

Relations, or their designees, not be subject to amendment and not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole; that the original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I only do so in order to ask the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) a question.

Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) assure me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, having to do with Lebanon is not a part of the en bloc amendment, and that that will be considered as a separate amendment?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAHOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Yes, I can give that assurance to the gentleman.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2002 AND 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 138 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1646.

□ 1613

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, amendment No. 4, offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on International Relations or a designee to offer amendments en bloc printed in House Report 107-62 or germane modifications of any such amendment.

The amendments en bloc shall be considered read, except that modifica-

tions shall be reported, shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member, or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The original proponent of an amendment included in the amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before disposition of the amendments en bloc.

□ 1615

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. HYDE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the order of the House of today and House Resolution 138, I offer en bloc amendments consisting of the following amendments printed in House Report 107-62: Amendment No. 5; amendment No. 6, as modified; amendments numbered 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25 and 26.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

The text of the amendments en bloc is as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Mr. HYDE, consisting of the following:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. LAMPSON: Page 32, after line 5, insert the following:

(C) REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH THE HAGUE CONVENTION ON THE CIVIL ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.—Section 2803(a) of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (as contained in division G of Public Law 105-277) is amended in the first sentence by striking “2001,” and inserting “2003.”

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. HYDE: Page 66, after line 12, add the following:

SEC. 344. CORRECTION OF TIME LIMIT FOR GRIEVANCE FILING.

Section 1104(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4134(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “but in no case less than two years after the occurrence giving rise to the grievance” and inserting “but in no case more than three years after the occurrence giving rise to the grievance.”

SEC. 345. CLARIFICATION OF SEPARATION FOR CAUSE.

Section 610(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4010(a)) is amended—

(a) in paragraph (1), by inserting “decide to” after “may”;

(b) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6) and inserting the following:

“(2) When the Secretary decides under paragraph (1) to separate, on the basis of misconduct, any member of the service (other than a United States citizen employed under section 311 who is not a family member) who either (A) is serving under a career appointment, or (B) is serving under a limited appointment, the member may not be separated from the Service until the member receives a hearing before the Foreign Service Grievance Board and the Board decides that cause for separation has been established, unless the member waives the right to such a hearing in writing, or the member’s appointment has expired, whichever occurs first.

“(3) If the Board decides that cause for separation has not been established, the Board

may direct the Department to pay reasonable attorneys fees to the extent and in the manner provided by section 1107(b)(5). A hearing under this paragraph shall be conducted in accordance with the hearing procedures applicable to grievances under section 1106 and shall be in lieu of any other administrative procedure authorized or required by this or any other law. Section 1110 shall apply to proceedings under this paragraph.

“(4) Notwithstanding the hearing required by paragraph (2), when the Secretary decides to separate a member of the Service for cause, the member shall be placed on leave without pay. If the member does not waive the right to a hearing, and the Board decides that cause for separation has not been established, the member shall be reinstated with back pay.”

Amendment No. 9 offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

Page 95, after line 3, add the following:

SEC. 706. PARTICIPATION BY SMALL BUSINESSES IN PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OF USAID.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall conduct a study to determine what industries are under-represented by small businesses in the procurement contracts of the Agency.

(b) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the designated congressional committees a report that contains the following:

(1) The results of the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a).

(2)(A) A specific plan of outreach to include measurable achievement milestones, to increase both the total numbers of contracts and the percentage of total contract dollars to small business, small disadvantaged business, women-owned businesses (as such terms are defined in the Small Business Act), and small businesses participating in the program under section 8(a) of such Act.

(B) The plan shall include proposals for all contracts (Washington, D.C.-based, field-based, and host country contracts) issued by the Agency or on behalf of the Agency.

(C) The plan shall include proposals and milestones of the Agency to increase the amount of subcontracting to businesses described in subparagraph (A) by the prime contractors of the Agency.

(D) The milestones described in subparagraph (C) shall include a description of how the Agency will use failure to meet goals by prime contractors as a ranking factor in evaluating any other submissions from this vendor for future contracts by the Agency.

(c) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—The Administrator shall submit to the designated congressional committees on a semiannual basis a report that contains a description of the percentage of total contract dollars awarded and the total numbers of contracts awarded to businesses described in subsection (b)(2)(A), including a description of achievements toward measurable milestones for both direct contracts of the Agency, host country contracts, and for subcontracting by prime contractors of the Agency.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “designated congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Small Business of the Senate.

Amendment No. 10 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 95, after line 3, add the following:

SEC. 706. ANNUAL HUMAN RIGHTS COUNTRY REPORTS ON CHILD SOLDIERS.

(a) COUNTRIES RECEIVING ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE.—Section 116(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9)(A) wherever applicable, a description of the nature and extent of—

“(i) the recruitment and conscription of individuals under the age of 18 by armed forces of the government of the country, government-supported paramilitaries, or other armed groups, and the participation of such individuals in such groups; and

“(ii) the participation of such individuals in conflict;

“(B) what steps, if any, taken by the government of the country to eliminate such practices; and

“(C) such other information related to the use by the country of individuals under the age of 18 as soldiers, as determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.”.

(b) COUNTRIES RECEIVING SECURITY ASSISTANCE.—Section 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(b)) is amended by inserting after the sixth sentence the following: “Each report under this section shall also include (i) wherever applicable, a description of the nature and extent of the recruitment and conscription of individuals under the age of 18 by armed forces of the government of the country, government-supported paramilitaries, or other armed groups, the participation of such individuals in such groups, and the participation of such individuals in conflict, (ii) what steps, if any, taken by the government of the country to eliminate such practices, and (iii) such other information related to the use by the country of individuals under the age of 18 as soldiers, as determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.”.

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. SANDERS: Page 95, after line 3, add the following:

SEC. 706. AMENDMENTS TO THE VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING AND VIOLENCE PROTECTION ACT OF 2000.

(a) ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS IN OTHER COUNTRIES.—Section 107(a)(1) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 is amended by adding at the end the following: “In addition, such programs and initiatives shall, to the maximum extent practicable, include the following:

“(A) Support for local in-country nongovernmental organization-operated hotlines, culturally and linguistically appropriate protective shelters, and regional and international nongovernmental organization networks and databases on trafficking, including support to assist nongovernmental organizations in establishing service centers and systems that are mobile and extend beyond large cities.

“(B) Support for nongovernmental organizations and advocates to provide legal, social, and other services and assistance to trafficked individuals, particularly those individuals in detention.

“(C) Education and training for trafficked women and girls upon their return home.

“(D) The safe reintegration of trafficked individuals into an appropriate community or family, with full respect for the wishes,

dignity, and safety of the trafficked individual.

“(E) Support for increasing or developing programs to assist families of victims in locating, repatriating, and treating their trafficked family members.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 113 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “for fiscal year 2002” and inserting “for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “and \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2002” and inserting “, \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2003”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “for fiscal year 2001” and inserting “for each of the fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003”; and

(3) in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (e), by striking “and \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2002” each place it appears and inserting “, \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2003”.

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. MILLER of Florida:

Page 95, after line 3, add the following:

SEC. 706. REPORT ON EXTRADITION EFFORTS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in conjunction with the Attorney General, shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report on efforts between the United States and the governments of foreign countries to extradite to the United States individuals described in paragraph (2).

(2) INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.—An individual described in this paragraph is an individual who is being held in custody by the government of a foreign country (or who is otherwise known to be in the foreign country), and with respect to which a competent authority of the United States—

(A) has charged with a major extraditable offense described in paragraph (3);

(B) has found guilty of committing a major extraditable offense described in paragraph (3); or

(C) is seeking extradition in order to complete a judicially pronounced penalty of deprivation of liberty for a major extraditable offense described in paragraph (3).

(3) MAJOR EXTRADITABLE OFFENSES DESCRIBED.—A major extraditable offense described in this paragraph is an offense of murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, aggravated assault, kidnapping, abduction, or other false imprisonment, drug trafficking, terrorism, or rape.

(b) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The report required under subsection (a) shall also include the following:

(1) The aggregate number of individuals described in subsection (a)(2) who are being held in custody by all governments of foreign countries (or are otherwise known to be in the foreign countries), including the name of each such foreign country and the number of such individuals held in custody by the government of each such foreign country.

(2) The aggregate number of requests by competent authorities of the United States to extradite to the United States such individuals that have been denied by each foreign government, the reasons why such individuals have not been so extradited, and the specific actions the United States has taken to obtain extradition.

(c) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—In preparing the report under subsection (a), the Secretary of State, in conjunction with the Attorney General—

(1) shall establish procedures under which a competent authority of a State, which is requesting extradition of 1 or more individuals from a foreign country as described in subsection (a)(2) and with respect to which the foreign country has failed to comply with such request, may submit to the Attorney General appropriate information with respect to such extradition request; and

(2) shall include information received under paragraph (1) in the report under subsection (a).

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. MANZULLO:

Page 95, after line 3, add the following:

SEC. 706. PAYMENT OF ANTI-TERRORISM JUDGMENTS.

Section 2002(a)(2)(A)(ii) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-386; 114 Stat. 1542), is amended by inserting “June 6, 2000,” after “March 15, 2000.”.

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. BRADY of Texas:

Page 122, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 747. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE NEGOTIATION OF EFFECTIVE EXTRADITION TREATIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds as follows:

(1) According to the Department of Justice, there are approximately 3,000 open extradition cases worldwide at any time.

(2) The United States has extradition treaties with only approximately 60 percent of the worlds nations.

(3) Of such treaties, nearly half were enacted prior to World War II and are seriously out of date.

(4) Treaties enacted prior to the 1970’s are basically ineffective because only specific crimes listed in the treaties are extraditable offenses.

(5) Treaties negotiated since the 1970’s are much more effective because they are flexible and reflect modern criminal justice issues such as international child abduction and cybercrimes.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—The Congress calls on the Secretary of State to develop and implement a process for negotiating new effective extradition treaties with countries with which the United States has no current extradition treaty, as well as renegotiating old ineffective treaties, and to work closely with the Department of Justice in achieving these objectives.

Amendment No. 15 offered by Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

Page 122, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 747. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS RELATING TO UPCOMING ELECTIONS IN FIJI, EAST TIMOR, AND PERU.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the upcoming national elections in Fiji and East Timor in August 2001 and Peru in June 2001 are crucial and should be conducted in a free, fair, and democratic manner; and

(2) the Secretary of State should send election monitors to Fiji, and should offer technical support, as appropriate, to East Timor and Peru, to support free and fair elections in these nations.

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. BRADY of Texas:

Page 122, after line 23, insert the following:
SEC. 747. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE MURDER OF JOHN M. ALVIS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On November 30, 2000, John M. Alvis was brutally murdered in Baku, Azerbaijan.

(2) John Alvis was serving his final two weeks of a two year full-time commitment to the International Republican Institute, an American nongovernmental organization carrying out assistance projects for the United States Government to help promote democracy and strengthen the rule of law in Azerbaijan.

(3) Almost immediately following the news of the murder of John M. Alvis, our United States Ambassador to Azerbaijan, Ross Wilson, raised the issue with the the President of Azerbaijan and with the Minister of Interior, and was assured that every effort would be made to carry out a prompt and thorough investigation.

(4) After the murder, 18 members of Congress, led by Congressman Kevin Brady and then-Chairman of the House International Relations Committee, Ben Gilman, wrote President Aliyev expressing the commitment of the Congress to seeing John's murder solved, and Senator John McCain wrote former President Clinton's Administration requesting the FBI's involvement.

(5) The United States Ambassador to Azerbaijan continues to raise this issue with Azerbaijani officials.

(6) The Government of Azerbaijan has cooperated with the FBI to find the individual or individuals responsible for killing John Alvis.

(7) United States President George W. Bush wrote Azerbaijan's President Hedar Aliyev and thanked Azerbaijan for its efforts to find the murderer or murderers of John M. Alvis.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States and the Congress is absolutely committed to ensuring that the truth of the murder of John M. Alvis is determined and the individual or individuals responsible for this heinous act are brought to justice; and

(2) the Congress—

(A) appreciates the efforts of the Government of Azerbaijan to find the murderer or murderers of John M. Alvis and urges it to continue to make it a high priority; and

(B) urges the United States Department of State to continue to raise the issue of the murder of John M. Alvis with the Government of Azerbaijan and to make this issue a priority item in relations between the Government of the United States and the Government of Azerbaijan.

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Page 122, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 747. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT OF SYRIA CONCERNING ISRAEL.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 27, 2001, at the first regular Arab summit gathering in more than 10 years, President Bashar al-Assad used his speech to lash out at Israel.

(2) On March 28, 2001, the New York Times reported, "In electing Mr. Sharon to be their leader, President Assad said, Israelis had chosen a man who hated anything to do with Arabs and had dedicated his career to killing them."

(3) President Assad additionally said, "We say that the head of the government is a racist, it's a racist government, a racist army

and security force," he said, adding that by extension, "It is a racist society and it is even more racist than the Nazis."

(4) On March 28, 2001, State Department spokesman Richard Boucher described President Assad's remarks as, "absolutely wrong...totally unacceptable and inappropriate."

(5) On March 29, 2001, the Bush administration's top Middle East diplomat, Assistant Secretary of State Edward Walker, responding to Assad's remarks stated, "His statement at the Arab League was unacceptable, particularly his reference to Zionism as racism."

(6) On May 5, 2001, in his welcoming speech to Pope John Paul II, upon the Pope's arrival in Damascus, President Assad said, "They, Israelis, try to kill all the principles of divine faiths with the same mentality of betraying Jesus Christ and torturing Him, and in the same way that they tried to commit treachery against Prophet Mohammad."

(7) On May 6, 2001, at the Umayyad Mosque, Muhammad Ziyadah, Syria's minister of religious affairs, said, "We must be fully aware of what the enemies of God and malicious Zionism conspire to commit against Christianity and Islam."

(8) On May 7, 2001, State Department spokesman Richard Boucher condemned President Assad's remarks, "Our view is that these comments are as regrettable as they are unacceptable. There's no place from anyone or from any side for statements that inflame religious passions and hatred."

(9) It is only through constructive diplomacy, and not through hateful, counterproductive speech, that peace can possibly be achieved in the Middle East.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—The Congress—

(1) condemns Syrian President Bashar al-Assad for his inflammatory remarks on March 27, 2001, and May 5, 2001;

(2) expresses its solidarity with the state and people of Israel at this time of crisis;

(3) calls upon President Assad and the Syrian Government to refrain from any future inflammatory remarks;

(4) commends the Administration for its swift response to President Assad's remarks; and

(5) urges the Administration to emphasize to Syrian Government officials the concerns of the United States about the negative impact such remarks make on Middle East peace negotiations.

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. UNDERWOOD:

Page 122, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 747. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION AND HEALTH EFFECTS IN THE PHILIPPINES EMANATING FROM FORMER UNITED STATES MILITARY FACILITIES.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of State, in cooperation with the Secretary of Defense, should continue to work with the Government of the Philippines and with appropriate nongovernmental organizations in the United States and the Philippines to fully identify and share all relevant information concerning environmental contamination and health effects emanating from former United States military facilities in the Philippines following departure of the United States military forces from the Philippines in 1992;

(2) the United States and the Government of the Philippines should continue to build upon the agreements outlined in the Joint Statement by the United States and the Republic of the Philippines on a Framework for

Bilateral Cooperation in the Environment and Public Health signed on July 27, 2000; and

(3) Congress should encourage an objective non-governmental study which would examine environmental contamination and health effects emanating from former United States military facilities in the Philippines, following departure of United States military forces from the Philippines in 1992.

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. SHAYS:

Page 122, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 747. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE LOCATION OF PEACE CORPS OFFICES ABROAD.

It is the sense of the Congress that, to the degree permitted by security considerations, the Secretary of State should give favorable consideration to requests by the Director of the Peace Corps that the Secretary exercise his authority under section 606(a)(2)(B) of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (22 U.S.C. 4865(a)(2)(B)) to waive certain requirements of that Act in order to permit the Peace Corps to maintain offices in foreign countries at locations separate from the United States embassy.

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. ENGEL:

Page 122, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 747. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE MISTREATMENT OF UNITED STATES CIVILIAN PRISONERS INCARCERATED BY THE AXIS POWERS DURING WORLD WAR II.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Axis Powers captured and incarcerated 18,745 United States civilians who were living or traveling abroad during World War II, of which 1,704 died or were executed in captivity.

(2) These civilian prisoners of war were subjected to barbaric prison conditions and endured torture, starvation, and disease.

(3) The incarceration of these United States civilians and the conditions of such incarceration violated international human rights principles.

(4) The vast majority of these civilian prisoners of war have never received any formal recognition or compensation for their suffering, despite the physical and emotional trauma they endured.

(5) The incarceration of United States civilians by the Axis Powers during World War II and the conditions of such incarceration violated international human rights principles.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—The Congress—

(1) extends its sympathies to the brave men and women who endured the terrible hardships of such incarceration and to their families; and

(2) encourages foreign nations that incarcerated United States civilians during World War II to formally apologize to these individuals and their families.

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 122, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 747. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.

In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act (including any amendment made by this Act), it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. MENENDEZ:

Page 153, after line 23, add the following:

TITLE IX—IRAN NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION PREVENTION ACT OF 2001

SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Iran Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 2001”.

SEC. 902. WITHHOLDING OF VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY FOR PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS IN IRAN.

Section 307 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2227) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) Notwithstanding subsection (c), the limitations of subsection (a) shall apply to programs and projects of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Iran, unless the Secretary of State makes a determination in writing to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that such programs and projects are consistent with United States nuclear nonproliferation and safety goals, will not provide Iran with training or expertise relevant to the development of nuclear weapons, and are not being used as a cover for the acquisition of sensitive nuclear technology. A determination made by the Secretary of State under the preceding sentence shall be effective for the 1-year period beginning on the date of the determination.”

SEC. 903. ANNUAL REVIEW BY SECRETARY OF STATE OF PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY; UNITED STATES OPPOSITION TO PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS OF THE AGENCY IN IRAN.

(a) ANNUAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall undertake a comprehensive annual review of all programs and projects of the International Atomic Energy Agency in the countries described in section 307(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2227(a)) and shall determine if such programs and projects are consistent with United States nuclear nonproliferation and safety goals.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and on an annual basis thereafter for 5 years, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report containing the results of the review under paragraph (1).

(b) OPPOSITION TO CERTAIN PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS OF INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY.—The Secretary of State shall direct the United States representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency to oppose programs of the Agency that are determined by the Secretary under the review conducted under subsection (a)(1) to be inconsistent with nuclear nonproliferation and safety goals of the United States.

SEC. 904. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and on an annual basis thereafter for 5 years, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the United States representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency, shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report that—

(1) describes the total amount of annual assistance to Iran from the International Atomic Energy Agency, a list of Iranian officials in leadership positions at the Agency, the expected timeframe for the completion of the nuclear power reactors at the Bushehr

nuclear power plant, and a summary of the nuclear materials and technology transferred to Iran from the Agency in the preceding year which could assist in the development of Iran’s nuclear weapons program; and

(2) contains a description of all programs and projects of the International Atomic Energy Agency in each country described in section 307(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2227(a)) and any inconsistencies between the technical cooperation and assistance programs and projects of the Agency and United States nuclear nonproliferation and safety goals in these countries.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—The report required to be submitted under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, to the extent appropriate, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 905. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the United States Government should pursue internal reforms at the International Atomic Energy Agency that will ensure that all programs and projects funded under the Technical Cooperation and Assistance Fund of the Agency are compatible with United States nuclear nonproliferation policy and international nuclear nonproliferation norms.

Amendment No. 25 offered by Mr. LANTOS: Page 153, after line 23, add the following:

TITLE IX—EAST TIMOR TRANSITION TO INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 2001

SECTION 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “East Timor Transition to Independence Act of 2001”.

SEC. 902. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On August 30, 1999, the East Timorese people voted overwhelmingly in favor of independence from Indonesia. Anti-independence militias, with the support of the Indonesian military, attempted to prevent then retaliated against this vote by launching a campaign of terror and violence, displacing 500,000 people and murdering at least 1,000 people.

(2) The violent campaign devastated East Timor’s infrastructure, destroyed or severely damaged 60 to 80 percent of public and private property, and resulted in the collapse of virtually all vestiges of government, public services and public security.

(3) The Australian-led International Force for East Timor (INTERFET) entered East Timor in September 1999 and successfully restored order. On October 25, 1999, the United Nations Transitional Administration for East Timor (UNTAET) began to provide overall administration of East Timor, guide the people of East Timor in the establishment of a new democratic government, and maintain security and order.

