ties between the United States and China to convey to their friends in Beijing that their continued engagement with the Mugabe regime can provide no tangible benefit.

Continuing the shipment of weapons to Zimbabwe at this time only makes them complicit in the campaign of terror and intimidation that has been unleashed upon the Zimbabwean people.

If China wishes to mend its tarnished image, denying weapons sales to known perpetrators of human rights violations might be a good place to start.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1270.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING RESTRICTIONS ON FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND WIDESPREAD PRESENCE OF ANTI-SEMITIC MATERIAL IN ARAB MEDIA AND PRESS

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1127) condemning the endemic restrictions on freedom of the press and media and public expression in the Middle East and the concurrent and widespread presence of anti-Semitic material, Holocaust denial, and incitement to violence in the Arab media and press, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1127

Whereas a free press and the right of free expression are both fundamental, universal

human rights and are essential to making governments accountable to the people from whom their powers are derived;

Whereas the nations of the Middle East, with Israel being the sole exception, suffer profound deficits when compared to the global community with regard to both measures of human development and measures of human freedom and dignity;

Whereas the Middle East is a region of vital national security interest to the United States and the twin deficits in human development and human freedom negatively affect United States efforts to help resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict and to stabilize the region for the benefit of all;

Whereas overt censorship, intimidation, harassment through the civil courts, assaults by government agents on journalists and political activists, arbitrary press, and emergency laws, and extra-legal restrictions on the kinds of topics which may be addressed are endemic practices in the Middle East, though varying in degree and extent in the different Arab countries;

Whereas many of the countries engaged most actively in efforts to stifle public debate, suppress political discussion, and impose capricious limits on thought and expression are among the largest recipients of United States foreign assistance, potentially giving the mistaken impression that the United States endorses or condones the restrictive policies of the recipient countries;

Whereas Holocaust denial regularly appears throughout the Middle East in speeches and pronouncements by public figures, in articles and columns by journalists and in the resolutions of professional organizations;

Whereas continued anti-Semitic incitement invites violent action and creates an environment conducive to, and accepting of, terrorism;

Whereas the extensive restrictions on speech and expression in the Arab world are uniquely counterposed by the space left open by Arab governments for grotesque anti-Semitism, Holocaust denial, incitement to violence, and glorification of terrorism;

Whereas the exception from censorship and restrictions on expression for certain kinds of hate speech are not only exploited by government proxies, but often even by Arab governments themselves, including states that nominally prohibit racial, religious, or ethnic hate speech;

Whereas in the Middle East, where the press is generally not free, where there are rules for what can and cannot be said, the persistent promulgation of hate-speech indicates an obvious and dangerous form of state endorsement;

Whereas numerous government-owned, government-sanctioned, or government-controlled publishing houses throughout the region promulgate stories of imaginary Israeli massacres, Jewish blood libels, and alleged Israeli medical experiments on Palestinian children, and produce Arabic translations of anti-Semitic tracts such as "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" and "Mein Kampf"; and

Whereas many of the same Arab governments to which the United States has turned for assistance in ending the Arab-Israeli conflict are themselves responsible for using their government-owned, government-sanctioned, or government-controlled publishing houses and media to engage in anti-Semitic incitement to violence and Holocaust denial: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly condemns the endemic restrictions on freedom of the press and expression in the Arab world and the concurrent and widespread presence of anti-Semitic mate-

rial, Holocaust denial, and incitement to violence in the Arab media and press;

(2) deplors the methods and practices utilized by the governments in the Middle East to exert control over the press, and on public expression, including—

(A) overt censorship;

(B) intimidation and harassment of reporters, editors, and publishers by government agents, and through manipulation of the civil courts;

(C) assaults by government agents on journalists and political activists;

(D) arbitrarily enforced press and emergency laws; and

(E) extra-legal restrictions on the kinds of topics which may be addressed either in public or in private;

(3) expresses deep concern that some Arab governments, including some that are involved in multilateral efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, use their government-owned, government-sanctioned, or government-controlled publishing houses and media to promulgate insidious, incendiary, and poisonous speech regarding Israel and the Jewish people that makes United States efforts to help resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict all the more difficult;

