The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Hyde), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 108-206.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

Mr. PAUL. 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. 6. Offered by Mr. Paul: Page 32, after line 3, insert the following (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

Subtitle C—Limitations
SEC. 131. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED BY THIS ACT FOR ANY UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITED NATIONS OR ANY AFFILIATED AGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended to pay any United States contribution to the United Nations or any affiliated agency of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Paul) and a Member opposed (Mr. Hyde) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Paul).
declared war or when we went to war without declaration of war last fall, we had a resolution on the floor which cited the U.N. 23 different times. I do not believe we should go to war under U.N. resolutions, and we have essentially been in Iraq under a U.N. resolution. As we know, in early 1990s it was under U.N. resolution that we went to war. The old-fashioned way of going to war was a declaration of war.

We went into Korea over 50 years ago under a U.N. resolution. We are still in Korea. We still have serious problems in Korea. There is still a confrontation that we have with the government of North Korea. I do not see where it is to our benefit, I do not see where it is a benefit to world peace to rely on the United Nations. Even though we rely on the United Nations for authority, when we want the United Nations to go along with our policy as our President asked earlier this year, it was refused. So in many ways we have a policy that does not work.

It gets to be almost a joke around the world about some of the things the U.N. does. You think about the Commission of Human Rights and who is appointed as the chairman of the Commission of Human Rights, nobody else other than Libya. And before the war it was actually Iraq who was supposed to chair the Disarmament Commission.

So this I think in many ways reflects the ineptness of the United Nations and its inability to pursue any policy that is in our interest. So it is for this reason, whether it is rejoining UNESCO and throwing more money down another on another useless program, here we are spending a lot of money giving up our sovereignty. Much of this money should be spent here at home.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding me time.

I rise, Mr. Chairman, in the strongest possible opposition to the Paul amendment which would cause great harm to our national interests. Mr. Chairman, I do not look upon the United Nations through rose-colored spectacles. It is obvious that for every criticism my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), has of the United Nations, I could probably cite a half dozen. But the fact remains that many of the activities of the United Nations are clearly in the U.S. national interest.

The International Atomic Agency monitors and exposes countries such as North Korea and Iran attempting to develop nuclear weapons. The World Health Organization works to prevent infectious diseases throughout the world, and it was critically recently in putting a stop to the spread of SARS. UNESCO, which the President wisely decided to rejoin, will provide us an opportunity to make our voice heard in the educational, cultural and scientific field of the international organization. UNICEF, the United Nations International Children’s Fund, is providing invaluable assistance across the globe to non-profits in crises from despair to need; and the U.N. itself, more often than not, is helpful in attaining our own foreign policy objectives.

The absurdity of the United States, the one remaining superpower, the most powerful civilizing force on the face of this planet in the 21st century, withdrawing from the United Nations is nothing short of absurd; and I strongly urge all of my colleagues to reject overwhelmingly this amendment.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, whether you think the U.N. is an abomination or you think it is a useless organization, whether you think that we are advantaged as a country of being a member of the U.N. or you think we ought not to be a member of the U.N., you can vote for this amendment. Vote for the Paul amendment with confidence that you are doing the right thing. Let me explain.

Both the Department of Defense and the Congressional Research Service have documented that we have spent over $19 billion of taxpayers’ money on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities. Now, the U.N. has legitimized our claim that this ought to be credited against our dues because they have credited $1.8 billion of this against our dues.

I am going to vote for this amendment. I will vote for any amendment that denies funding to the U.N. without any argument whether we ought to be long, any argument of whether it is good or bad, but the simple argument that, in all fairness, please do an accounting of the monies we have spent on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities. Please credit appropriate amounts of that to our U.N. dues. Then, if there are dues left over, we will pay those dues. But until that accounting is done, everybody in this Congress, we are in very tough financial times now, ought to vote yes for the Paul amendment that will demand that the accounting is done; and then we can debate whether or not we ought to be members of the U.N. or whether or not it is an efficacious organization.

But, for today, the simple fact that we have not been credited for almost $17 billion of monies that we have spent on legitimate U.N. peacekeeping activities is more than a legitimate right to vote for this amendment. Vote for the Paul amendment.

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. PAUL, I once again urge a yes vote on this amendment to limit the funding to the United Nations and to all its agencies. The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) mentioned that there were some programs under the United Nations which were sort of “feel-good” programs, social welfare programs, and I think I would grant that some of these programs have had some benefit. That in itself is not enough for me to endorse the continuation of social welfare through the United Nations. However, too often I think they leave doing these programs that are designed to help people who are truly suffering versus getting involved with what we call peacekeeping missions. The United Nations are not allowed to declare war. They never go to war, and yet too often we get involved in war. That is why they were called peacekeepers in the first place. That is why we have a peacekeeping mission when we go to Iraq. But, still, the armies are raised, and young men are called off, and people are killed on these peacekeeping missions. Therefore, I say that the United Nations has tended to take away the responsibility of this Congress to make these very, very important decisions.

I believe in many ways that by joining the United Nations we have allowed our Constitution to be amended merely by U.N. vote. If the U.N. says something and we go along with that, we do that by majority vote here in the Congress. Where if we look to the Constitution for the authorities that we
are allowed to do and what we are not permitted to do, we look to article I, section 8, and what the U.N. is doing is not permissible under the article.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL). The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) are postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 108-206.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I am the designee of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

Page 88, after line 17, insert the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 406. LIMITATION ON THE UNITED STATES SHARE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR UNITED NATIONS REGULAR BUDGET.

Section 11 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287e-3) is amended by striking “22 percent of the total of all assessed contributions for that budget” and inserting “the largest assessed contribution of any other permanent member country of the United Nations Security Council”.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 2303, sponsored by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), I am happy to offer this amendment, which is the first step in reforming the United Nations.

In the run-up to the war in Iraq, France was able to hold U.S. policy hostage by virtue of its status as a permanent member of the Security Council and the veto power that goes with it, but France was not alone. The other permanent Security Council Members, China, Russia, United Kingdom, of course, also the United States; they all have a veto power; and they regularly obstruct our foreign policy goals and vote the opposite of the United States.

According to the State Department’s voting practices in the United Nations of 2002, on votes important to U.S. interests, France and the U.K. voted with us just 50 percent of the time, Russia 22 percent of the time and China, 20 percent.

Even though the U.S. has no more power on the Security Council than any of the other four permanent members, it pays the lion’s share of the United Nations’ budget. The United States pays $341 million a year, or 22 percent of the budget. China pays just $24 million, even though it has the world’s second largest economy. Russia pays a paltry $19 million, which is less than Canada, Holland, Australia, or Switzerland.

This amendment would limit the U.S. contribution to the regular U.N. budget to no more than the highest amount paid by any other member of the Security Council. Our veto power should cost us no more than what China, France, Russia, or the U.K. pay for theirs.

This proposal would not affect U.S. payments to the U.N. for peacekeeping operations, voluntary programs, or membership organizations. It would only affect the U.N. regular budget. Even at this reduced amount, the U.S. would still contribute over $1.4 billion in various U.N. programs, far more than any other country.

So aside from simple equity, enactment of this amendment would hopefully lead to reconsideration of how U.N. dues are assessed among permanent members. China and Russia are now essentially getting a free ride at our expense. The solution would be for all permanent members to pay equal amounts of the regular budget based on their inclusion in this body. The assessments are made instead on the basis of a member state’s share of the world gross domestic product. In the case of China, the U.S. share should actually be well over 22 percent.

In short, the amendment would have the same practical effect as that of the gentleman from Texas’ (Mr. PAUL) amendment, undercutting any role we would have in the U.N. and eventually leading to our withdrawal from the world body. If my colleagues voted against the Paul amendment, they should oppose this amendment as well.

In short, it takes a unilateral approach which could potentially harm U.S. interests and objectives around the world. Our contribution to the U.N. regular budget and to all other U.N. programs and agencies are agreed to by mutual consent of all U.N. members. If the U.S. were to unilaterally cut its assessment, we would start building arrearages to the U.N. again just after completing a 3-year arrearage repayment effort under the Helms-Biden legislation where we obtained substantial management and administrative reforms in return for the payment of our back dues.

Adoption of this amendment would undercut those ongoing reform efforts, and I urge it be defeated.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire as to the amount of time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) both have 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois’ remarks with regard to the United Nations and some of the implications of any change that we might make in how the dues are assessed against the United States, and I would point out that our gross domestic product is comparable to that of the balance of the Security Council and all the other priority members that are there; and even though it is indexed to the gross domestic product, it is certainly out of proportion.

Additionally, these members of the United Nations Security Council have exerted far more influence than their economic counterparts in the world economy, as the United Nations dues or any type of forces that we might have put there, and so I would suggest that the United Nations has become a
Third World class envy debating society where the strongest and most powerful countries’ foreign policy is dictated by countries who wish to undermine the United States. It is entirely inappropriate that the United States must contribute a disproportionate share of its resources, regardless of a proportional method as far as the dues are concerned in the Security Council, that somehow or another we have had a democratic debating society there, but we see dictators and tyrants at the United Nations, who give them full voice to utter their opinions, their tyrannical opinions, when they would not let a single one of their citizens do the same within their own country; and this is the flaw in the United Nations that we have lived with all of these years.

We have got to move down the path of reforming the United Nations, and this is the first good step to do so. U.N. membership, structure, and policy aside, it is preposterous that the United States continues to pay for 22 percent of the entire U.N. regular budget. That 22 percent is $341 billion; and in fact, the U.N. votes against the United States 32 percent of the time on important issues. The United States contributes currently $115 million more to the regular budget than France, Germany, Russia, and China combined; but our veto power should cost no more than what France, Russia, or China pays for theirs. China only pays $24 million, even though it is the world's second largest economy. The Russians pay $19 million, which is less than Canada, Holland, Australia, or Switzerland. It is ridiculous to have this position. The United States is funding its political opposition.

I want to make it clear that this amendment would not affect U.S. payments to the U.N. for peacekeeping operations, voluntary programs, or membership organizations. If this amendment is adopted, the U.S. will still contribute more than $1.4 billion to various U.N. programs. In summary, this amendment would simply limit the U.S. contributions to the U.N. regular budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment. A “yes” vote is not a vote against the U.S., but rather a vote to make it more accountable.

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

I might just say that the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of our committee for yielding me the time, and I want to identify my views with the chairman's footnotes.

The United Nations was founded at the end of the Second World War when the United States was economically not only a superpower but had a vastly disproportionate share of global gross domestic product. At the time, our 22 percent contribution to the U.N. was 40 percent. It is now 22 percent; and I think a legitimate case can be made for multilaterally, through negotiation, adjusting our contributions to the U.N. as gross domestic products of the various countries change. But to take unilateral action at this stage, when the United Nations is so badly needed, despite all of its flaws, would be a singular ill-advised move; and I strongly urge all of my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Hayworth/King Amendment that would limit what the U.S. pays in U.N. dues to an amount no more than the highest amount paid by any other permanent U.N. Security Council member.

Let's put this amendment in perspective. In the run-up to the war against Saddam Hussein, we saw all too clearly the real goal of France in obstructing and sabotaging U.S. policy—to challenge U.S. global leadership and see itself as the leader of a competing coalition. By itself, however, France is incapable of countering or competing with the U.S. militarily or economically, and that situation will only grow worse as France faces a demographically-driven decline. The key to France's strategic ambition is therefore based solely on its permanent membership on the UN Security Council, or UNSC, and, most importantly, the veto power that goes with it. Without its veto, France would lose its chief claim to geopolitical relevance.

I don't mean to pick on France, Mr. Chairman, but its actions leading up to the war with Iraq make it an easy target. The truth is, the entire Security Council regularly obstructs our foreign policy goals and permanent members—China, France, Russia, and the U.K.—regularly vote the opposite of the U.S.

According to the State Department's Voting Practices in the United Nations 2002, on votes important to U.S. interests, France and the U.K. voted with us just 50 percent of the time, Russia 22 percent, and China 23 percent. Overall, the General Assembly voted the U.S. position only 32 percent of the time on important issues. Areas of specific disagreement include the Middle East, nuclear disarmament, certain human rights issues, and the International Criminal Court.

What makes all this even more galling is that even though the U.S. has no more power on the Security Council than any of the other four permanent members, it pays the lion's share of the U.N. budget. Indeed, even though the aggregate GDP of the other permanent members is about twice as large as the U.S., the U.S. contributes about $115 million more to the U.N. regular budget than those four countries combined.

What's more, U.N. dues are supposed to be based on ability to pay. Yet there are a dozen countries that in 2003 will pay more in dues than China's $24 billion even though it now has the world's second largest economy. The Chinese are clearly getting a lot of bang for their U.N. buck. So are the Russians. Their 2003 assessment is only $19 million, less than Canada, Holland, Australia, and Switzerland.

The Hayworth/King Amendment would restore some balance to this picture. It would limit the U.S. contribution to the regular U.N. budget to no more than the highest amount paid by any other permanent UNSC member. The rationale is simple. Our veto power should cost us no more than what China, France, Russia, or the U.K. pay for theirs.

The U.S.'s 2003 assessment for the U.N. regular budget is $341 million. Under this amendment, we would pay no more than France, which has been assessed the second-highest amount, or $100 million. This proposal would not affect U.S. payments to the U.N. for peacekeeping operations, voluntary programs, or membership organizations. It would only affect the U.N. regular budget. Even at this reduced amount the U.S. would still contribute over $1.4 billion to various U.N. programs, far more than any other country.

Aside from simple equity, enactment of my bill would hopefully lead to a reconsideration of how U.N. dues are assessed among permanent members. China and Russia are now essentially getting a free ride at our expense. The solution would be for all permanent members to pay equal amounts of the regular budget because of the U.S. military power and the goodwill and magnanimity of the five permanent UNSC members that can block any reform. The U.S. would have to pay a little more, Russia and China a lot more, the U.S. a lot less.

A debate over dues could also prompt a broader discussion on U.N. reform. The outrages are not limited to the meltdowns over Iraq, Cuba began its recent crackdown on dissidents as the U.N.'s Human Rights Commission was holding its annual meeting in Geneva. It promptly elected Cuba to another three-year term, an act author Carl Hiaasen wrote was "a little like naming a necktie after the Boston Strangler." The United States, beleaguered by Libya and includes some of the worst abusers of human rights in the world, including Vietnam, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, and Zimbabwe.

If the U.N. does not reform itself, it risks becoming, in the words of Mexican Foreign Minister Luis Ernesto Derbez, another "Red Cross." The U.N. can become relevant again, but whether it does so will ultimately rest on the goodwill and magnanimity of the five permanent UNSC members who can block any reform with a veto.

As we have learned, U.N. reform takes time. Ronald Reagan pulled the U.S. out of UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, in 1984. It took 18 years for UNESCO to implement sufficient reforms for the U.S. to return. More fundamental reform could take even longer.

By approving this action today we will be sending a message that the U.S. is serious about reform at the U.N.

Support the Hayworth/King Amendment. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.
The amendment is identical to language that Senator Enzi offered and that was passed as part of the Senate foreign relations bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) will be postponed.

Mr. BEREUTER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The amendment also improves the U.S. export control system. It enables the State Department to focus its resources on the transfer of truly sensitive data and allows U.S. companies to communicate with our allies internationally and friends in a timely and cost-effective manner about basic marketing information.

Our national security is closely linked to our technological leadership which guarantees the military advantage we have today, but our national security is also threatened by a sick industry that is falling behind its competition because of our vulnerability to our national security.

I urge my colleagues to support the Tauscher-Bereuter amendment.

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

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to this amendment loosening satellite export controls.

I am profoundly concerned, Mr. Chairman, that the language of the amendment would result in all satellite marketing information being exempted from any licensing requirement at all. Even if unclassified, some of the information transferred might well be sensitive. It is also possible that companies, without the government review of a license requirement, may unintentionally transfer more information than they should under the pressure of making a sale. The Departments of State and Defense would have no idea whatsoever what information is actually being transferred.

The Congress needs more time and information to consider the full and serious ramifications of this change in satellite licensing regime in order to ensure that our national security is not compromised. I would urge the sponsors of this amendment, for whom I have a great deal of respect, to include at a future time a provision making clear that companies must first obtain a license to transfer marketing information. Short of that, I reluctantly oppose the amendment and ask all of my colleagues to vote against it.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the co-author of this amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. The gentlewoman has explained adequately the very limited number of circumstances under which licensing would not be required. In fact, they have to require such licensing now. That is the point of this amendment.

But the U.S. market share in the commercial satellite industry has fallen from 75 percent of the market now to 50. As U.S. sales have dropped, European commercial satellites have dramatically increased. Among the key concerns which commercial satellite customers cite is licensing. Exemptions from licensing the sharing of very limited type of nonclassified marketing information does in no way jeopardize the security interests of the United States. Amazingly, the competitiveness of U.S. satellite processors, however, if we damage it by continuing this unnecessary licensing, does damage the security interest of the United States.

I was a member of the Cox Commission, which generated the concern about licensing information. I am very concerned about the transfer of classified information or something that would jeopardize our national security. This in no way does. There is no good reason why this nonclassified marketing information should not be shared, and I urge support for this amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's yielding...
...me this time to speak on this amendment.

This is an example of why our export control regime is broken and badly in need of review. The typical high school student's bedroom has more computing power than the United States possessed when it developed the atomic and hydrogen bombs. Our friends and allies are worthy partners to deal with us in the satellite industry. As has been pointed out by my two colleagues in favor of this, what we are doing is we are asking to deregulate satellite technology so that we should allow them to be disseminated so that we can keep the small part of the business that we have left.