(4) UNTAET and the East Timorese leadership currently anticipate that East Timor will become an independent nation as early as late 2001.

(5) East Timor is one of the poorest places in Asia. A large percentage of the population live below the poverty line, only 20 percent of East Timor’s population is literate, most of East Timor’s people remain unemployed, the annual per capita Gross National Product is \$340, and life expectancy is only 56 years.

(6) The World Bank and the United Nations have estimated that it will require \$300,000,000 in development assistance over the next three years to meet East Timor’s basic development needs.

SEC. 903. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO SUPPORT FOR EAST TIMOR.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) facilitate East Timor’s transition to independence, support formation of broad-based democracy in East Timor, help lay the groundwork for East Timor’s economic recovery, and strengthen East Timor’s security;

(2) help ensure that the nature and pace of the economic transition in East Timor is consistent with the needs and priorities of the East Timorese people, that East Timor develops a strong and independent economic infrastructure, and that the incomes of the East Timorese people rise accordingly;

(3) begin to lay the groundwork, prior to East Timor’s independence, for an equitable bilateral trade and investment relationship;

(4)(A) recognize East Timor, and establish diplomatic relations with East Timor, upon its independence;

(B) ensure that a fully functioning, fully staffed, adequately resourced, and securely maintained United States diplomatic mission is accredited to East Timor upon its independence; and

(C) in the period prior to East Timor’s independence, ensure that the United States maintains an adequate diplomatic presence in East Timor, with resources sufficient to promote United States political, security, and economic interests with East Timor;

(5) support efforts by the United Nations and East Timor to ensure justice and accountability related to past atrocities in East Timor through—

(A) United Nations investigations;

(B) development of East Timor’s judicial system, including appropriate technical assistance to East Timor from the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Drug Enforcement Administration;

(C) the possible establishment of an international tribunal for East Timor; and

(D) sharing with the United Nations Transitional Administration for East Timor (UNTAET) and East Timorese investigators any unclassified information relevant to past atrocities in East Timor gathered by the United States Government; and

(6)(A) as an interim step, support observer status for an official delegation from East Timor to observe and participate, as appropriate, in all deliberations of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) group, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and other international institutions; and

(B) after East Timor achieves independence, support full membership for East Timor in these and other international institutions, as appropriate.

SEC. 904. BILATERAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The President, acting through the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, is authorized to—

(1) support the development of civil society, including nongovernmental organizations in East Timor;

(2) promote the development of an independent news media;

(3) support job creation, including support for small business and microenterprise programs, environmental protection, sustainable development, development of East Timor’s health care infrastructure, educational programs, and programs strengthening the role of women in society;

(4) promote reconciliation, conflict resolution, and prevention of further conflict with

respect to East Timor, including establishing accountability for past gross human rights violations;

(5) support the voluntary and safe repatriation and reintegration of refugees into East Timor; and

(6) support political party development, voter education, voter registration, and other activities in support of free and fair elections in East Timor.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under paragraph (1) are authorized to remain available until expended.

SEC. 905. MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States executive director at the International Board for Reconstruction and Development and the Asian Development Bank to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to support economic and democratic development in East Timor.

SEC. 906. PEACE CORPS ASSISTANCE.

The Director of the Peace Corps is authorized to—

(1) provide English language and other technical training for individuals in East Timor as well as other activities which promote education, economic development, and economic self-sufficiency; and

(2) quickly address immediate assistance needs in East Timor using the Peace Corps Crisis Corps, to the extent practicable.

SEC. 907. TRADE AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) OPIC.—The President should initiate negotiations with the Government of East Timor (after independence for East Timor)—

(1) to apply to East Timor the existing agreement between the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and Indonesia; or

(2) to enter into a new agreement authorizing the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to carry out programs with respect to East Timor,

in order to expand United States investment in East Timor, emphasizing partnerships with local East Timorese enterprises.

(b) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Trade and Development Agency is authorized to carry out projects in East Timor under section 661 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2421).

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Trade and Development Agency to carry out this subsection \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

(B) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subparagraph (A) are authorized to remain available until expended.

(c) EXPORT-IMPORT BANK.—The Export-Import Bank of the United States should expand its activities in connection with exports to East Timor to the extent such activities are requested and to the extent there is a reasonable assurance of repayment.

SEC. 908. GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should encourage the Government of East Timor (after independence for East Timor) to seek to become eligible for duty-free treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.; relating to generalized system of preferences).

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The United States Trade Representative and the Commissioner of the United States Customs Service are authorized to provide technical assistance to the Government of East Timor (after independence for East Timor) in order to assist East Timor to become eligible for duty-free treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974.

SEC. 909. BILATERAL INVESTMENT TREATY.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should seek to enter into a bilateral investment treaty with the Government of East Timor (after independence for East Timor) in order to establish a more stable legal framework for United States investment in East Timor.

SEC. 910. PLAN FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES IN EAST TIMOR.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF DETAILED PLAN.—The Secretary of State shall develop a detailed plan for the official establishment of a United States diplomatic mission to East Timor, with a view to—

(1) recognize East Timor, and establish diplomatic relations with East Timor, upon its independence;

(2) ensure that a fully functioning, fully staffed, adequately resourced, and securely maintained United States diplomatic mission is accredited to East Timor upon its independence; and

(3) in the period prior to East Timor's independence, ensure that the United States maintains an adequate diplomatic presence in East Timor, with resources sufficient to promote United States political, security, and economic interests with East Timor.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than three months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report that contains the detailed plan described in subsection (a), including a timetable for the official opening of a facility in Dili, East Timor, the personnel requirements for the mission, the estimated costs for establishing the facility, and its security requirements.

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—The report submitted under this subsection shall be in unclassified form, with a classified annex as necessary.

(c) CONSULTATION.—Beginning six months after the submission of the report under subsection (b), and every six months thereafter until January 1, 2004, the Secretary of State shall consult with the chairmen and ranking members of the committees specified in that paragraph on the status of the implementation of the detailed plan described in subsection (a), including any revisions to the plan (including its timetable, costs, or requirements).

SEC. 911. SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR EAST TIMOR.

(a) STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—The President shall conduct a study to determine—

(A) the extent to which East Timor's security needs can be met by the transfer of excess defense articles under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(B) the extent to which international military education and training (IMET) assistance will enhance professionalism of the armed forces of East Timor, provide training in human rights, and promote respect for human rights and humanitarian law; and

(C) the terms and conditions under which such defense articles or training, as appropriate, should be provided.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report that contains the findings of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date on which Congress receives the report transmitted under subsection (a), or the date on which Congress receives the certification transmitted under paragraph (2), whichever occurs later, the President is authorized—

(A) to transfer excess defense articles under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j) to East Timor in accordance with such section; and

(B) to provide military education and training under chapter 5 of part II of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2347 et seq.) for the armed forces of East Timor in accordance with such chapter.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this paragraph is a certification that—

(A) East Timor has established an independent armed forces; and

(B) the assistance proposed to be provided pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(i) is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(ii) will promote both human rights in East Timor and the professionalization of the armed forces of East Timor.

SEC. 912. AUTHORITY FOR RADIO BROADCASTING.

The Broadcasting Board of Governors is authorized to further the communication of information and ideas through the increased use of audio broadcasting to East Timor to ensure that radio broadcasting to that country serves as a consistently reliable and authoritative source of accurate, objective, and comprehensive news.

SEC. 913. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every six months thereafter until January 1, 2004, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, the Secretary of the Treasury, the United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of Commerce, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Director of the Trade and Development Agency, the President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Peace Corps, shall consult with the Chairman and ranking member of the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate concerning the information described in subsection (b).

(b) INFORMATION.—The information described in this subsection includes—

(1) developments in East Timor's political and economic situation in the period covered by the report, including an evaluation of any elections occurring in East Timor and the refugee reintegration process in East Timor;

(2)(A) in the initial consultation, a 2-year plan for United States foreign assistance to East Timor in accordance with section 904, prepared by the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, which outlines the goals for United States foreign assistance to East Timor during the 2-year period; and

(B) in each subsequent consultation, a description in detail of the expenditure of United States bilateral foreign assistance during the period covered by each such consultation;

(3) a description of the activities undertaken in East Timor by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Asian Development Bank, and other international financial institutions, and an evaluation of the effectiveness of these activities;

(4) an assessment of—

(A) the status of United States trade and investment relations with East Timor, including a detailed analysis of any trade and investment-related activity supported by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and the Trade and Development Agency during the period of time since the previous consultation; and

(B) the status of any negotiations with the United Nations Transitional Administration for East Timor (UNTAET) or East Timor to facilitate the operation of the United States trade agencies in East Timor;

(5) the nature and extent of United States-East Timor cultural, education, scientific, and academic exchanges, both official and unofficial, and any Peace Corps activities;

(6) a description of local agriculture in East Timor, emerging opportunities for producing, processing, and exporting indigenous agricultural products, and recommendations for appropriate technical assistance from the United States; and

(7) statistical data drawn from other sources on economic growth, health, education, and distribution of resources in East Timor.

Amendment No. 26 offered by Mr. LANTOS: Page 153, after line 23, add the following:

TITLE IX—FREEDOM INVESTMENT ACT OF 2001

SECTION 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Freedom Investment Act of 2001”.

SEC. 902. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Supporting human rights is in the national interests of the United States and is consistent with American values and beliefs.

(2) Defenders of human rights are changing our world in many ways, including protecting freedom and dignity, religious liberty, the rights of women and children, freedom of the press, the rights of workers, the environment, and the human rights of all persons.

(3) The United States must match its rhetoric on human rights with action and with sufficient resources to provide meaningful support for human rights and for the defenders of human rights.

(4) Providing one percent of amounts available annually for foreign affairs operations for human rights activities, including human rights monitoring, would be a minimal investment in protecting human rights around the world.

(5) The Department of State should have individuals in positions in foreign countries that are designated for monitoring human rights activities and developments in such countries, including the monitoring of arms exports.

SEC. 903. SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF THE BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND LABOR.

For fiscal year 2004 and each fiscal year thereafter, not less than 1 percent of the amounts made available to the Department

of State under the heading “Diplomatic and Consular Programs”, other than amounts made available for worldwide security upgrades and information resource management, are authorized to be made available only for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, including funding of positions at United States missions abroad that are primarily dedicated to following human rights developments in foreign countries and that are assigned at the recommendation of such Bureau in conjunction with the relevant regional bureau.

SEC. 904. HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY FUND.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.**—There is established a Human Rights and Democracy Fund (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “Fund”) to be administered by the Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor.

(b) **PURPOSES OF FUND.**—The purposes of the Fund are—

- (1) to support defenders of human rights;
- (2) to assist the victims of human rights violations;
- (3) to respond to human rights emergencies;
- (4) to promote and encourage the growth of democracy, including the support for non-governmental organizations in other countries; and
- (5) to carry out such other related activities as are consistent with paragraphs (1) through (4).

(c) **FUNDING.**—Of the amounts made available to carry out chapter 1 and chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and chapter 4 of part II of such Act for each of the fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004, \$27,000,000 for each such fiscal year is authorized to be made available only to the Fund for carrying out the purposes described in subsection (b).

SEC. 905. REPORTS ON ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES TO ENCOURAGE RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) **SECTION 116 REPORT.**—Section 116(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d)) is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” at the end and inserting a semicolon;
- (2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;
- (3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) for each country with respect to which a determination has been made that extrajudicial killings, torture, or other serious violations of human rights have occurred in the country, the extent to which the United States has taken or will take action to encourage an end to such practices in the country.”

(b) **SECTION 502B REPORT.**—Section 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(b)) is amended by inserting after the 4th sentence the following: “Such report shall also include, for each country with respect to which a determination has been made that extrajudicial killings, torture, or other serious violations of human rights have occurred in the country, the extent to which the United States has taken or will take action to encourage an end to such practices in the country.”

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report Amendment No. 6, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 6, as modified, offered by Ms. SLAUGHTER:

Page 43, insert the following after line 21:

SEC. 214. REPORT CONCERNING THE GERMAN FOUNDATION “REMEMBRANCE, RESPONSIBILITY, AND THE FUTURE”.

(a) **REPORT CONCERNING THE GERMAN FOUNDATION “REMEMBRANCE, RESPONSIBILITY, AND THE FUTURE”.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter until all funds made available to the German Foundation have been disbursed, the Secretary of State shall report to the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the implementation of the Agreement and, to the extent possible, on whether or not—

(1) during the 180-day period preceding the date of the report, the German Bundestag has authorized the allocation of funds to the Foundation, in accordance with section 17 of the law on the creation of the Foundation, enacted by the Federal Republic of Germany on August 8, 2000;

(2) the entire sum of DM 10,000,000,000 has been made available to the German Foundation in accordance with Annex B to the Joint Statement of July 17, 2000;

(3) during the 180-day period preceding the date of the report, any company or companies investigating a claim, who are members of ICHEIC, were required to provide to the claimant, within 90 days after receiving the claim, a status report on the claim, or a decision that included—

(A) an explanation of the decision, pursuant to those standards of ICHEIC to be applied in approving claims;

(B) all documents relevant to the claim that were retrieved in the investigation; and

(C) an explanation of the procedures for appeal of the decision;

(4) during the 180-day period preceding the date of the report, any entity that elected to determine claims under Article 1(4) of the Agreement was required to comply with the standards of proof, criteria for publishing policyholder names, valuation standards, auditing requirements, and decisions of the Chairman of ICHEIC;

(5) during the 180-day period preceding the date of the report, an independent process to appeal decisions made by any entity that elected to determine claims under Article 1(4) of the Agreement was available to and accessible by any claimant wishing to appeal such a decision, and the appellate body had the jurisdiction and resources necessary to fully investigate each claim on appeal and provide a timely response;

(6) an independent audit of compliance by every entity that has elected to determine claims under Article 1(4) of the Agreement has been conducted; and

(7) the administrative and operational expenses incurred by the companies that are members of ICHEIC are appropriate for the administration of claims described in paragraph (3).

The Secretary of State’s report shall include the Secretary’s justification for each determination under this subsection.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the resolution of slave and forced labor claims is an urgent issue for aging Holocaust survivors, and the German Bundestag should allocate funds for disbursement by the German Foundation to Holocaust survivors as soon as possible; and

(2) ICHEIC should work in consultation with the Secretary of State in gathering the information required for the report under subsection (a).

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AGREEMENT.**—The term “Agreement” means the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and

the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the Foundation "Remembrance, Responsibility and the Future", done at Berlin July 17, 2000.

(2) ANNEX B TO THE JOINT STATEMENT OF JULY 17, 2000.—The term "Annex B to the Joint Statement of July 17, 2000" means Annex B to the Joint Statement on occasion of the final plenary meeting concluding international talks on the preparation of the Federal Foundation "Remembrance, Responsibility and the Future", done at Berlin on July 17, 2000.

(3) GERMAN FOUNDATION.—The term "German Foundation" means the Foundation "Remembrance, Responsibility and the Future" referred to in the Agreement.

(4) ICHEIC.—The term "ICHEIC" means the International Commission on Holocaust Era Insurance Claims referred to in Article 1(4) of the Agreement.

Mr. HYDE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, as modified, be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This en bloc amendment, Mr. Chairman, consists of 19 amendments that were made in order by the rule on H.R. 1646. The inclusion of these 19 provisions into this en bloc amendment reflects the concurrence of each sponsor and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on International Relations.

I assure my fellow Members that these measures are noncontroversial, and I recommend an aye vote on this en bloc amendment. I appreciate very much the cooperation we have received from the sponsors of these amendments and from the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), my Democratic colleague, for working with us to advance these measures in this manner.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first, let me express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for the extraordinarily cooperative and collegial manner in which he has handled both this matter and all matters that we have dealt with in the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this en bloc amendment. This en bloc amendment includes amendments from both sides of the aisle and includes a technical provision requested by the Department of State.

I would like to highlight several provisions that enjoy broad bipartisan

support: the amendment of the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) supporting free, fair and democratic elections in Fiji, East Timor, and Peru; the amendment of the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) on the Philippines; the amendment of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) on small business contracting by AID; the amendment by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) on child soldiers; the amendment by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) on trafficking; the amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) on U.S. civilian prisoners during World War II; and the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) on IAEA and Iran.

Mr. Chairman, a provision offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) seeks to ensure congressional oversight and enforcement in the area of Holocaust restitutions by requiring the Secretary of State to determine in a report to Congress whether the foundation established for this purpose is meeting its responsibilities to claimants.

The en bloc amendment also contains the East Timor Transition to Independence Act, legislation I introduced with the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

I would express my appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific, and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA), ranking Democratic member, for their help on this legislation, along with the East Timor Action Network.

Two years ago, Mr. Chairman, the people of East Timor voted overwhelmingly for independence from Indonesia. In response, anti-independence militias, with the support of the Indonesian military, launched a campaign of terror and violence.

The East Timorese have now won their hard-earned freedom, and the United States is playing a lead role in helping the East Timorese get back on their feet. This legislation provides a 3- to 5-year trade, aid, and security agenda with East Timor so that our Nation remains a key player in helping to rebuild that small and long-suffering country.

It authorizes \$25 million in bilateral U.S. assistance to East Timor, authorizes the establishment of a Peace Corps Program in that country, and mandates a series of steps to increase the involvement of U.S. trade and export agencies in East Timor.

I also wish to point to the amendment offered by the gentleman from

New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and myself titled the Freedom Investment Act. This amendment ensures that our human rights and democracy programs are not merely part of our foreign policy rhetoric, but are also part of U.S. foreign policy reality.

If we are to accomplish this, the human rights function within the Department of State must be strengthened appreciably.

This provision provides a permanent authorization for the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor equal to 1 percent of the Department's main operating account. This continues specific authorizations that the Congress has provided for the democracy and human rights functions and boosts the human rights and democracy fund.

This fund administered by the Department of State has been crucial to providing small level grants to human rights causes around the globe, and it definitely should be increased.

So I want to reiterate my support, Mr. Chairman, of the en bloc amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), and I urge my colleagues to vote for his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), my good friend, thanking the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for including in his en bloc amendment our amendment, which extends until 2003 the reporting requirement of the State Department on compliance with the provisions of the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction.

My colleagues will recall that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) and I offered legislation last year adopted in both the House and the Senate that urged compliance by signatory countries with the Hague Convention. The legislation became necessary because, sadly, some Hague signatories consistently fail to comply fully with both the letter and the spirit of their international legal obligations under the Convention.

The Hague Convention establishes reciprocal rights and duties between and among its contracting states to expedite the return of children to the state of their habitual residence as well as to ensure that rights of custody and of access under the laws in one contracting state are respected in other contracting states. Unfortunately, some parties to the Convention have been routine offenders.

My colleagues have often heard me talk about the case of a Cincinnati man, Tom Sylvester, whose then baby daughter, Carina, was abducted by her mother back in 1995 and taken to Austria where she remains today. Six

years after the abduction, the case remains unresolved despite a number of court orders in Mr. Sylvester's favor in both the United States and Austria, including an order all the way up to the Austrian Supreme Court in Mr. Sylvester's favor.

Unfortunately, the Sylvester case is not a rarity. Every year, more and more American parents suffer similar circumstances and face similar obstacles from other nations, many of whom are signatories of the Hague Convention.

This amendment which extends for 2 years the reporting requirements of the Department of State on compliance by Hague signatories is, unfortunately, quite necessary. The continuation of this language in the State Department authorization legislation sends a message to those offending countries who consistently fail to honor their obligations under international law, that the Congress takes their failure to comply very seriously and will continue to pursue efforts to bring our American children home.

I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON). As chairman of the Congressional Caucus on Missing and Exploited Children, he has done an extraordinary job in bringing national and international attention to this growing problem that devastates so many American families. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) on their continuing efforts on focusing their attention on this very tragic situation that so many parents are in across our Nation. We welcome the opportunity to include this amendment in the en bloc, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for including it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, part of the en bloc is one that I offer on Iran because I am deeply concerned about U.S. taxpayer dollars being used to support the development of a 1,000 megawatt nuclear power reactor at Bushehr in Iran's Persian Gulf coast. I want specifically to address the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency's technical assistance for this plant, because I believe the agency is indirectly supporting Iran in its well-known endeavors to acquire dangerous nuclear technology.

Iran claims it is merely seeking the wherewithal to meet its publicly desired statement to have a civil nuclear power program to generate electricity, which is suspect in light of Iran's hav-

ing the world's largest oil and natural gas reserves. But it is no secret that Iran is also pursuing a nuclear weapon's development program.