(4) affirms the unshakable belief of the American people in the universal right of all persons to freely and peaceably express themselves, to publish and advocate for their nonviolent beliefs, and to petition their government for redress of their grievances;

(5) calls on the President to—

(A) raise the issue of the lack of media freedom in the Middle East and the proliferation of anti-Semitic incitement in all appropriate bilateral and multilateral fora;

(B) take into account the compliance of governments throughout the region with international norms and obligations regarding media freedom and anti-Semitic incitement when determining the provision of United States assistance to those governments; and

(C) utilize the existing public diplomacy apparatus, professional development, and democratization programs to focus on the issues of media freedom and anti-Semitic incitement; and

(6) calls on United States allies and governments throughout the Middle East to publicly repudiate purveyors of anti-Semitic incitement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in January of this year, the Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia held a hearing entitled "That Which Is Not Obligatory Is Prohibited: Censorship and Incitement in the Arab World." We received

testimony from three witnesses, one each from Freedom House, the Committee To Protect Journalists, and the Anti-Defamation League. What we heard was not a surprise, but was still shocking. As a result of that hearing, I drafted this resolution and would like to ask all of my colleagues to give it their utmost consideration.

It is sad to note that in the 21st century, there is still not one Arab country that can be described as "free" by the metrics used by Freedom House, and frankly, by anyone actually familiar with the concept. While there are very significant differences throughout the region in the latitude given to public debate, political argument and press and media freedom, with the notable exception of Israel, not one Arab country can argue that its public square is truly open to all and that their government protects, rather than restricts, that freedom.

The ugly and typically stupid hand of the censor is unfortunately not a rare sight in the Middle East. It is not only ubiquitous, it is, in fact, often attached to the arm of the editor, the producer, the copy-writer, or the publisher. According to the United Nations' Arab Human Development reports, while Arab societies have, in general, failed to keep up with other developing nations, in the mechanisms of censorship in the Arab world, they have shown a remarkable degree of institutional adaptation and technological savvy. Their success in stifling debate and narrowing acceptable opinion is all the more remarkable given the frequent failures of Arab bureaucracies in meeting the basic needs of their people for things like education, infrastructure, economic opportunity and clean governance.

Countries that can't ensure that their citizens are literate or have clean drinking water still find the resources necessary to operate the red pen of the censor, or the self-serving manipulation of the truth endemic to government-owned, government-controlled and government-operated media. It would be nice if these ugly and ultimately self-defeating practices were merely the problem of other people in faraway places. We could pity them, think gravely about the words of Thomas Jefferson, and bless the wisdom of our Founders who, in a world of despots and danger, saw that a free press and free speech were the indispensable safeguards of our Republic and our liberty.

But we don't live in a world that gives us immunity from the troubles of others. Three thousand Americans paid the price for that lesson on September 11, 2001. If we don't visit the world's bad neighborhoods, they will visit us. The fact is, the world has grown smaller, and fair or not, the grievances between the peoples of the Middle East and their governments can be, and often are, attributed to the United States. We saw this phenomena metastasize in Iran in the late 1970s. And

we've heard the same complaints explicitly from al Qaeda's leaders. As a nation with vital national interests in that region, we have wisely built strong ties with the governments of almost all of the Arab States.

Unfortunately, while these ties have brought greater stability to the region, they have also aligned us with governments that don't share our values when it comes to political and civil human rights. Don't think for a moment that the people of these countries have not noticed. The United States speaks constantly of freedom, but is the ally of authoritarians. The United States prizes and celebrates the first amendment to our Constitution, but is in league with nations that abuse and imprison journalists. The United States uses taxpayer money to train others in the rule of law, but also works hand in glove with security forces of other governments that not only sniff out and destroy terrorists, but often do likewise to their own civil leaders and political reformers.

Like it or not, we are entangled in the conflicts between Arab publics and their governments. It is not our role nor our duty to choose the form of government for any people but ourselves.

But that does not forbid or restrict our right, and I would say our obligation, to speak out for the values that we believe are universal, including speaking out to our friends who sometimes believe that their extensive cooperation entitles them not only to our understanding and support, but our silence. I don't agree, and I don't accept such a formulation. In the end, such an approach will produce neither stability for them nor security for ourselves.