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

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

If there is no export license requirement, it is difficult if not impossible to prevent information from being retransferred to a third country. This is an important principle we are not always have the same policies as we do in satellite cooperation with China and other countries. The practical effect would be to deregulate much information about satellites and satellite technology. Given the importance of space technology to our national security, I am persuaded that such a drastic step should be approached with an abundance of precaution and entertained, if at all, only after detailed analysis.

In sum, if this amendment were written to provide the President with discretion not to require licensing, that would be one thing. But this amendment prohibits the President from considering any factors in determining whether an export license should be granted, if at all, only after detailed analysis.

Amendment No. 9 having not been offered, Mr. MENENDEZ.

The question was taken; and the noes appeared to have it.

Chairman pro tempore announced that the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) will be postponed.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

SEC. 2. ASSISTANCE TO TAMIL NADU.

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

(1) Several United States businesses invested more than $800,000,000 in capital in the State of Tamil Nadu in the United States and operate state-of-the-art electric generation facilities to serve local customers.

(2) For nearly 2 years since these power plants went into service, the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board has not paid the electricity produced by the plants in accordance with purchase agreements.

(3) The Tamil Nadu Electricity Board now owes these United States companies in excess of $150,000,000 in arrearages despite repeated assurances by the Government of Tamil Nadu that the situation would be resolved.

(b) REQUIREMENTS. — In order to provide the Government of Tamil Nadu with needed capital and financing, Congress makes the following requirements:

(1) Several United States businesses entered into a $1,800 megawatt agreement with the Tamil Nadu government to provide electricity to Tamil Nadu at a combined cost of about $1 billion. Each company entered into a long-term contract for the purchase of the electricity generated at these plants at an agreed-upon price.

(2) For nearly 2 years since these power plants went into service, the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board has not paid the electricity produced by the plants in accordance with purchase agreements.

(3) The Tamil Nadu Electricity Board now owes these United States companies in excess of $150,000,000 in arrearages despite repeated assurances by the Government of Tamil Nadu that the situation would be resolved.

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

My amendment is premised on an unfortunate situation that has arisen in the state of Tamil Nadu, India, involving several American companies that are currently attempting to conduct business there.

In seeking to provide additional electric generating capacity several years ago the Tamil Nadu government sought to induce foreign companies to design and build power plants there. Five American companies accepted this proposition and constructed four projects that generate approximately 800 megawatts of electricity in Tamil Nadu at a combined cost of about $1 billion. Each company entered into a long-term contract for the purchase of the electricity generated at these plants at an agreed-upon price.

After getting these plants up and running, the Tamil Nadu government then began a systematic underpayment of the contract terms, sufficient to keep them running but providing no return on the initial investment. Technically, the projects are in a state of default; and, as far as we know, the Tamil Nadu government owes these American companies approximately $150 million under the terms of these contracts.

Now, India has been a strategic ally and trading partner of the United States. Unfortunately, the state of Tamil Nadu has lagged behind the rest....
of that country in terms of maintaining a strong commitment to the rule of law and providing for these types of open, transparent transactions. So we simply, through our amendment, seek to create an opportunity to ensure that the United States will not affect any foreign assistance that deals with human rights or nutrition or any of those things, but we do deal with all other issues that are not humanitarian, health-related, or justice sector relief initiatives designed to help those citizens of Tamil Nadu. So this is a way to stand up for U.S. companies who make legitimate investments and do the right thing and at the end of the day do not have the transparency and the opportunities for their investments to be honored in a way in which we want to see throughout the world.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding. I strongly support his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is outrageous that American businesses entering in good faith into commercial transactions in various countries should be subjected to provincial governmental abuse. This is not the government of India which is fostering the rights obligation but a condition of having to Indian, Tamil Nadu.

I think the gentleman is bringing an important matter before us, and I urge all of my colleagues to support him.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, re-claiming my time once again, Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for his comments.

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

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I have some reservations about this amendment. This points out a serious problem which is actually ongoing with not just India but some other countries as well. However, I am willing to accept this amendment and will do so with pleasure.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reclaiming my time once again, Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for his support.

Hopefully, Mr. Chairman, we will have a resolution and will not have to pursue it much further than this. But I appreciate the opportunity to at least have this conversation. I believe their chance to have an opportunity for their investments to be upheld under international law.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my marks.

This amendment sends a signal to the government of the Indian state of Tamil Nadu that it must abide by its contracts with American and other foreign investors. Five American energy companies built state-of-the-art energy plants in Tamil Nadu. These companies negotiated contracts with the state government to provide energy at a guaranteed minimum rate.

However, the government of Tamil Nadu has paid less than the guaranteed rate to the tune of over $130 million.

One of the affected companies, CMS Energy, is based in the 7th district of Michigan. CMS built a state-of-the-art energy plant, providing jobs and training to the Tamil people. It also provides steps to support economic development and growth in Tamil Nadu.

The government of Tamil Nadu's violation of its contract has cost CMS over $14 million.

The amendment affects only the state of Tamil Nadu. It is not anti-India. It will do nothing to affect other Indian states that respect the sanctity of contracts and provide an excellent environment for the foreign investment that benefits both India and investors. We should not be using our aid to reward governments that do not respect contracts.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the precedent for temporary pro tem, the Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania:

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. 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. 1 offered by Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to the Republic of Moldova unless the President determines and certifies to Congress that the Government of Moldova has met its obligations with respect to investments made by U.S. citizens in the former Soviet Union, such as Moldova, can carry significant risks for Americans and others. If the government of Moldova wish to enhance their economic prospects by encouraging foreign investment, then ensuring the security of those investments and honoring contractual agreements must be a top priority. I urge the government of Moldova to improve the transparency of its actions regarding foreign investment and to further develop the rule of law in this and other areas.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as I have stated before, I do not want to alienate Moldova. The citizens of Moldova are not at fault. They are good people. It is their government that is at fault, and I do not think it is fair that its people suffer. Something must be done to remedy this matter. I will request to withdraw my amendment with assurance from the gentleman from Illinois that we will try to remedy this situation.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, by working together, I believe we will be able to resolve this matter in a manner that is satisfactory to all parties concerned.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Committee on International Relations and the ranking member who do such a great job for consideration of all issues.

I look forward to working with him on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.
The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. HYDE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 316, I offer the following amendments en bloc consisting of the following amendments printed in House Report 108-206: amendments numbered 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. 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. 12 offered by Mr. MANZULLO:

After section 3 of the bill, insert the following new section, and conform the table of contents accordingly:

SEC. 4. SPECIAL RULES FOR APPLYING BUY AMERICAN ACT.

(a) ACQUISITIONS OF ARTICLES, MATERIALS, AND SUPPLIES.—With respect to any acquisition under this Act or any amendment made by this Act of articles, materials, or supplies that are subject to section 2 of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a), such section shall be applied to such acquisition by substituting "at least 65 percent" for "substantially all".

(b) CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION, ALTERATION, OR REPAIR.—With respect to any contract for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work entered into under this Act or any amendment made by this Act that is subject to section 3 of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 11b), such section shall be applied to such contract by substituting "at least 65 percent" for "substantially all".

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. CROWLEY:

Page 111, after line 13, insert the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 507. CONTRACTOR REQUIREMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the overruling national security aspects of the international programs of the International Broadcasting Bureau require the assurance of uninterrupted logistic support under all circumstances for the programs. Therefore, it is in the best interests of the United States to provide a preference for United States contractors bidding on these projects.

(b) PREFERENCE FOR UNITED STATES CONTRACTORS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any case where there are two or more qualified bidders on projects of the International Broadcasting Bureau, including design and construction projects and projects respecting to respect to transmitters, antennas, spare parts, and other technical equipment, all the responsive bids of United States persons and qualified United States joint ventures shall be considered to be reduced by 10 percent.

(c) EXCEPTION.—

(1) Subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to any contract of the International Broadcasting Bureau when—

(A) precluded by the terms of an international agreement with the host foreign country; or

(B) a foreign bidder can establish that the foreign bidder is a national of a country whose government permits United States contractors and suppliers the opportunity to bid on a competitive and nondiscriminatory basis with its national contractors and suppliers, on programs relating to the construction, modernization, upgrad, or expansion of:

(i) its national public radio and television sector,

(ii) its private radio and television sector, to the extent that such procurement or project is, in whole or in part, funded or otherwise under the control of a government agency or authority,

(iii) the Secretary of Commerce certifies (in advance of the contract) to the Board of the International Broadcasting Bureau that the foreign bidder is not receiving any direct subsidy from any foreign government, the effect of which would be to disadvantage the competitive position of United States persons who also bid on the project, or

(iv) the statutes of a host foreign country prohibit the use of United States contractors on such projects within that country.

(b) An exception under paragraph (1)(D) shall only become effective with respect to a foreign country 30 days after the Secretary of State certifies to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate what specific actions the Secretary of State has taken to urge the foreign country to permit the use of United States contractors on such projects.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "United States person" means a person who—

(A) is incorporated or otherwise legally organized under the laws of the United States, and including any State (and any political subdivision thereof) and the District of Columbia;

(B) has its principal place of business in the United States;

(C) has been incorporated or otherwise legally organized in the United States for more than 5 years before the issuance date of the Invitation For Bids or the Request For Proposals with respect to a foreign country 30 days after the Secretary of State certifies to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate what specific actions the Secretary of State has taken to urge the foreign country to permit the use of United States contractors on such projects.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall be applied to such contract by substituting "at least 65 percent" for "substantially all."
this as an urgent matter, one that must be promptly addressed if the United States is to meet both its national security and economic development goals.

(1) In paragraph (a), the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Congress that—

(i) the appropriate congressional committees.

(ii) A review of the designation of a foreign terrorist organization made under subparagraph (A) shall take place pursuant to subparagraph (B) in the Federal Register. Subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(2) A review of the designation of a foreign terrorist organization made under subparagraph (A) in the Federal Register. (B) and (C) in paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(3) An amendment to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(4) A review of the designation of a foreign terrorist organization made under subparagraph (A) in the Federal Register. Subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(5) An amendment to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(6) An amendment to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(7) An amendment to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(8) An amendment to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(9) An amendment to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(10) An amendment to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(11) An amendment to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(12) An amendment to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(13) An amendment to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(14) An amendment to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation.

(15) An amendment to a designation in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Paragraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (7), as amended by redesignation upon such publication. Paragraph (2)(A)(i), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) shall also apply to an amended designation. 
SEC. 274. NOTICE TO UNITED STATES EMBASSIES ABROAD REGARDING CHILDREN WHO ARE SUBJECT TO INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION AND GUIDELINES RELATING TO ASYLUM FOR ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) NOTICE OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.—The Secretary of State shall establish procedures to ensure that appropriate United States Embassies abroad are notified of the possible presence in that country of any child who has been the subject of international child abduction in violation of the order described in clause (i), if such person has been detained or retained, or at the time custodian and child are permitted to return to United States from the person granted custody by that order.

(i) the term ‘child’ means an individual who was a child at the time the individual was subject to the custody of the individual was withheld, as described in clause (i), regardless of the age or marital status of the individual after such time and

(iv) IDENTIFICATION OF ALIENS SUPPORTING ABDUCTORS AND RELATIVES OF ABDUCTED CHILDREN.

SEC. 275. INADMISSIBILITY OF ALIENS SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTORS AND RELATIVES OF ABDUCTED CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(a)(10)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(10)(C)) is amended—

(2) in subclause (II), by striking , or'' at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(3) by amending subclause (III) to read as follows:

‘‘(III) is a spouse of the abductor child, other than the abducted child, parent, sibling, uncle, aunt, nephew, niece, or grandparent of an alien described in clause (i), is an agent of such an alien or is a principal for such an alien as an agent, if such person has been designated by the Secretary of State at the Secretary’s sole and unreviewable discretion; or’’ and

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF ALIENS SUPPORTING ABDUCTORS AND RELATIVES OF ABDUCTED CHILDREN.—In all instances in which such an alien commits an act described in clause (i), the Secretary of State shall take appropriate action to identify the individuals who are inadmissible under clause (ii).

(c) NOTICE TO CUSTODIAL PARENTS AND GUARDIANS; ANNUAL REPORT; DEFINITIONS.—Section 212(a)(10)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(10)(C)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(iv) IDENTIFICATION OF ALIENS SUPPORTING ABDUCTORS AND RELATIVES OF ABDUCTORS.—In all instances in which such an alien commits an act described in clause (i), the Secretary of State shall take appropriate action to identify the individuals who are inadmissible under clause (ii).

‘‘(v) NOTICE TO CUSTODIAL PARENTS AND GUARDIANS.—In all instances in which an alien commits an act described in clause (i), the Secretary of State shall, upon request of the person granted custody of the child concerned, inform the person of whether, and make arrangements for the personnel of United States Embassies abroad concerning procedures relating to asylum at such facilities for children who are the subject of international child abduction.

SEC. 276. INADMISSIBILITY OF ALIENS SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTORS AND RELATIVES OF ABDUCTED CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(a)(10)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(10)(C)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subclause (II), by striking ‘‘ or’’ at the end and inserting a semicolon;

and

SEC. 231. INTERFERENCE WITH PROTECTIVE FUNCTIONS.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF ALIENS SUPPORTING ABDUCTORS AND RELATIVES OF ABDUCTED CHILDREN.—In all instances in which such an alien commits an act described in clause (i), the Secretary of State shall take appropriate action to identify the individuals who are inadmissible under clause (ii).

(c) NOTICE TO CUSTODIAL PARENTS AND GUARDIANS.—In all instances in which an alien commits an act described in clause (i), the Secretary of State shall, upon request of the person granted custody of the child concerned, inform the person of whether, and make arrangements for the personnel of United States Embassies abroad concerning procedures relating to asylum at such facilities for children who are the subject of international child abduction.
of hundreds of ballistic missiles directed toward Taiwan, which threaten the security and stability in the Taiwan Strait;

(2) the President should direct all appropriate officials to reiterate to the leaders of the People's Republic of China that there will not be a quid pro quo between the dismantling of missiles aimed at Taiwan by the People's Republic of China, and arms sales to the United States, to the People's Republic of China.

(4) China should dismantle the missiles that threaten Taiwan, otherwise the President should consider the appropriate officials to take steps to defend Taiwan in the face of threat presented by a missile attack from China; and

(5) the future of Taiwan should be determined peacefully and with the express consent of the people of Taiwan.

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. Bereuter:
Page 211, after line 11, insert the following section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):
SEC. 736. SENSE OF CONGRESS IN APPRECIATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND REGARDING RESTORING STABILITY AND SECURITY IN IRAQ.

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

(1) The United States, with the support of forces from Great Britain and other countries, has supported a free and courageous liberated Iraq in three weeks.

(2) Conditions on the ground in parts of Iraq continue to pose a grave threat to American security and stability and complicate American efforts to restore law and order and essential public services for Iraqis. Such efforts are further complicated by the absence of effective communications with the Iraqi people.

(3) Ultimately, maintaining law and order in Iraq and preserving its territorial integrity will require the creation of a professionally trained, capable police force and a reformed Iraqi military; however, that will take a significant amount of time and in the meantime international armed forces and police forces will be required.

(4) Approximately 145,000 United States troops are currently deployed in Iraq, meaning that American troops comprise roughly 90 percent of the U.S. Department of Defense forces. If, as the Department of Defense has stated, an additional 10,000 international troops join the Coalition effort in Iraq by September, Americans will still comprise roughly 85 percent of Coalition forces.

(5) Maintaining the existing force level in Iraq currently requires $3,900,000,000 each month.

(6) The Department of Defense has stated that it will require one year to train a new Iraqi Army of 12,000 soldiers and three years to train 40,000 soldiers.

(7) The Coalition Provisional Authority has stated that it will require at least one year to recruit and train a police force of 40,000 officers capable of assuming minimal police functions in Iraq, that it will require five years to recruit and train a full force of 75,000 officers, and that at least 550 additional U.S. military police are needed to train, assist, and jointly patrol with the existing Iraqi police force.

(8) President Bush has noted that “the rise of Iraq as a modern democracy and a source of hope and prosperity, is a large and long-term undertaking,” and it is clear that increasing the number of troops and police from countries other than the United States will reduce risks to American soldiers and the financial cost to the United States.

(9) Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld testified that “we certainly want assistance from NATO and from NATO countries” and it is clear that involving the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the United States, in any further action in Afghanistan and elsewhere has been done in Kosovo and Bosnia, allows the Coalition to maintain a robust military presence while decreasing the exposure and risk to American troops.

(10) Rebuilding Iraq’s neglected infrastructure, and economy and administering Iraq— including providing basic services and paying the salaries and essential costs of the public sector salaries—will require billions of dollars over several years and projected Iraqi oil revenues will be insufficient to meet these costs.

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

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to remain engaged in Iraq in order to ensure a peaceful, stable, unified Iraq with a representative government;

(2) the President should consider requesting formally and expeditiously that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) raise a force for deployment in post-war Iraq similar to what it has done in Afghanistan, Bosnia, and Kosovo and the Congress urges NATO allies and other nations to provide troops and police to Coalition efforts in Iraq; and

(3) the President should consider calling on the United Nations to urge its member states to provide military forces and civilian police to promote stability and security in Iraq and resources to help rebuild and administer Iraq.

Amendment No. 23 offered by Ms. Bordallo:
Page 83, after line 10, insert the following (and amend the table of contents accordingly):
SEC. 311. TREATMENT OF TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS AS PART OF THE GEOGRAPHIC UNITS OF THE UNITED STATES AND REGARDING RESTORING STABILITY AND SECURITY IN IRAQ.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of transfer allowances for employees of the Department of State under section 5924(2)(B) of title 5, United States Code, the territories and possessions of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Ross Dependency will be considered part of the geographic United States.