Last fall, Assistant Secretary of State for Nonproliferation Bob Einhorn stated in testimony before the Senate that the administration opposed construction of the Bushehr plant because, "it would be used as a cover for maintaining wide-ranging contacts with Russian nuclear entities and for engaging in more sensitive forms of cooperation with more direct applicability to a nuclear weapons program." I could not agree more.

Let me suggest to my colleagues that we must decide as a government whether to oppose or acquiesce in the construction of the plant, which is being built with Russian support. I submit to my colleagues that acquiescence in this case is tantamount to our acceptance as inevitable the construction of the nuclear power plant. This is not about safety, this is about operational capacity. If we do not speak out, who will?

My amendment would simply withhold U.S. proportional voluntary assistance to the IAEA for programs and projects of the agency which go for technical assistance for the Bushehr plant. I have no interest in cutting off all IAEA assistance to Iran, but it is ludicrous for the United States taxpayers to support a plant which could pose a threat to the United States and to stability in the Middle East.

Please support my colleagues in supporting the en bloc amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, the Flake-Gilman-Cantor-Wexler amendment is a bipartisan straightforward resolution condemning the remarks of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad.

On March 27 at the first regular Arab summit gathering in more than 10 years, President Assad used his speech to lash out against Israel.

In electing Mr. Sharon to be their leader, President Assad said Israelis "had chosen a man who hated anything to do with Arabs and had dedicated his career to killing them."

President Assad continued by saying, "We say that the head of the government is a racist, it's a racist government, a racist army and security force." "It is a racist society and it is even more racist than the Nazis."

Mr. Chairman, as if President Assad's remarks back in March were not enough, he reiterated his anti-Semitic remarks 11 days ago in his welcoming speech to Pope John Paul, II, in Damascus.

In both cases, the administration has been swift to condemn Assad's remarks. The time has now come for Members of the House to go on record

condemning these inflammatory remarks and express its support for people of Israel.

Finally, President Assad's remarks illustrate a counterproductive pattern beginning there. These types of actions will only have a negative impact on the region in this time of crisis.

This amendment sends a message that the United States opposes this type of speech by world leaders. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support the en bloc amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

□ 1630

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for his cogent remarks with regard to the appalling remarks made by the President of Syria recently. He was criticized by the press, by leaders throughout the world for encouraging and inciting more hostility rather than being a leader for peace.

We had looked to the new President of Syria for greater leadership than he has demonstrated, and we hope he will take a good hard look at what he has done to stir up the problems in the Middle East and recant his statement, and we look forward to hearing from the President of Syria further on this issue.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from California, the ranking member, the distinguished gentleman, for yielding time to me.

I certainly agree with the remarks of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) condemning the President of Syria, and I would also add that Syrian troops ought to leave Lebanon as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment, which is rolled into the en bloc amendments, addresses the unfortunate events of World War II in which almost 19,000 American civilians living or traveling abroad were captured by the Axis powers and incarcerated, 1,700 of whom either died in captivity or were executed. It is really a shocking statistic. To date, no formal apology has been offered for these terrible actions.

My amendment would extend the Congress' sympathy to the brave men and women who were incarcerated and their families for the terrible hardships they endured. Also, it encourages foreign nations that incarcerated U.S. civilians during World War II to formally apologize to these individuals and their families.

Passage of this amendment would honor the many who suffered, including Michael Kolanik, Sr., of Westchester County, New York, which I represent. He was captured by Nazi Germany and was a slave laborer for 6

years. Unfortunately, he has already passed away; but his son Mike, Jr., a Vietnam veteran, has been pursuing this issue in honor of his father.

While recognition of their ordeal will not erase the painful reality of their imprisonment, it will provide a sense of closure for them and their families and put to rest a long and drawn-out battle to honor those brave men and women for their suffering.

I know this has bipartisan support, and I thank everybody for that; and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment so that we can begin to heal the wounds of the past.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Flake amendment. In a gesture of interfaith reconciliation, Pope John Paul II recently undertook the first-ever visit by a Pope to Syria where he visited a mosque. I commend the Pope for these historic actions that are in keeping with the finest teachings of our Judeo-Christian heritage. Despite these generous acts, Pope John Paul II was subjected to a primitive anti-Jewish outburst by Syrian President Bashar Assad. President Assad attacked the Jews as a people "who try to kill the principles of all religions with the same mentality with which they betrayed Jesus Christ, and in the same way they tried to commit treachery against the Prophet Muhammad."

Later, Pope John Paul II was subjected to a second bigoted tirade, this time by the Syrian Religious Affairs minister, who railed against "what the enemies of God and malicious Zionism conspire to commit against Christianity and Islam." On the second day of the Pope's visit to Syria, a front page editorial in the official government newspaper called *Israelis* "the enemies of God and faith."

These expresses must have been particularly painful to the Pope, in view of the fact that he has worked so long and hard to further increase understanding between Christians and Jews and people of all faiths. The religious bigotry expressed by Syria's president is contrary to America's values of religious tolerance and undermines the chance for peace and poisons relations between people of different faiths.

There have been reports that the Syrian government hopes to improve its relationship with the United States in order to qualify for American financial aid. Such anti-Semitic rhetoric is not a positive step and merely fans the flames of violence.

The Flake amendment would shed light on the actions and statements of high-ranking Syrian government officials and emphasizes the concern of the United States about the negative impact such remarks make on the prospects for Middle East peace. Congress must speak up and act to condemn this

hatred. Accordingly, I strongly urge all Members to support this amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, time is running out for Germany to provide a measure of justice to the survivors of the Holocaust, 10 to 15 percent of whom are dying every year. I urge passage of the Slaughter-Waxman-Schakowsky amendment to H.R. 1646 that would require the Secretary of State to report to Congress twice a year on the status of the German foundation, Remembrance, Responsibility, and the Future.

The amendment also expresses the sense of Congress regarding the urgency of payments to Holocaust slave and forced labor camp survivors, and encourages the International Commission on Holocaust Era Insurance Claims to work with the Secretary of State in gathering the information required for the report.

Behind this amendment are real faces, faces of survivors from a variety of concentration and forced labor camps. Thousands suffered torture, mental abuse, loss of family, destruction of their culture during the Holocaust; yet they continue to wait on reparations for the suffering they endured so many years ago. Nearly a year after the agreement signed by the United States and Germany establishing the German foundation as the exclusive forum for the resolution of Holocaust-era restitution claims, not one Deutsche Mark has been paid out to a Holocaust survivor.

The German foundation is supposed to be an exclusive remedy. We must make sure it is an effective remedy. This amendment would serve notice to the German foundation that Congress is concerned about Holocaust survivor restitution claims and expects the allocations of funds from the German foundation to go forward without further delay.

During the last Congress, I introduced the Justice for Holocaust Survivors Act, H.R. 271, a bill that would have allowed survivors to pursue reparations from Germany for the unspeakable suffering they endured during the Holocaust. H.R. 271 garnered the support of 96 bipartisan cosponsors. This legislation served as a major catalyst in the talks between the U.S. and Germany to reach a compensation agreement.

On July 17, 2000, the United States and Germany signed an agreement to establish the German Foundation, as the exclusive forum for the resolution of all Holocaust-era personal injury, property loss, and damage claims against German banks, insurers, and companies. In return, the U.S. Department of Justice has urged the U.S. courts to reject all existing and future lawsuits against German companies by slave laborers and other victims of the Nazi era.

However, nearly a year after the agreement's inception, not one Deutsche mark has been paid by the German Foundation to Holocaust survivors. There needs to be more oversight and enforcement of the agreement that was negotiated by the United States. The German Foundation is supposed to be an exclusive remedy; we must make sure it is an effective remedy.

Our amendment would achieve this goal by requiring the Secretary of State to report to Congress on whether the German Foundation is meeting its responsibilities to claimants; insurance companies joining the agreement abide by the same baseline set of standards; and slave and forced labor payments are distributed as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman, this report would also serve notice to the German Foundation that Congress is concerned about Holocaust survivor claims and expects the allocation of funds from the German Foundation to go forward without further delay.

We must address the current lack of oversight of the German Foundation. I urge my colleagues to join me in calling for this report to Congress on the status of the German Foundation before it is too late to grant justice to our aging Holocaust survivors.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), for his willingness to fold the Lampson-Jackson Lee-Chabot amendment regarding international child abduction into his en bloc amendment. I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for their earlier comments and their hard work on this issue that affects so many parents and children in the United States of America.

In the fall of 2000, I wrote to former Secretary of State Albright to express my strong concern regarding the U.S. State Department's adherence to the reports required in section 202 of the consolidated appropriations act of last year. Congress takes this reporting requirement very seriously, as it is designed to strengthen the implementation of the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction.

In the past, the Department of State has submitted reports to Congress that in my mind have not been meeting the statutory requirements required by the reports and has not helped the cause of many parents left behind in the United States.

As H.R. 1646 is currently written, there is no reporting requirement of the U.S. Department of State on the compliance with the provisions of the Convention on Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction done at the Hague in 1980, and this amendment

simply extends the reporting requirement in last year's State Department authorization bill from the current requirement of 2001 for 2 years, to 2003.

The entire purpose of this report is to educate judges, attorneys, and the public to promote remedial actions in current cases and to prevent as many new ones as possible. This depends on full disclosure by the State Department of information sought by Congress and the sort of widespread dissemination of the report that was called for in the last Congress' law.

So again I thank the chairman for accepting this as part of the en bloc amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for yielding me this time; and I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for including this amendment in the en bloc amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support the en bloc amendment, particularly my amendment regarding the former United States military facility in the Philippines. Basically, what my amendment does is support the joint statement by the United States and the Republic of the Philippines on the Framework for Bilateral Cooperation in the Environmental and Public Health, signed on July 27, 2000. This would encourage an objective non-governmental study which would examine the environmental contamination and health effects emanating from the former U.S. facilities in the Philippines following the departure of the U.S. military forces from the Philippines in 1992.

This is good responsible policy. It cements an ongoing dialogue that we have with the Philippines on the results of the contamination which was evident in the military facilities which we left in 1992. This is particularly important at this particular time as we examine our ongoing relationships with the Philippines.

The United States and the Philippines have a long and proud history of friendship and cooperation. We originally acquired the Philippines under the Treaty of Paris in 1898; and frankly, we were engaged in a period of imperialism and forcibly took the Philippines. But since that time, we have helped the Philippines to develop its democratic foundations and its military, as most Philippine military institutions are modeled after the United States. We could consider the Philippines the first pioneer democracy in Asia.

Now, this is particularly important at this time as we have finalized a visiting forces agreement with the Phil-

ippines. We continue to understand that in the ongoing environment of Asia we need the Philippines now more than ever. It is time we take a little responsibility for the environmental cleanup and take a good strong look at it. I urge passage of the amendment and again thank the chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment regarding the former United States military facilities in the Philippines to H.R. 1646, The Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY 2002.

My amendment would support the Joint statement by the United States and the Republic of the Philippines on a Framework for Bilateral Cooperation in the Environmental and Public Health signed on July 27, 2000, which I ask permission to submit for the record; and would encourage an objective non-governmental study which would examine environmental contamination and health effects emanating from the former U.S. military facilities in the Philippines, following departure of U.S. military forces from the Philippines in 1992.

The United States and the Philippines have a long and proud history of friendship and cooperation. Spain ceded the islands to the United States under the terms of the Treaty of Paris signed December 10, 1898, which ended the Spanish-American War. In turn, the United States helped the Philippines to develop its democratic foundations and its military, as most Philippine military institutions were modeled after United States counterparts. Depending upon one's perception of history and definition of democracy, the Philippines could be considered the first pioneer democracy in Asia. In 1906, as a U.S. territory, the Philippines elected two Resident Commissioners to the U.S. Congress. In 1935, the Philippine Islands became the Commonwealth of the Philippines. Between 1907-1946, the Philippines elected 13 different Resident Commissioners to the U.S. Congress. In 1946, the Philippines became fully independent.

The United States and the Philippines maintained their relationship as allies during World War II and the postwar period. In 1941, then President Roosevelt called up members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army into the service of the United States. Over one hundred thousand Filipinos fought alongside the allies to reclaim the Philippine Islands from Japan. This valiant sacrifice and dedication to our shared values during their service in World War II is the foundation of the U.S. and Philippine relationship.

In 1947, the U.S. and the Philippines signed the Military Bases Agreement, which resulted in Clark Air Force Base and Subic Bay Naval Base. Throughout, U.S.-Philippine relations have been and continue to be based on shared history and commitment to democratic principles.

During negotiations between the U.S. and the Philippines in 1991, the Philippine Senate rejected the renewal of the Military Bases Agreement. As a result, in 1992, the U.S. withdrew from Clark Air Force Base and Subic Bay Naval Base, thereby ending the almost 100 years of American military presence there. In the haste of our departure, unfortunately lit-

tle effort was made to provide any environmental restoration in the bases, albeit none was required. This was a result of the 1988 Amendments to the Military Base Agreement.

Moreover, the 1998 Defense Authorization Act specifically states that the armed forces "should not be deployed outside the U.S. to provide assistance to another nation in connection with environmental preservation activities in that nation, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that such activities are necessary for national security purposes." Given this legal and Congressional framework, the U.S. is not legally obligated to provide any environmental restoration in regards to the Philippines. However, I would strongly argue that while both our nations share a profound concern for the quality of the environment, the U.S. has a moral obligation to the Philippines to cooperate in ameliorating this environmental degradation.

Nevertheless, according to the General Accounting Office, the Department of Defense (DOD), and the World Health Organization, at least eighteen contaminated sites on or surrounding these former military installations in the Philippines have been identified. High levels of toxic materials were generated on these sites from over 45 years of intensive military activities, including the production, cleaning, use, and storage of weapons, ordnance, aircraft, naval vessels, land vehicles, and electronic equipment. Wastes were dumped with little regard for the environment as was the norm during the Cold War. As a result of frequent chemical waste dumping, and inadequate sewage and treatment facilities, these toxic materials directly polluted the soil, air, and water.

The urgency of my amendment is shown through the severe illnesses and increasing number of deaths experienced by the current Filipino inhabitants near the former bases. Their health concerns include high rates of urinary tract, reproductive, and nervous system problems, plus high rates of respiratory disorders in children. Various reports have suggested possible connection between these health problems and the drinking water containing heavy metals such as mercury and lead. There has also been a high occurrence of skin diseases, miscarriages, stillbirths, birth defects, various cancers, heart and lung ailments, and leukemia. In only one village where mercury and other contaminants were found in the water, 68 deaths were reported between 1995 and 1999.

Not only are the lives of numerous families at stake, but our actions should be considered within the larger scope of U.S.-Philippines relations. Clark Air Force Base and Subic Bay Naval Base were strategically valuable during the Cold War—especially during the Vietnam and Korean conflicts. The Filipino people have been our loyal allies throughout this century. Therefore we cannot ignore these pressing issues as the daily lives of thousands have been adversely affected from such contamination.

In a positive step forward, in 1999, the U.S. and the Philippines reached agreements to revive the security relationship, which had declined following the U.S. withdrawal from military bases in 1992. The two governments concluded a Visiting Forces Agreement that will

allow U.S. military personnel to enter the Philippines for joint training and other cooperative activities.

In addition, in July of 2000, the U.S. and the Philippines signed a Joint Statement that outlines a cooperative partnership that would include increased sharing of information, best practices and partnerships through ongoing capacity building programs, among government and non-government experts. The goal of this Joint Statement would be to enhance the Philippines' institutional and technical capacity to address environmental and public health problems throughout the Philippines and help coordinate military-to-military consultations to discuss ways to reduce the environmental impacts of peacetime military activities.

I would like to commend the DOD and the State Department for their collaborative efforts in working within the legal framework provided, and cooperating with the Philippines in turning over records and documents via the U.S. Embassy. Moreover, I would like to point out the many successful U.S. inter-agency team visits to the Philippines. In May 2000, officials from DOD, State, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Department of Energy (DOE) began to discuss the broad environmental issues facing the Philippines. In October 2000, a DOD team began a defense-to-defense environmental information exchange program, and conducted a workshop on hazardous waste management. And, in December of 2000, yet another inter-agency team consisting of DOD, State, EPA, the US Agency for International Development, and US Geological Service conducted more workshops on environmental management systems. My amendment supports these activities and provides further constructive steps by encouraging an objective non-governmental study that would build upon this positive work.

A new study issued May 14th by the Rand organization, entitled "U.S. & Asia—Toward a New U.S. Strategy and Force Posture" reinforces the importance of U.S.-Philippine relations.

This study argues that the conflict between Taiwan and mainland China are key to U.S. security posture in the Pacific and recommends the U.S. engage in new relationships with the Philippines and Guam. Specifically, the study reports that the U.S. should ". . . expand cooperation with the Philippines" and ". . . the Philippines may present an interesting opportunity to enhance Air Force access in the Western Pacific." Moreover, the study suggests that Guam "should be developed into a major hub from which the Air Force and Navy could project power into the South China Sea and elsewhere in Southeast Asia."

Given this analysis of the importance of the Philippines, Congress should seek to encourage better cooperation and increased dialogue between our two countries, which my amendment intends to do.

Passage of this important amendment will also help raise awareness of the environmental contamination and health issues at the former military bases in the Philippines. I urge all Members to support my amendment.

JOINT STATEMENT BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES ON FRAMEWORK FOR BILATERAL COOPERATION IN THE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC HEALTH

Whereas the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines have a long and proud history of friendship and cooperation.

Whereas both nations share a profound concern for the quality of the natural environment and the impact environmental quality has on the health and well-being of our peoples.

Whereas both nations recognize the critical importance that environmental quality plays in the stability and security of nations.

Whereas both nations share a strong interest in working to prevent environmental problems that could threaten public health or the national security of either nation.

Whereas both nations intend to cooperate to help protect air, soil, and water resources, marine and coral reefs, tropical forests, and biological diversity.

And taking note of the joint statement on clean energy and climate change signed by their Energy Departments, both nations do hereby express their intent to reduce industrial and toxic pollution and the emissions of greenhouse gases that can contribute to global climate change, and to enhance local capacities for improved environmental and public health management.

Accordingly, the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines announce that they intend to jointly expose ways in which this cooperation can further enhance their long tradition of friendship and help ensure the well-being of their peoples and the planet.

This cooperation is envisioned to include increased sharing of information, best practices and partnerships through ongoing capacity building programs, among government and non-governmental experts, directly and by electronic means. The goal of this cooperation would be to enhance the Philippines' institutional and technical capacity to address environmental and public health problems throughout the Philippines.

In particular, cooperative efforts should be undertaken to build capacity for effective regulation of the competitive electric power industry that will be evolving in the Philippines in order to facilitate the market deployment of energy efficient technologies, renewable energy sources, and less carbon intensive fuels such as natural gas, all of which can help limit emissions of both carbon dioxide and conventional air pollutants.

In addition, these exchanges and consultations may also include cooperation to minimize loss of life and property damage resulting from natural disasters.

Further, in consideration of the treaty alliance between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, and believing strongly in the importance of a close relationship between our armed forces, as part of our cooperative effort, we intend to convene defense-to-defense consultations to discuss ways to reduce the environmental impacts of peacetime military activities.

Further specific priorities for this enhanced framework for cooperation on the environment and public health are to be defined in an ongoing dialogue by interagency teams of both Governments and should build on current bilateral efforts. Through this dialogue, the Philippine side will provide the United States a prioritized list of proposed cooperative activities with a view to achieving the objectives of this Joint Statement.

Washington, DC, July 27, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for allowing this amendment to come to the floor. I support the en bloc, and I ask for the support of my colleagues for this amendment that places governments on notice that the United States pays attention to those nations who use children as soldiers.

The amendment mandates that the Department of State annual Human Rights Report for each country, where applicable, include a description of the nature of conscription, and participation of persons under the age of 18 by governmental forces, government-supported paramilitaries, or other armed groups.

Do I need to name the countries? Countries in South America, Sierra Leone in Africa, Sudan, Liberia, and other places where children have been placed into conflicts not of their own choosing. This is important documentation that will tell us a great deal about the real human rights practices that occur when children are absorbed into armed conflict.

The mere compilation of annual country reports regarding this human tragedy will be a critical tool in the United States foreign policy. We must stop children being forced into armed war. An estimated 300,000 children under the age of 18 were engaged in armed military conflicts in more than 30 countries, and they are currently fighting along with the adults in these armed conflicts.