As a nation that has strayed badly over the past several years from our own ideals, we have an obligation to be humble and circumspect in condemning others. Much of the credibility America used to enjoy when speaking out on human rights has been squandered by short-sighted and morally debilitated agents of fear. But we are still a nation of ideas and a people dedicated to certain universal values, that all people are created equal, that the rule of law and due process are not luxuries but fundamental human rights, and that the freedom of speech, conscience, association and the press are not gifts from governments or rulers, but the shared inheritance of all humanity.

Moreover, for purely selfish reasons, we have ample cause to be concerned. Many of the same Arab governments which we are turning to help stabilize the region, and in particular, to help resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, are the very same governments that, with a wink and a nod, are helping stir the pot of bitterness and discontent among their own citizens.

For example, Arab governments that say small steps toward normalizing relations with Israel are too hard because of public opinion often use government-owned, government-sanctioned or

government-controlled press and media to disseminate stories of imaginary Israeli massacres, Jewish blood-litels, alleged Israeli medical experiments on Palestinian children, and for bigots with a taste for history, cheap Arabic-language translations of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and Mein Kempf.

Moreover, in many Arab countries while there is ruthless and effective censorship, especially concerning political expression, somehow publication of vicious anti-Semitism, Holocaust denial and even incitement to violence against Jews is allowed.

These things are bad enough, but in a place where the press is not free and where there are rules for what you can and cannot say, the fact that these forms of hatred-speech are not prohibited indicates an obvious and dangerous form of state endorsement. In the end, the outcome is a public that is not only less open to peace, but is less ready to engage with the modern world.

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been a violent one, and the news about it inevitably reflects that fact. Likewise, revolving the core issues of that conflict does not depend on a free and honest press in the Arab world. And no state and no government is or should be above correction, criticism and complaint, not the United States, not Israel, not anyone. And to state the blindly obvious, criticism of Israeli policy is not, by definition, anti-Semitic.

But there is also no question that the cumulative weight of unreasoned and incendiary hatred toward Israel or the Jewish people which has not only been allowed but in some cases inserted into the press and media by Arab governments or their proxies has made the Middle East more violent and more dangerous.

The resolution before us will not solve these problems. But it will send a message. We are not a nation capable of indifference to either hate or oppression. We have interests in the Middle East beyond oil, and expanding the scope of human freedom is one of them. We may have strayed from our ideals, but we are trying to come home.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman BERMAN and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for their support in bringing this resolution before the House, and I urge all of our Members to support the motion and the underlying resolution.

I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1127, and I urge my colleagues to adopt this condemnation of the anti-Semitism that is sadly so widespread in the Arab media and the press.

As the resolution of my good friend and colleague, Mr. ACKERMAN, points out, this anti-Semitism often takes the violent forms of Holocaust denial and incitement to violence.

Madam Speaker, when political leaders fail to speak out against anti-Se-

mitic hatred and incitement, the void is not only demoralizing to the victims, but silence actually enables the wrongdoing. Silence by political leaders, in particular, conveys official approval or at least acquiescence and contributes to a climate of fear and a sense of vulnerability.

It is tragic that modern Arab leaders have not done a better job of speaking out against anti-Semitism. We here in the U.S. Congress can speak out today. It is very important that we do so. But our words are not as effective as would be the condemnations from Arab leaders. Members of Congress are going to have to carry, as we go forward to Middle Eastern countries or meet with the leaders when they come here, the sentiments contained in this resolution, and again, as we have in the past, explain to them the importance of speaking out. We cannot remain silent any longer.

If this fight against anti-Semitism in the Arab world is to succeed, we need officials in the U.S. and Europe and again the Arab world to, without hesitation or delay, denounce anti-Semitic acts whenever and wherever they occur. There can't be any exceptions. The purveyors of hate never take a holiday or grow weary, nor should we. Holocaust remembrance and tolerance education must dramatically expand, especially in the Middle East where it is almost nonexistent, and must find a footing in the Arab world. We have to ensure that our laws and the laws of other countries punish those who incite violence against Jews. And it is not utopian to begin to encourage modern Arab governments to adopt such laws. It is time to push this issue harder, far harder than we have done so in the past.