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. Brown of Ohio:
Page 283, after line 10, insert the following (and amend the table of contents accordingly):
SEC. 712. REPORT CONCERNING OBSERVER STATUS FOR UNITED STATES FOR PURPOSES OF TRANSFER ALLOWANCES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of transfer allowances for employees of the Department of State under section 5924(2)(B) of title 5, United States Code, the territories and possessions of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the states referred to in section 5924(2)(B) of title 5, United States Code, the territories and possessions of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the states referred to in section 5924(2)(B) of title 5, United States Code, the territories and possessions of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Ross Dependency will be considered part of the geographic United States.

Amendment No. 25 offered by Mr. Crane:
On January 15, 2002, Avraham Boaz, 72, a resident of Kansas City, Missouri, was killed in a Hamas bombing.

On May 13, 1996, United States citizen David Boim, 19, of New York City, was killed in a drive-by shooting near Beit El, north of Jerusalem.

On June 9, 1996, United States citizen Yaron Ungar was killed in a drive-by-shooting near Beit Shemesh.

On July 30, 1997, United States citizen Lisa Rosen of Passaic, New Jersey, was killed in a Hamas bombing.

On September 4, 1997, a Hamas bomb killed Yael Botwin, 14, of Los Angeles.

On April 19, 1998, an attack near the Israeli town of Ma'on killed United States citizen Dov Driben.

On October 8, 2000, Rabbi Hillel Lieberman, 36, of New York City, was stabbed and killed near Nablus.

On October 30, 2000, two United States citizens Yaron Ungar and Natan Magid, 25, were shot in Jerusalem.

On December 31, 2000, Rabbi Binyamin Klig, 34, and his wife, Meira, 22, of East Jerusalem, were killed in a drive-by shooting near Ofrat.

On May 9, 2001, Iacov “Koby” Mandle, 13, of Rehovot, was killed.

On May 17, 2001, United States citizen Yitzhak Shaul, 20, of New Jersey, was killed in an attack near Tekoa.

On May 29, 2001, Sarah Blaustein, 53, of New York City, was killed in an attack near Kfar Darom.

On October 29, 2001, United States citizen Joan Daveny, 30, was killed.

On April 9, 1995, an Islamic Jihad bomb attack on a bus near Kfar Darom killed United States citizen Alisa Flatow, 20, from West Orange, New Jersey.

On August 21, 1995, in a Hamas bus bombing near Jerusalem, United States citizen Joan Daveny, from New Haven, Connecticut, was killed.

On September 9, 1995, Mara Frey of Chicago was stabbed in Ma'alot Michmash resulting in her unborn child's death.

On February 25, 1996, three United States citizens, Sara Duker of Teaneck, New Jersey, Yael Botwin, 14, of Los Angeles, and Yaron Ungar were killed in a Hamas bus bombing in Jerusalem.

On May 13, 1996, United States citizen Nachshon Wachsman, 19, whose family came from Los Angeles.

On August 21, 1995, in a Hamas bus bombing near Jerusalem, United States citizen Noah Duker of Teaneck, New Jersey, was killed.

On March 19, 1996, United States citizen John Slesin, 18, of New York City, was killed.

On August 21, 1995, in a Hamas bus bombing in Jerusalem, United States citizen Joan Daveny, from New Haven, Connecticut, was killed.

On September 9, 1995, a Hamas bus bombing near Kfar Darom killed United States citizen Yitzhak Weinstock, 19, whose family came from Los Angeles.

On September 9, 1995, a Hamas bus bombing near Jerusalem, United States citizen Dan Beerman, 22, from New York City, was killed.

On October 2, 2001, United States citizen Alisa Flatow, 20, from West Orange, New Jersey, was killed.

On June 30, 1997, United States citizen Nachshon Wachsman, 19, from Los Angeles, was killed.

On February 28, 1998, United States citizen David Boim, 20, from New York City, was killed in a Hamas bus bombing in Jerusalem.

On October 29, 2000, United States citizen Nachshon Wachsman, 19, from Los Angeles, was killed.

On October 29, 2000, United States citizen Nachshon Wachsman, 19, from Los Angeles, was killed.

On January 15, 2002, Avraham Boaz, 72, was killed in a Hamas bombing.

On May 9, 2001, Iacov “Koby” Mandle, 13, of Rehovot, was killed.

On May 17, 2001, United States citizen Yitzhak Shaul, 20, of New Jersey, was killed in an attack near Tekoa.

On May 29, 2001, Sarah Blaustein, 53, of Lawrence, New York, was killed in a drive-by shooting near Efrat.

On August 9, 2001, two United States citizens, judith L. Greenbaum, 31, and Malka Roth, 15, were killed in the Jerusalem Sbarro pizzeria.

On November 4, 2001, Shoshana Ben-Yishai, 16, of New York City, was shot and killed during an attack on a Jerusalem bus.

On September 11, 2001, United States citizen Yaron Ungar was killed in a shooting near Bethlehem.
(21) On January 18, 2002, United States citizen Aaron Eliss, 32, was killed in a shooting in Hadera.
(22) On February 15, 2002, United States citizen Moe Kethun, was shot and killed near Ramallah.
(23) On February 16, 2002, Keren Shatsky, 14, of New York City and Maine, and Rachel Thaler, 49, of New York, Maryland, were killed in a bombing in Kafr Shomron.
(24) On February 25, 2002, United States citizen Moran Amit, 25, was stabbed and killed in Abu Nau, Jerusalem.
(25) On March 24, 2002, Esther Kleinman, 23, formerly of Chicago, was shot and killed near Ohrma.
(26) On March 27, 2002, United States citizen Hannah Rogen, 50, was killed in a bombing at a hotel and Passover seder in Netanya.
(27) On March 27, 2002, United States citizen Morty Gottlieb, 70, of Los Angeles, was killed in a bus bombing in Jerusalem.
(28) On June 19, 2002, United States citizens Gila Sara Kessler, 19, was killed in a bombing at a Jerusalem bus stop.
(29) On July 31, 2002, five United States citizens were killed in a bombing of a Hebrew University cafeteria. Maria Bennett, 24, of San Diego, Benjamin Blutstein, 25, of Susquehanna Township, Pennsylvania, Janis Ruth Coulter, 36, of Massachusetts, David Gritz, 55, of Massachusetts (and dual French-United States citizenship), and Dina Carter, 37, of North Carolina, were killed.
(30) On March 7, 2003, United States citizens Rabbi Eli Horowitz, 52, who grew up in Chicago, and Dina Horowitz, 50, who grew up in Florida, were killed in their home.
(31) On June 11, 2003, United States citizen Alan Gritz, 79, who grew up in Cincinnati, was killed in a bus bombing in Jerusalem.
(32) On June 20, 2003, United States citizen Tzvi Goldstein, 47, originally from New York City, was shot and killed in an attack while driving through the West Bank.
(33) On June 20, 2003, five United States citizens were killed in a bombing of a Hebrew University cafeteria. Marla Bennett, 24, of San Diego, Benjamin Blutstein, 25, of Susquehanna Township, Pennsylvania, Janis Ruth Coulter, 36, of Massachusetts, David Gritz, 55, of Massachusetts (and dual French-United States citizenship), and Dina Carter, 37, of North Carolina, were killed.
(34) At least another 79 United States citizens have been injured in Palestinian terrorist attacks, including United States citizen Jack Baxter, 50, of New York City, who was injured on April 30, 2003, in a bombing at a Tel Aviv coffee shop.
(35) The official Palestinian Authority television broadcast on March 14, 2003, of a live sermon calling for the destruction of the United States caused a blaring of sirens to attempt to incite violence against United States and Israeli citizens.
(b) STATEMENTS OF POLICY.—(a) The President is authorized to transfer vessels to foreign countries on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321), as follows:
1. BAHRAIN.—To the Government of Bahrain, the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigate GEORGE PHILIP (FFG 12).
2. PORTUGAL.—To the Government of Portugal, the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigate SIDES (FFG 14).
3. TRANSFERS BY SALE.—The President is authorized to transfer vessels to foreign countries under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2770) as follows:
1. BRAZIL.—To the Government of Brazil, the SPRUANCE class destructor O'BRIEN (DD 995).
2. CHILE.—To the Government of Chile, the SPRUANCE class destructor FLETCHER (DD 992).
3. TURKEY.—To the Government of Turkey, the ANCHORAGE class dock landing ship ANCHORAGE (LSD 36).
(36) The Secretary shall annually report to Congress the annual total of transferred excess defense articles. The value of a vessel transferred to another country on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321) is determined as follows:
1. BAHRAIN.—To the Government of Bahrain, the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigate GEORGE PHILIP (FFG 12).
2. PORTUGAL.—To the Government of Portugal, the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigate SIDES (FFG 14).
3. TRANSFERS BY SALE.—The President is authorized to transfer vessels to foreign countries under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2770) as follows:
1. BRAZIL.—To the Government of Brazil, the SPRUANCE class destructor O'BRIEN (DD 995).
2. CHILE.—To the Government of Chile, the SPRUANCE class destructor FLETCHER (DD 992).
3. TURKEY.—To the Government of Turkey, the ANCHORAGE class dock landing ship ANCHORAGE (LSD 36).
(37) In any bill or joint resolution authorizing the transfer of a vessel to a foreign country, performed at a shipyard located in the United States, including a United States Navy shipyard.
(f) EXPEDITION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority in section 735 shall expire at the end of the two-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.
Amendment No. 28 offered by Mr. HYDE: Strike section 227 (relating to GAO assessment of security capital cost sharing) and insert the following:
SEC. 227. SECURITY CAPITAL COST SHARING.
(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The first section of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 256) is amended by adding at the end of 3 of the following:
"(c) SECURITY CAPITAL COST-SHARING PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary of State, as the single manager of all buildings and grounds acquired under this Act or otherwise acquired or authorized for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments in foreign countries, is authorized to establish and implement a Security Capital Cost-Sharing Program to collect funds from each agency on the basis of the total overseas presence in a manner that encourages rightsizing of its overseas presence, and, in addition, to accelerate the provision of safe, secure, functional buildings for United States Government personnel overseas.
"(2) The Secretary is authorized to determine annually and charge each Federal agency the amount to be collected under paragraph (1) from the agency. To determine such amount, the Secretary may prescribe and use a formula that takes into account the number of authorized positions of each agency, including any locally hired personnel, who are assigned to United States diplomatic facilities and are under the authority of a chief of mission pursuant to section 207 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3907).
"(3) The head of an agency charged a fee under this section shall remit the amount of the fee to the Secretary of State through the Intra-Governmental Payment and Collection System or other appropriate means.
(38) There shall be established on the books of the Treasury General Fund an account to be known as the 'Security Capital Cost-Sharing Program Fund', which shall be administered by the Secretary. There shall be deposited into the account all amounts authorized by the Secretary pursuant to the authority under paragraph (1), and such funds shall remain available until expended. Such funds shall be used solely for the purchase of new, safe, secure, functional diplomatic facilities that comply with all applicable legal standards, including those standards established by the authority of the Secretary of State for the Provision of Security and Counterterrorism Act of 1999. The Secretary shall include in the Department of State’s Congressional Presentation Document an accounting of the sources and uses of the amounts deposited into the account.
(g) The Secretary shall not collect a fee for any authorized function of the Federal Government that has been or would be granted a waiver pursuant to section 603(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (22 U.S.C. 4853(a)(2)(B)(i)).
In this subsection—
(A) the term 'agency of the Federal Government' includes the Interagency Cooperative Administrative Support Service; and
"(B) the term 'United States diplomatic facility' has the meaning given that term in..."
section 603 of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (22 U.S.C. 4865 note)).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2004.

Amendment No. 29 offered by Mr. Hyde:
In section 1712 of the bill, strike all after "United States passports) strike 'travelers' both places it appears and insert 'travelers'." Strike line 34 on page 43 through line 2 on page 79.

Add a new subsection, to be known as section 116(e), after section 120(e) of the bill, and strike ``For fiscal year 2004."

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. Lantos:
In section 1713 of the bill (relating to enhanced police training)—
(1) strike the second paragraph (1) as paragraph (2).
(2) insert after title XVI the following new title:
(3) strike ``For fiscal year 2004'' and insert "Travelers'' and "Fiscal year 2004".

In the first sentence of section 130(b)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as proposed to be added by section 126(e) of the bill, strike "For fiscal year fiscal year 2004" and insert "For fiscal year 2004".

Amendment No. 30 offered by Mr. Lantos:
In section 1713 of the bill (relating to enhanced police training)—
(1) strike "Section 606(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961" and insert "(a) in General...".
(2) add at the end the following new subsection:
(a) Notification Requirement.—Section 606 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2320) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:
(1) Each funds may be obligated for assistance under subsection (b)(8) unless the Secretary of State notifies the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives of the amount and the proposed assistance at least 15 days in advance of the proposed obligation in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications pursuant to section 534A of this Act. This notification shall include a comprehensive report and, wherever practicable, include a plan describing the police assistance and rule of law programs of relevant United States agencies for each country which is to receive assistance under section 606(b)(8).

Amendment No. 31 offered by Mrs. Maloney:
In Division B of the bill—
(1) redesignate title XVII as title XVIII (and conform all sections therein accordingly and conform the table of contents); and
(2) insert after title XVI the following new title (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE XVII—ACCESS FOR AFGHAN WOMEN

SEC. 1701. SHORT TITLE.
This title may be cited as the "Access for Afghan Women Act of 2003".

SEC. 1702. FINDINGS.
Congress makes the following findings:
(1) Despite the removal of the Taliban from power, women in Afghanistan continue to experience brutal and frequent violation of their human rights, generally outside of Kabul where warlords are reasserting control.
(2) Strong and continued support from the United States and the international community can ensure that the advances made by Afghan women since the fall of the Taliban will continue and grow, rather than recede.
(3) While the United States and the international community continue to make substantial contributions to emergency humanitarian and relief operations in Afghanistan, the establishment of a stable, peaceful, prosperous, and democratic Afghanistan with a broad-based, multi-ethnic, gender-sensitive, and inclusive government requires a significant increase in long-term investments in development and reconstruction assistance.
(4) The maternal mortality rate in Afghanistan is among the highest in the world, with recent reports estimating that every 30 minutes an Afghan woman dies of pregnancy related causes, or approximately 15,000 women each year. The estimated maternal mortality rate of 1,600 deaths per 100,000 live births can be reduced through access to primary health care services, including basic birthing supplies, emergency obstetric care, prenatal and postnatal care, contraception, and prevention and treatment for the effects of sexual coercion and rape.
(5) Women comprise 75 percent or more of the refugees and internally displaced in camps, urban areas, and villages in Afghanistan.
(6) 85 percent of Afghanistan's population lives in rural areas. The women in rural areas perform hard work in production, processing, and preparation. Successful reconstruction and development assistance must target rural women as part of any agricultural and rural development plan.
(7) Afghanistan is among the highest in the world, with recent reports estimating that every 30 minutes an Afghan woman dies of pregnancy related causes, or approximately 15,000 women each year. The estimated maternal mortality rate of 1,600 deaths per 100,000 live births can be reduced through access to primary health care services, including basic birthing supplies, emergency obstetric care, prenatal and postnatal care, contraception, and prevention and treatment for the effects of sexual coercion and rape.
(8) The Afghan Ministry for Women's Affairs is an important ministry that is essential for re-establishing women's human rights, ensuring that women are included in all development efforts, and delivering critical health and economic and humanitarian assistance. Women comprise 75 percent or more of the refugees and internally displaced in camps, urban areas, and villages in Afghanistan.
(9) Afghan women are taking the initiative to reach across the conflict divide and foster peace. Women's perspectives and experiences in seeking solutions to conflicts are necessary to ensure a peaceful Afghanistan.
(10) The inadequate security situation in Afghanistan disproportionately impacts women and girls as the lack of rule of law results in the frequent assault, kidnapping, and sexual abuse of Afghan women and girls throughout Afghanistan.
(11) Despite significant improvements in healthcare and infrastructure for women and girls in Afghanistan, the lack of security and rule of law throughout most of Afghanistan effectively denies access to these facilities and the critical services they provide.

SEC. 1703. ESTABLISHMENT OF AFGHAN WOMEN'S FUND.
(a) Establishment.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall establish a fund for the purpose of assisting women and girls in Afghanistan in establishing political and human rights, health care, education, training, security, and shelter.
(b) Activities Supported.—The fund established under subsection (a) shall support the activities described in section 103(a)(7) of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 and the following activities:
(1) Direct financial and programmatic assistance to the Ministry of Women's Affairs in Afghanistan (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Ministry") to promote the strengthening of the Ministry as the Government of Afghanistan continues its transition to a long-term government structure and to increase the quality and scope of these services to Afghan women and girls.
(2) Direct financial assistance to the National Human Rights Commission of Afghanistan.
(3) Construction of women's educational facilities in Afghanistan.
(c) Authorization of Appropriations.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not less than $22,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005 and such sums as are necessary for each subsequent fiscal year.

SEC. 1704. ASSISTANCE TO AFGHANISTAN.
Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not less than 15 percent of the aggregate amount of economic and humanitarian assistance authorized to be appropriated under sections 116(a)(1) to 116(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for each of the fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005 shall be made available for assistance directly to Afghan women-led organizations, including Afghan women-led organizations, with demonstrated experience in delivering services to Afghan women and children to support their programmatic activities and organizational development. In recognition of the appreciating capacity of Afghan-led local non-governmental organizations, including Afghan women-led organizations, an appropriate percentage of the aggregate amount of economic and humanitarian assistance authorized to be appropriated under sections 116(a)(1) to 116(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for each of the fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005 shall be made available for assistance directly to Afghan women-led organizations, including Afghan women-led organizations.

