

It does make a difference. We have to have clean water, and this legislation hopefully will move quickly.

It is being sponsored and introduced in the Senate today by Senators Torricelli and Corzine from New Jersey, and hopefully we will get a lot more support for it and we can move it quickly so that it becomes law.

REPORT ON H.R. 5093, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

Mr. KOLBE, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-564) on the bill (H.R. 5093) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT BETWEEN ETHIOPIA AND ERITREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to discuss an important issue in the Horn of Africa, a final and binding resolution of the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea.

The Horn of Africa is one of the poorest regions in the world but also one of the most strategic. It is a region plagued by years of war and conflict, some of which were caused by colonial legacies, the Cold War, and border disputes, but now with the help of the international community, the nations of Eritrea and Ethiopia sit at the cusp of permanently breaking a cycle of conflict.

One of my top priorities when I came to this House was to help end conflict on the continent of Africa by serving as a member on the Subcommittee on Africa. There have been many wars in Africa. Some were just wars where African peoples fought to overthrow the yokes of colonialism and systems of

racism. However, other wars in Africa fall into the category of unjust or senseless wars.

□ 1345

In the category of senseless wars in Africa, very few would top the 2-year border war between Eritrea and Ethiopia, two former brothers-in-arms who once fought together for over 30 years against dictatorships and for the right to self-determination.

The conflict that erupted in 1998 between the two countries was the result of a dispute over land in a barren, roadless area of shrubs and desert, and subsequent claims of military incursions. Two years of fighting left tens of thousands of people dead and more than a million refugees on both sides of the border displaced. What made this war even more destructive was that these nations, two of the poorest nations in the world and dependent upon foreign aid, were able to spend \$3 billion to purchase weapons to wage this war.

Mr. Speaker, during the war, I always kept my doors open to officials from both nations. The only side I ever chose during the conflict was to stand on the side of all Ethiopians and all Eritreans who were committed to peace and who opposed the voices of militarism on either side.

On December 12, 2000, the two countries signed a United Nations-backed peace treaty, resulting in the end of hostilities and the creation of an independent commission to study and demarcate the disputed border area. According to the treaty, the border demarcation by the Hague Commission was to be final and binding. At the time, both countries stated their commitment to peace by vowing to fully implement the commission's ruling no matter what the outcome.

Mr. Speaker, on April 13 of this year, the Hague Commission released its decision on the demarcation of the Eritrean and Ethiopian border. Their decision reiterated the senselessness of the war by leaving the border substantially unaltered. Hence, what was this war about? Why did thousands of Ethiopians and Eritrean men and women have to die to resolve a border dispute?

Following the decision by the Hague Commission on May 13, 2002, the Ethiopian Government requested an interpretation of the commission's decision and order to implement the border demarcation process. While the original peace agreement gave no room for appeals by either party, the Hague Commission decided to accept the request by Ethiopia and pledged to provide a response within 30 days. This is why I wanted to speak on this issue today.

On June 24, the Hague Commission released its clarification report in response to Ethiopia's request. While the commission reviewed each of the points in Ethiopia's clarification request, it concluded by saying, "The Ethiopian request for clarification and interpretation appears to be founded on

a misapprehension regarding the scope and effect of the Boundary Commission's Rules of Procedure. The commission does not find in any of the items that appear in section 2, 3 or 4 of the Ethiopian request anything that identifies an uncertainty in the commission's decision that could be resolved by interpretation at this time. Accordingly, the commission concludes that the Ethiopian request is inadmissible and no further action will be taken upon it."

With this decision, it is high time for a newly created African Union, the United States, and the entire international community to emphasize the following points to the leaders of both Eritrea and Ethiopia:

One, that the Hague Commission's decision and reply to Ethiopia's clarification request must be adopted by both parties as the final decision, once and for all; that both countries must abide by the Hague Commission's ruling, and the international community should offer support to both nations to fully implement the decision.

Two, both societies should learn the lessons of the history of this war so that its causes are not repeated in the future. Conflicts over boundaries using extreme forms of nationalism or ethnic exaggerations are senseless struggles.

Finally, I would like to urge the leaders of both nations to have the courage to place the will of their citizens over the interests of their power and outdated ideas about security.

Neither society won anything from the war and both sides lost. Previous progress was set back and both Ethiopia and Eritrea wasted human and financial resources. The only winners in unjust wars, are international arms sellers and traders.

I am confident that the peoples of both nations are tired of war. It is up to the leadership of both nations to serve the will of their citizens and demonstrate the vision to chart an irreversible course towards a permanent peace. I would like to challenge the leaders of both nations to understand that real power comes from leading a strong and prosperous society in a nation that is respected and able to assume its rightful place and responsibilities in the global community.

More importantly, real security and sustainable processes of peace are not attainable simply by having defined borders and territorial integrity. In this era of globalization, well defined borders and territorial integrity do not and can not always guarantee security.

Yes borders and territorial integrity are important, but they can't prevent instability and insecurity in any nation whose citizens face poverty, health crises and other forms of violence. Real security for any nation or society in the 21st century is linked to the degree of the political, social and economic conditions, rights, and opportunities of its citizens.

So I say to the Governments of Ethiopia and Eritrea: Accept the principle contained in OAU's framework for peace agreement which calls for both sides to: "Reject the use of force as a means of proposing solutions to disputes." Recognize that it is in your national security interests to accept the ruling as final and binding. Recognize that it is in your national strategic interests to put a senseless