Madam Speaker, on June 16, 2004, the Helsinki Commission held a hearing, and I chaired it, one of several in a series on combating anti-Semitism. Our prime witness at that hearing, as he had been previously, was one of the greatest, finest, most effective and certainly the most courageous human rights leaders the world has ever known, Natan Sharansky.

□ 1400

As we all know, Natan Sharansky spent years in the Soviet Gulag. Congressman FRANK WOLF and I in the 1980s actually went to Perm Camp-35 where he had spent many of his years in solitary confinement, where he had been tortured, and met with many of the political prisoners who knew him well, and they had nothing but accolades and respect for this man.

He pointed out at our hearing that, "Thirty years ago I was a dissident in the former Soviet Union. The irony is that 30 years later I am in the same job, collecting information about anti-Semitism," in that case as a cabinet minister in the Israeli government.

He pointed out that the new wave of anti-Semitism is characterized by two components. The first one is the so-

called new anti-Semitism, and the lines between anti-Israeli propaganda and anti-Semitic propaganda are blurred.

He said the second is the classical anti-Semitism, the old, deep, primitive prejudice against Jews used over and over again to hurt individuals. He points out that this time, these images and this promotion of anti-Semitism is coming mainly through state-sponsored and state-supported media in the Middle East.

He pointed out that if you want to be successful in this struggle, we have to, like any other evil, we must have moral clarity about the issue. It is important to define the line between legitimate criticism of Israel and anti-Semitism. Israel, he said, is a strong democracy and the only democracy in the Middle East, and it is built on criticism from within and from without.

Of course, we support all forms of legitimate criticism, he went on, but it is very important to see the difference, draw the line between legitimate criticism and anti-Semitism.

He gave us a way of discovering it, or pointing it out and exposing it. He called it the three D's. You know it is anti-Semitism when it is all about demonization, double standard and delegitimization.

At our hearing, Madam Speaker, he brought with him a 150 page study entitled "Anti-Semitism in the Contemporary Middle East." The study surveys anti-Semitic reporting, editorials and editorial caricatures in the government-controlled press of Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon and the Palestinian Authority, Syria, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States. In the more than 100 editorial cartoons included in the report, Jews and Israelis are invariably represented as poisonous snakes, murderous Nazis and bloodthirsty crusaders. When I looked at it, I was sickened. It was disgusting.

The report found that vicious anti-Semitism expressly calls for massive terrorism and genocide against Jews, Zionists and the State of Israel. He pointed out as well in the report that the overwhelming majority of the propaganda again was from government-controlled media and from supposedly respectable publishing houses closely tied to those regimes.

In a brief review of the findings, classic European and anti-Semitic imagery is widespread in the Middle East, as is Holocaust denial and the identification of Israel as a Nazi state. The borders between anti-Semitism and anti-Americanism and anti-Westernism are blurred, almost completely blurred, the report found. Islamic religious themes, quotations and sayings are being widely mobilized to demonize Jews and Israelis and to justify the outright annihilation of the State of Israel and all its Jewish and non-Jewish supporters.

The Arab-Israeli conflict is increasingly portrayed as part of an internal confrontation between pan-Islamic nations and the infidels, Jews and Chris-

tians alike, who embody all evil. All Israelis, men and women and children, and Jews around the world, the report found, as well as their crusader allies, are held responsible for alleged crimes committed by the Jews.

He also showed at that hearing a movie, part of a movie, a 15-hour movie, an anti-Semitic film produced in Syria. That film was all about blood libel. He pointed out to us that that film is not seen just in the Middle East, and it ran for 15 hours every night during the Ramadan season, it is also seen in Europe.

We wonder why people are incited to hate Jews. We watched just a few minutes of it, and, again, it was despicable and made it seem as if blood libel was real.

Finally, Madam Speaker, Sharansky concluded by telling us that anti-Semitism is not only a threat to Jews. History has shown us that left unchecked, the forces behind anti-Semitism will imperil all the values and freedom that our civilization holds dear. We must not let that happen; to which I say again, and this resolution strongly suggests, we must not let that happen.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), a leading spokesman on human rights and fairness.