I am gratified that the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), is a cosponsor, as is the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS). Far too many of these children have been forcibly conscripted through kidnapping or coercion, and others join because of economic necessity, to avenge the loss of a family member, or for their own personal safety. It is horrific to see children with mutilated hands, but even more so for the children to mutilate those because they are forced to do so.

Listen to the story of a girl from Uganda who was kidnapped, taken away from picking tomatoes in the garden. These soldiers surrounded her, they then took her to her home, killed her mother, and then took her away, leaving behind her little brother and two little sisters. It is a tragedy. And these children try to resist.

This is a good amendment and I ask for support. We must stop the utilization of children for soldiers in armed warfare.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to extend my strong support for the Jackson Lee-Lewis-Lantos amendment to the underlying bill. It would enhance our understanding of the treatment of children being used as soldiers.

In short, the amendment would require annual human rights country reports on children used as soldiers. Nothing in the amendment would require any change in U.S. policy or prohibit any funding through multilateral or bilateral assistance given abroad. Mr. Chairman, the amendment merely places governments on notice that the United States pays attention to those nations who use children as soldiers.

The amendment mandates that the Department of State annual Human Rights Report for each country, where applicable, include a description of the nature of conscription, and participation in of persons under the age of 18 by governmental forces, government supported paramilitaries, or other armed groups; their use in combat; and what steps are being taken by the government of that country to eliminate such practices. This is important documentation that will tell us a great deal about the real human rights practices that occur when children are absorbed into armed conflict. The mere compilation of annual country reports regarding human rights has been a critical tool of American foreign policy under Republican and Democratic Administrations.

An estimated 300,000 children under the age of 18 were engaged in armed military conflicts in more than 30 countries are currently fighting in armed conflicts. Sadly, far too many of these wonderful children are forcibly conscripted through kidnapping or coercion and others joined because of economic necessity, to avenge the loss of a family member or for their own personal safety. There are so many stories of children being abused in this way.

"B." [who wishes to remain unidentified], a 14-year-old young girl, was abducted in Uganda in February 1997: "I had gone to the garden to collect tomatoes at around eight or nine in the morning. Suddenly, I was surrounded by about 50 rebels. They started picking tomatoes and eating them. They arrested me and beat me terribly. Finally, I walked them to my home. We went there and collected my clothes. There, they killed my mother. They made me go, leaving behind my little brother and two little sisters. . . . I was resisting. Then they started beating me until I became unconscious."

War is a daily reality for millions of children. Some have never known any other life—they have grown up in the midst of civil wars, guerrilla wars, guerrilla insurgency, or long-term occupation by a foreign army. For others, the world is suddenly turned upside down when invasion of forced internal displacement drives them on the road of refugees or displaced persons, often separated from their families.

The results are devastating. Children injured in armed conflicts often-innocent bystanders, but some are targeted deliberately by security forces and armed opposition groups, in retribution or to provoke outrage in each other's communities. Some, mainly girls are singled out for sexual abuse. While both boys and girls are used as fighters, girls are at particular risk of rape.

Casualty rates among child soldiers are generally high, because of their inexperience, fearlessness and lack of training, and because they are often used for particularly hazardous assignments, such as intelligence or planting landmines. Both governments and armed

groups use children because they are easier to condition into fearless killing and unthinking obedience; child soldiers are sometime provided with drugs and alcohol to overcome their fear or reluctance to fight.

Last year, the United States government signed two landmark Protocols that address prostitution, the impact of pornography on children, and the global practice of child labor. This resolution, in an entirely complimentary way, applauds the decision by the U.S. government to support the Protocol that condemns the use of children as soldiers by government and nongovernment forces. Further, the House passed H. Con. Res. 348, a resolution that condemns the use of children as soldiers. And there is good reason why we did that. This is a common sense step forward.

It is important that the House accept the Jackson Lee-Lewis-Lantos amendment so that the U.S. Department of State may include reports on other countries that use children as soldiers. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1645

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and rise to support an amendment which outlines a 3- to 5-year trade, aid and security agenda with East Timor which, as everyone knows, is currently under United Nations control and is scheduled for full independence later this year.

This legislation contained in the en bloc authorizes bilateral U.S. assistance to East Timor in order to promote civil society, independent media, job creation and economic development. It authorizes the establishment of a Peace Corps program in East Timor, requires that a developmental plan to establish full diplomatic facilities in East Timor be accomplished and mandates a series of steps to increase the involvement of U.S. trade and export agencies in East Timor.

I had the honor of having the chance to travel to East Timor with Nobel Prize winner Bishop Carlos Belo, and this was just after he received the Nobel Peace Prize. As my colleagues know, for the last 30 years East Timor has been fighting for its independence. Finally it won it.

Mr. Chairman, now we need to make sure that independence sticks and stability takes hold. In this Congress and many other places, we prepare for war. And when we prepare for war, we make sure that we make an investment in order to win war once we have prepared for it. Now we need to win the peace. We need to make sure that peace takes hold in East Timor. So we also need to make sure that peace takes hold, and this legislation within the en bloc will make that take place.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this very important amendment which will

help our relationship with East Timor and help it get underway.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge support for two amendments that we have offered as part of the en bloc proposal today. The first deals with fugitives who continue to flee America and American justice. The world has gotten smaller and the number of criminals fleeing America continues to grow. With this amendment, Congress takes another step towards the days when there is nowhere in the world for fugitives to hide.

According to the Department of Justice, more than 3,000 indicted criminals have fled and remain out of our American reach. Their crimes include murder, terrorism, drug trafficking, money laundering, child abduction, financial fraud, and cyber crime. Our extradition agreements are terribly outdated. Half of them predate World War II, and we do not have agreements with over 40 percent of the world, so there are safe havens throughout the globe.

Mr. Chairman, our goal with this amendment is to ensure that the State Department creates a process for updating our outdated extradition agreements and starting a process to incur new agreements to return these criminals to face American justice and to work with the Department of Justice in doing so.

The second amendment is designed to express a sense of our Congress which is absolutely committed to ensuring the truth of the murder of a Texan American, John Elvis, who was brutally murdered last November in Baku, Azerbaijan. He was finishing a 4-year commitment to the International Republican Institute for Fair and Free Elections, and had only 2 weeks left before he returned home to Texas and his family.

We appreciate the support the government of Azerbaijan has provided us, the FBI, and our Ambassador onsite to attempt to solve this murder. This young man was a friend, a colleague and a true freedom fighter for America. President Bush and others continue to urge Azerbaijan to cooperate with us to ultimately find this murderer or murderers, and bring them to justice.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Slaughter-Waxman-Schakowsky amendment and thank my co-authors for their hard work on this important subject, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the distinguished chairman and ranking Democratic member of the Committee on International Relations.

My district, the Ninth Congressional District of Illinois, includes Skokie

and is home to one of the largest Holocaust survivor populations in this country. With passage, this body will make it clear to Holocaust survivors in my district and throughout the world that the United States places the utmost importance on providing some measure of justice, albeit long overdue, to those who suffered the worst atrocities of the last century.

This amendment also puts it clearly on record in underscoring the critical timing of this issue for the aging Holocaust survivor population, and urges the German Bundestag to provide the funds for disbursement by the German foundation to Holocaust survivors as soon as possible. Holocaust survivors have been waiting more than 50 years. This amendment will help assure that their pain and patience is acknowledged in some small way.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I join Representative SLAUGHTER and Representative SCHAKOWSKY today in offering an important amendment to the State Department Authorization Bill, which will enhance U.S. Government oversight of the major Holocaust restitution settlement that created the German Foundation "Rememberance, Responsibility, and the Future."

Nearly a year ago, on July 17, 2000, the German Foundation was established to expedite payments to Holocaust survivors who were tortured as slave and forced laborers, and settle claims for banking and insurance policies stolen by the Nazis. Unfortunately, its implementation has fallen far below expectations.

Thousands of aging survivors who suffered through the horrors of concentration camps continue waiting for the distribution of payments months after all of the class action slave and forced labor cases were dismissed or withdrawn from U.S. courts. In the matter of insurance, merely 496 claims out of the 70,000 filed with the International Commission on Holocaust Era Insurance Claims (ICHEIC) have been settled. The rest have been idled or rejected because the companies have largely ignored many of ICHEIC's standards for approving claims and publishing policyholder names.

During the ceremony preceding the announcement of the German Foundation, U.S. Holocaust Envoy Stuart Eizenstat said, "It is critically important that all German insurance companies cooperate with the process established by the International Commission on Holocaust Era Insurance Claims, or ICHEIC. This includes publishing lists of unpaid insurance policies and subjecting themselves to audit. Unless German insurance companies make these lists available through ICHEIC, potential claimants cannot know their eligibility, and the insurance companies will have failed to assume their moral responsibility."

We must vigilantly pursue resolution of these issues. The amendment asks the State Department for a status report on the progress of the German Foundation, including verification that all participating insurance companies abide by the same baseline set of claims handling procedures and standards for publishing policyholder names. It is troubling

enough that barely half of the modest DM 10 billion designated for the German Foundation has been contributed, but no amount of money is worthwhile unless survivors have meaningful access to the funds.

Congress played a vital role in fostering and facilitating the creation of the German Foundation, and we must be equally devoted to overseeing its proper implementation. We should continue holding congressional hearings on this issue, and briefings to help Members of Congress assist constituents in filing claims as deadlines rapidly approach. The deadline to qualify for slave and forced labor payments is August 11, 2001, and the deadline to file for insurance claims is January 31, 2002.

We must do as much as possible to make sure that the German Foundation offers not just an "exclusive remedy," but the fair and just process that was envisioned.

Mr. SCHROCK, Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. MANZULLO'S Amendment and in support for a constituent in Virginia's 2nd district who will be directly affected by this amendment.

Ms. Chantal Ganthier was the wife of one of the service men taken hostage on the hijacked TWA flight 847 in 1985. I support Ms. Ganthier becoming eligible for compensation due to the traumatic suffering she and her family has endured since her husband was brutally taken as a hostage in 1985.

I encourage my colleagues to vote yea for the Manzullo amendment. It's time was recognize the legal right of these families, these victims of a terrible hijacking, to become eligible for compensation.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that there was not an amendment addressing the Kyoto Protocol language in the State Department reauthorization bill. This language that calls for implementary the protocol will potentially have far-reaching ramifications. An issue of such importance should have been debated before the House.

Under the Kyoto Protocol, by 2008 to 2012 the U.S. would be required to slash emissions of greenhouse gases to seven percent below the 1990 level—a level last achieved in 1979. Based on projections of the future growth in U.S. energy use, this would require a real cut in emissions of over 30 percent. In the meantime, major greenhouse-gas emitters, such as China, India, Mexico, and Brazil, would be able to continue business as usual.

But while the Protocol sets stringent targets and timetables for developed countries, it left the important details of implementation for later negotiations. After three years, these negotiations have gone nowhere, the developing countries have repeatedly refused to even discuss the possibility that targets and timetables might apply to them, as well.

Furthermore, in the recent round of discussions that I attended at The Hague last November, the European Union obstructed any effort to establish a system to account for carbon sinks that take carbon gases out of the air. Some estimates suggest that U.S. carbon sinks—mainly forests and agricultural crop land—offset all of our carbon dioxide emissions in the U.S. As U.S. farmers know, corn, sorghum, wood lots, and other crops take up vast amounts of carbon dioxide. But instead of negotiating in good faith on this and other

issues, European governments seemed more intent on using the treaty to weaken America's competitiveness.

The United States Senate has already voted against the treaty. With no realistic hope that the treaty could be salvaged and eventually ratified by the Senate, the Bush Administration did the right thing and rejected the treaty. Although many European governments have expressed bitter disappointment about the U.S. decision, it should be pointed out that Romania is the only developed country to ratify the treaty so far.

We need to reduce emissions of green house gases, and we are doing that but the simple fact is that for the U.S. to achieve the unfair U.S. responsibility set out in the Kyoto treaty, energy costs would have to rise sharply.

Today's high cost of energy provides just a hint of the kinds of price increases we could expect if we agree to the Kyoto treaty. The Energy Information Administration projects that under Kyoto, by 2010 the average cost of a gallon of gasoline, in current dollars, would rise 32 cents. Diesel fuel prices to would rise to an average of \$2.18 compared to \$1.47 today. Home heating oil also would be expected to rise to \$2.10 per gallon, well above last winter's price.

Such price increases would have a devastating impact on the U.S. economy. Good-paying, high-skilled manufacturing jobs in many industries would be lost at investment in American plants dries up and industries relocate to developing countries not subject to the treaty's requirements. The losses suffered in these industries will be felt throughout the economy in lower incomes and fewer jobs.

A study by the well-respected econometrics firm WEFA Inc. estimates that the treaty would lead to a drop in average household income of \$2,700 per year. Further, an additional 2.4 million U.S. manufacturing jobs could be expected to move to developing countries where companies could take advantage of cheaper energy. Once these countries became sanctuaries for energy-intensive industries, they would be even less likely to agree to emissions limits in the future.

The treaty also lacks a firm scientific basis. While there is not scientific disagreement that more carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases are in our atmosphere than before the Industrial Revolution, scientists disagree about the extent man-made gases contribute to global warming, the amount of warming, or even if the planet is warming at all. Some research indicates even warmer global temperatures in the past than what we are experiencing today.

Current computer models predicting warming over the next century may prove to be no more reliable than the five-day weather forecast. But even assuming that these models are right, achieving the emission goals in the treaty would reduce project warming by about two-tenths of a degree by 2050. But that does not mean we should ignore this potential problem.

There are many things about the climate system we still do not understand. That is why I support continued research to increase our

understanding of climate variability and the potential human impact of greenhouse gas emissions. Instead of Kyoto's command and control approach, the Administration and Congress must work to develop new technologies, market-based incentives, and other approaches to increase energy efficiency and reduce greenhouse emissions. I fully support these approaches and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sanders-Morella amendment. Last year, Congress passed the landmark Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, authorizing funds through FY 2002. Our amendment authorizes an increase in funds for FY 2003 and makes some technical amendments to the Act's foreign assistance provisions.

The international trafficking of human beings for slavery, forced labor, or prostitution is a growing global problem that affects poor and rich countries alike. The Congressional Research Service estimates that every year two million people are trafficked against their will to work in some form of servitude. The majority of trafficking victims are under the age of 18 and annually, about 50,000 women and girls are trafficked into the United States alone. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) estimates that trafficking in human beings is a \$5 to \$7 billion industry worldwide.

Women, children, and men are trafficked to work in a variety of settings beyond forced prostitution and pornography. These areas include domestic work, illegal labor in manufacturing, service industries, or farms, bonded labor, servile marriage, false adoption, and street begging to profit traffickers. Women and girls may be initially trafficked to work as sweatshop laborers and then be transferred into prostitution or domestic servitude.

The states of the former Soviet Union and Southeast Asia are principal sources of trafficked women and girls, but women are trafficked from many developing countries. In Southeast Asia, trafficking is responsible for approximately 10% of the region's gross domestic product (GDP).

Ending the global trade in human beings will require a multi-dimensional approach that addresses the causes of trafficking, protects and supports victims, and prosecutes traffickers. Most importantly, women's vulnerability to trafficking is rooted in poverty and their low social status in many nations. Increased education, work skills, business development, and economic opportunity for women and girls will cut trafficking off at its roots. Additionally, training for law enforcement, customs and immigration officials, and courts in source and destination countries can help deter traffickers. International attention is necessary, not only because the United States imports thousands of women and girls but also because, in many cases, police, judges, and elected officials at all levels of government collude with traffickers—making a law enforcement approach alone ineffective.

The United States has and should continue to be active in combating the growing problem of trafficking in humans. I want to thank Chairman HYDE and Congressman SMITH for their dedication to this issue and encourage members to support the Sanders-Morella amendment.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Manzullo amendment. Last year, in enacting the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act, Congress provided relief to Americans victimized in five terrorist incidents sponsored by nation states. One of these incidents involved seven Americans who were taken hostage when TWA flight 847 was hijacked by terrorists allegedly sponsored by Iran. Through an unfortunate error, Congress did not provide compensation to six of the Americans who filed suit against Iran in March 2000. Former Navy diver Ken Bowen, a constituent of mine from Lake City, Florida, is one of those Americans. He and the other military personnel were taken to Lebanon where they were beaten and subjected to mock executions over 17 days before their release. Equity demands that we correct this grave error. As we work toward the Memorial Day recess and the June 14 anniversary of the hijacking, I ask you to please join me in supporting the Manzullo amendment so that Mr. Bowen and the other American victims can receive the compensation they so justly deserve.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to address an issue of great importance to the Peace Corps and its many fine Volunteers serving around the world—the potential application of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act to require Peace Corps to “collocate” its offices with embassies abroad.

More than 7,000 Peace Corps Volunteers are currently serving in developing countries around the world. Volunteers give two years of their lives to provide assistance to, and learn from, the people of some of the poorest countries in the world.

Living and working with ordinary people, volunteers contribute in a variety of capacities to improving the lives of those they serve. They also seek to share their understanding of other countries with Americans back home.

For 40 years, Peace Corps offices have existed separately from U.S. embassies in their host country. Volunteers generally reside outside capital cities, often in remote villages at the same economic level as the people to whom they lend their energy, skills, and friendship.

There is a critical security aspect to this arrangement. When Volunteers are recognized as development workers serving a community's needs, they are embraced, supported and protected by the community.

If, on the other hand, a perception arises that Volunteers are serving U.S. political objectives or are possibly connected with intelligence activity, the protection the Peace Corps has traditionally relied upon will erode.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment expresses the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of State should give favorable consideration to requests by the Peace Corps and exercise his waiver authority in order to permit the Peace Corps to maintain offices separate from U.S. embassies abroad.

I offer this amendment because I know firsthand that Volunteers are able to meet their goals only to the extent they are accepted into and trusted by their communities. Significantly increased reliance upon, and contact between, Peace Corps Volunteers and the embassy—

an inevitable result of collocation—would compromise that trust.

I would like to thank Chairman HYDE and his staff for their assistance in drafting this amendment and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of my amendment to the State Department authorization bill. My amendment is a simple, technical correction to legislation Congress passed and the president signed last fall: H.R. 3244, the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000.

In its closing weeks, the 106th Congress passed H.R. 3244 to provide relief to Americans victimized in five terrorist incidents sponsored by nation states. H.R. 3244 permits the payment of anti-terrorism judgments with the frozen assets of countries that sponsor terrorism, such as Iran.

One of the five incidents involved seven Americans, retired and active duty members of the U.S. Navy and U.S. Army, who were taken hostage by terrorists allegedly sponsored by the nation state of Iran when TWA flight 847 was hijacked from Athens, Greece to Beirut, Lebanon airport in 1985. The Americans were tortured and held hostage for 17 days. Of the seven American TWA victims, Robert Stethem was murdered. The remaining six Americans, survived. One of them is my constituent.

Stethem's family members filed suit against Iran in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on March 15, 2000, pursuant to the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. The remaining six American TWA victims filed a separate but similar suit against Iran in the same court on June 6, 2000. Through inadvertent error, Congress listed only Stethem's suit, not that of the other six American TWA victims, when it provided relief in H.R. 3244 in the closing weeks of the 106th Congress. The two American TWA victim cases are now consolidated and await a joint trial during the summer of 2001.

My amendment would render the six American TWA victims eligible for compensation on the same basis as are complainants associated with the five other complaints listed in H.R. 3244.

This is a matter of fairness. I ask my colleagues for their strong support.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Ranking Member of the International Relations Committee that would outline and authorize over three-to-five years a recovery and transition to independence strategy for U.S. aid for East Timor.

I was proud to introduce this legislation as H.R. 675 with my colleagues, Representatives LANTOS (CA) and KENNEDY (RI) in February. I want to express my appreciation for their leadership in designing a bill that looks towards establishing permanent and productive relations with a soon-to-be independent East Timor.

This amendment calls upon the Administration to continue to facilitate East Timor's transition to independence, to support democracy and economic recovery, and to strengthen the security of East Timor. Today, the situation on the border between East and West Timor remains tense and combative. Over 100,000 East Timorese remain trapped in squalid refugee camps just inside the Indonesian territory

of West Timor. Indonesian-supported militia groups during the violence of 1999 forcibly removed most of these people from their homes in East Timor. International humanitarian and refugee organizations are limited or unable to provide these refugees with assistance because of the threatening climate created by Indonesia.

We should recall that three United Nations humanitarian workers were brutally and publicly murdered—stabbed to death—by these militias while Indonesian police and authorities stood by. The individuals who carried out the murders were tried and sentenced to the lightest of sentences, giving official sanction to similar violent acts.