SEC. 1705. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO UNITED STATES ACTIVITIES IN AFGHANISTAN.
(a) In General.—Activities described in subsections (b) through (e) that are carried out by the United States in Afghanistan should comply with the applicable requirements contained in such subsections.
(b) Governance of Afghanistan.—With respect to the governance of Afghanistan, the applicable requirements are the following:
(1) Include the perspectives and advice of Afghan women's organizations, networks, and leaders in United States policymaking related to the governance of Afghanistan.
(2) Provide the inclusion of a significant number of women in future legislative bodies to ensure that women's full range of human rights are included in the constitution or legal structures of Afghanistan.
(3) Encourage the appointment of women to high level positions within Afghan Ministries.
(c) Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development.—With respect to activities relating to post-conflict stability in Afghanistan, the applicable requirements are the following:
(1) Encourage United States organizations that receive funds authorized by this title to partner with or create Afghan-led counterpart organizations and provide these organizations with significant financial resources, technical assistance, and capacity building. Such organizations include Afghan-led organizations, including Afghan women-led organizations.
(3) Provide long-term financial assistance for primary, secondary, higher, nontraditional, and vocational education for Afghan girls, women, boys, and men.

(4) Integrate education and training programs for former combatants with economic development programs to encourage their reintegration into society and to promote post-conflict stability.

(5) Provide assistance to rehabilitate children affected by the conflict, particularly child soldiers.

(6) Integrate educational efforts to increase awareness with respect to landmines, facilitate the removal of landmines, and provide services to individuals with disabilities caused by landmines.

(d) Afghan Military and Police.—With respect to training for military and police forces in Afghanistan, the applicable requirements are the following:

(1) Include training on the protection, rights, and the particular needs of women and emphasize that violations of women’s rights are intolerable and should be prosecuted.

(2) Encourage such trainers who will carry out the activities in paragraph (1) to consult with non-governmental organizations in Afghanistan to ensure that training content and materials are adequate, appropriate, and comprehensive.

(e) Relief, Resettlement, and Repatriation of Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons.—With respect to the relief, resettlement, and repatriation of refugees and internally displaced persons in Afghanistan, the applicable requirements are the following:

(1) Take all necessary steps to ensure that women refugees and internally displaced persons in camps, urban areas, and villages are directly receiving food aid, shelter, relief supplies, and other services from United States-sponsored programs.

(2) Take all necessary steps to ensure that women refugees in camps, urban areas, and villages are accessing high-quality health services, including primary, maternal, child, and mental health services.

(3) Take all necessary steps to ensure that women and children in refugee camps are protected from sexual exploitation.

(4) Take all necessary steps to ensure refugees and internally displaced persons that seek to return to their place of origin can do so voluntarily, safely, and with the full protection of their rights. United States-sponsored efforts shall not coerce refugees or internally displaced persons to return to their places of origin.

SEC. 1706. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall prepare and transmit to Congress a report that contains documentation of the progress in implementing the requirements of section 1705. All data in the report shall be disaggregated by gender.

Amendment No. 34 offered by Mr. Smith of New Jersey:

Add at the end of the bill the following new division (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

DIVISION C—ASSISTANCE FOR VIET NAM

TITLE X—CONDITIONS ON INCREASED NONHUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF VIET NAM

SEC. 2001. BILATERAL NONHUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.

(a) Assistance.—

(1) In general.—United States nonhumanitarian assistance may not be provided to the Government of Viet Nam in an amount exceeding the amount so provided for fiscal year 2003—

(A) for fiscal year 2004 unless not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act the President determines and certifies to Congress that the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (2) have been met during the 12-month period ending on the date of the certification; and

(B) for each subsequent fiscal year unless the President certifies to Congress in the most recent annual report submitted pursuant to section 501 that the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (2) have been met during the 12-month period covered by the report.

(2) Requirements.—The requirements of this paragraph are that—

(A) the Government of Viet Nam has made substantial progress toward releasing all political and religious prisoners from imprisonment, house arrest, and other forms of detention;

(B)(i) the Government of Viet Nam has made substantial progress toward respecting the right to freedom of religion, including the right to participate in religious activities and institutions by or involvement of the Government; and

(ii) has made substantial progress toward returning estates and properties confiscated from the church or its affiliated organizations;

(C) the Government of Viet Nam has made substantial progress toward allowing Vietnamese nationals free and open access to United States-sponsord programs.

(D) the Government of Viet Nam has made substantial progress toward respecting the human rights of members of ethnic minority groups in the Central Highlands and elsewhere in Viet Nam; and

(E)(i) neither any official of the Government of Viet Nam nor any agency or entity directly receiving food aid, shelter, relief supplies, and other services from United States-sponsord programs shall be complicit in a severe form of trafficking in persons;

(ii) the Government of Viet Nam shall provide or take all appropriate steps to end any such complicity and hold such official, agency, or entity fully accountable for its conduct.

(b) EXCEPTION.—

(1) Continuation of assistance in the national interest.—Notwithstanding the failure of the Government of Viet Nam to meet the requirements of subsection (a)(2), the President may waive the application of subparagraph (a)(2) if the President determines that the provision to the Government of Viet Nam of increased United States nonhumanitarian assistance would advance the purposes of this Act or is otherwise in the national interest of the United States.

(2) Exercise of waiver authority.—The President may exercise the authority under paragraph (2) with respect to—

(A) all United States nonhumanitarian assistance to Viet Nam; or

(B) one or more programs, projects, or activities of such assistance.

(c) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Severe form of trafficking in persons.—The term “severe form of trafficking in persons” means any activity described in section 103(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–386 (114 Stat. 1470); 22 U.S.C. 7102(b)).

(2) United States nonhumanitarian assistance.—The term “United States nonhumanitarian assistance” means—

(A) any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including programs under title IV of chapter 2 of part I of that Act, relating to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation), other than—

(i) disaster relief assistance, including any assistance under chapter 9 of part I of that Act;

(ii) assistance which involves the provision of food (including monetization of food) or medicine; and

(iii) assistance for refugees; and

(B) other nonhumanitarian assistance, including assistance under the Arms Export Control Act.

TITLE XXI—ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY IN VIET NAM

SEC. 2101. ASSISTANCE.

(a) In General.—The President is authorized to provide assistance, through appropriate nongovernmental organizations, for the support of individuals and organizations to promote democracy and internationally recognized human rights in Viet Nam.

(b) Authorization of Appropriations.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out subsection (a) $2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2004 and 2005.

TITLE XXII—UNITED STATES PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

SEC. 2201. RADIO FREE ASIA TRANSMISSIONS TO VIET NAM.

(a) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—It is the policy of the United States to take such measures as are necessary to overcome the jamming by the Government of Viet Nam, including the active pursuit of broadcast facilities in close geographic proximity to Viet Nam.

(b) Authorization of Appropriations.—In addition to such amounts as are otherwise authorized to be appropriated for the Broadcasting Board of Governors, there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the policy under subsection (a) $9,100,000 for the fiscal year 2004 and $1,100,000 for the fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 2202. UNITED STATES EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS WITH VIET NAM.

It is the policy of the United States that programs of educational and cultural exchange with Viet Nam should actively promote progress toward freedom and democracy in Viet Nam by providing opportunities to Vietnamese nationals from a wide range of occupations and perspectives to see freedom and democracy in action and, also, by ensuring that Vietnamese nationals who have already demonstrated commitment to these values are included in such programs.

TITLE XXIII—UNITED STATES REFUGEE POLICY

SEC. 2301. REFUGEES RESETTLEMENT FOR NATIONALS OF VIET NAM.

(a) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—It is the policy of the United States to offer refugee resettlement to nationals of Viet Nam (including members of the Montagnard ethnic minority groups) who were eligible for the Orderly Departure Program (ODP), Resettlement Opportunities for Vietnamese Returnees (ROVR) or any other United States refugee program and who were deemed ineligible due to administrative error or who for reasons beyond the control of such individuals (including insufficient or contradictory information or the inability to pay bribes demanded by officials of the Government of Viet Nam) were unable or failed to apply for such programs in compliance with deadlines imposed by the Department of State.

(b) Authorized Activity.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for Migration and Refugee Assistance for each of the fiscal years 2005 and 2006, such sums as may be necessary are authorized to be made available for the protection (including resettlement in appropriate countries) of Vietnamese and asylum seekers, including Montagnards in Cambodia.
SEC. 2401. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) In General.—Not later than 6 months after the enactment of this Act and every 12 months thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Congress a report on the following:

(1) The determination and certification of the President that the requirements of section 2003(a)(2) have been met, if applicable;

(2) The determination of the President under section 2003(b)(2), if applicable.

(b) Efforts by the United States Government to secure transmission sites for Radio Free Asia. In close geographical proximity to Viet Nam in accordance with section 2003(a).

(c) Efforts to ensure that programs with Viet Nam promote the policy set forth in section 302 and with section 102 of the Human Rights, Refugee, and Other Foreign Policy Provisions Act of 1996 regarding participation in programs of educational and cultural exchange.

(d) Steps taken to carry out the policy under section 2003(c).

(e) Lists of persons believed to be imprisoned, detained, or placed under house arrest, tortured, or otherwise persecuted by the Government of Viet Nam due to their participation in the pursuit of internationally recognized human rights. In compiling such lists, the Secretary shall exercise appropriate discretion, including concerns regarding the safety and security of the persons who may be included on the lists and their families.

(f) In addition, the Secretary shall include a list of such persons and their families who may qualify for protection under United States refugee programs.

(g) A description of the development of the rule of law in Viet Nam, including, but not limited to—

(1) progress toward the development of institutions of democratic governance;

(2) processes by which statutes, regulations, rules, and other legal acts of the Government of Viet Nam are developed and become binding within Viet Nam;

(3) the extent to which statutes, regulations, rules, and other legal acts of the Government of Viet Nam are published and are made available for public inspection;

(4) the extent to which administrative and judicial decisions are supported by statements of reasons that are based upon written statutes, regulations, rules, and other legal acts of the Government of Viet Nam;

(5) the extent to which individuals are treated equally under the laws of Viet Nam with regard to citizenship, race, religion, political opinion, or current or former associations;

(6) the extent to which administrative and judicial decisions are supported by statements of reasons that are based upon written statutes, regulations, rules, and other legal acts of the Government of Viet Nam;

(7) the extent to which administrative and judicial decisions are supported by statements of reasons that are based upon written statutes, regulations, rules, and other legal acts of the Government of Viet Nam;

(8) the extent to which individuals are treated equally under the laws of Viet Nam with regard to citizenship, race, religion, political opinion, or current or former associations;

(9) the extent to which administrative and judicial decisions are supported by statements of reasons that are based upon written statutes, regulations, rules, and other legal acts of the Government of Viet Nam;

(h) A description of the rule of law in Viet Nam and the extent to which administrative and judicial decisions are supported by statements of reasons that are based upon written statutes, regulations, rules, and other legal acts of the Government of Viet Nam;

(i) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(j) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(k) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(l) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(m) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(n) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(o) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(p) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(q) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(r) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(s) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(t) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(u) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(v) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(w) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(x) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(y) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(z) The extent to which the protection afforded by the laws of Viet Nam are protected by the Department of State.

(Amendment No. 35 offered by Mr. SOUDER: Page 78, after line 23, insert the following section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 274. ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY OF UNITED STATES EMBASSIES, CONSULATES, AND OTHER DIPLOMATIC BUILDINGS.

It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent possible, in the construction and renovation of United States embassies, consulates, and other diplomatic buildings, the Secretary of State shall consider and seek to preserve the architectural integrity and cohesiveness of the neighborhood and environments and to minimize any disruption to the presence of the embassy, consulate, or other diplomatic building.

Amendment No. 36 offered by Mr. STEARNS: Page 211, after line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 726. SENSE OF CONGRESS GRATING ALL-
LOCATION OF RESOURCES FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF STATE AS THE
CENTRAL AUTHORITY FOR THE
UNITED STATES UNDER THE HAGUE
CONVENTION ON INTERCOUNTRY
ADOPTION.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Department of State shall consider and seek to constructively address migration and labor issues between our two countries.

Amendment No. 37 offered by Mr. DREIER: Strike section 731 (page 191, lines 22 through page 204, lines 10) and insert the following:

SEC. 731. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MI-
GRATION ISSUES BETWEEN THE
UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.

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

(1) During President Bush's first meeting with President Fox in Guanajuato, Mexico, the Presidents stated in the Joint Communique of February 16, 2001, that we are instructing our Governments to engage, at the earliest opportunity, in formal high-level negotiations aimed at achieving short and long-term agreements that will allow us to constructively address migration and labor issues between our two countries.

(2) During President Fox's official visit to Washington, D.C. on September 6, 2001, summarized the meeting as follows: "The Presidents reviewed the progress made by our joint working group on migration and national security. The Secretary of State and Secretary of the Interior, CastaZeda, and Creel and Attorney General Ashcroft and noted this represented the most fruitful and frank dialogue we have ever had on a subject important to both nations. They praised implementation of the border safety initiative, and recognized that migration-related issues are deeply felt by our publics and Vital to our prosperity, well-being, and the kind of societies we want to build. They renewed their commitment to forging new and realistic approaches to migration initiatives that are legal and dignified, and agreed on the framework within which this ongoing effort is based. This includes: matching willing workers with willing employers; serving the social and economic needs of both countries; respecting the human dignity of all migrants, regardless of their status; recognizing the contribu-
tions migrants make to enriching both soci-
eties; respecting our bilateral migration agenda," he

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

(1) the United States and Mexico should as soon as is practicable commence negotiations in an attempt to reach a migration accord that is as comprehensive as possible and which addresses the key issues of concern for both nations; and

(2) that as part of any migration agreement between the United States and Mexico, the issues of the extradition of violent criminals and law enforcement cooperation between the two nations be addressed.

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 77, after line 3, insert the following new section and (amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 258. AMENDMENT AND ENLARGEMENT OF IRISH PEACE PROCESS CULTURAL AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) AMENDMENT OF PROGRAM.—


(2) by adding at the end "No partici-
patant in the program may receive a degree from an institution of higher education."
(A) by striking "35 years of age or younger having a residence" and inserting "21 to 35 years of age, unemployed for not less than 6 months, having resided for not less than 6 months in the Republic of Ireland or the United Kingdom,"; and

(B) by striking "36 months" and inserting "24 months".

(3) Section 221(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1121(e)) is amended—

(a) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subparagraph (1):  

"(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), no person admitted under section 101(a)(15)(V)(ii)(I) or acquiring such status after admission shall be eligible to apply for an immigrant visa, an adjustment to permanent residence, or for nonimmigrant visa status under this Act until it is established that such person has resided and been physically present in the country of nationality or last residence for an aggregate of at least two years following departure from the United States.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the requirement of such one-year foreign residence abroad if the Secretary determines that—

(1) departure from the United States would not result in exceptional hardship upon the alien's spouse or child (if such spouse or child is a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence);

(2) the admission of the alien is in the public interest or the national interest of the United States;

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING CHANGES.—


(1) in subsection (d)(1) by striking "2006," and inserting "2005;"

(2) in subsection (d)(2) by striking "2006," and inserting "2011;"

(3) by striking (a)(3) by inserting "the last three program years and for the 3 subsequent years," and inserting "each program year;"


(1) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new section:

"(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

The Secretary shall add additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(g) CLARIFICATION OF LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the conveyance of ownership of the aircraft to the Army Aviation Heritage Foundation, the United States shall not be liable for any death, injury, loss, or damage that results from any use of that aircraft by any person other than the United States.

Amendment No. 42 offered by Mr. HEFLY: After title VII, add the following new section and conform the table of contents accordingly:

SEC. 1113. CONDITION ON THE PROVISION OF CERTAIN FUNDS TO INDONESIA.

(a) CONDITION ON ASSISTANCE.—Subject to subsection (c), no funds made available under section 661(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 6201) or chapter 22 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347 et seq.) in fiscal year 2004, other than funds made available for expanded military education and training programs, may be made available for a program that involves the Government of Indonesia or the Indonesian Armed Forces until the President certifies to Congress that the certification described in subsection (b) is in effect.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—The certification referred to in subsection (a) is a certification submitted by the President to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of Indonesia and the Indonesian Armed Forces have taken effective measures, including cooperating with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—

(1) to conduct a full investigation of the attack on United States citizens in West Papua, Indonesia on August 31, 2002; and

(2) to criminally prosecute the individuals responsible for such attack.

(c) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall prohibit the United States Government from continuing to conduct programs or training with the Indonesian Armed Forces, including joint exercises, official visits, port visits, or educational exchanges that are being conducted on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that Crane amend—

From the end of title VII of the bill, add the following new section and (conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1. ATTACKS ON UNITED STATES CITIZENS BY PALESTINIAN TERRORISTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Since Yasser Arafat renounced violence in the Oslo Peace Accords on September 13, 1993, at least 41 United States citizens have been murdered by Palestinian terrorists and one United States citizen miscarried after being stabbed in a Palestinian terrorist attack.

(2) On December 1, 1993, in a drive-by shooting north of Jerusalem, Hamas killed United States citizen Yitzhak Weinstock, 19, whose family came from Los Angeles.

(3) On October 9, 1994, in a drive-by attack on a bus near Kfar Darom killed United States citizen Alisa Flatow, 20, from West Orange, New Jersey.

(4) On April 9, 1995, an Islamic jihad bomb attack on a bus near Kfar Darom killed United States citizen Alisa Flatow, 20, from West Orange, New Jersey.

(5) On April 21, 1995, in a Hamas bus bombing in Jerusalem, United States citizen Joan Davenny, from New Haven, Connecticut, was killed.