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman from New York. I know that he has been an outstanding voice on this issue for as many years as I can remember. Long before I came to Congress to serve with him, I would watch him on C-SPAN as he spoke about this issue, and serving with him, I admire him all the more.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this important resolution. When we talk about peace in the Middle East, we so often get caught up in the specific details that we rarely discuss the fundamental problems in that region. Unlike our country, or Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East, most countries in that part of the world have very little freedom of the press and therefore very little accountability to their people.

Such restrictions on free speech serve those Middle Eastern autocrats very well, keeping their populations in line and focusing the anger of the street outside of their own borders. The populations there have very little choice but to believe the daily insults that many state-run newspapers heap on our country and on Israel. They have no other avenue by which to get their news. So instead of rebelling against their own corrupt dictators, the people of the Middle East flood their streets to burn American and Israeli flags, with little or no hope that they can change events in their own countries that are controlled by these dictatorial regimes.

Mr. Speaker, such restrictions on speech not only condemn the people of the Middle East to intellectual poverty

and ignorance, they make peace harder and harder to achieve. And it is not only the media, it is also the textbooks that need to be changed. From the Palestinian territories to Saudi Arabia, Middle Eastern children are taught that Jews are monkeys and snakes and worse, and that Israel must be destroyed because it has no right to exist. Such education, both in school and in the newspapers, and such disinformation, cannot create possibly a condition for peace.

With this resolution today, we can send a clear message to the Middle East that we, the United States of America, stand with those who seek a free press, those who want to bring out the truth and let freedom ring throughout the Middle East.

To quote the resolution itself, by passing this we will affirm "the universal rights of all persons to freely and peaceably express themselves, to publish and advocate for their non-violent beliefs, and to petition their government for redress of grievances."

I thank the gentleman again, and I urge support for this resolution.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, today, I was proud to support, H. Res. 1127, a bill which condemns the endemic restrictions on freedom of the press and media and public expression in the Middle East and the concurrent and widespread presence of anti-Semitic material, Holocaust denial, and incitement to violence in the Arab media and press.

The people of Israel have been victims of violence and hatred for far too long. Not only are these peace-loving individuals targets of rocket attacks and terrorist actions, they are also victims of government-censored, hateful press. It is far too common for Arab media markets to condemn Israel and promote actions which foster violence and hinder the peace process in the region. Israeli reporters and journalists have been harassed and intimidated by Middle East government officials who have placed harsh legal restrictions on what news can and cannot be reported.

I strongly believe that the universal right of all persons to peacefully express themselves in a nonviolent way should be upheld in the Middle East. It is the responsibility of the United States and the global community to condemn this lack of freedom and work to promote an environment which fosters the license of nonviolent speech and press and peace.

Mr. ACKERMAN. We yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1127, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution condemning the endemic restrictions on freedom of the press and media and public expression in the Middle East and the concurrent and widespread presence of anti-Semitic incitement to violence and Holocaust denial in the Arab media and press."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS
THAT THE UNITED STATES
SHOULD END COMMERCIAL
WHALING

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 350) expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States, through the International Whaling Commission, should use all appropriate measures to end commercial whaling in all of its forms, including scientific and other special permit whaling, coastal whaling, and community-based whaling, and seek to strengthen the conservation and management measures to facilitate the conservation of whale species, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 350

Whereas 79 nations have adopted the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (the Convention), which established the International Whaling Commission (the Commission) to provide for the conservation of whale stocks;

Whereas the Commission has adopted a moratorium on commercial whaling in order to conserve and promote the recovery of whale stocks, many of which had been hunted to near extinction by the whaling industry;

Whereas the United States was instrumental in the adoption of the moratorium, and has led international efforts to address the threat of commercial whaling for more than 3 decades;

Whereas despite the moratorium, 3 Commission member nations continue to kill whales for financial gain, disregarding the protests of other Commission members, and since the moratorium entered into force have killed more than 25,000 whales including over 11,000 whales killed under the guise of scientific research;