While some areas of reconstruction and recovery have moved ahead in East Timor, a great deal more needs to be done to rebuild this tiny nation which has suffered so much in order to gain its freedom. Current reconstruction and longer-term economic aid should focus on creating employment economic security for the majority of East Timorese. It should include the participation of local communities in the planning and design of projects and help preserve, strengthen and expand local leadership. The people of East Timor are eager and more than capable of rebuilding their homes, businesses and communities. International aid targeted at these tasks should hire and compensate the East Timorese for their productive labor, rather than flowing into the pockets of high-salary consultants and officers of multilateral and other foreign organizations.

This amendment looks ahead to the future of an independent East Timor. It sets forth requirements for the provision of bilateral assistance, multilateral aid, Peace Corps assistance, scholarships for East Timorese students, security assistance, and trade and investment aid.

I can see that future, and I commend the gentleman from California in moving this amendment forward so that it can become a reality.

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, May 5, 2001]

BORN AMID VIOLENCE, AND YET LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

(By Arnold Kohen)

DILI, EAST TIMOR.—Jose Maria Barreto Lobato Goncalves typifies the youth of this country. But his own life is anything but typical.

When he was a toddler, Jose was snatched from the arms of his mother, Isabel, as she faced execution on that day in December 1975 when Indonesian forces invaded this island nation.

The boy—son of Nicolau Lobato, a legendary symbol of resistance—was himself nearly put to death, but at the last moment, the Indonesian commander was persuaded to spare him.

Adopted by his aunt, Olimpia, and her husband, the late Jose Goncalves, the boy was taken to live in the Indonesian capital of Jakarta. Kept unaware of his true parentage (and of his father's death in 1978 in an Indonesian ambush), he was educated in Indonesia's best Jesuit school, later studying computers and management.

Now, at 28, he is back in his homeland, which was freed in late 1999 by international peacekeepers after nearly a quarter-century of harsh Indonesian military control.

Today, Lobato is an assistant to the chief executive at a local relief organization. He

displays all the good humor and intellectual nimbleness of the best of his contemporaries anywhere, combined with a spirit of reconciliation that is all the more impressive in light of his family's suffering.

In this way, he is said to take after his father. "He was a nationalist, a man of rectitude, just and humane," says Bishop Carlos Ximenes Belo, the 1996 Nobel Peace Prize co-laureate.

Indeed, Lobato's father was a man who refused to seek revenge against Indonesian prisoners or Timorese accused of working for Indonesia, even after nearly all his family members were murdered.

The bishop, a priest in the Salesian Order, noted for its ministry to the young, knows that people like Jose Lobato must be groomed for the task of eventually running this new nation, on a tropical island off northern Australia whose beauty and perfume-scented air belie its tragic history.

It has been estimated that one-third of East Timor's original population of 700,000 perished during the nearly 25-year Indonesian military occupation. On April 2 an East Timor Genocide Documentation Project was launched by Yale University's Genocide Studies Program, adding to existing Yale efforts on Cambodia and Rwanda.

The country, still reeling from its violent past, is struggling to rebuild.

For almost two years, it has been administered by the United Nations, yet border attacks from Indonesian territory continue. Street children are common now, after never before having been a problem in East Timor. Essential systems, such as water and electrical, have been hampered after Indonesian military elements bent on vengeance destroyed the manuals needed to operate them.

The East Timorese are receiving help from the United States. There is a small U.S. military contingent based offshore, called USGET, the U.S. Support Group East Timor, which is by U.S. law operating independently of the United Nations peacekeepers. The USGET presence is an important signal of American backing for the transition to independence. (East Timor had, before its annexation by Indonesia, been a Portuguese colony.) USGET receives periodic help from the Air Force, Army, Marines, and Navy in its work in East Timor, renewing schools, community centers, and repairing power and water lines.

Last month, hundreds of tons of U.S. relief aid were distributed, some of these donations with the help of Jose Lobato and his organization.

Although young Lobato is far too diplomatic to even hint at this, the stability created by sustained American help is seen privately as the least the United States can provide, given the billions of dollars in economic and military aid spent to support Indonesia's military occupation of East Timor. More reconstruction would be possible if Congress increased the modest \$25 million if appropriated last year for East Timor.

Many concerned about East Timor's future—Bishop Belo certainly among them—see a continuing international presence as vital. Dire outcomes can be averted with timely initiatives. Like many other things, it is simply a matter of political will.

For his part, Lobato knows he has been blessed with an excellent education, and is eager to advance the prospects of others less privileged. Young leaders like him give strong reason for hope for East Timor's future. The question is whether they will receive the international help they need.

[From the Tablet, Apr. 21, 2001]

HIGH HOPES OF A NEW NATION

(By Arnold Kohen)

Easter is an especially verdant time of the year in East Timor, a tropical island off northern Australia whose beauty belies its tragic history. Regeneration, both within East Timor and of the international networks vital to the sustenance of this martyred land, is urgently needed. Administered by the United Nations since an international peace-keeping force entered the former Portuguese colony in September 1999, East Timor is still reeling from its ordeal. Border attacks from Indonesian territory continue.

Two years ago, the people of East Timor suffered a mounting series of assaults by Indonesian army and local militias, some carried out in and around churches in this predominantly Roman Catholic island nation. After nearly 80 percent of eligible voters opted for independence from Indonesia in a referendum, the territory was subjected to an orgy of violence and destruction spearheaded by these same Indonesian forces. Now, 18 months later, renewal is under way.

The task is immense. Much if not most of the infrastructure was left in ruins. Electrical and water facilities were severely damaged, and even the manuals needed to operate these systems were destroyed by Indonesian military elements bent on vengeance. Many homes and public facilities have yet to be rebuilt. Though the UN presence has created jobs, an estimated 70 percent of East Timor's people are unemployed. Paradoxically, many of those without work at present were among the most committed members of the resistance to the 24-year Indonesian occupation: often they did not pursue their studies or were expelled for their political activities. Their plight must be redressed urgently.

UN-sponsored elections are due on 30 August this year. In these crucial transitional months leading up to the poll, the people of East Timor are under great stress. Yale University medical specialists report that a majority of them are suffering from the after-effects of the traumatic events surrounding the referendum of 1999. With only minor exceptions, justice has not been forthcoming and will take time to achieve—indeed, is impossible under current conditions, for the Indonesian military is refusing to cooperate with prosecution of those in its ranks seen as the guilty parties. An international tribunal should be established.

Massive reconstruction remains to be done, and many areas need the most fundamental attention such as the cleaning up of garbage and debris. Reforestation, planting of gardens, building or rebuilding of parks and gardens could all be increased to improve the environment and serve as an important psychological boost to a long-suffering population. Beyond such emergency jobs, Bishop Carlos Ximenes Belo, the Nobel peace laureate, has issued a call to all nations to work to create sustainable enterprises to tackle unemployment.

The East Timorese are demonstrating enormous pride and resilience. Bishop Belo has told the young people that this Easter they should become joyful and happy about opportunities now open to them that never before existed. In fact, a vibrant civil society is developing resourceful non-governmental organizations devoted to human rights, women's concerns, the environment, relief and reconstruction and the rest. Most of these groups are led by people under 35, which gives strong reason for hope in the future. Can the world community fulfill its obligation to provide stability and sustained

support—especially those nations that spent decades and billions of dollars of economic and military aid effectively supporting Indonesia's military occupation of the former Portuguese colony? For a start, the UN staff and peacekeeping troops are a force for stability and a bulwark against reinvasion: they should stay for several years.

International financial authorities, the real economic overlords in the territory, have argued that in three or four years East Timor will be simply another poor Pacific island nation and have no special status. But they miss a crucial point: something terrible has happened in East Timor over the past quarter-century that the world must not be allowed to forget. A small but significant step was taken on 2 April in the United States when the East Timor genocide documentation project was launched by Yale University's genocide studies programme, adding to existing Yale efforts on Cambodia and Rwanda.

About a third of East Timor's original population of 700,000 perished from the combined effects of the Indonesian military occupation. As the East Timor resistance leader Xanana Gusmao recently asked two priests who schooled him as a young man, who is going to dry the tears of the widows of the freedom fighters? Who will feed those who struggled for more than two decades? In the light of the special relationship of the Catholic Church with the people of East Timor, it would seem appropriate to request backing from international church authorities so that they may press governments for long-term support for East Timor, in terms of troops, qualified aid workers and finance. Local and foreign church agencies (and private development organizations such as Oxfam) that support East Timor have limited means to address employment or larger economic and political matters, but they have knowledge that should be transmitted to interested parties.

For example, Maryknoll Sisters have medical and psychological expertise, and are specialists on women's health. Agencies associated with Caritas such as Cafod and Trocaire can use their influence in Europe to gather support for East Timor: Cafod staff have travelled widely in hard-hit areas near the border with Indonesia. For its part the Jesuit Refugee Service, led by Fr Frank Brennan, is doing indispensable work assisting East Timorese refugees who remain in West Timor.

The United States bishops can work in Washington, where lawyers for East Timorese victims of the carnage of 1999 recently brought a case against an Indonesian general who was in the chain of command during those events. The testimonies of the Timorese, whose identities were not revealed for their own protection, provided a searing microcosm of what their nation underwent: lives and limbs lost, property and meagre possessions totally destroyed; in some instances families nearly wiped out.

International headlines featuring East Timor these days focus on who will be the first president of this nascent nation, which is expected to become independent next year. But the politics of the moment are far less important than long-term international programmes to help in the country's resurrection. A major danger is that discontent fuelled by East Timorese unemployment will provide fertile ground for subversive forces, some of them linked to Indonesian military elements that were responsible for the tragic events of 1999. Left unchecked, the situation could lead to riots and social breakdown

which could sabotage the international peacekeeping mission and UN efforts. But such dire outcomes can be averted with timely initiatives and patience. Like many other things, it is simply a matter of political will.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I first became involved in extradition reform in 1997 when there was a horrible crime in my district in Sarasota, Florida. Sheila Bellush, a mother of six, was brutally murdered in her home while her 2-year-old quadruplets watched. The murderer, Jose Luis Del Toro, immediately fled to Mexico where he managed to avoid extradition for almost 2 years. The Mexican government demanded that we waive the death penalty in order to have him returned to the U.S. Despite our cooperation, they still held up his extradition for over a year. This kind of policy is not acceptable. We are dealing with cases of Americans, killing other Americans, on American soil. No foreign country has the right to interfere in the just prosecution of these criminals!

Unfortunately, the Del Toro case is not an isolated one. In 1977 in Philadelphia, Ira Einhorn brutally murdered Holly Maddux. He bludgeoned her to death and then shoved her body in a steam chest where she remained in his closet for 18 months. While waiting to stand trial for this heinous crime, Einhorn fled overseas. He is now in France, successfully avoiding extradition by continuously hiding behind false claims regarding his case. In 1977, the death penalty was not legal in Philadelphia, therefore it was never an option in the Einhorn case. Yet, the French use Einhorn as a poster child for their crusade against capital punishment and are still pursuing all options possible in holding up his extradition to the United States. The French Prime Minister, Lionel Jospin, has signed Einhorn's extradition order, but the appeals process can take an unspecified amount of time and there is no indication that they are interested in expediting the matter. In the meantime, the family of Holly Maddux is in its 24th year of watching and waiting to see if justice will be served.

The more involved I have become in this issue, the more I realize that while the United States may not be to blame for the lack of cooperation from these countries, we certainly have not done our part in formulating a solution. To date, the Department of State has no tracking system for extradition cases. It is absolutely incomprehensible to me that there is no place for anyone, whether a Member of Congress or a family member of a victim, to find simple answers on which countries are extraditing criminals and which ones are not. How can the State Department work effectively with the government of France in getting Einhorn returned, if they have no idea how many similar cases are pending in France. We need to have these answers. If Mexico has 35 outstanding extradition requests from the United States, and 10 have been denied—we need to know that! And we also need to know why!

My amendment will require that the State Department compile this information and submit it to Congress. It will provide a country by country report of the number of Americans being held by foreign governments, the number of extradition requests that the United States has made to such governments, the

number of those requests denied, and any reasons for delays. This is not a controversial amendment. It is a matter of ensuring that justice is served. When foreign governments blatantly disregard reasonable and legitimate requests by the United States, our authority is undermined. My amendment would take us one step closer to ending this practice. My thoughts and prayers go out to the Maddux family and any others who have lost a loved one in a tragic murder where the killer remains free in a foreign land. I sincerely hope that you will all see justice served in the near future.

Mr. FALEOMAVEGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment to H.R. 1646 and my amendment which is contained therein.

The amendment I offered is a Sense of Congress provision that recognizes the extraordinary importance of the national elections this year in Fiji, East Timor and Peru, and urges the Secretary of State to support the holding of free and fair elections in these nations.

Mr. Chairman, each of these countries has recently undergone significant political instability and turmoil.

In Fiji, the government of former Prime Minister Mahendra Chaudry, an Indo-Fijian, was deposed by an attempted coup in May of last year. Fiji has long suffered from political and economic tensions between its indigenous Fijian population and the Indo-Fijian community, which is comprised of individuals of Indian descent. I believe much of Fiji's problems today are a tragic result of Great Britain's bitter legacy of colonialism. For a century, Fiji was controlled and ruled by England as a colony. During that period, from 1879 to 1916, the British brought waves of indentured servants and laborers from India, another English colony, to work the sugar plantations of Fiji. The colonial policies of transmigration have resulted in a dilemma today for native Fijians who fear they may lose control of their government as well as their homeland.

This August 25th, Fiji's caretaker administration will hold national elections intended to return Fiji to parliamentary government. Both New Zealand and Australia have pledged to assist with Fiji's elections, and the United States should join that effort by providing election monitors to ensure free, fair and democratic elections.

As our colleagues know, when East Timor voted to break away from Indonesia in the August 1999 referendum, it triggered a campaign of killings and destruction by pro-Indonesia militias that devastated the territory. Five hundred thousand East Timorese were made refugees and upwards of 2,000 were murdered.

Under the guidance of the United Nations Transitional Administration, East Timor is slowly recovering stability and progressing towards democracy. A crucial part of that process will take place on August 30th, when East Timor holds its first national election to select the 88-member Constituent Assembly. Once seated, the new parliament will draft a Constitution for an independent and democratic East Timor.

The recent resignations from the National Council, the interim government, by President Xanana Gusmao and Nobel laureate Jose Ramos-Horta is not a good sign, indicating

that problems may surface in the lead up to the elections. The United States should support East Timor and U.N. authorities to ensure that the first national elections are successful in consolidating democratic government for the people of East Timor.

Mr. Chairman, Peru is overcoming 10 years of authoritarian rule under former President Alberto Fujimori, whose administration has increasingly been revealed as crime-ridden, with high-level corruption spanning from top politicians to Supreme Court Justices to military generals. Fujimori's intelligence chief, Vladimiro Montesinos, orchestrated the rigging of elections, bribing of high officials, and plotting against opponents. This culminated last year with Fujimori's fraudulent attempt to win a third term, the collapse of his administration, and the former president fleeing the country in November.

This past month, the interim government of Peru held open and fair presidential elections which I was privileged to witness as an election monitor with a delegation led by former President Jimmy Carter. On June 10th, a runoff election will be held between the two top presidential candidates, Alejandro Toledo and Alex Garcia.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the Peruvian electoral officials for the open and impartial elections held in April and urge that our nation continue to support Peru, as well as Fiji and East Timor, to ensure that the upcoming crucial elections are conducted under free and fair conditions necessary for democracy to flourish.

I thank Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS for their support of this provision and urge our colleagues to adopt the en bloc amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

The amendments en bloc, as modified, were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 107-62.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT OF MARYLAND

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

Page 76, after line 12, insert the following new subsection (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly):

(a) ADDITIONAL RESTRICTION ON RELEASE OF ARREARAGE PAYMENTS RELATING TO GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORT ON UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.—

(1) In addition to the satisfaction of all other preconditions applicable to the obliga-

tion and expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated by section 911(a)(3) of the United Nations Reform Act of 1999, such funds may not be obligated or expended until the date on which the General Accounting Office submits a report to Congress under paragraph (2) or September 30, 2001, whichever occurs first.

(2) Not later than September 30, 2001, the General Accounting Office, in consultation with the Department of Defense, shall submit to the Congress a detailed accounting of United States contributions to United Nations peacekeeping operations during the period 1990 through 2001, including a review of any reimbursement by the United Nations for such contributions.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 138, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first I will include in the RECORD a brief report from GAO called "U.S. Costs in Support of Haiti, Former Yugoslavia, Somalia, and Rwanda" for the years 1992 through 1996.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. These documents which will be included in the RECORD indicate that the United States has spent about \$18 billion on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities. There are reports from CRS, from GAO, and from Department of Defense itself, all corroborating that we have spent about \$18 billion on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities. Through the years 1992 through 1996, we have been credited for \$1.8 billion of that against dues. There has been no other accounting and no other credit with the U.N. for the moneys which we have spent on U.N. peacekeeping activities.

Before these funds are released, our amendment says that the Congress needs to know the cost of peacekeeping activities for which we have not been given credit by the U.N. This report is to be issued on or before September 30, 2001. The funds will be withheld until that date. If the report is issued before that, then the funds can be released before that.

Mr. Chairman, I would note that this sequestering of this payment to the U.N. is a much shorter period of time than the sequestering which has already been accomplished by a prior amendment. Again, this is a very simple amendment which simply intends to inform the Congress and the people of the United States, through a report of the GAO, of all of the moneys that we have spent on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities.

My hope is when this report comes to the Congress, that the people of the United States seeing the report of the GAO, and the Congress seeing this report will ask for an accounting; but our

amendment does not withhold the payment beyond the issuing of this report or beyond September 30, 2001, whichever occurs first.

The American people need to know the amounts of money that we have spent and not been given credit for. Congress needs to know that the reality is with all of these moneys that we have spent on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities, we have paid our dues several times over. But notwithstanding that, this amendment does not prevent the release of this last payment of the dues, it simply withholds it until the report is issued and the Congress and the American people have a chance to look at the report, or September 30, 2001, whichever occurs first.

The report previously referred to is as follows:

[U.S. GAO Report to the Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, March 1996]

PEACE OPERATIONS: U.S. COSTS IN SUPPORT OF HAITI, FORMER YUGOSLAVIA, SOMALIA, AND RWANDA

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTER-
NATIONAL AFFAIRS DIVISION,

Washington, DC, March 6, 1996.

Hon. ROBERT DOLE,

Majority Leader, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: As requested, we are providing you information on U.S. agencies' estimated costs for their support of U.N. peace operations in Haiti, the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Somalia for fiscal years 1992 through 1995. For this report, we define peace operations as actions taken in support of U.N. resolutions designed to further peace and security, including observers; monitors; traditional peacekeeping; preventive deployment; peace enforcement; security assistance; the imposition of sanctions; and the provision, protection, and delivery of humanitarian relief.

BACKGROUND

U.S. agencies' costs in support of peace operations are paid from their congressional appropriations. These costs include expenditures for (1) direct participation of U.S. military forces, (2) the U.S. share of U.N. peacekeeping assessments, and (3) humanitarian and related assistance. The Departments of Defense (DOD) and State are the two lead agencies responsible for planning and implementing U.S. participation in peace operations. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) is the primary agency responsible for providing humanitarian assistance, including food donated by the Department of Agriculture, USAID provides humanitarian assistance through the United Nations and private organizations. The Departments of Justice, Commerce, Treasury, Transportation, and Health and Human Services are also involved in activities in support of peace operations. The agencies' specific actions related to the four peace operations are presented in appendix I.

RESULTS IN BRIEF

From fiscal years 1992 through 1995, the incremental cost reported by U.S. government agencies for support of U.N. peace operations in Haiti, the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Somalia was over \$6.6 billion (see table 1). The United Nations has reimbursed the United States \$79.4 million for some of these costs.

TABLE 1.—REPORTED U.S. COSTS FOR SUPPORT OF SELECTED U.N. PEACE OPERATIONS
(Fiscal years 1992–95, dollars in millions)

Country	Fiscal year—				
	1992	1993	1994	1995	1992–95
Haiti	\$79.7	\$130.4	\$530.8	\$875.8	\$1,616.7
Former Yugoslavia	126.7	408.7	959.0	692.5	2,186.9
Rwanda	22.1	24.8	261.4	265.4	573.7
Somalia	92.9	1,124.8	913.3	92.1	2,223.1
Total	321.4	1,688.7	2,664.5	1,925.8	6,500.4

Note: As of August 1995, the United Nations had reimbursed the United States \$79.4 million for its participation in these operations.