(6) On September 9, 1995, Mara Frey of Chicago was stabbed in Maa'ale Michmash resulting in her unborn child's death.

(7) On February 25, 1996, three United States citizens, Sara Duker of Teaneck, New Jersey, Matthew Eisenfeld of West Hartford, Connecticut, and Ira Weinstein of New York City, were killed in a Hamas bus bombing in Jerusalem.

(8) On May 13, 1996, United States citizen David Boim, 17, of New York City, was killed in a drive-by shooting near Beit El, north of Jerusalem.

(9) On June 9, 1996, United States citizen Yaron Ungar was killed in a drive-by-shootout near Beit Shemesh.

(10) On July 30, 1997, United States citizen Leah Stern of Passiac, New Jersey, was killed in a Hamas bombing in Jerusalem's Mahane Yehuda market.

(11) On September 4, 1997, a Hamas bombing on Ben-Yehuda Street, Jerusalem, killed Yael Botwin, 14, of Los Angeles.


(13) On October 8, 2000, Rabbi Hillel Levine, 36, of New York City, was stabbed and killed near Nablus.

(14) On October 30, 2000, United States citizen Esh-Kodesh Gilmore, 25, was shot in Jerusalem.

(15) On December 31, 2000, Rabbi Binyamin Kahane, 34, and his wife, Talia Hertzlich Kahane, both formerly of New York City, were killed in a drive-by shooting near Ofra.

(16) On May 9, 2001, J acob "Koby" Mandel, 13, of Silver Spring, Maryland, was killed in an attack near Tekoach.

(17) On May 20, 2001, Sarah Blaustein, 53, of Lawrence, New York, was killed in a drive-by shooting near Efrat.

(18) On August 9, 2001, two United States citizens, Judith L. Milstein, 31, and Malka Roth, 15, were killed in the Jerusalem Sbarro pizzeria bombing.
(19) On November 4, 2001, Shoshana Ben-Yishai, 16, of New York City, was shot and killed during an attack on a Jerusalem bus. (20) On January 15, 2002, Avraham Boaz, 72, of New York City, was killed in a shooting near Bethlehem. (21) On February 15, 2002, United States citizen Aaron Elvis, 32, was killed in a bombing in Hadera. (22) On February 16, 2002, United States citizen Lee Akunis, was shot and killed near Ramallah. (23) On February 16, 2002, Keren Shatsky, 14, of New York City, was killed in a bombing in Karmel Shomron. (24) On March 4, 2002, United States citizen Moran Amit, 25, was stabbed and killed in Abu Tor Peace Forest, Jerusalem. (25) On March 24, 2002, Esther Kleinman, 23, formerly of Chicago, was shot and killed near Ofra. (26) On March 27, 2002, United States citizen Hannah Rogen, 90, was killed in a shooting near Bethlehem. (27) On June 18, 2002, Moshe Gottlieb, 70, of Los Angeles, was killed in a bus bombing in Jerusalem. (28) On June 19, 2002, United States citizen Gila Sara Kessler, 19, was killed in a bombing at a Jerusalem bus stop. (29) On July 31, 2002, five United States citizens were killed in a bombing of a Hebrew University cafeteria: Marla Bennett, 24, of San Diego, Benjamin Blutstein, 25, of Susquehanna Township, Pennsylvania, Janis Ruth Coulter, 30, of Massachusetts, David Gritz, 24, of Peru, Massachusetts (and of dual French-United States citizenship), and Dina Carter, 37, of North Carolina. (30) On March 5, 2003, Abigail Leitel, 14, who was born in Lebanon, New Hampshire, died in a bus bombing in Haifa. (31) On March 7, 2003, United States citizens Rachel Elia, 22, who grew up in Chicago, and Dina Horowitz, 50, who grew up in Florida, were killed in their home. (32) On June 11, 2003, United States citizen Alan Beer, 47, who grew up in Cleveland, was killed in bus bombing in Jerusalem. (33) On June 20, 2003, United States citizen Tzvi Goldstein, 47, originally from New York City, was killed and killed in an attack while driving through the West Bank. (34) At least another 79 United States citizens have been injured in Palestinian terrorist attacks. (b) STATEMENTS OF POLICY.—Congress— (1) condemns the attacks on United States citizens and on Palestinian terrorists; (2) calls on the Palestinian Authority to work with Israel to protect all innocent individuals, regardless of citizenship, from terrorist atrocities; (3) offers its condolences to the families and loved ones of United States citizens who were killed by Palestinian terrorist attacks; and (4) calls on the Secretary of State to include a listing of the killing of every United States citizen by terrorists in the “Chronology” and “Significant Terrorist Incidents,” as included in the Department of State’s Patterns of Global Terrorism Report issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA. The amendment as modified is as follows:

SEC. 275. INADMISSIBILITY OF ALIENS SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTORS AND RELATIVES OF ABductORS.—(a) NOTICE OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.—The Secretary of State shall establish procedures to ensure that appropriate United States Embassies abroad are notified of the possible presence in that country of any child who has been the subject of international child abduction in violation of the order of a court in the United States. (b) GUIDELINES FOR SANCTUARY.—The Secretary of State shall promulgate guidelines for United States Embassies abroad concerning procedures relating to sanctuary at such facilities for children who are the subject of international child abduction. (c) IDENTIFICATION OF ALIENS SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTORS AND RELATIVES OF ABductORS.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(a)(10)(C)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(10)(C)(iii)) is amended— (2) in subclause (I), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon; (3) in subclause (II), by striking “or” and inserting “and”; (4) by amending subclause (I) to read as follows:— (II) is a spouse (other than the spouse who is the parent of the abducted child), child (other than the abducted child), parent, sibling, cousin, uncle, aunt, nephew, niece, or grandparent of an alien described in clause (I), is an agent of such an alien, or is a principal indispensable to an agent, if such person has been designated by the Secretary of State at the Secretary's sole and unreviewable discretion, is inadmissible until such child is surrendered to the person granted custody by the order described in that clause, and such custody is in the best interest of the child; and (5) by striking clause (ii) and inserting— (IV) is a spouse of the abducted child described in clause (I), if such person has been designated by the Secretary of State at the Secretary's sole and unreviewable discretion; or (d) in subclause (II), by striking— (I) the term ‘child’ means an individual— (I) the term ‘child’ means an individual— (II) in which an authority under this subparagraph was exercised (and with respect to each such case, the specific ground for inadmissibility shall be specified); and (III) in which an authority under this subparagraph has not been exercised but in which an order by a court in the United States granting custody to a person of a United States citizen child, detained or retained the child, or withheld the child, shall be deemed to have been issued by the Secretary of State from the person granted custody by that order. (e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subparagraph— (I) the term ‘child’ includes individuals who was a child at the time the individual was detained or retained, or at the time custody was withheld, as described in clause (i), regardless of the age or marital status of the individual after such time; and (II) the term ‘sibling’ includes a step-sibling or half-sibling.”.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DREIER. The amendment, as modified is as follows: Strike section 731 (page 199, line 22 through page 204, line 10) and insert the following:

SEC. 731. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MIGRATION RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds as follows:

(1) During President Bush’s first meeting with President Fox in Guanajuato, Mexico, the Presidents stated in the Joint Communique of February 1, 2001 that “we are restructuring our Governments to engage, at the earliest opportunity, in formal high level negotiations aimed at achieving short and long-term agreements that will allow us to constructively address migration and labor issues between our two countries.”

(2) During President Fox’s official visit to Washington, D.C., the Joint Statement of September 6, 2001, summarized the meeting as follows: “The Presidents reviewed the progress made by our joint working group on migration chaired by Secretaries Powell, CastaZeda, and Creel and Attorney General Ashcroft and noted this represented the most fruitful and frank dialogue we have ever had on the issue so important to both Societies. They praised implementation of the border safety initiative, and recognized that migration-related issues are deeply felt by our publics and vital to our prosperity, well being, and the kind of societies we want to build. They renewed their commitment to forging new and realistic approaches to migration that ensure it remains a legal and dignified, and agreed on the framework within in which this ongoing effort is based. This includes: matching willing workers with willing employers; serving the social and economic needs of both countries; respecting the human dignity of all migrants, regardless of their status; recognizing the contributions that migrants make to both Societies; shared responsibility for ensuring migration takes place through safe and legal channels. Both stressed their commitment to continue our discussions, instructing the high-level working group to reach mutually satisfactory results on border safety, a temporary worker program and the status of undocumented Mexicans in the United States. They requested that the working group provide them proposals with respect to these issues as soon as possible. The Presidents agreed that this is a rapidly evolving and challenging area of public policy, and that it is critical to address the issue in a timely manner and with appropriate thoroughness and depth.”

(3) On September 7, 2001, during President Fox’s historic State Visit to Washington, the
United States and Mexico issued a joint statement instructing our cabinet-level working group to provide us with specific proposals to forge a new and realistic framework that will establish a safe, legal, orderly, and dignified migration flow between our countries. We have today agreed that our Cabinet-level migration group should continue to work closely together with the States Binational Commission (BNC) meetings in an attempt to reach a migration accord that will address the key issues of concern for both nations; and that as part of any migration agreement between the United States and Mexico, the implementation of violent criminals and law enforcement cooperation between the two nations be addressed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. There is no objection. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments are modified.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the resolution, 336, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 10 minutes.

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

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

I rise in strong support of the Hyde en bloc amendments. This measure includes a number of critical amendments that were ruled in order by the Committee on Rules. They include initiatives in support of U.S. companies and U.S. workers obtaining procurement contracts from our foreign policy agencies, improvements in our visa application processes, and the establishment of an Inter-American Commission to work on key issues of concern to the United States and Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. BORDALLO), and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. MALONEY)?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZULLO), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SCHIFF), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ADELAIDE Y. HYDE), the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY)? The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. There is objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. INGELSTADT)?

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for an opportunity to talk about what has happened to manufacturing in our country and to thank the gentleman for including this amendment in the en bloc amendments.

In the latest report out by the National Association for Manufacturing, the executive summary ends on this statement: "If this U.S. manufacturing base continues to shrink at its present rate and its critical mass is lost, the manufacturing innovation process will shift to other global centers. Once that happens, a decline in U.S. living standards in the future is virtually assured."

What this amendment does, it requires the State Department to increase the content of the articles, materials and supplies for construction, alteration or repair, to increase it from the 50 percent that it is currently at to 65 percent. It is a modest amendment, but it takes the acquisitions that our government has and uses them to level the playing field so as to assure contracts to help out this precious manufacturing base.

We have lost nearly 3 million manufacturing jobs in the past 2 the half years. Fifty-four thousand manufacturing jobs are lost every month, and that has been continuous for the past 30 months. So we come to the United States Congress and the House of Representatives and we say something has to be done to prevent the destruction of manufacturing in this country. This amendment helps out because it increases the content, which assures more manufacturing jobs for the manufacturers of America.

SECURING AMERICA’S FUTURE: THE CASE FOR A STRONG MANUFACTURING BASE

U.S. manufacturing is the heart of a significant process that generates economic growth and has produced the highest living standards in history. But today this complex success faces serious domestic and international challenges which, if not overcome, will lead to reduced economic growth and ultimately a decline in living standards for future generations of Americans.

Manufacturing’s innovation process is the key to present, past and future prosperity. Lower living standards, which make it is hidden from view and poorly understood.

Manufacturing’s innovation process provides enormous benefits for the entire U.S. economy:

- Grows the Economy—Manufacturing growth spurs more additional economic activities and jobs that any other economic sector. Every $1 of final demand for manufactured goods generates an additional $0.67 in other manufactured products and $0.76 in products and services from nonmanufacturing sectors.

- Invents the Future—Manufacturers are responsible for almost two-thirds of all private sector R&D—$127 billion in 2002. Spillovers from this R&D benefit other manufacturing and nonmanufacturing firms. R&D spillovers are enhanced by geographic proximity.

- Generates Productivity Increases—Manufacturing productivity gains are historically higher than those of any other economic sector—over the past two decades, manufacturing averaged twice the productivity gains of the rest of the private sector. These gains enable Americans to do more with less, increase our ability to compete, and facilitates higher wages for all employees.

- Provides More Rewarding Employment—Manufacturing salaries and benefits average $54,000, higher than the average for the total private sector. Two factors in particular attract workers to manufacturing: higher pay and benefits, and opportunities for advanced education and training.

- Pays the Taxes—Manufacturing has been an important contributor to regional economic growth and tax revenues at all levels of government. During the 1990s, manufacturing corporations paid 30–34 percent of all corporate taxes collected by state and local governments, Social Security and payroll taxes, excise taxes, import and tariff duties, environmental taxes and license taxes.

Meanwhile, other nations, recognizing that a strong manufacturing base is the proven path to a world-class economy, have been learning from the American example and are forging their own innovation processes to compete with ours.

America’s manufacturing innovation process requires a critical mass to generate wealth and higher standards of living. If the U.S. manufacturing base continues to diminish at its present rate that process may deteriorate beyond repair and with it the seedbed
of our industrial strength and competitive edge.

The most serious challenges to the long-term viability of the U.S. manufacturing base and the innovation process that underlie it are:

Loss of Jobs—U.S. manufacturers historically lead the way in an economic expansion, but are lagging in recovery from the recent recession. Since July 2000, manufacturing has lost 2.3 million jobs, many of which have been outsourced or relocated overseas. Manufacturing output has shown no growth since December 2001—the official end of the recession—in the weakest manufacturing sector since 1910.

Loss of Export Potential—Manufacturing exports as a share of GDP have contracted since 1997, reflecting the strong dollar overseas, the recession of 2001, and the terrorist attacks in the United States in September 2001, and increased global competition. The U.S. trade deficit has ballooned to historic highs—reflecting an increase in purchases of foreign-made goods, especially from countries which do not freely float their currencies.

Investing Abroad Elsewhere—U.S. manufacturing’s share of capital investment and R&D expenditures, once a dominant feature of our nation’s commitment to progress, is disappearing. According to the Census Bureau, manufacturing invests two-thirds of private R&D; their R&D spending between 2000 and 2002 grew at only half the pace of the previous decade.

Needed Workers—Despite the loss of 2.3 million jobs, manufacturing is facing a potential shortfall of highly qualified employees with specific educational backgrounds and especially those with specific skills needed to produce manufactured goods. If the skills and knowledge of the American workforce do not improve it will be detrimental to manufacturing’s competitive edge and to the prospect for economic growth.

Facing Dramatically Rising Costs—The cost of doing business in the United States is rising dramatically, in large measure because of significant costs related to healthcare, litigation, and regulation. As a result, many U.S. manufacturers shut down or move production overseas to countries where they do not face, to the same extent, those kinds of impediments to reducing production.

U.S. manufacturing’s innovation process leads to investments in equipment and people. The U.S. manufacturing sector conducts two-thirds of private R&D, and these R&D expenditures are matched by federal and state funding.

This intricate process generates new and improved products and processes. This intricate process generates economic growth and higher living standards superior to any other economic sector. But serious challenges threaten to undermine the critical mass of manufacturing necessary to maintain a dynamic innovation process.

Investing Abroad Elsewhere—U.S. manufacturing’s share of capital investment and R&D expenditures, once a dominant feature of our nation’s commitment to progress, is disappearing. According to the Census Bureau, manufacturing invests two-thirds of private R&D; their R&D spending between 2000 and 2002 grew at only half the pace of the previous decade.

Needed Workers—Despite the loss of 2.3 million jobs, manufacturing is facing a potential shortfall of highly qualified employees with specific educational backgrounds and especially those with specific skills needed to produce manufactured goods. If the skills and knowledge of the American workforce do not improve it will be detrimental to manufacturing’s competitive edge and to the prospect for economic growth.

Facing Dramatically Rising Costs—The cost of doing business in the United States is rising dramatically, in large measure because of significant costs related to healthcare, litigation, and regulation. As a result, many U.S. manufacturers shut down or move production overseas to countries where they do not face, to the same extent, those kinds of impediments to reducing production.

U.S. manufacturing’s innovation process leads to investments in equipment and people. The U.S. manufacturing sector conducts two-thirds of private R&D, and these R&D expenditures are matched by federal and state funding.

This intricate process generates new and improved products and processes. This intricate process generates economic growth and higher living standards superior to any other economic sector. But serious challenges threaten to undermine the critical mass of manufacturing necessary to maintain a dynamic innovation process. The U.S. manufacturing base continues to shrink at its present rate and the critical mass is lost, the manufacturing innovation process will shift to other global centers. Once that happens, a decline in U.S. living standards in the future is virtually assured.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

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

I wanted to speak in support of the amendment which expresses a sense of the Congress concerning the liberation of Iraq. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member, and the State Department for supporting this change.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BERREUTER).

Mr. BERREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendments and appreciate the fact that it includes amendment No. 22, so I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

This amendment offered by this Member begins with a set of findings concerning the liberation of Iraq by U.S. coalition forces, the current situation on the ground and the challenges and demands facing American military forces and American taxpayers in bringing stability to Iraq. The amendment proceeds with a statement by President Bush that, "The rise of Iraq as an example of moderation and democracy and prosperity is a massive and long-term undertaking," and testimony by Defense Secretary Rumsfeld that, "We certainly want assistance from NATO and from NATO countries."

This amendment exactly parallels the amendment offered by Senator BIDEN, endorsed by Senator LUGAR which passed the Senate recently by a 97-0 vote. In the operative section, the amendment expresses the sense of Congress that it is in the national security interest of the United States to remain engaged in Iraq in order to ensure a peaceful, stable, unified Iraq with a representative government.