Whereas whaling conducted for scientific purposes has been found to be unnecessary by the majority of the world's cetacean scientists because nonlethal research alternatives exist;

Whereas the member nations of the Commission have adopted numerous resolutions opposing and calling for an end to scientific whaling, most recently in 2007 at the annual Commission meeting in Anchorage, Alaska;

Whereas commercial whaling in any form, including scientific and other special permit whaling, coastal whaling, and community-based whaling, undermines the conservation mandate of the Convention and impairs the Commission's ability to function effectively;

Whereas proposed coastal whaling is commercial, unless conducted under the aboriginal exemption to the moratorium; and

Whereas the majority of Americans oppose the killing of whales for commercial purposes and expect the United States to use all available means to end such killing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States, through the International Whaling Commission, should—

(1) should use all appropriate measures to end commercial whaling in all of its forms, including scientific and other special permit

whaling, coastal whaling, and community-based whaling;

(2) oppose any initiative that would result in any new, Commission-sanctioned coastal or community-based whale hunting, even if it is portrayed as noncommercial, including any commercial whaling by any coastal communities that does not qualify as aboriginal subsistence whaling; and

(3) seek to strengthen conservation and management measures to facilitate the conservation of whale species.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the concurrent resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first let me congratulate my colleague, the Chair of the Committee on Natural Resources, Mr. RAHALL, for putting forward this very important resolution.

The resolution sends a very clear message to all International Whaling Commission members as they prepare for their annual meeting in Santiago, Chile, later this month: Protect our whales. Keep the ban on commercial whaling. The resolution also makes it clear that the American people care deeply and passionately about the protection of these magnificent creatures, and that the United States must continue to lead this international effort to protect and save them.

Mr. Speaker, the International Whaling Commission was created in 1946 by the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling to address the devastating impact that commercial whaling was having on the entire whale population. For years, the commission failed to manage the commercial hunting of whales, leaving many species facing imminent extinction. However, this changed in 1982 when the commission finally agreed to a moratorium on commercial whaling.

However, since then, a number of countries have worked feverishly to undermine it. Norway resumed commercial whaling in 1993. Japan and Iceland have exploited provisions in the convention that allow permits for "scientific whaling," a provision that enables them to slaughter whales under the guise of science and then sell the meat for commercial profits.

According to the International Fund for Animal Welfare located on Cape Cod, Massachusetts, more than 30,000 whales have been slaughtered for com-

mercial purposes, with 11,000 whales killed allegedly in the name of science. And here is how they do it. They use harpoons with explosive grenades. Now, if the first explosion is insufficient to kill the whale, then they hoist it by the tail, keeping the blowhole underwater, leaving it helpless and thrashing against the side of the ship until eventually the whale drowns.

This is not science. The commission's own Scientific Committee has repeatedly found that these scientific permits are completely unnecessary, yet this horrific practice still continues.

Japan and other pro-whaling states want to unravel the global consensus against commercial whaling even further.

□ 1415

Their latest proposal is to allow coastal whaling or community whaling. They have worked hard to recruit allies to their side.

The 75-plus member commission is now almost evenly split. This resolution, H. Con. Res. 350, calls on the United States delegation to the commission to fight these efforts and aggressively oppose commercial whaling in all of its forms. It's critical that the State Department take the pro-whaling threat seriously and undertake an aggressive diplomacy to line up the requisite votes to preserve the moratorium.

Mr. RAHALL's resolution sets an important marker. Whales constitute a vital component of the world's maritime and marine ecology. They are the largest and one of the most intelligent mammals on earth. Conserving them requires strong U.S. diplomacy to uphold international agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 350, which raises congressional concerns about the continued practice of whale hunting.

With the 60th annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission set to begin in Santiago, Chile, it is fitting and proper to consider this resolution. Over two decades after this Commission adopted a moratorium on commercial whaling, the hunt continues.

The humpback whale, a species designated as endangered under the provisions of the U.S. Endangered Species Act, was included among those whales pursued in the most recent hunting season. The marine life in our oceans, as we all know, including the whale, forms a precious part of these natural resources which we should strive to preserve.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution and reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, let me now recognize the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, the gentledady from Guam