From fiscal years 1992 through 1995, DOD's incremental costs to support the four operations were about \$3.4 billion, the State Department's were about \$1.8 billion, and USAID's were about \$1.3 billion (including \$556 million for commodities and transportation). The Departments of Justice, Commerce, Treasury, Transportation, and Health and Human Services reported incremental costs of which totaled about \$91 million. Figure 1 shows the percentage distribution of agency costs from fiscal years 1992 through 1995.

FIGURE 1.—DISTRIBUTION OF U.S. AGENCY COSTS IN SUPPORT OF SELECTED PEACE OPERATIONS
(Fiscal years 1992–95)

	Percent
DOD	51.5
State	27.8
USAID	19.3
Other agencies	1.4

AGENCY COMMENTS

The Department of State, DOD, and USAID generally agreed with this report, but each offered some technical and editorial suggestions, which we have incorporated where appropriate. DOD's written comments are reprinted in appendix II; State and USAID provided oral comments.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

We met with officials from DOD, the Departments of State, Agriculture, Justice, Commerce, Transportation, and Health and Human Services, USAID; and the U.S. Mission to the United Nations to obtain information on the costs in support of the four peace operations. We obtained DOD's reported incremental costs for the four operations from fiscal years 1992 through 1995. We also reviewed data supporting DOD's request for supplemental appropriations. For the other agencies and departments, we used a data collection instrument to obtain the cost information, including funds obligated and transferred through lead agencies. We also obtained budget reports and documents from State Department officials and from finance officials at the U.N. Controller's Office and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations.

At all the agencies, we discussed with officials how they budgeted and accounted for peace operations' costs. In addition, we reviewed other GAO reports that previously reported cost data for peace operations. In some cases, the cost data we obtained from participating agencies changed from amounts previously reported because agencies update their costs as more information becomes available. We did not verify the accuracy of the costs reported; however, a forthcoming report will address issues concerning the consistency, accuracy, and reliability of DOD's incremental costs related to contingency operations.

We did our review from February to November 1995 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

We are sending copies of this report to appropriate congressional committees; the Secretaries of Defense, State, Agriculture, Treasury, Transportation, Justice, Commerce, and Health and Human Services; the Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, the Director, Office of Management and Budget; and the Secretary General of the United Nations. Copies will also be made available to others upon request.

Please contact me at (202) 512-4128 if you or your staff have any questions concerning this report. The major contributions to this report were Tetsuo Miyabara, Joseph C. Brown, and Elizabeth Nyang.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD J. JOHNSON,
Associate Director,
International Relations and Trade Issues.

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS FOR THE FOURTH QUARTER, FISCAL YEAR 1996 IN COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 8113, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1996

The Defense Appropriations Act for 1996 (Act) requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report at the end of each quarter indicating "all costs (including incremental costs) incurred by the Department of Defense (DoD) during the preceding quarter in implementing or supporting resolutions of the United Nations Security Council." The data included herein are provided in response to section 8113.

The Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) compiles incremental costs associated with United States military operations based on data provided by the military departments and defense agencies. These data were modified, as necessary, to properly reflect transfer actions and unreported costs applicable to contingency operations. Data are presented below in both quarterly and cumulative (for the fiscal year) format. It is important to note that DFAS cost reports include information received during a particular quarter of the fiscal year: comprehensive cost data are not available in the immediately succeeding quarter. The Department collects only incremental costs, which are defined as additional costs to the DoD component appropriations that would not have been incurred if a contingency operation had not been supported. All other costs are available by reference to annual appropriations information. All incremental costs included below are current as of 30 September 1996, and are aggregated for FY96, with the exception of reimbursements received for troop contributions (section 2), which are presented individually.

(In thousands of dollars)

Operation/region	Reported for 4Q FY96	Cumulative for FY 96 through 4Q
Former Yugoslavia Operations:		
Able Sentry (FYROM)	\$16,864	\$30,929
Deny Flight/Decisive edge	37,516	225,949
Provide Promise	2,005	21,756
Sharp Guard	735	9,275
IFOR Preparation	147	158,437
IFOR Operations	789,564	2,073,052
UNCRO	12	469
Southern Watch (Iraq)	257,943	576,248
Provide Comfort (Iraq)	13,538	88,901
UNMIH (Haiti)	17,821	86,838
Sea Signal (Haitian migrants)	1,894	24,789
Total	1,138,039	3,296,643

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS FOR THE FOURTH QUARTER, FISCAL YEAR 1997 IN COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 8091, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1997

The DoD Appropriations Act for 1997 (Act) requires the Secretary of Defense to submit

a report at the end of each quarter indicating "all costs (including incremental costs) incurred by the Department of Defense (DoD) during the preceding quarter in implementing or supporting resolutions of the United Nations Security Council." The data included herein are provided in response to section 8091.

The Defense Finance and Accounting Services (DFAS) compiles incremental costs associated with United States military operations based on data provided by the military departments and defense agencies. These data were modified, as necessary, to properly reflect transfer actions and unreported costs applicable to support to UN operations. Data are presented below in both quarterly and cumulative (for the fiscal year) format. It is important to note that DFAS cost reports include information received during a particular quarter of the fiscal year: comprehensive cost data are not available in the immediately succeeding quarter. The Department collects only incremental costs, which are defined as additional costs to the DoD component appropriations that would not have been incurred if a contingency operation had not been supported. All incremental costs included below are current as of 30 September 1997, and are aggregated for FY97, and exclude reimbursements received for troop contributions (section 2), which are presented individually.

(In thousands of dollars)

Operation/Region	Reported for 4Q FY97	Cumulative for FY97 through 4Q
Former Yugoslavia Operations:		
Able Sentry (FYROM)	\$2,950	\$11,727
Deny Flight/Decisive Edge	30,101	183,266
IFOR/SFOR Operations	779,316	2,087,518
Southern Watch/Vigilant Sentinel (Iraq)	185,499	597,312
Provide Comfort/Northern Watch (Iraq)	20,627	93,115
Total	1,018,493	2,972,938

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS FOR THE FOURTH QUARTER, FISCAL YEAR 1998 IN COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 8079, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1998

The DoD Appropriations Act for 1998 (Act) requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report at the end of each quarter indicating "all costs (including incremental costs) incurred by the Department of Defense (DoD) during the preceding quarter in implementing or supporting resolutions of the United Nations Security Council." The data included herein are provided in response to section 8079.

The Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) compiles incremental costs associated with United States military operations based on data provided by the military departments and defense agencies. These data were modified, as necessary, to properly reflect transfer actions and unreported costs applicable to support to UN operations. Data are presented below in both quarterly and cumulative (for the fiscal year) format. It is important to note that DFAS cost reports include information received during a particular quarter of the fiscal year, but comprehensive cost data are not normally available in the immediately succeeding quarter. This report is prepared as soon as data are compiled. Also, the Department collects only incremental costs, which are defined as additional costs to the DoD component appropriations that would not have been incurred if a contingency operation had not been supported. All incremental costs included below are current as of 30 September 1998, and exclude reimbursements received for troop contributions (section 2), which are presented individually.

(In thousands of dollars)

Operation/Region	Reported for FY98	Cumulative for FY98 through 4Q
Former Yugoslavia Operations:		
Able Sentry (FYROM)	(979)	10,466
Deny Flight/Decisive Edge	33,144	159,269
IFOR/SFOR Operations	548,739	1,792,861
Southern Watch (Iraq)	469,874	1,497,242
Northern Watch (Iraq)	31,771	135,976
Total	1,082,549	3,595,814

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS FOR THE FIRST QUARTER, FISCAL YEAR 1999 IN COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 8073, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1999

The DoD Appropriations Act for 1999 (Act) requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report at the end of each quarter indicating "all costs (including incremental costs) incurred by the Department of Defense (DoD) during the preceding quarter in implementing or supporting resolutions of the United Nations Security Council." The data included herein are provided in response to section 8073.

The Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) compiles incremental costs associated with United States military operations based on data provided by the military departments and defense agencies. These data were modified, as necessary, to properly reflect transfer actions and unreported costs applicable to support to UN operations. Data are presented below in both quarterly and cumulative (for the fiscal year) format. It is important to note that DFAS cost reports include information received during a particular quarter of the fiscal year, but comprehensive cost data are not normally available in the immediately succeeding quarter. This report is prepared as soon as data are compiled. Also, the Department collects only incremental costs, which are defined as additional costs to the DoD component appropriations that would not have been incurred if a contingency operation had not been supported. All incremental costs included below are current as of 31 December 1998, and exclude reimbursements received for troop contributions (section 2), which are presented individually.

(In thousand of dollars)

Operation/Region	Reported for 1Q, FY99	Cumulative for FY99 through 1Q
Former Yugoslavia Operations:		
Able Sentry (FYROM)	\$2,091	\$2,091
Deliberate Forge	40,234	40,234
Joint Forge (SFOR)	264,351	264,351
Southern Watch (Iraq)	230,244	230,244
Northern Watch (Iraq)	28,218	28,218
Total	565,138	565,138

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Who claims time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, we are not opposed to the amendment. We deem the amendment redundant and unnecessary, but it will have no practical effect and we are not opposing it.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bartlett Amendment to withhold the final payment of \$244 million in UN arrearages until the GAO completes a report to Congress relating to the U.S. voluntary contributions to the UN for peacekeeping operations from 1990 to 2001.

I have long been suspicious of the United Nations. In fact, I have long hoped that we would end our membership in the United Nations. Given the recent slaps in the face that the United States has suffered—being voted off the secret ballot from the UN Human Rights Commission and being kicked off the UN International Narcotics Control Board—I am now more convinced than ever that the U.S. should remove itself from the UN and pursue an international agenda dictated by the American people.

The Bartlett Amendment is a common sense addition to this bill that will allow Congress to carefully review and make an informed decision on whether to release these funds to UN. It is important to note that this is only a delay in the funding and should not impact the deal that finally reduces the disproportionate share that the U.S. pays in UN dues. I urge all Members to support this amendment and vote to allow the Congress to see exactly how many millions of dollars for peacekeeping that the U.S. has given voluntarily compared to what the UN says we owe.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 107-62.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. LANTOS

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), I offer an amendment on his behalf. He will arrive momentarily.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Mr. LANTOS: Page 122, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 747. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO STATE DEPARTMENT TRAVEL WARNINGS FOR ISRAEL, THE WEST BANK AND GAZA.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of State should, in an effort to provide better and more accurate information to American citizens traveling abroad, review the current travel warning in place for Israel, the West Bank and Gaza, to determine which areas present the highest threat to American citizens in the region and which areas may be visited safely; and

(2) the Secretary of State should revise the travel warning for Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza as appropriate based on the above determinations.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 138, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment we are discussing was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), calling for a State

Department travel warning to Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza. I commend him for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTOS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to this amendment. If the gentleman wishes, we gladly accept it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's offer.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment by my colleague and neighbor Representative ANTHONY WEINER.

In January of this year I had the opportunity to travel to Israel on my third trip to that amazing country with my colleagues ANTHONY WEINER and JERRY NADLER.

While American media has focused on the West Bank and Gaza and attacks carried out by Palestinian terrorists against Israeli military and civilian targets, the media and our own government misses the other part of the story.

Ben Yehuda Street in Jerusalem is not Hebron. Dizengoff Square in Tel Aviv is not the Gaza Strip.

Warnings from the State Department which lump trouble in the West Bank and Gaza Strip into blanket warnings for the entire State of Israel miss the larger picture.

For the majority of Israelis who live inside the 1948 borders of Israel what is known as the Greenline, they live their life every day without disruption.

For visitors to Jerusalem the eternal Capital, to vibrant Tel Aviv and to the Holy Galilee, by exercising common sense, they will have a wonderful, fulfilling visit.

At a time when the U.S. people should be standing with Israel, we do not need alarmist bureaucrats dissuading Americans from visiting the Holy Land.

It is time for the State Department to separate myth from reality. For American visitors travel to the major tourist sites and cities in Israel is safe.

I urge my colleagues to support the Weiner Amendment and to support the State of Israel.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) have 2 minutes to explain his amendment we just adopted.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) may be recognized for 2 minutes, and a Member opposed may be recognized for 2 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, you will forgive me for being short of breath. I was off the floor at the time my amendment was called.

Mr. Chairman, the State Department has said in a rather comprehensive

fashion that it is unsafe to travel to Israel. It is unsafe to visit there. It is unsafe for our personnel that are stationed there.

This has had a broad and draconian effect on the economy of the State of Israel. Make no mistake, Israel is under almost constant state of siege from terrorists. The terrorists are the Palestinians. They take sniper attacks at small children. They blow up buses. Simply put, they are in a state of war, and terrorism is their tool.

However, as we have often said in this Chamber, the way that you fight terrorism is to be wary, is to be vigilant, but you do not capitulate.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment says to the State Department, let us have a sophisticated way for travelers to know where it is safe and where it is not; but we will not capitulate to terrorists by saying to school groups you should not visit there; saying to businessmen, if you travel there, your travel insurance will not be valid; to simply deal with the true effects of the status that Israel has.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleagues that Israel is not a victim and that they are not cowering to the terrorism. It is a thriving country. It is the birthplace of the major religions of the world. It is a place that is joyous and historic to visit. This amendment asks the State Department to return to the drawing board and give us a comprehensive but fair assessment of where it is safe to travel in Israel and where it might not be.

□ 1700

While we consider this, let us remember that this state of terrorism that exists in Israel should also be addressed by the State Department of why it is the Palestinians do not appear on the terrorism watch list and why it is we continue to believe that terrorism is a state of being rather than something perpetuated on the people of the State of Israel. I thank the chairman and I thank the ranking member for their consideration of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 107-62.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. LANTOS

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 23 offered by Mr. LANTOS:
Page 153, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 863. ASSISTANCE TO LEBANON.

(a) **MILITARY ASSISTANCE.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall not provide assistance under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347 et seq.; relating to international military education and training) to the armed forces of the Government of Lebanon unless the President certifies to

the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the armed forces of Lebanon have been deployed to the internationally recognized border between Lebanon and Israel; and

(2) the Government of Lebanon is effectively asserting its authority in the area in which such forces have been deployed.

(b) **ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE.**—If the President has not made the certification described in subsection (a) within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a plan to terminate assistance to Lebanon provided under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to the economic support fund).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted for the discussion of this amendment be extended by an additional 10 minutes equally divided between the proponents and the opponents. I have discussed it with the distinguished chairman who had no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman would allow just an additional 10 minutes on top. There are a number of Members that would like to speak on this amendment and I know that the gentleman did that earlier on with the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). If the gentleman could extend it by an additional 10 minutes in addition to what he has, we would be grateful to him for that.

Mr. LANTOS. If the gentleman will yield, let me be sure that I understand my friend. I am asking for an additional 10 minutes equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, which I believe is fair.

Mr. LAHOOD. So the total time would be?

Mr. LANTOS. Twenty minutes. Each side would have 10 minutes.

Mr. LAHOOD. So I am asking the ranking member if he would do an additional 5 minutes on each side. I have many Members. It is obviously strictly up to the gentleman from California, but I know for the Hyde amendment, when he had many Members over there, he extended it. I do not think that I am asking for too much.

Mr. LANTOS. I think doubling the original amount is reasonable.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 138, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a very simple but a very important amendment.

The amendment, Mr. Chairman, has two aspects. The first aspect is by far the most important, and I offered my colleagues on the other side to drop the second aspect because that is not the thrust of the amendment. So let me deal with the first aspect which is critical for preserving peace and stability along the Israeli-Lebanese border. The amendment does not intend to take one thin dime in economic aid going to Lebanon as long as it does not go to the Hezbollah terrorists.

Last summer, Israel withdrew all of its forces from the territory of Lebanon. Lebanon was obligated under U.N. Resolution 425 to deploy its robust army of some 60,000 people on the Lebanese-Israeli border to prevent the recurrence of another war in the area.

As Members will recall, Mr. Chairman, in 1982, terrorists controlled that border, a war ensued, and 17,000 innocent people were killed. A portion of the Lebanese-Israeli border today is controlled by Hezbollah terrorists. This is a well-known fact and the Lebanese Ambassador a few days ago confirmed it to me personally. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, made the following statement concerning Lebanon's responsibilities with respect to the deployment of their forces on the border:

"I believe that the time has come to establish the state of affairs envisaged in Resolution 425. This requires first and foremost that the government of Lebanon take effective control of the whole area vacated by Israel last spring and assume its full international responsibilities, including putting an end to the dangerous provocations that have continued across the line."

Our own Secretary of State last summer made the following statement:

"Those with authority in Lebanon now have a clear responsibility to ensure that the area bordering Israel is not used to launch attacks." Attacks, Mr. Chairman, are being launched daily, most recently yesterday. And attacks invite retaliation. The most recent Israeli retaliation resulted in the death of three Syrian soldiers, which indicates the direction in which we are going. There will be more terrorist attacks by Hezbollah, there will be stronger retaliation, and we may be on the verge of yet another military confrontation, a bloodbath in the Middle East, which is the last thing U.S. national interests would call for.

Let me spend a minute or two, Mr. Chairman, on the question of the nature of Hezbollah, the terrorist group which clearly controls a portion of an international border because the Lebanese Army is not deployed there. It is this group, in conjunction with similar terrorist groups, which in recent years was responsible for the murder of 241

American Marines at the Marine barracks in Lebanon, 19 of our military at Khobar Towers, and 17 in the attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*, 277 military who have been forced to give up their lives because of this interlocking, complex web of extremist terrorism. We are now allowing them, unless we pass this amendment, to control a portion of an international border.

Now, no people have suffered more in the last few decades than the Lebanese people as a result of war being waged on their territory. My resolution would secure that border, would eliminate the terrorist presence from that border, and would see to it that just as the Egyptian-Israeli border is now secure, the Jordanian-Israeli border is now secure, even the Syrian-Israeli border is secure, the final border between Lebanon and Israel would be secured on the one side by the Israeli military and on the other side by Lebanon's 60,000-strong military.

It is difficult to fathom who would benefit from allowing a border, an international border in a volatile and fragile and explosive area, being controlled by terrorists who openly and clearly desire no return to the peace process. They want the bloodbath to continue. They would like nothing more but yet another explosion of military hostilities.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from California's intent here. I listened very closely to his remarks. Each one of the incidents of terror and loss of American life which he so adequately described is horrendous, and I join him in condemning every one of those attacks. Any loss of innocent civilian lives is to be highly condemned no matter who the perpetrators.

But I ask my distinguished colleague, Lebanon was not responsible for these acts of terror. As the gentleman has said, the Lebanese themselves have suffered over the last couple of decades. The Lebanese are the victims. Let us face it, the Lebanese are the victims here.

Now, if we cannot take direct aim at Syria itself and, let us face it, Syria is very much a controlling influence in Lebanon, then why should we take aim at the innocent Lebanese government? This amendment attempts to send a message to Syria. It is clear and simple what its intent is concerning the cross-border attacks against Israel, which I condemn as well. But this amendment would not accomplish the intent of securing that border. All it accomplishes is to do more harm to the Lebanese.

Lebanon cannot comply with this amendment that it deploy all of its troops to the southern border between Israel and Lebanon, because Syria will not allow it. I believe that the sponsor of the amendment is fully aware of that.

The administration is against this amendment. Secretary Powell has sent a very strong letter stating what a destabilizing situation would occur in the south if U.S. assistance and its training, both military and economic, were to be cut off. USAID helps send Lebanese children to school through scholarship programs. That is the economic part of it. The IMET training helps train the Lebanese Army so that they can go down into the south and secure the border when given the political go-ahead to do it. I think Secretary Powell and this administration knows well that this amendment would seriously impede the long-term massive effort that has gone into pursuing critical U.S. policy in this area. That is what we should be most concerned with here, U.S. best interests in this region. This amendment does not further the United States' best interests.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the Democratic leader of the Committee on International Relations, and I commend him for his leadership.

I rise as someone who has consistently supported U.S. assistance to Lebanon, but I now believe that the Lantos amendment is necessary and I believe it has been carefully crafted to advance key U.S. foreign policy objectives. The Lantos amendment strikes a careful balance between promoting U.S. interests in Lebanon's recovery and development and the need to provide incentives to the government of Lebanon to address a security problem which, if left unattended, could lead to a regional war.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that Israel has fulfilled its obligations to the Security Council under Resolution 425 and it has fully withdrawn its forces from Lebanese territory. The U.N. Secretary-General has said so and the U.S. has confirmed it. The question is whether Lebanon has fulfilled its obligations under Resolution 425 to resume effective authority in the area bordering the State of Israel.