The amendment goes on to suggest that the President should consider a foreign policy that reflects a greater role in Iraq and that other NATO allies and other nations should provide military forces and civilian police to promote security, not the U.N. itself. The situation in Iraq is far too dangerous for a U.N. peacekeeping operation. It deserves to have the first-rate one, N.O.O.

Mr. Chairman, this Member believes we have no option but to remain engaged in Iraq, but this Member believes that we should seek as much assistance in this effort as possible.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of the en bloc amendment and certainly recognize the wisdom that has now been included in the en bloc amendment of my original amendment in the Committee on International Relations. I support the conclusion of a migratory agreement between the United States and Mexico in the national interests of both countries. It certainly is in the national interest of the United States to regularize the bor-
And certainly I am happy to see the removal of the Mexican oil from the migration agreement that was not only offensive but outright wrong as far as our foreign policy is concerned. As the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Intercountry Adoption, I am pleased to see that we are headed now in the right direction. I am very pleased that Democrats have led on this issue and that our Republican colleagues have joined us on it in this en bloc amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time and for his extraordinary leadership on international affairs and so many issues that are important to this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the en bloc amendment and to note that the amendment which the gentleman from California (Mr. HYDE) and I put forward to help women and girls in Afghanistan was included. I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

The amendment creates the Afghan Women’s Fund of not less than $22 million per year for the years 2003, 2004, and 2005. The Afghan Women’s Fund will support the efforts of the Afghan Ministry of Women’s Affairs, other government ministries, and independent commissions to increase women and girls’ access to health care, education, and income-earning opportunities, as well as to programs to prevent trafficking in girls and women. This amendment also ensures that not less than 15 percent of the Afghan Women’s Fund will reach organizations run by Afghans, especially Afghan women.

These organizations and civil society leaders are ideal partners, as they offer extensive governance experience, knowledge of the local culture, and deep connections with the people they serve. Their success is also very closely tied to the success of efforts in Afghanistan for democracy because democracies cannot stabilize without a strong civil society. The Afghan women’s amendment will support Afghan women and girls as they endeavor to make their country a more stable, safer, and better place.

I thank the leadership on the Democrat and Republican side for including this important amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. I thank my colleague for yielding me this time. I want to thank the managers of the bill, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), for including in the en bloc amendment the Hyde-Cunningham-Davis-Filner amendment, which deals with a rather amazing situation on the Mexico-California border in my district. Three years ago, this House passed by unanimous vote a bill that was authored by then-Congressman Bilbray and myself which set up a process and a plan for solving the sewage problem at the border.

Mr. Chairman, there are 50 million gallons of raw sewage flowing throughout my district every day. Because the Tijuana River flows north, Mexico simply does not have the technical ability to treat its sewage, we get it, and the health of our citizens is threatened. This was sanctioned by this House, came up with a public-private partnership to solve this issue. Three years ago, we voted unanimously to instruct the International Boundary and Water Commission to carry out this plan. Three years and nothing has happened. Absolutely nothing has occurred to carry out the wishes of this Congress and to protect the health of the citizens of the United States. That is absolutely incredible. It is absolutely threatening to, really, the authority of the United States Congress.

What we have in the en bloc amendment is a sense of Congress saying to the IBWC, the International Boundary and Water Commission, to get to it, do it, and do it quickly. We will hold them in contempt of Congress myself because the Chair of that commission, in testimony to the United States Congress, to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, said they were going to carry this out. He has not done so. That commission, Mr. Chairman, is in disarray. This Congress should carry out an investigation of that commission, but this is a first step in the sense of Congress resolution. I thank the managers for it.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak on the State Department Authorization Bill. The bill contains key provisions that will improve international relations. I commend Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS for their work and dedication to international affairs.

The citizens of the United States have benefitted greatly from the strides made by medical science, but despite these advances, the health status of people living in developing countries lags far behind the rest of our citizens. Funding for the United Nations Population Fund is needed to ensure that future generations in other countries prosper. The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) is the largest internationally funded source of population assistance to developing countries. Over the past 33 years, UNFPA has provided more than $6 billion in assistance to more than 160 countries for voluntary family planning and maternal and child health care.

The UNFPA provides great assistance to a number of African countries. UNFPA’s priorities include working to increase access to reproductive health services, improve approaches to adolescent reproductive health; promote safe pregnancy and delivery, reduce maternal mortality, provide emergency assistance in refugee situations, and prevent and control the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa. The US government has been concerned about the spread of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa, but we lack the resources to address this crisis. The current funding does not provide the necessary resources to address these challenges.

The combined effect of plummeting livestock prices and skyrocketing cereal prices, the poverty households face an even worse predicament in obtaining food. Their wage rate is reported to be 3 times lower in the current year than in the same period last year.

According to recent studies, there were 36,000 people in Quito, 34,000 people in Amboseli, 16,300 in Wadla, 17,455 in Kewet and 156,200 in the three words of South Gondar who were in need of external assistance through the upcoming months.
ETHIOPIAN ECONOMY IN THE FACE OF FAMINE

Ethiopia’s poverty-stricken economy is based on agriculture, which accounts for half of GDP, 85% of exports, and 80% of total employment. The agricultural sector suffers from frequent drought and poor cultivation practices, and as many as 4.6 million people need food assistance annually. Coffee is critical to the Ethiopian economy with exports of some $260 million in 2000. Other important exports include live animals, hides, and gold.

The food crisis in 1999–2000 and recent drought have buffeted the economy, in particular coffee production. In November 2001, Ethiopia qualified for debt relief from the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative. Under Ethiopia’s land tenure system, the government owns all land and provides long-term leases to the tenants; the system continues to hamper growth in the industrial sector where entrepreneurs are unable to use land as collateral for loans. Despite this limitation, strong growth is expected to continue in the near term as good rainfall, the cessation of hostilities, and renewed foreign aid and debt relief push the economy forward.

SHORT-TERM CONSEQUENCES OF INACTION OR LACK OF ASSISTANCE

An estimated six children die of drought-related conditions daily in Ethiopia, according to one estimate. Many of them have collapsed from disease or dehydration after walking for days with their families in search of nourishment. Thousands are fleeing remote villages where wells have dried up and agencies have yet to establish food stations.

WHO IS AT RISK?

The U.N. warns that as many as 16 million people are at risk of starvation in 10 countries across East and central Africa, from Burundi to Eritrea to Somalia. The crisis is most severe in Ethiopia’s perpetually dry Ogaden region, where wells have gone dry, crops have withered and the skeletons of cattle and sheep lay in barren fields. Camels in Ogaden have stopped lactating, leaving children without milk, a staple in the impoverished nation.

Some Ethiopians are fortunate enough to have access to feeding centers, which supply rehydration treatments and high protein biscuits. Relief agencies are struggling to set up more centers in remote regions before residents run out of food. Sometimes, lack of clean drinking water, which is needed to mix the children’s food into gruel, makes it impossible for centers to be stationed in some areas.

A RICH HISTORY OF FIGHTING HUNGER IN THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

The late Honorable Mickey Leland established the House Select Committee on Hunger in 1984 and served as its chairman until his tragic death in 1989. The Select Committee was instrumental in drawing attention to the problem of hunger internationally and within the United States. On a humanitarian mission to Africa, Mickey experienced the death of a starving child in his arms. This eye-opening experience led him to redouble his efforts to fight hunger, and he raised $350,000 to provide food to aid famine victims in Ethiopia. Congress- man Leland lost his life in Ethiopia trying to save more lives. I would like to work with this committee to include report language in this bill that encourages a greater emphasis on the ongoing famine and a solution to this deadly problem.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, I speak to you today regarding a pressing matter that deserves attention as we balance out the debate on H.R. 1950. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you an issue, the relevance of which, will potentially merit inclusion into the House Reports on H.R. 1950, the State Department Authorization bill. The issue concerns the initiative of achieving international peace by way of the leadership of women.

WOMEN LEADERS AS THE UNIVERSAL HUB IN THE PEACE PROCESS

Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, I propose that women play any and all roles that will give them an opportunity to use their leadership skills in the peace process. Therefore, this request would include diplomatic as well as formal organizational leadership roles. I support the International Leadership Act of 2003, co-authored by you and Representative David Dreier, Chairman of the House Committee on Rules and included in the bill provisions.

WOMEN’S ROLE IN THE INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP ACT OF 2003

I see women leaders adding important skills to the “Democracy Caucus” proposed in the Act. The Democracy Caucus would work as a very timely vehicle for women to lead the way, especially in the area of rebuilding democratic government in post-war Iraq. With the help of the United Nations, we can prevent insurgency or other dangerous amounts of influence and taking advantage of the vulnerabilities of rebuilding nations such as Iraq and even Liberia. I would posit that fashioning the proposed diplomacy program under the Act to give women particular attention will greatly enhance the multilateral character of our ambassador fleet.

THE OSLO SUMMIT: WOMEN’S PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE

Mr. Chairman, I took advantage of a unique experience when I served as an Honorary Chair for the Women’s Partnership for Peace in the Middle East in Oslo, Norway in June of this year. I shared a panel with an unprecedented group of more than 70 women from Israel, Palestine, the United States, Europe and Asia who met in Oslo, Norway at the Nobel Peace Institute to launch the Women’s Partnership for Peace in the Middle East. The objective of the summit was to set clear goals and devise a plan of action for achieving a greater role for women in peace negotiations in the region and in the overall effort to achieve peace, a movement largely devoid of women’s perspectives and participation. I would like to see women play a more pronounced role not only in the establishment of business opportunity but also in the peace process, and this kind of forum offers a platform that is both transnational as well as international. In training our diplomats to act as educators and facilitators, it is critical that we deputize our strong women leaders.

HER EXCELLENCY DR. INONGE MWIBUKIWA-LEWANKA: AN ICON OF PEACE

As a final remark and by way of example, I would like to highlight the experience and achievement of Her Excellency Dr. Inonge Mwikusita-Lewanika, Ambassador to Zambia. This woman, whom I had the honor and pleasure of presenting the Freedom Magazine Award for Human Rights Leadership on July 9, 2003 is an example of the impact a woman can have on international peace negotiations and efforts.

If I may chronicle a few of her accomplishments, she was appointed as a special envoy to the African Union and allowed to advance the women of her nation in the effort for peace. Her various posts have decorated her career with great international breadth and astute conflict-resolution skill: UNICEF Regional Advisor for Families and Children in 19 countries; as stated above, a Peace Envoy convening several peace missions such as the Organization for African Unity; and the United Nations-sponsored peace mission to Rwanda amidst the period of human rights atrocity and genocide. In fact, Her Excellency Lewanka is one of the few prominent women who advocated United Nations missions for war-torn African nations. Moreover, she understands the importance and the benefits of structuring and maintaining an organized democratic government and an effective electoral process. These initiatives are evidenced by her audacious efforts to lead a 1,000-member observe team from the Electoral Institute of Southern Africa to Zimbabwe’s parliamentary elections and to spearhead the nine-member resignation from the Ruling Party in Zambia due to findings of corruption and lack of vision in 1993, whereupon she was elected President of the Opposition National Party. Furthermore, her positions of leadership in organizations such as the Forum for Parliamentarians for Peace in Eastern and Southern Africa; the African Women Committee for Peace and Development; the Women Development Association; and the Federation of African Women’s Peace Networks, heading the first delegation of women for peace to Ethiopia and Eritrea during the bloody and tumultuous border war in Zambias’s Opposition Party, Agenda for Zambia’s President, exerting “impeccable and willingness to commit the time and effort that is required to follow through on organization mission statements rather than spewing forth rhetoric and flowery speeches absent any real action.

For the reasons stated above, I would hope that those concerns regarding women involved in international peace efforts can be included in report language during conference.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, I speak to you today regarding a pressing matter that deserves attention as we balance out the debate on H.R. 1950. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you an issue, the relevance of which, will potentially merit inclusion into the House Reports on H.R. 1950, the State Department Authorization bill. The issue concerns a nation that was founded during the nineteenth century by freed American slaves. Once a nation for whom the principles of freedom and opportunity, the Liberia of today is wrought with political upheaval and social unrest.

Within the last twenty years, Liberia has been the site of intense devastation and profound loss due to almost two decades of civil war. The latest war has lasted for approximately three years and has caused immense disruption to the social and political fabric of the region.

The health infrastructure in Liberia has crumbled, schools have become refugee camps, and the people have taken the law into their own hands. Nearly half of the Liberian population has been forced to neighboring countries or to internationally assisted camps in Liberia. Large numbers of innocent, young children are being made into
Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the four co-chairs of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus endorsing Taiwan’s entrance into the World Health Organization.

It is unconscionable that 23 million Taiwanese are precluded from receiving the benefits of membership in the WHO. This political exclusion has deprived the people of Taiwan of the World Health Organization’s resources, intelligence, and expertise. Taiwan’s own health care developments, impaired its crisis response teams and created a wall of separation between Taiwan’s medical field and that of the rest of the world. Moreover, Taiwan’s exclusion from the WHO has deprived the World Health Organization’s crisis response teams of intelligence regarding infectious disease, thus putting them at a disadvantage in the global response to infectious disease outbreaks.

Never were the effects of Taiwan’s exclusion from the WHO more pronounced than this past year, when Taiwan was denied assistance from the WHO in its diagnosis and treatment of suspected cases of SARS—a disease which caused over 800 deaths, 84 of which occurred in Taiwan. Despite the extraordinary grave health conditions posed by SARS, the WHO repeatedly rejected Taiwan’s requests for help, and consequently endangered the lives of its entire population.

Unconscionably, the WHO’s decisions were based—not upon its concern for the people of Taiwan—but rather, on short-sighted political considerations and China’s rejection of Taiwan’s membership. This amendment makes a clear and unequivocal statement: Taiwan is an indivisible part of China, and the WHO should be supplied to the region as well.

At its Seventh Plenum in January 2003, the Communist Party’s Central Committee issued a resolution calling for the establishment of cells of Communist Party members within each of Vietnam’s six approved religions in order to foil “hostile forces.” All religious groups in Vietnam face great restrictions and are denied access to government religious affairs departments, and are denied access to government religious development programs. The independent and self-governing Buddhist community in Vietnam has deteriorated dramatically since this agreement, especially for Montagnard Christians in the Central Highlands of Vietnam.

Legislation to address the serious human rights situation is needed now more than ever. The United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution of 2002 acknowledged the need to improve human rights in Vietnam. Never was the affects of Taiwan’s exclusion from the WHO more pronounced than this past year, when Taiwan was denied assistance from the WHO in its diagnosis and treatment of suspected cases of SARS—a disease which caused over 800 deaths, 84 of which occurred in Taiwan. Despite the extraordinary grave health conditions posed by SARS, the WHO repeatedly rejected Taiwan’s requests for help, and consequently endangered the lives of its entire population.

Unconscionably, the WHO’s decisions were based—not upon its concern for the people of Taiwan—but rather, on short-sighted political considerations and China’s rejection of Taiwan’s membership. This amendment makes a clear and unequivocal statement: Taiwan is an indivisible part of China, and the WHO should be supplied to the region as well.

As chairman of the SARS crisis committee, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which protects the health interests of the people of Taiwan and ensures that they will not fall victim to the next global health crisis.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of an amendment to support human rights in Vietnam. This important amendment will impose a significant penalty on the Vietnamese government for their ongoing and egregious persecution of their own people.

During the 107th Congress, I introduced H.R. 2833, legislation designed to address the human rights situation in Vietnam. It passed the House by an overwhelming 410–1 margin, but stalled in the Senate. This year, I introduced nearly identical legislation, H.R. 1587, with 30 original cosponsors.

Many felt that the ratification of the Bilateral Trade Agreement with Vietnam in 2001 would lead to an improvement in human rights. Unfortunately, the human rights situation in Vietnam has deteriorated dramatically since this agreement, especially for Montagnard Christians in the Central Highlands of Vietnam.

Legislation to address the serious human rights situation is needed now more than ever. The United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution of 2002 acknowledged the need to improve human rights in Vietnam. Never was the affects of Taiwan’s exclusion from the WHO more pronounced than this past year, when Taiwan was denied assistance from the WHO in its diagnosis and treatment of suspected cases of SARS—a disease which caused over 800 deaths, 84 of which occurred in Taiwan. Despite the extraordinary grave health conditions posed by SARS, the WHO repeatedly rejected Taiwan’s requests for help, and consequently endangered the lives of its entire population.

Unconscionably, the WHO’s decisions were based—not upon its concern for the people of Taiwan—but rather, on short-sighted political considerations and China’s rejection of Taiwan’s membership. This amendment makes a clear and unequivocal statement: Taiwan is an indivisible part of China, and the WHO should be supplied to the region as well.

At its Seventh Plenum in January 2003, the Communist Party’s Central Committee issued a resolution calling for the establishment of cells of Communist Party members within each of Vietnam’s six approved religions in order to foil “hostile forces.” All religious groups in Vietnam face great restrictions and are denied access to government religious affairs departments, and are denied access to government religious development programs. The independent and self-governing Buddhist community in Vietnam has deteriorated dramatically since this agreement, especially for Montagnard Christians in the Central Highlands of Vietnam.

Legislation to address the serious human rights situation is needed now more than ever. The United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution of 2002 acknowledged the need to improve human rights in Vietnam. Never was the affects of Taiwan’s exclusion from the WHO more pronounced than this past year, when Taiwan was denied assistance from the WHO in its diagnosis and treatment of suspected cases of SARS—a disease which caused over 800 deaths, 84 of which occurred in Taiwan. Despite the extraordinary grave health conditions posed by SARS, the WHO repeatedly rejected Taiwan’s requests for help, and consequently endangered the lives of its entire population.

Unconscionably, the WHO’s decisions were based—not upon its concern for the people of Taiwan—but rather, on short-sighted political considerations and China’s rejection of Taiwan’s membership. This amendment makes a clear and unequivocal statement: Taiwan is an indivisible part of China, and the WHO should be supplied to the region as well.

As chairman of the SARS crisis committee, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which protects the health interests of the people of Taiwan and ensures that they will not fall victim to the next global health crisis.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of an amendment to support human rights in Vietnam. This important amendment will impose a significant penalty on the Vietnamese government for their ongoing and egregious persecution of their own people.

During the 107th Congress, I introduced H.R. 2833, legislation designed to address the human rights situation in Vietnam. It passed the House by an overwhelming 410–1 margin, but stalled in the Senate. This year, I introduced nearly identical legislation, H.R. 1587, with 30 original cosponsors.

Many felt that the ratification of the Bilateral Trade Agreement with Vietnam in 2001 would lead to an improvement in human rights. Unfortunately, the human rights situation in Vietnam has deteriorated dramatically since this agreement, especially for Montagnard Christians in the Central Highlands of Vietnam.

Legislation to address the serious human rights situation is needed now more than ever. The United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution of 2002 acknowledged the need to improve human rights in Vietnam. Never was the affects of Taiwan’s exclusion from the WHO more pronounced than this past year, when Taiwan was denied assistance from the WHO in its diagnosis and treatment of suspected cases of SARS—a disease which caused over 800 deaths, 84 of which occurred in Taiwan. Despite the extraordinary grave health conditions posed by SARS, the WHO repeatedly rejected Taiwan’s requests for help, and consequently endangered the lives of its entire population.

Unconscionably, the WHO’s decisions were based—not upon its concern for the people of Taiwan—but rather, on short-sighted political considerations and China’s rejection of Taiwan’s membership. This amendment makes a clear and unequivocal statement: Taiwan is an indivisible part of China, and the WHO should be supplied to the region as well.
under the government's official export labor program, in which the government forces its own people to endure involuntary servitude and debt bondage.

As Chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, I am particularly concerned about the continued persecution of the Montagnards, who were purposefully tortured and systematically relocated to infertile lands by the Communist Party leaders in retaliation for their past loyalty to America. This past December, Vietnamese soldiers reportedly threatened to shoot Montagnard Christians if they celebrated Christmas, and several were arrested and tortured.

I would like to submit the findings of H.R. 1587, which lay out a more complete case of Human Rights in Vietnam, to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They were kept out of this amendment because of their length, but they speak loudly with respect to the regime and the world about the egregious human rights abuses occurring in Vietnam.

Vietnam's continued policy of harassment, discrimination, intimidation, and persecution of religious and human rights leaders is shameful. The Vietnamese government and its agents have consistently pursued a policy of harassment, discrimination, and intimidation, and some of the regime's clergy have often been imprisoned for persecution. A government decree for persecution. A government decree to infertile lands by the Communist Party leaders in retaliation for their past loyalty to America. This past December, Vietnamese soldiers reportedly threatened to shoot Montagnard Christians if they celebrated Christmas, and several were arrested and tortured.

I would like to submit the findings of H.R. 1587, which lay out a more complete case of Human Rights in Vietnam, to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They were kept out of this amendment because of their length, but they speak loudly with respect to the regime and the world about the egregious human rights abuses occurring in Vietnam.

Vietnam's continued policy of harassment, discrimination, intimidation, and persecution of religious and human rights leaders is shameful. The Vietnamese government and its agents have consistently pursued a policy of harassment, discrimination, and intimidation, and some-of the regime's clergy have often been imprisoned for persecution. A government decree to infertile lands by the Communist Party leaders in retaliation for their past loyalty to America. This past December, Vietnamese soldiers reportedly threatened to shoot Montagnard Christians if they celebrated Christmas, and several were arrested and tortured.

I would like to submit the findings of H.R. 1587, which lay out a more complete case of Human Rights in Vietnam, to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They were kept out of this amendment because of their length, but they speak loudly with respect to the regime and the world about the egregious human rights abuses occurring in Vietnam.

Vietnam's continued policy of harassment, discrimination, intimidation, and persecution of religious and human rights leaders is shameful. The Vietnamese government and its agents have consistently pursued a policy of harassment, discrimination, and intimidation, and some-of the regime's clergy have often been imprisoned for persecution. A government decree to infertile lands by the Communist Party leaders in retaliation for their past loyalty to America. This past December, Vietnamese soldiers reportedly threatened to shoot Montagnard Christians if they celebrated Christmas, and several were arrested and tortured.

I would like to submit the findings of H.R. 1587, which lay out a more complete case of Human Rights in Vietnam, to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They were kept out of this amendment because of their length, but they speak loudly with respect to the regime and the world about the egregious human rights abuses occurring in Vietnam.

Vietnam's continued policy of harassment, discrimination, intimidation, and persecution of religious and human rights leaders is shameful. The Vietnamese government and its agents have consistently pursued a policy of harassment, discrimination, and intimidation, and some-of the regime's clergy have often been imprisoned for persecution. A government decree to infertile lands by the Communist Party leaders in retaliation for their past loyalty to America. This past December, Vietnamese soldiers reportedly threatened to shoot Montagnard Christians if they celebrated Christmas, and several were arrested and tortured.
The Government of Viet Nam systematically violates a range of fundamental human rights across Vietnam, including violations of freedom of religion, expression, and assembly; freedom of association; freedom of movement; freedom from arbitrary deprivation of life or liberty; freedom from torture; and international standards of fair trial and due process. The Vietnamese authorities have arrested and detained hundreds of individuals for peacefully exercising their rights. 

The Vietnamese authorities have also violated the rights of Vietnamese people who have refused to leave their homes. They have arrested and detained hundreds of people for peaceful assembly and expression, including members of religious groups and political dissidents. The Vietnamese authorities have also violated the rights of people who have sought to leave Vietnam, including asylum seekers and refugees. They have detained and deported hundreds of people who have sought to leave Vietnam by sea or land. 

In addition to the restrictions on freedom of expression, the Vietnamese authorities have also imposed restrictions on freedom of association, including restrictions on freedom of association for religious groups and political parties. They have also imposed restrictions on freedom of assembly, including restrictions on freedom of assembly for political and religious organizations. 

The Vietnamese authorities have also violated the rights of children, including the right to education, health care, and protection from exploitation. They have also violated the rights of women, including the right to equality before the law and the right to protection from discrimination. The Vietnamese authorities have also violated the rights of workers, including the right to freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining. 

The Vietnamese authorities have also violated the rights of asylum seekers and refugees who have sought protection in Vietnam. They have also detained and deported hundreds of people who have sought to leave Vietnam by sea or land. 

The Vietnamese authorities have also violated the rights of people who have sought to leave Vietnam, including asylum seekers and refugees. They have detained and deported hundreds of people who have sought to leave Vietnam by sea or land. 

The Vietnamese authorities have also violated the rights of children, including the right to education, health care, and protection from exploitation. They have also violated the rights of women, including the right to equality before the law and the right to protection from discrimination. The Vietnamese authorities have also violated the rights of workers, including the right to freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining. 

The Vietnamese authorities have also violated the rights of asylum seekers and refugees who have sought protection in Vietnam. They have also detained and deported hundreds of people who have sought to leave Vietnam by sea or land.
to develop this plant, the IBWC completely lost control of the project. Congress has authorized the $239 million—over $100 million more than had been authorized for the project. Despite the massive cost overrun, the plant still did not meet U.S. Clean Water Act standards and may soon be forced to close as a result of numerous Clean Water Act violations.

In an attempt to find an innovative solution to this problem, the House authorized a public-private partnership that will keep the cost for a 4 million-gallon-per-day plant to $100 million. This project will provide water treatment for the City of Tijuana. Furthermore, an estimated 56 percent of Tijuana’s water needs will be met by reclaimed water from this proposed plant. More importantly, this project will be built in Mexico, at the source of the problem and it will be built quicker and cheaper than any public-only alternative.

This amendment requires the IBWC to make this project a priority and finally, after 70 years of misery for San Diego beach communities, end the pollution problem that has damaged our coastline. This project is critical for the future of San Diego County, and it is critical for California. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the Rules Committee for making this amendment. I am glad that my colleagues lent us their support as we attempt to address one of the great concerns of the Hill—dramatic increases in and the ability to adopt children that the federal government has not previously been able to address.

In this new role, the office will find their duties greatly expanded and we hope that this amendment will express the support of Congress not only to the efforts of the State Department on behalf of intercountry adoption, but also to the Commerce, Justice, and State Appropriations Committee whose job it will be to ensure that the Office of Children’s Issues has sufficient resources to continue their work on behalf of the millions of children in orphanages throughout the world.

I am thankful to the Chairman for his support of the amendment and would urge Members of Congress to take advantage of the Department’s role in intercountry adoptions to also support the amendment.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, Imperial Beach, the city which is the brilliant cornerstone on the Southwestern point of our country, has a beautiful beach as well as a unique location. However, for too many days of the year, this natural resource cannot be enjoyed by its children, families, and visitors.

Unfortunately, the burgeoning city of Tijuana located just across the border and the source of the Tijuana River lacks adequate sewage treatment. As a result, particularly when rain falls on the mesas and canyons along this border, raw sewage and other pollutants are washed into the Tijuana River, flow across the border, and empty into the Pacific Ocean just next to the beautiful sand of Imperial Beach.

Congress enacted Public Law 106–457 in 2000 to authorize the International Boundary and Water Commission, composed of representatives of the United States and Mexico, to complete a new Treaty Minute for creation of a public-private partnership to construct and operate a wastewater treatment facility in Mexico. However, this has not occurred.

As members of Congress, our San Diego delegation has sought to resolve this issue through repeated questions of members of the IBWC. However, they have not been forthcoming. Therefore, this amendment is needed to make completion of this agreement not only obligatory but also to require monthly reports from the Commission on its progress to the appropriate congressional committees.

The community of Imperial Beach has been prevented from fully using its natural resource for too many years. It is time to require action.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is intended to highlight a troubling situation in Indonesia.

On August 31, 2002, the staff of the International School in West Papua, Indonesia decided to take a picnic. The teachers lived and worked in Tembagapura, a company town located high in the mountains near the Grasberg gold and copper mine. The group of eleven people, including a six-year-old child, drove in two vehicles to a picnic site about ten miles away on the road to Timika. Because it began to rain, they decided to return to town for lunch.

The road they were traveling on is not an ordinary road. The road is surrounded by the gold and copper mine, and is heavily guarded by the Indonesian military. At both ends of this road are military check points, which seals the road and control access to Tembagapura.

As they returned home, the group was brutally attacked by a band of terrorists. Two Americans, Ted Burgon (from Oregon) and Rick Spier (from Colorado), and an Indonesian man were killed in the ambush. The attack, which occurred less than a half-mile away from an Indonesian military check point, went on for approximately 45 minutes. Hundreds of rounds were fired at the teachers and their vehicles. Most of the survivors, including the six-year-old child, were shot. Several of the teachers were shot multiple times and suffered horrible injuries.

Ted Burgon of Sunriver, Oregon was killed and his wife Nancy suffered facial cuts and pellets around the eye and her husband's foot. Colorado was killed, and his wife Patsy was shot in the back and foot. Francine Goodfriend of Rockford, Illinois was shot and has a spinal cord injury. Steven Emma of Broward County, Florida was shot in the legs, buttocks, and suffered internal bleeding. Lynn Poff of Ogun, Washington was shot in the shoulder and legs. Sunanda Hopkins of Sunriver, Oregon was shot in the side, legs, and pellets around the eye and his wife Taia was shot in the buttocks.

Following the attack, the Indonesian Police promptly began investigation. They collected evidence, interviewed witnesses and reconstructed the ambush. The Indonesian Police issued a report (that I ask for unanimous consent to submit for the record) concluding, “there is a strong possibility that the Tembagapura case was perpetrated by members of the Indonesian National Army Force, however, it still needs to be investigated further.”

In early November 2002, the Sydney Morning Herald reported that “United States intelligence agencies have intercepted messages between Indonesian army commanders indicating that they were involved in staging an ambush at the remote mine in which three school teachers, two of them Americans, were killed.” The Washington Post has reported these same intelligence intercepts.

Despite this intelligence, the investigation of the attack has faltered. The Indonesian Police have been effectively removed from the case due to their report that implicated the military. The senior Indonesian police officers who uncovered evidence of the army’s involvement have been transferred to new posts, and the investigation has now been handed over to a joint military police team. Not surprisingly, the Indonesian military has exonerated itself. An Interim investigative team, including the FBI, have not been able to continue their investigations due mainly to the Indonesian military’s refusal to cooperate and its tampering of evidence.

The evasions and obstructions of the Indonesian military are wholly unacceptable, and it is incumbent upon this Congress to see that a thorough investigation is conducted. The victims of this brutal attack deserve no less. My amendment is, therefore, intended to ensure...
that the perpetrators of this heinous crime against Americans are brought to justice. To the extent that the Indonesian military was involved, the United States should insist on criminal prosecution of all involved parties.

My amendment would limit Indonesia from receiving International Military Education and Training (IMET) funds until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Indonesia and the Indonesian Armed Forces are taking effective measures, including cooperating with the Director of the FBI, in conducting a full investigation of the attack and to criminally prosecute the individuals responsible for the attack.

My amendment will not prohibit the United States from continuing to conduct programs or training with the Indonesian Armed Forces, including counter-terrorism training, officer visits, port visits, or educational exchanges that are being conducted on the date of enactment it would prevent future exchanges.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is important. It gives voice to our commitment that the United States will hold accountable the perpetrators and protectors of terrorism. We will pursue terrorists wherever they may be and hold to account. We will demand justice for attacks against our citizens and withhold aid from those countries that do not cooperate in bringing terrorists to justice. As President Bush has stated, “if you are not with us you are against us.” It is time for Indonesia to choose who it will align itself with, the terrorists or the coalition of nations that bring them to justice.

Make no mistake, a vote against this amendment is a vote against holding nations accountable for terrorist attacks.

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. HOSTETTLER.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. HOSTETTLER:

Page 29, after line 2, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 231. ISSUANCE OF CONSULAR IDENTIFICATION CARDS BY FOREIGN MISSIONS.

(a) ISSUANCE OF CONSULAR IDENTIFICATION CARDS.—The Congress finds that foreign governments have been issuing consular identification cards to foreign nationals in the United States for purposes other than those intended by the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (done at Vienna on 24 April 1963).

(b) ISSUANCE OF CONSULAR IDENTIFICATION CARDS.—The issuance by foreign missions of consular identification cards shall be considered a benefit to a foreign mission under section 203 (2) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1966 and shall be regulated by the Secretary of State in accordance with this section and section 204 of that Act.

(c) AUTHORITY TO ISSUE REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall issue regulations consistent with this section with respect to the issuance by foreign missions in the United States of consular identification cards to foreign nationals residing in the United States.

(d) CONTENT OF REGULATIONS.—Regulations referred to in subsection (c) shall include the following requirements:

(1) NOTIFICATION TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.—A foreign mission shall notify the Secretary of State of each consular identification card issued within the United States, including the name and current address within the United States of the recipient of a card.

(2) ISSUANCE TO BONA FIDE CITIZENS OF THE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN.—A foreign mission may issue a consular identification card only to a national of the country represented by the foreign mission that has established procedures to verify the nationality of card recipients through either national or regional systems for registration identification systems, and bona fide documents such as a passport issued by the country of origin.

(3) MAINTENANCE OF ACCURATE AND COMPLETE RECORDS.—A foreign mission shall maintain at the mission complete and accurate records of all consular identification cards issued. The records shall maintain an automated record system that contains such records in a manner that can be rapidly accessed to prevent duplicate or fraudulent issuance of such cards.

(4) ADDRESS CHANGE NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A foreign mission shall require card recipients to notify the foreign mission of any change of address within 30 days after such address change.

(5) ACCESS TO AUDIT RECORDS.—At the request of the Secretary of State, a foreign mission shall make available for audit and review, by the Secretary or the Inspector General of the Department of State, the records of all consular identification cards issued.

(e) FAILURE TO ADHERE TO REGULATIONS.—(1) If the Secretary of State determines that a foreign mission has issued consular identification cards in violation of the requirements of regulations related to the issuance of such cards by foreign missions and such violation potentially threatens the security of the United States or facilitates fraudulent or criminal acts, the Secretary of State shall notify the government of the country represented by the foreign mission that the foreign mission complies with the requirements of regulations related to the issuance of consular identification cards until compliance with applicable regulations is established.

(2) If the foreign mission of a country fails to suspend issuance of consular identification cards in accordance with a notification under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State shall direct the consular officials in that country to cease the issuance of immigrant or non-immigrant visas, or both, to nationals of that country until such time as the Secretary of State determines that the foreign mission of that country is in compliance with the requirements of regulations related to the issuance of such cards by foreign missions.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

This amendment establishes, Mr. Chairman, requirements that must be met by foreign governments in issuing consular identification cards in the United States and authorizes the Secretary of State to regulate the issuance of these documents.

In the last 2 years, foreign governments have issued more than 1.5 million consular cards in the United States. Recent testimony by the FBI before the Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims, which I chair, highlights the need for such requirements. The FBI explained that the most commonly issued of these cards are vulnerable to fraud and forgery, posing both criminal threats and potential terrorist threats. The requirements set forth in the amendment will address these flaws.

It is important to note that this amendment does not address the acceptance of these documents in the United States. It prohibit their issuance so long as the foreign mission complies with the requirements of the amendment. Rather, it simply extends the Secretary of State’s authority under the Foreign Missions Act and the Vienna Convention on Consular Affairs to include their issuance of consular ID cards.