Unfortunately, the government of Lebanon has not lived up to its requirements, as demonstrated by the ongoing and unimpeded attacks by the Hezbollah from Lebanon's southern border against the State of Israel. The continued absence of the Lebanese Army from the south of Israel is obvious and indicative of the fact that Lebanon is not even trying to keep its own border secured.

Some might argue that providing security to Israel is not a Lebanese obligation. Not only is this assertion wrong, it overlooks a fundamental truth and all nations are responsible for securing their own borders. A secure border with Israel is overwhelmingly in the interest of Lebanon itself.

Lebanese Prime Minister Hariri campaigned and won on a plan for the reconstruction of Lebanon predicated on the active engagement, assistance, and support of the international community. There is no question that Lebanon badly needs foreign assistance to rebuild and recover from decades of strife. But the determining factor in whether or not Lebanon will be able to elicit the outside resources it needs, is whether or not there is peace and stability on the Lebanese-Israeli border.

So far the Lebanese government appears unprepared to take decisive steps to maintain a peaceful and stable border with Israel, as is its responsibility, and thus ensure that the region will not again be pushed into conflict due to cross-border attacks.

Mr. Chairman, I commend my friend the gentleman from California for offering this amendment. I strongly support the Lantos amendment and ask my colleagues as well to give it their strong support.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 40 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the House.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, what does this amendment do? It eliminates two items of assistance. The first is \$600,000 for the Lebanese Army. The second is \$35 million to USAID for humanitarian concern and aid to U.S. educational institutions in Lebanon.

What my good friend, and I express great affection and respect for him, does is he aims at Hezbollah but he lands a haymaker on the person of the innocent Lebanese, USAID and U.S. educational institutions. That is what the amendment does.

If you are for peace in the Middle East, you do not want to hurt those undertakings.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

□ 1715

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DINGELL moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I will not insist on the motion, but I want my colleagues to understand what this does, and I cannot believe that my good friend from California really

wants the result of what he is going to get.

Now, he has quoted a lot of sources, but I want to read what Colin Powell, the Secretary of State, had to say about this matter. He says, "The Department opposes the amendment proposed by Representative Lantos to H.R. 1646. If enacted, this amendment would severely impede our ability to pursue the critical U.S. policy objectives in Lebanon and the region, including stabilizing the south and providing a counterweight to the extremist forces."

If you want to drive the Lebanese into the arms of extremists, the Lantos amendment is the mechanism for doing so.

Now, Kofi Annan has been quoted. What did he have to say? He had this to say about what the Lebanese are doing. "At present, Lebanese administrators, police, security, and army personnel function throughout the area, southern Lebanon, and their presence and activities continue to grow. They are reestablishing local administration in the villages and have made progress in reintegrating the communications infrastructure, health, and welfare systems with the rest of the country."

That is what this amendment would bring to a halt. He goes on to say, "The deployment of both UNIFIL and the Lebanese Joint Security Forces proceeded smoothly, and the return to the Lebanese administration is ongoing. I appeal to donors to help Lebanon meet urgent needs for relief and economic revival in the south, pending the holding of a full-fledged donor conference."

He has gone on to point out that we should help, not hurt, the Lebanese in these undertakings.

Let us take a look at a little bit more here.

Look at the resolution. I may not have time to put the whole of it in, but it does not call upon the Lebanese to do the kind of thing that the gentleman from California would have them do under penalty of loss of assistance.

I call on my colleagues to remember, this is a haymaker at U.S. policy in the area. It hurts American universities, it hurts humanitarian aid, and it drives the Lebanese into the arms of the extremists and the terrorists. Is that what we want? No.

What we want is peace. American interests in this area are vital to this country and they are vital to us in terms of assuring world peace and to assuring the Arabs that this country wants to be an honest broker in terms of seeing to it that we can sell peace and that we can work together with both sides, with the Israelis and with the Lebanese and with the other Arabs and Muslims and other people in that area.

The amendment, I know the gentleman offers in the best of good faith;

but, remember, it is a haymaker at innocent Lebanese, it is a haymaker at American educational institutions, and it drives the Lebanese into the arms of the terrorists. If that is what you want, vote for the Lantos amendment, and that is what you will get. You will have more trouble in South Lebanon that will affect the Israelis adversely and that will fill that area with more enemies of Israel and more terrorists receiving more support from the people in the area.

If you want to restore peace in the area, the small amount of money, which is supported by this administration and which is supported by the U.N., is the way to do it. The Lantos amendment is the way to kill this.

I urge this body to reject what is clearly on its face an amendment which does not look to the U.S. policy or understand what that amendment, in fact, does.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. It is unwise, it is irresponsible, it is destructive of American interests, it is destructive of the interests of the people of Lebanon, and it is destructive not only of these, but also the best interests of the people of Israel and the people of the whole area over there.

If you want peace, if you want this country to work for and be able to effectively lead the people in that area towards peace, if you want to strike a blow at Hezbollah and the others who are causing trouble in that area, reject this amendment. Show the Lebanese people that you are in support of their desire to redevelop a peaceful land. And do something else: Let us show the people in the area that this is a country that wants to be a friend to all parties. I note we have established this for the benefit of our friends in Israel. There is about \$5 billion in here for Israel. The amendment offered by my good friend from California would take out \$35 million which would go to help the Lebanese.

I urge Members to reject the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does any Member claim time in opposition to the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL)?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, first let me say my amendment has the intent of not withdrawing one single dime of economic and technical assistance to Lebanon. As a matter of fact, I earlier offered to cosponsor with some of the opponents a measure that would increase economic and technical assistance to Lebanon.

My amendment is designed to stop the aid to Hezbollah-controlled com-

munities. It is absurd that American taxpayer funds are used to support Hezbollah activities, which is, in fact, what is taking place as of today. If American taxpayers would know that their funds are used to enhance Hezbollah goals, they would be in revolt against that.

Every dime currently appropriated for economic and technical assistance to Lebanon, I support; and I am ready to increase that amount. But I want to be sure that those funds go to communities, organizations and institutions that are not under the control of Hezbollah.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding to me, and I rise in reluctant opposition to the dean of the House.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is funded on the principle that peace in the Middle East is based on security and that long-lasting peace in the Middle East cannot be based on Israel's insecurity. As America has subsidized Lebanon, we have a growing insecurity on Israel's northern border, and that does not help the peace process.

This sends a message that Lebanon must control her own border. And let us remove all artifice. There is no such thing as Hezbollah. Hezbollah is a wholly owned subsidiary of the MOIS, the Iranian Intelligence Service. Is time that Iran's control of Lebanon's southern border with Israel ends, and this amendment sends that message.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in firm support of the amendment introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). One year ago, the Israeli government put its own security at risk in the name of cooperation and reconciliation. Israel unilaterally withdrew its armed forces from the security zone on the Lebanese-Israeli border. The hope for a reciprocal response from Beirut never occurred.

In conjunction with the Israeli withdrawal, the Lebanese Army was responsible for filling the vacuum left by the Israeli troops. In a location where law and order was meant to prevail under the watchful eye of the Lebanese Army, now exists chaos, disorder and lawlessness. The northern border zone is now occupied by Hezbollah troops, who filled the void when the Lebanese refused to take the action required by U.N. Security Council Resolution 425.

Two weeks ago, I stood alongside families of three Israeli soldiers abducted by Hezbollah along the Lebanese-Israeli border. It is the Lebanese inaction that allowed that to take place.

The State of Israel will continue to be at risk until Lebanon fulfills its obligation to the international community. I believe that this amendment is

a proportional response to the current stance taken by the Lebanese government.

It is an honor to train with American troops. That privilege should continue to be extended to those who play by the rules. That is a message this amendment will convey, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment prohibiting the IMET funding for the Lebanese Armed Forces in response to Lebanon's failure to keep its border with Israel free of Hezbollah terrorists.

One year ago, Israel unilaterally withdrew from southern Lebanon. U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan certified Israel's complete withdrawal from Lebanon and its full compliance with U.N. Security Council Resolution 425. This is the same resolution that commits Lebanon to deploy its security forces in order to secure its border with Israel.

However, Lebanon has not lived up to its obligation. Israel continues to face attacks, kidnappings and the prospect of rocket attacks from the north. Today, hundreds of thousands of Israelis live within range of Hezbollah Katusha rockets.

This amendment sends a very important message. If we are to treat Lebanon as a sovereign nation, it must fulfill its obligations. Lebanon must deploy its army to the Israeli border and fill the vacuum that is currently being filled by Hezbollah terrorists. The Lebanese-Israeli border should be more stable, not less stable, since Israel's withdrawal. Hezbollah terrorists continue to operate in southern Lebanon because the government of Lebanon refuses to assert its effective authority in the area.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time for debate on the preferential motion has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the preferential motion is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) has 7½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the House.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, it is with profound regret that I read to my

good friend from California the language of his amendment, which concludes with saying that the President shall commit to the Congressional committees a plan to terminate assistance to Lebanon provided under chapter 24, part 2, of the Foreign Assistance Act, et cetera.

What the gentleman does is terminates all assistance, military and economic and humanitarian. I think with a more careful reading, perhaps the good author of the amendment would join me in opposition to it.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, not because I oppose the goal of extending Lebanese government control to south Lebanon, but because I believe this amendment would be counterproductive to that goal.

I agree that the Lebanese Army needs to secure its border with Israel to prevent attacks against Israeli soldiers and civilians, but the key to achieving this is to extract more cooperation from the Syrians. We should not be punishing Lebanon for the sins of Syria and the Hezbollah.

I also think that threatening to eliminate our foreign assistance program for Lebanon is the wrong way to go about this. All of the \$35 million that we allocate to Lebanon in fiscal year 2001 is provided to none-governmental organizations, private, voluntary organizations, contractors. They implement our assistance programs for Lebanon.

Not a penny of it goes to the government, and \$3 million to the American University of Beirut and the Lebanese-American University to help with education. The largest program is the Rural Development Clusters program, which helps rural villages in Lebanon. It has been focused on the south in an effort to provide an alternative to the economic and social development activities of the Hezbollah.

Punishing the villagers of south Lebanon by withdrawing this program is not going to do anything to assist in the effort to persuade the Lebanese government to remove its security forces.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. It is not in the interests of Lebanon, Israel, or the United States.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I have a deep respect for the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and how he has handled this bill, but I do rise in opposition to his amendment.

Next week marks one year since the withdrawal of Israeli troops from southern Lebanon. The Lantos amendment on the face of it cuts funding for the Lebanese military, education and training, but as the dean of the House has just told us, if you look a little closer at the amendment, it sets in motion to cut all aid to Lebanon in 6 months after the passage.

□ 1730

Discontent in the Middle East has taken a tremendous toll on Lebanese infrastructure, and this is not the time to remove our efforts toward stability in the region. Our aid package is funneled through USAID, American NGOs, and not through the government; and it is directed at, as we have heard several times from the floor from the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), it is directed toward building civilian infrastructure.

Secretary Powell has said that he opposes this amendment. He has also said we are hurting the ability of those non-governmental organizations to provide the service that the people need. That sentiment has been echoed on this floor. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly oppose the Lantos amendment, which represents a major step backward in Lebanese-American relations.

The aid which we provide Lebanon is an investment in a future stability of Lebanon and the well-being of a people who only wish peace in the Middle East.

I share with the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) the feeling of frustration that the south of Lebanon is today not secure and that, in fact, the south of Lebanon is being operated often by terrorists; but I must remind the gentleman from California that for over 20 years, the best trained and best equipped army in the Middle East, the Israeli Army, with billions of dollars of resources, was unable to completely quiet that aggression originating out of Iran. How would we expect an army that we fund at \$600,000 to do so?

After the defeat of this amendment, I strongly hope the gentleman from California and I can work together to develop a funding package for Lebanon that would enable it to make some real dent in enforcing its borders.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) close on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California has the right to close.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is far from a simple amendment. The idea that this is a simple amendment is simply not true. This is a slap at the face of the people of Lebanon, the Government of Lebanon. The gentleman met with the prime minister when he was here, and the gentleman heard him say that they are trying to forge a peace in Lebanon. The prime minister met with the President of the United States; the Vice President; the Secretary of State; Condoleeza Rice, the National Security Advisor; the Secretary of Defense. This is no way to treat Lebanon, and I guarantee my colleagues, this House would never pass an amendment like this against Israel, against Palestine, against Jordan, against any of the countries in the Middle East. We would not do this.

This is a slap in the face to not only the peace process, but a small country who is trying to get its act together, and they are trying to get their act together economically, they are trying to get their act together as a democracy. They work very hard at it.

When the prime minister was here, he said they are working very hard to get their act together. Is it perfect? Of course not. It is an intolerable situation in the region with many people getting killed. This amendment does not help anyone. It does not send the signal that the gentleman wants it to send. It really hurts the process. It really hurts our government's ability to be in that region and get the people to work together.

Now, this amendment is opposed by the administration. The Secretary of State spoke out against it at the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations; and the chairman of this committee, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), is also opposed to this amendment, as well as the Dean of the House.

The gentleman is not accomplishing what he wants to do here; and I wish, and this in no way diminishes my respect for the gentleman, the gentleman knows that I respect him. And I know the gentleman visited the region, and I know the gentleman has been to Lebanon. This hurts the country that the gentleman is trying to send a message to. I ask the gentleman, really, the gentleman still has time here to ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment, because the gentleman is sending the wrong message, not only to

our government, but all over this region. This simply is wrong. It is wrong-headed, and it does not help.

The money that we are allocating here is walking-around change in this House, compared to what we give to so many other countries in that region, including Egypt and Jordan and so many other countries in that region. This helps people get an education. It helps rebuild the country. Gosh darn it, it is about time we help a country like this. This is our way of doing it. This is our way of encouraging peace. I would encourage the gentleman, to ask to withdraw the amendment, because it is hurtful and it does not help the process.

All this talk around here about Hezbollah and trying to create some kind of a one-headed monster out of Lebanon is wrong; it is nonsense. We should not be doing it to a country like Lebanon. It just does not make any sense to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge every Member of the House who has people of Lebanese descent in their districts, and I know there are people watching this on C-SPAN, and I know there are staff people; this is an amendment that hurts the process. If my colleagues have people that they are representing of Lebanese descent and of Arab descent, vote against this amendment and send a message that the United States is for peace. We are for bringing people together. We do not want to hurt the country of Lebanon. We want to bring the process together. This pitance amount of money absolutely is a drop in the bucket compared to all of the other resources that we are spending there. But it is the message that is being sent.

So I urge Members to look carefully at this. This is not about Israel. This is about what we can do for Lebanon and the peace process.

So I urge the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) to give consideration to withdrawing this amendment. The gentleman will send a message that he is for peace; he will send a message that he cares about Lebanon. If the gentleman cannot do that, then I ask all Members to defeat this amendment and send a message that we are for peace, true peace, and that Lebanon is a country that we can count on.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I rise in support of his amendment.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 520 expresses strong support for Lebanese sovereignty "under the sole and exclusive authority of the Government of Lebanon through the Lebanese Army throughout Lebanon." It is time that the Lebanese Government abides by the call of the Security Council and de-

plays its military throughout the country.

It is inexcusable that in the wake of the complete Israeli withdrawal, southern Lebanon remains under the control of the terrorist organization called Hezbollah. I will not stand idly by while the United States provides military support to a government which refuses to halt acts of terror on a neighbor.

I still favor humanitarian and educational assistance to Lebanon. I hope in conference we can continue economic assistance to Lebanon. But such assistance is put in jeopardy by the inaction of the Lebanese Government to control Hezbollah.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support Lebanon. The Lebanese people have suffered enough. Syria, Hezbollah and all terrorist organizations need to get out of Lebanon now. It is not enough for the Government of Lebanon to wring their hands and claim that they have no maneuverability. They need to attempt at least to take strong actions now.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, before yielding to our closing speaker, to just say, if my colleagues wish to see the terrorist organization Hezbollah control an international border and provide the opportunity for further bloodshed in the region, vote against this amendment. If my colleagues want peace in the Middle East and a stable border, vote for my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. American domestic policy is built on the twin foundations of opportunity and responsibility. Our foreign policy should be built on no less of a strong foundation.

The opposition objects that Lebanon is not responsible, and this is precisely the problem. Lebanon has not taken responsibility for its own borders, and we ought to use whatever leverage device we have to require them to take control of their own borders.

The objection has been made that we will give greater rein to Hezbollah and terrorism, and yet Hezbollah already has a free run on the border. What greater rein could be given to the Hezbollah?

Finally, the opposition argues that this will not accomplish what it has set out to do, and yet the opposition has no alternative to recommend, no alternative. If we cannot use the power of our purse and our financial support to force the Lebanese Government to exercise its own sovereignty, what else will work? Nothing. I urge Members' support.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Lantos amendment which

has the potential to cut off all economic aid to Lebanon. While I share Representative LANTOS' goal for stability on the Israel/Lebanon border and end to Hezbollah terrorist attacks on Israel, I do not believe this amendment is the best approach. This amendment would hurt the peace process between Israel/Lebanon, would strain the U.S. bilateral relationship with Lebanon, and would cut humanitarian assistance to those in need.

Secretary of State Colin Powell has made it clear that the Administration opposes this amendment. He stated,

We don't support that particular amendment. And a lot of the aid that being spoken of its distributed to non-governmental organizations. So you're hurting the ability of these non-governmental organizations to provide the service to people in need.

I agree with the Secretary of State that this amendment would have the effect of hurting innocent people. I would urge my colleagues to vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 210, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

AYES—216

Ackerman	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Andrews	Dooley	Hunter
Armey	Doyle	Inslee
Bachus	Duncan	Israel
Ballenger	Edwards	Istook
Bartlett	Ehrlich	Jackson-Lee
Bentsen	Emerson	(TX)
Berkley	Engel	Jefferson
Berman	English	Johnson (IL)
Bilirakis	Etheridge	Johnson, Sam
Bishop	Evans	Jones (OH)
Blagojevich	Fattah	Kelly
Blunt	Ferguson	Kennedy (RI)
Bonilla	Filner	King (NY)
Boswell	Flake	Kingston
Boyd	Fletcher	Kirk
Brown (FL)	Foley	LaFalce
Brown (OH)	Fossella	Lampson
Brown (SC)	Frelinghuysen	Langevin
Bryant	Frost	Lantos
Burr	Gallegly	Larsen (WA)
Camp	Gilman	Larson (CT)
Cantor	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Cardin	Goode	LoBiondo
Carson (OK)	Gordon	Lowe
Chabot	Graham	Lucas (KY)
Clyburn	Graves	Maloney (CT)
Coble	Green (TX)	Maloney (NY)
Condit	Grucci	Manzullo
Costello	Gutierrez	Markey
Coyne	Hall (TX)	Mascara
Cramer	Harman	Matheson
Crenshaw	Hart	Matsui
Crowley	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Cunningham	Hayworth	McCollum
Davis (CA)	Hefley	McInnis
Davis (FL)	Hill	McIntyre
Davis, Jo Ann	Hilleary	McNulty
Davis, Tom	Hilliard	Meehan
Deal	Hobson	Meek (FL)
DeGette	Hoefel	Meeks (NY)
Delahunt	Holden	Menendez
DeLauro	Holt	Millender
DeLay	Honda	McDonald
Deutsch	Hooley	Moore

Moran (KS)	Roukema
Morella	Ryan (WI)
Nadler	Ryun (KS)
Neal	Sanchez
Nussle	Sandin
Ose	Saxton
Otter	Scarborough
Owens	Schaffer
Pallone	Schakowsky
Pastor	Schiff
Paul	Schroock
Pence	Scott
Peterson (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Phelps	Shadegg
Pickering	Shaw
Pitts	Shays
Platts	Sherman
Pombo	Sherwood
Portman	Shows
Ramstad	Skelton
Rangel	Slaughter
Reyes	Smith (NJ)
Reynolds	Solis
Riley	Souder
Rodriguez	Spence
Ros-Lehtinen	Spratt
Ross	Stearns
Rothman	Stenholm

NOES—210

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Miller (FL)
Aderholt	Gilchrest	Miller, Gary
Akin	Gillmor	Miller, George
Allen	Goodlatte	Mink
Baca	Goss	Mollohan
Baird	Granger	Moran (VA)
Baker	Green (WI)	Murtha
Baldacci	Greenwood	Myrick
Baldwin	Gutknecht	Napolitano
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Nethercutt
Barr	Hansen	Ney
Barrett	Hastings (WA)	Northup
Barton	Hayes	Norwood
Bass	Herger	Oberstar
Becerra	Hinche	Obey
Bereuter	Hinojosa	Olver
Berry	Hoekstra	Ortiz
Biggert	Horn	Osborne
Blumenauer	Hostettler	Oxley
Boehler	Houghton	Pascarell
Boehner	Hulshof	Payne
Bonior	Hutchinson	Pelosi
Bono	Hyde	Peterson (PA)
Boucher	Isakson	Petri
Brady (TX)	Issa	Pomeroy
Burton	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Buyer	Jenkins	Pryce (OH)
Callahan	John	Putnam
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Quinn
Cannon	Johnson, E. B.	Radanovich
Capito	Jones (NC)	Rahall
Capps	Kanjorski	Regula
Capuano	Kaptur	Rehberg
Carson (IN)	Keller	Rohrabacher
Castle	Kennedy (MN)	Royal-Allard
Chambliss	Kerns	Royce
Clay	Kildee	Rush
Clayton	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Clement	Kind (WI)	Sanders
Collins	Kleczka	Sawyer
Combest	Knollenberg	Serrano
Conyers	Kolbe	Sessions
Cooksey	Kucinich	Shimkus
Cox	LaHood	Simmons
Crane	Largent	Simpson
Culberson	Latham	Smith (MI)
Cummings	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Davis (LL)	Leach	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lee	Snyder
DeMint	Levin	Stark
Dicks	Lewis (CA)	Stump
Dingell	Lewis (KY)	Sununu
Doggett	Linder	Tanner
Doolittle	Lipinski	Tauzin
Dreier	Lofgren	Taylor (NC)
Dunn	Lucas (OK)	Thomas
Ehlers	Luther	Thompson (MS)
Esch	McCarthy (MO)	Thornberry
Everett	McCrery	Tierney
Farr	McDermott	Toomey
Ford	McGovern	Traficant
Frank	McHugh	
Ganske	McKeon	
Gekas	McKinney	
Gephardt	Mica	

Upton	Watts (OK)	Wilson
Walsh	Weldon (FL)	Wolf
Waters	Weldon (PA)	Woolsey
Watkins	Whitfield	Young (AK)
Watt (NC)	Wicker	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Borski	Cubin	Skeen
Brady (PA)	Moakley	

□ 1806

Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri, Messrs. EHLERS, OLVER, LARGENT and BERRY changed their vote from "aye to "no."

Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. HART, Messrs. CAMP, GOODE, WALDEN of OREGON, HILLEARY, COBLE, BARTLETT of Maryland, SHAYS, PICKERING, GALLEGLY, GUTIERREZ, HOBSON, CUNNINGHAM, VITTER and TANCREDO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 119 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Aye."

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 119 I inadvertently pressed the "No" button. I meant to vote "Aye."

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the Committee for 1 minute.

Mr. FOLEY. I object, Mr. Chairman. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Objection is heard.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Lee Amendment, a provision in this bill included by my friend and colleague from California, BARBARA LEE.

I would like to begin by reminding my colleagues that since 1973, no U.S. dollars have been used to pay for the performance of an abortion as a method of family planning or for involuntary sterilizations overseas—None!

The Lee provision does not alter that restriction, but instead restores U.S. support for international family planning organizations. In my view the best way to reduce the number of abortions worldwide, a goal we all share, is to ensure access to family planning. Yet, supporters of the so-called Mexico City policy claim that we must limit all funds to prevent United States dollars from being used in clinics that only inform their patients on the option of abortion—including clinics in countries where abortion is legal.

Turning this into a vote about abortion does a disservice to the millions of women throughout the world who do not have access to the health care and reproductive services, education and treatment that women in this country take for granted.

Mr. Chairman, I support a woman's right to choose whether or not to have a child. I also recognize that for some women, that choice is about whether or not to give birth to a healthy child. More than 600,000 infants become infected with HIV each year worldwide. That is appalling. How can we possibly claim to be working to prevent the spread of HIV if we do

not offer counsel and education in family planning? It seems to me that it is an oxymoron to be both anti-abortion and anti-family planning. Only through family planning efforts can we reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies—a result always preferable to abortion.

The Lee provision will prevent international family planning groups from being denied life-saving funds to carry out their work—both in preventing unintended pregnancies and the spread of the deadly HIV/AIDS disease.

We have the chance to really make a difference for millions of women worldwide. Let's give women the opportunity to make informed and educated decisions about their reproductive health. Vote for to keep the Lee provision.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as we consider the authorization bills for our foreign policy agenda, it is necessary to recognize the continuing human rights abuses practiced by governments in the Horn of Africa, particularly in Ethiopia. The U.S. Department of State must carefully investigate the continuing human rights abuses in Ethiopia.

Just recently, I am outraged by the recent violence in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, especially the loss of life in the face of peaceful demonstrations on the campus at Addis Ababa University on April 11th. I am deeply disturbed that police forces used excessive force to prevent students from vocalizing their discontent in an academic setting. I understand that as many as 41 brave individuals were killed on or near the campus at Addis Ababa University, while another 250 persons were injured in an indiscriminate attack by the police forces. The recent action taken by police forces can never be justified.

Although I have strongly spoken out against human rights abuses in Ethiopia before, I wholeheartedly join the Ethiopian community in the United States in denouncing the indiscriminate killings that recently occurred in Ethiopia. Justice must be served swiftly and fairly even though the brutal attack has already exacted an unimaginable toll. Further, I am somewhat relieved that approximately 2,000 students who were detained by police have now been released. That is not enough, however. As some of you may know, the U.S. Department of State is concerned that dozens of persons who were arrested without warrant remain detained. The United States Government must vigorously call upon the government of Ethiopia to promptly and unconditionally release all the students that remain in detention. Their freedom cannot be denied.

In the past, I successfully fought for a legislative measure that would prohibit the government of Ethiopia from receiving aid until human rights abuses are eliminated. We must do more. The people of Ethiopia deserve to be treated humanely by their government.

Mr. Chairman, in the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, "We believe that the only whole man is a free man." I hope we can support efforts to bring human rights abuses by government actors in Ethiopia to a halt.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank the Members of the House Committee on International Relations for including \$13.5 million for the East-West Center in the FY2002 State Department Authorization bill. An amendment to delete this funding was

overwhelmingly defeated in Committee on a vote of 6 yeas to 30 noes.

The last time we considered the State Department Authorization bill in July 1999, we had to defeat an amendment on the floor to reduce the funding authorization for the East-West Center, North-South Center, and the Asia Foundation. That amendment was defeated on a vote of 180 yeas to 237 noes. I am very pleased that we face no such amendment this year.

The East-West Center is an internationally respected research and educational institution based in Hawaii with a 40-year record of achievement. It is an important forum for the development of policies to promote stability and economic and social development in the Asia-Pacific region. Established in 1960 through a bipartisan effort of the Eisenhower Administration and the Congress, the Center has worked to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations and peoples of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training, and research. Presidents, prime ministers, ambassadors, scholars, business executives, and journalists from all over the Asia-Pacific region have used the Center as a forum to advance international cooperation.

The Asia-Pacific region accounts for more than half the world's population, about a third of the world's economy, and vast marine and land resources. The United States has vital national interests in connecting itself in partnership with the region. As the Asia-Pacific region continues to develop and change, it is essential that the United States be seen as a part of the region rather than an outsider. The most powerful force of U.S. influence in the Asia-Pacific region has been our ideas, and the East-West Center is the only program that has a strategic mission of developing a consensus on key policy issues in U.S.-Asia-Pacific relations through intensive cooperative research and training.

I want to thank my colleagues for supporting the mission of the Center with this authorization and I ask that the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Subcommittee fully fund this important national program.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1646 the Foreign Relations Authorization. When this bill was placed on the floor of this House, I was surprised to see such a reasonable piece of legislation. For several years now this bill has been used to advance a conservative agenda including restrictions on international family planning activities, refusals to pay our commitments to international organizations, and fund totaling billions of dollars in direct military and economic aid to other countries.

I am encouraged that there is not a multi-billion dollar package of military and economic aid to other countries in this bill. It is foolish to help train and equip other countries for war when there are so many people here at home who need help to obtain prescription drugs, lift their families out of poverty, and educate our children. Unfortunately, the amendment process has overridden my earlier support. This bill now restricts international organizations, cuts funding to these organizations, and re-implements draconian restrictions on international family planning activities abroad.

The first amendment passed by the House provided special protections from international prosecution to U.S. forces engaged in human rights abuses. The International Criminal Court (ICC) was created to ensure that those people who violate internationally recognized human rights would suffer consequences for doing so. By providing special protection from prosecution to U.S. forces we are telling the world community that Human Rights are not important to the United States and that we should not have to abide by the same rules as the rest of the world. This is wrong and I am disappointed that so many of my colleagues supported this language.

The second amendment passed by the House halted repayment of our back dues to the United Nations until we are given a seat on the UN Human Rights Commission (UNHRC). I disagree fundamentally with this decision and was dismayed that a majority of my colleagues supported this amendment too. This body has passed numerous bills and resolutions supporting democracy throughout the world. Unfortunately, when three other countries were democratically elected to the UNHRC rather than the United States, a majority of this House voted against democracy because we didn't win the election. It's an infantile reaction and I oppose it.

The third amendment passed by the House re-affirms President Bush's implementation of the Mexico City provisions which prohibit U.S. funding to organizations who mention abortion in their counseling of people seeking family planning services. Existing law has prohibited these groups from using U.S. dollars to conduct abortions. This bill does nothing more than eliminate important services to people around the world, including access to contraception and other family planning services which reduce the number of abortions by decreasing the number of unwanted pregnancies. I strongly oppose its inclusion in this bill.

I am disappointed in the bill as amended. It has gone back to advancing a conservative agenda when it should advance a free and democratic agenda. I oppose this bill and the principles it now supports.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. There being no further amendments in order, under the rule the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 138, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1646 to the Committee on International Relations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 58, after line 20, insert the following:
SEC. 306. UNITED STATES SPECIAL COORDINATOR FOR KOREA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to engage diplomatically with the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in order to reduce the threats from such government and to improve the stability of the Korean peninsula and surrounding countries until such time as the United States concludes that such efforts are no longer productive.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT—There shall be within the Department of State a United States Special Coordinator for Korea who shall be designated by the Secretary of State.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of State shall consult with the chairman and ranking minority member of the appropriate congressional committees prior to the designation of the special coordinator.

(d) CENTRAL OBJECTIVES.—The central objectives of the special coordinator are as follows:

(1) To seek to reduce or eliminate the missile program of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and its export of ballistic missile technology through steps that include resumption of the discussions between the United States and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea regarding a binding and verifiable agreement.

(2) To ensure the compliance of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the International Atomic Energy Agency agreement and increase the transparency of its nuclear activities.

(3) To reduce the conventional military threat of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Republic of Korea.

(e) DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—The special coordinator shall—

(1) serve as the primary advisor to the Secretary of State on security issues on the Korean Peninsula, including the central objectives outlined in subsection (d);

(2) coordinate United States Government policies, programs, and projects concerning security issues on the Korean Peninsula;

(3) oversee discussions and negotiations on issues concerning the central objectives in subsection (d);

(4) consult with the Governments of the Republic of Korea and Japan to coordinate negotiating strategy and overall policy toward the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

(5) serve as the primary liaison to Congress on issues relating to the central objectives in subsection (d); and

(6) take all appropriate steps to ensure adequate resources, staff, and bureaucratic support to fulfill the responsibilities of the special coordinator.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the motion.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as good as this bill is that is presently before us, I think this motion to recommit with instructions would make it even stronger.

Mr. Speaker, there are several realities upon which we can all agree. Security and stability on the Korean Peninsula is a matter of vital national interest to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, reducing and eliminating the North Korean long-range missile threat is a vital national interest of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, eliminating any vestiges of a North Korean nuclear weapons program is a vital national interest of the United States.

The motion that the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and I have drafted would create a special coordinator position within the Department of State for Korea. This official would be charged with serving as the primary advisor to the Secretary of State on security issues on the Korean Peninsula; coordinate United States Government policies, programs and projects; oversee discussions and negotiations with North Korea; consult with the governments of the Republic of Korea and Japan to coordinate negotiating strategy and overall policy towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; and serve as the primary liaison to Congress on issues related to North Korea.

The previous administration had a special envoy on North Korea. This administration cannot afford to reduce the level of institutional attention to these matters by not creating a similar position.

Indeed, our colleagues in Europe in the European Union have already begun to fill the void that we have cre-

ated. Mr. Speaker, we must not allow ourselves to be losing opportunities to shape the future of this region which is so vital to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, the North Korean threat to the United States and its allies in the region is too great to downgrade its management to lower-level officials.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion and allow it to be included as part of the underlying bill. It does not change the structural underlying portion of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), my good friend, who is a cosponsor of this motion.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding, and I rise in support of the motion to recommit the bill to create the special position of special coordinator for Korea.

North Korea tested a missile in August 1998. They have not tested a missile since, because the Clinton administration successfully negotiated a moratorium on their test program.

□ 1815

North Korea has voluntarily continued this moratorium through 2003. If they cannot test their missiles, they cannot deploy their missiles to threaten us. President Bush, Mr. Speaker, has refused to continue negotiations with the North Koreans.

Mr. Speaker, we can negotiate away the North Korean missile threat but only if we sit down at the table to discuss the subject. That is why we need a special coordinator for Korea. President Bush appears to be more interested in justifying a technologically unproven missile defense than in eliminating the missiles themselves. It is easier to defend against the missile that is never launched than one that is.

Let us seize this opportunity to negotiate an end to the North Korean missile threat. I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the amendment made in order by this motion would require the creation of a special office in the Department of State to carry out negotiations with North Korea. It mandates that the person appointed to that office, and I quote, must oversee discussions and negotiations with North Korea regarding missile proliferation and other matters.

It does not mandate negotiations, and that is what the gentleman said we want. It does not do anything except say hire somebody and give them a

title and he should oversee negotiations.

This is micromanagement gone mad. We should not be telling a new State Department, a new administration what personnel it should have and what they should do. There will be somebody overseeing negotiations in North Korea. It may be the Secretary of State who is a general of some accomplishment. It may be the Deputy Secretary of State. It may be an Assistant Secretary of State. It may be lots of people.

But to set up a special office and give him a title and he is to oversee discussions and negotiations is micromanagement, and the administration should be given the opportunity to do this in its own way. If we do not like what they are doing, we can criticize it. But to micromanage the Department of State and tell them they must hire somebody, give them the title, and then he should oversee negotiations is just a tad arrogant. I would trust Secretary Powell to do the right thing.

So I hope my colleagues will vote this down. We can pass this bill and get on to other matters.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker: this motion to recommit symbolizes the direction I believe we should be steering U.S. national security policy in the 21st century.

Last year, our diplomats made significant progress, negotiating an agreement with North Korea in which it would end its ballistic missile program.

Unfortunately, President Bush has backed away from these discussions, publicly telling South Korean President Kim Dae Jung that the North Koreans could not be trusted.

Meanwhile, the administration is proceeding full speed ahead with plans for a costly missile defense system, whose initial purpose is to defend against ballistic missiles from North Korea.

These actions and others strongly suggest that the Bush administration is taking us down the wrong path: toward a policy of isolationism, unilateralism, and disengagement that jeopardizes our security and undermines our leadership role in the world.

We must resist this direction. Instead, we should convince the Administration that there is a better way to serve our interests and enhance the security of our citizens.

We must choose leadership over isolation. We must work to shape the international security environment rather than simply insulate ourselves from it by relying excessively on a defensive shield.

We should choose cooperation over unilateralism, and collaborate with our allies like South Korea, not alienate them.

Finally, we should choose engagement over disengagement, and pursue verifiable agreements like the one with North Korea that can eliminate real threats to our security.

By adopting this motion, we will demonstrate our commitment to reducing threats to the United States, at their source, before they spread to other unfriendly nations or are launched against us.

And we will indicate that we want our foreign and defense policies to go in the direction

of preserving America's security through leadership, engagement and cooperation.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 239, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

AYES—189

Abercrombie	Frank	Meek (FL)
Ackerman	Frost	Meeks (NY)
Allen	Gephardt	Menendez
Andrews	Gonzalez	Millender-
Baca	Gordon	McDonald
Baldacci	Green (TX)	Miller, George
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Mink
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Moakley
Barrett	Harman	Moore
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Moran (VA)
Bentsen	Hill	Nadler
Berkley	Hilliard	Napolitano
Berman	Hinchey	Neal
Berry	Hinojosa	Oberstar
Bishop	Hoefel	Obey
Blagojevich	Holden	Olver
Bonior	Holt	Ortiz
Boswell	Honda	Owens
Boucher	Hooley	Pallone
Boyd	Hoyer	Pascarell
Brown (FL)	Inslie	Pastor
Brown (OH)	Israel	Payne
Capps	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Capuano	(TX)	Pomeroy
Cardin	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Carson (OK)	Jones (OH)	Rangel
Clay	Kanjorski	Reyes
Clayton	Kaptur	Rodriguez
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Roemer
Clyburn	Kildee	Ross
Condit	Kilpatrick	Rothman
Conyers	Kind (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Costello	Kleczka	Rush
Coyne	Kucinich	Sabo
Cramer	LaFalce	Sanchez
Crowley	Lampson	Sanders
Cummings	Langevin	Sandlin
Davis (CA)	Lantos	Sawyer
Davis (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Schiff
DeFazio	Lee	Scott
DeGette	Levin	Serrano
Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
DeLauro	Lofgren	Skelton
Deutsch	Lowe	Slaughter
Dicks	Luther	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Maloney (CT)	Solis
Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Spratt
Dooley	Markey	Stark
Doyle	Mascara	Strickland
Edwards	Matheson	Stupak
Engel	McCarthy (MO)	Tanner
Eshoo	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher
Etheridge	McColum	Thompson (CA)
Evans	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Farr	McGovern	Thurman
Fattah	McIntyre	Tierney
Filner	McKinney	Towns
Ford	Meehan	Udall (CO)

Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Viscosky
Waters

Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler

Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—239

Aderholt
Akin
Army
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggett
Billirakis
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood

Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Matsui
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri

Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Trafcant
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Borski
Brady (PA)
Cubin

□ 1837

Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. GORDON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 352, noes 73, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

AYES—352

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armedy
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley

Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger

Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchesy
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoefel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Israel
Istook
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey

Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McColum
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Millender
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pheips

NOES—73

Akin
Baird
Barr
Berry
Blunt
Bonior
Carson (IN)
Castle
Clay
Combust
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Dicks
Doolittle
Duncan
Emerson
Everett
Filner
Flake
Goode
Hefley
Hostettler

NOT VOTING—6

Borski
Brady (PA)

Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schroock
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Viscosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Pombo
Putnam
Rahall
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sanders
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Slaughter
Solis
Stark
Stearns
Sununu
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Udall (CO)
Upton
Watkins
Weldon (FL)

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 1646, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2002 AND 2003

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1646, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, cross-references, and punctuation, and to make such stylistic, clerical, technical, conforming, and other changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN ETHIOPIA

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago on this floor I attempted to rise and speak out about the outrage of human rights violations in the country of Ethiopia. Unfortunately, it was objected to.

Mr. Speaker, what I cannot understand is how this House can ignore the fact that police forces use excessive force to prevent students from vocalizing their discontent in an academic setting. I understand that 41 brave individuals were killed on or near the campus in Addis Ababa. Two thousand students were detained.

It is imperative that as we talk about human rights around the world, that we are ultimately concerned that people who are our brothers and sisters are treated fairly. I am glad to know that the 2,000 students have been released, but this is not enough. There are dozens of persons arrested without warrant, and they remain detained.

It is extremely important that we say to Ethiopia that freedom cannot be denied, and it is extremely important that this floor and this House and Members of this House allow those of us who are concerned about human rights violations in Ethiopia to get on the floor of the House and debate it and ask that, in fact, we support human rights around this Nation. Mr. Speaker, I ask this Congress to act on the human rights violations in Ethiopia.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider the authorization bills for our foreign policy agenda, it is necessary to recognize the continuing human rights abuses practiced by governments in the Horn of Africa, particularly in Ethiopia. The United States Department of State must carefully investigate the continuing human rights abuses in Ethiopia.

Just recently, I am outraged by the recent violence in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, especially the loss of life in the face of peaceful demonstrations on the campus at Addis Ababa University on April 11th.

□ 1848

Messrs. ROYCE, BAIRD, and JACKSON of Illinois changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.