Further, this amendment does not violate our responsibilities under the Vienna Convention. In light of these facts, I urge passage of the amendment.

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

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

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, this amendment may seem by the way it was just described rather innocuous, but it is rather outrageous. It is a thinly veiled attempt to end something called the matricula consular.

To start with, this amendment could create a negative boomerang effect on the United States. The amendment tells other countries’ consulates what the United States cannot and cannot do above and beyond existing law. Do we want other countries to do the same to us? Do we want other countries to tell our consulates how we can relate to our own citizens abroad? This is an unprecedented attempt to change how a country can relate to its own nationals in a host country. I think it is a patently improper interpretation of the Foreign Missions Act and the Vienna Convention on Consular Affairs. The amendment would set a dangerous precedent for our embassies abroad.

But let me get to the core issue. This amendment is another anti-immigration tactic designed to get rid of the
matricula consular. Basically, they have loaded this amendment with requirements that are unreasonable for workers in this country to be able to achieve. How can migrant workers be expected to notify their own mission within 30 days every time they move? And we expect poor people from rural areas to produce all of the records that they suggest. This makes no sense. And then in a final attempt to completely get rid of the matricula consular, they include a punishment so strong that many countries might simply stop using it. If a country fails to comply with these onerous provisions, the United States would stop issuing immigrant and nonimmigrant visas. What country could take that risk? I do not quite understand it. I thought we had a victory collectively in moving into the right way in our bilateral relations with Mexico. This amendment takes us another step back. And again, Members on the other side of the aisle have shown their true feelings about some of the issues on the Hispanic community, the immigrant communities; and this amendment is no exception.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, increasingly, foreign governments have been lobbying localities in the United States to accept their consular cards as valid identification. At least two countries now issue consular cards in the U.S. for these purposes and many others are planning to do so. No standards govern these cards, there is little documentation on which localities can rely in deciding whether to accept a country’s consular card. All this amendment does is clarify the Secretary of State’s power to ensure that issuance of these cards is rational and safe.

By authorizing the Secretary of State to regulate these cards and setting requirements that countries must meet in issuing the cards, this amendment will allow localities to make informed decisions whether to accept such documents. Regulation of the cards will also protect the American people from the risks that unregulated and unreliable documents pose. Those risks were underscored recently by the FBI, who determined that because of their vulnerability to fraud and forgery, these cards pose criminal threats as well as a potential terrorist threat.

The requirements in this amendment will address those threats by deterring fraud and improving the reliability of consular identification cards.

The amendment also provides an enforcement mechanism that empowers the Secretary of State to regulate consulates’ compliance with these requirements. It is appropriate to vest this responsibility in the State Department. Not only does its Office of Foreign Missions currently regulate the activities of foreign consulates in the U.S., but the Department will also bring to this role its expertise in evaluating foreign documents. This amendment is needed to allow the State Department necessary authority to regulate foreign consulates in a changing environment. For this reason, I urge passage of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just would like to respond to my friend from New Jersey who every time someone offers an amendment or a bill trying to get a handle on illegal immigration, known as undocumented, where we have God knows how many people in this country living in substandard style because of the illegality of their presence, and do not manifest the hostility at all. We something about it in good faith does not mean there is some antipathy toward a racial group or an ethnic group at all. It is just a feeble attempt to get a handle on the borders of our country and who is here and who is not.

The problem is not getting better. It is getting worse. But trying to do something about it in good faith does not manifest the hostility at all. We are all immigrants sooner or later or back far enough, but I really resent the conclusion the gentleman draws that all Republicans do not like people of different ethnicity. I would say just the opposite.

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

I appreciate the chairman’s concern. I resent the constant surge of amendments that confront particularly a single community.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), senior member of the Committee on International Relations who has worked on these issues.

Mr. BERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

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

I rise in very strong opposition to the amendment. I have to say to the chairman of the committee, if this amendment were in effect, there would be no such card and the issue of finding out where the undocumented people are and who they are will not be enhanced one bit because no one who is here in undocumented status will give their accurate address. If they know it is going to be turned over to the administration for enforcement. So the amendment totally undermines the goal of the chairman of the committee in his comments.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I have 20 seconds. Can I take it on the gentleman’s time?
Finally, under the Hostettler amendment, a foreign state’s refusal to comply with a State Department order to stop issuing identification to its citizens would result in the State Department instituting a ban on visas for the offending country. This makes absolutely no sense. Under this logic, we would punish nationals of a country for what they quality—for family reunification or to accept a job. We would punish these law-abiding immigrants, their families, and U.S. employers because some nationals of their country might have a meaningless ID. This publishes those who follow the rule because there are some who might not.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. It is bad for foreign policy; it is bad for domestic policy; and we should reject it.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY).

(Mr. GALLEGLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Chairman, the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security have serious national security concerns regarding the issuance of consular cards. The FBI concluded the matricula consular is not a reliable form of identification due to the nonexistence of any means to verify the true identity of the card holder. The FBI also testified that, although there are many generations of the Mexican consular card, 90 percent of those in circulation are the older generation, which are very vulnerable to counterfeit and forgery.

The truth is that Poland, Mexico, Nicaragua, and other countries that are trying to expand their consular ID programs in the United States are doing so in an effort to allow illegal immigrants to receive services to which they are entitled. One service is the ability to use such cards to board commercial airplanes. Mr. Chairman, this is a dramatic step backwards toward the type of security we had before 9/11.

In addition, the six countries currently expanding the consular card programs could easily be 60 in the next few years.

I strongly urge my colleagues to advocate that the United States Federal Government, through the Department of State, regulate the issuance of those cards.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HIJO OSA) who resides and deals with the border all the time.

(Mr. HIJO OSA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIJO OSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hostettler-Gallegly amendment. It is a thinly veiled attack on the consular ID card that has been used by the Embassy of Mexico for over 130 years, sometimes referred to as the Matricula Consular card.

Contrary to what the Hostettler-Gallegly amendment contends, Mexico and other foreign governments have been issuing consular identification cards to foreign nationals in the United States following precisely the guidelines established by the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. This amendment would constitute a violation of that convention.

Under the convention, consular function is established as “performing any other functions entrusted to a consular post which are not prohibited by the laws and regulations of the receiving state.” There is no U.S. Federal law which forbids the issuance of Consular ID cards. In fact, the Treasury Department has issued regulations under section 326 of the PATRIOT Act that would allow the financial institutions to accept consular ID cards as valid forms of ID for the purpose of opening accounts.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hostettler-Gallegly amendment. It is a thinly veiled attack on the Consular ID Card that has been issued by the Embassy of Mexico for over 131 years, sometimes referred to as the Matricula Consular card.

Contrary to what the Hostettler-Gallegly amendment contends, Mexico and other foreign governments have been issuing consular identification cards to foreign nationals in the United States following precisely the guidelines established by the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. This amendment would constitute a violation of that convention.

Under that convention, consular function is established as “performing any other functions entrusted to a consular post which are not prohibited by the laws and regulations of the receiving state.” There is no U.S. Federal law which forbids the issuance of Consular ID cards.

In fact, the Treasury Department has issued regulations under Section 326 of the PATRIOT Act that would allow the financial institutions to accept consular ID cards as valid forms of ID for the purpose of opening accounts.

There are now more than 100 law enforcement agencies in California that accept the matricula card.

Wells Fargo, Bank of America, and credit unions and banks across the country support the use of the matricula consular. They understand that when you hurt our most vulnerable members of our society, we all lose.

The support that financial institutions have given to these cards is matched by the support we have received from local law enforcement organizations.

In my district, the Rialto police department recently decided to accept matricula consular cards, joining the police departments in Chino, Colton, Fontana, Indio, Redlands, San Bernardino, and Upland.

The State Department adamantly opposes this amendment because an Interagency Working Group is already working to address the issue of Consular ID cards. Consequently, this amendment prejudices the outcome of the Interagency Working Group’s efforts.

The State Department also has reciprocity concerns. The U.S. does, in certain instances, issue Consular ID cards to American nationals overseas.

The State Department fears reciprocal retaliation from overseas if the amendment were to pass.

These Consular ID cards are simply identification cards. They do not legalize the status of any immigrant.

They are not used to obtain any immigration or citizenship benefits such as work authorization or to obtain public benefits.

Their continued use, with consultations between the U.S. and Mexican governments, will foster greater transparency and increase security in the United States.

For these reasons and many others, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Tancredo Amendment.

I have always been a strong advocate of efforts that give Hispanics and other minorities greater access to our financial services system.

Whether that means providing more financial literacy programs or approving the use of the matricula consular card, we must do what it takes to make sure that every person in this country can live the American dream.

When we look to the future, we have to make sure that it includes people of all races and all colors. We must give all members of our society the tools they need to fully participate and benefit from our great democracy.

Unfortunately, there are those in this body who are trying to shut the doors to our immigrant community.

They do not care that there are as many as 10 million American households that do not have bank accounts. They are not acceptable.

Hispanics deserve the same opportunity others have to buy a home, invest in a business, pay for a college education, and improve the financial security of their families.

How do we do this? We do this by giving everyone the keys that open the doors to our financial system.

Everyone deserves the opportunity to open a bank account or get a credit card. We cannot have a society of "haves" and "have-nots.

That is why Arrowhead Credit Union in my district, Wells Fargo, Bank of America, and credit unions and banks across the country support the use of the matricula consular.

The amendment would violate the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations and U.S. citizen’s living abroad.

If the U.S. does not acknowledge valid foreign IDs, others have no obligation to recognize U.S. IDs.
It's clear to me that this amendment is an attack on the Mexican consular ID and the millions of Mexicans living in the U.S. and elsewhere who use it daily as a form of identification.

The matricula plays a vital role in our homeland security efforts by enabling the reliable identification of millions of Mexicans living and working in the United States.

800 police departments, various local governments, and at least 80 banks have accepted the matricula because it increases public safety, national security, and our economic competitiveness.

Law enforcement understands that the matricula helps identify people, including suspects, witnesses, and those who come forward to report crimes and suspicious activities.

The matricula is a safe, secure form of identification.

It has a number of extremely sophisticated security features, including a digitized photo, in-person consular interviews and review of supporting documentation that are more demanding than those used for U.S.-government issued IDs.

Acceptance of the Mexican consular ID has a proven track record of increasing public safety.

Failure to recognize it would reinforce millions of Mexicans living and working in the U.S. to identify themselves and assist in our homeland security efforts.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Hogeteller-Gallegly amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) will be postponed.
The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 7 offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas prevailed by a voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

**RECORDED VOTE**

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 207, noes 219, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]  

AYES—207

Baker, Charles (FL)  
Baker, Paul (TX)  
Baldwin, Patricia (NY)  
Baldwin, Spencer (PA)  
Berman, G. K. (NY)  
Berman, Howard (NY)  
Berman, Jerry (NY)  
Berkley, Eric (CA)  
Berghofer, Todd (OH)  
Berthoud, Scott (CO)  
Beverly, Howard (NC)  
Beverly, James (SC)  
Blackburn, Andy (TN)  
Blinn, Jack (CA)  
Boggs, James (IN)  
Bolten, Roger (FL)  
Bonham, Davis (CA)  
Bono, Karen (CA)  
Bonnell, Betty (OH)  
Boone, Mark (IA)  
Bradley, James (MI)  
Brady, James (PA)  
Branch, John (LA)  
Branstad, Terry (IA)  
Brandon, Joe (NY)  
Brandon, T. B. (KY)  
Braz, Charles (TX)  
Brewer, Joe (UT)  
Brown, Corrine (TX)  
Brown, David (CA)  
Brown, Mary (NY)  
Brown, Tom (OH)  
Brown, Brick (CO)  
Brown, Pat (OH)  
Brown, Vito (NY)  
Brown, William (NY)  
Brownley, Herm (CA)  
Brooke, James (GA)  
Brooks, Doug (CA)  
Brooks, Jackie (CA)  
Brooks, Joe (MS)  
Brooks, Tom (GA)  
Brooks, Zell (GA)  
Brooks, Zach (KY)  
Brostoff, Mark (WI)  
Brown, Craig (VA)  
Bruinezeel, David (VA)  
Buchen, Michael (CA)  
Buchanan, Bobbie (OR)  
Buck, Jim (AZ)  
Buck, Ron (KY)  
Buckley, John (NY)  
Buckley, Kevin (NY)  
Buckingham, David (CA)  
Buckley, William (NY)  
Buckley, William (RI)  
Buckling, Jay (NY)  
Buchanan, Alexander (CO)  
Bucq, Elise (CA)  
Buescher, Cher (NE)  
Buell, Myron (MO)  
Buell, Steve (OH)  
Butler, Gary (IN)  
Butler, John (OH)  
Butler, Steve (OR)  
Byrd, Howard (VA)  
Byrne, Stephen (NJ)  
Byrd, Marion (NY)  
Byrne, Tim (MA)  
Caldwell, David (LA)  
Calder, Don (CA)  
Calder, Peter (NY)  
Caldwell, Hugh (ID)  
Caldergov, Robert (ID)  
Calderon, Alex (CA)  
Calderon, Herbie (CA)  
Calderon, Justo (CA)  
Calderon, Raul (CA)  
Calderon, Raul (CA)  
Caldwell, фигурное скейтбординг

So the amendment was rejected.

**RECORDED VOTE**

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 offered by the gentleman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) on which further proceedings were postponed on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

AYES—207

Baker, Charles (FL)  
Baker, Paul (TX)  
Baldwin, Patricia (NY)  
Baldwin, Spencer (PA)  
Berman, G. K. (NY)  
Berman, Howard (NY)  
Berman, Jerry (NY)  
Berkley, Eric (CA)  
Berghofer, Todd (OH)  
Berthoud, Scott (CO)  
Beverly, Howard (NC)  
Beverly, James (SC)  
Blackburn, Andy (TN)  
Blinn, Jack (CA)  
Boggs, James (IN)  
Bolten, Roger (FL)  
Bonham, Davis (CA)  
Bono, Karen (CA)  
Bonnell, Betty (OH)  
Boone, Mark (IA)  
Bradley, James (MI)  
Brady, James (PA)  
Branch, John (LA)  
Branstad, Terry (IA)  
Brandon, Joe (NY)  
Brandon, T. B. (KY)  
Braz, Charles (TX)  
Brewer, Joe (UT)  
Brown, Corrine (TX)  
Brown, David (CA)  
Brown, Mary (NY)  
Brown, Tom (OH)  
Brown, Brick (CO)  
Brown, Pat (OH)  
Brown, Vito (NY)  
Brown, William (NY)  
Brownley, Herm (CA)  
Brooke, James (GA)  
Brooks, Doug (CA)  
Brooks, Jackie (CA)  
Brooks, Joe (MS)  
Brooks, Tom (GA)  
Brooks, Zach (KY)  
Brostoff, Mark (WI)  
Brown, Craig (VA)  
Bruinezeel, David (VA)  
Buchanan, Bobbie (OR)  
Buck, Jim (AZ)  
Buck, Ron (KY)  
Buckley, John (NY)  
Buckley, Kevin (NY)  
Buckingham, David (CA)  
Buckling, Jay (NY)  
Buckling, John (NY)  
Buckling, William (NY)  
Buckling, William (RI)  
Buckling, William (NJ)  
Buckling, William (NY)  
Buckling, William (NH)  
Buchanan, Alexander (CO)  
Bucq, Elise (CA)  
Buescher, Cher (NE)  
Buell, Myron (MO)  
Buell, Steve (OH)  
Butler, Gary (IN)  
Butler, John (OH)  
Butler, Steve (OR)  
Byrd, Howard (VA)  
Byrne, Stephen (NJ)  
Byrne, Tim (MA)  
Caldwell, David (LA)  
Calder, Don (CA)  
Calder, Peter (NY)  
Caldwell, Hugh (ID)  
Caldergov, Robert (ID)  
Calderon, Alex (CA)  
Calderon, Herbie (CA)  
Calderon, Justo (CA)  
Calderon, Raul (CA)  
Calderon, Raul (CA)  
Caldwell, фигурное скейтбординг

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.
Mr. BIGGERT changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mrs. KELLY, and Messrs. EDWARDS, THOMAS, RAHALL and ABERCROMBIE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as recorded above.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. HOSTETTEThe CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTER), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTEThe CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were recorded 226 ayes, 198 noes, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 367]

AYES—226

NOES—198

NOT VOTING—8

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPOREMessrs. CARTER, SIMPSON, TANCREDO, OTTER, NEUGEBAUER, TERRY, WHITFIELD, BURTON of Indiana, BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. CUBIN, Messrs. SHIMkus, FEENEY, BRADY of Texas, NETHERCUTT, KIRK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut

Mr. BIGGERT changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mrs. KELLY, and Messrs. EDWARDS, THOMAS, RAHALL and ABERCROMBIE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.
that we have spent a lot of time and effort in trying to build a better Caribbean basin initiative program where our friends in the Caribbean can share in trade with the United States of America. The leaders of the countries in this region and I may consume a handle on this disease, which is the largest region second only to sub-Saharan Africa, that you have to go beyond Guyana, you have to go beyond Haiti; you have to have a comprehensive approach to this disease in education, in prevention and in care.

And so it makes a lot of sense, we think, that as we approach this serious disease, that we give the leaders, especially the medical leaders in this area, an opportunity to put their program to work.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Lee), who has spent most of her legislative career trying to correct this disease, and I thank her for her effort, and I ask unanimous consent that she be entitled to yield to whomever the time would allow her to yield to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. Isakson). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. Lee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time and for his leadership and his commitment to addressing the HIV/AIDS pandemic globally.

We passed very recently H.R. 1298, the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003, and the President signed this into law. This bill would expand the list of countries which the HIV/AIDS response coordinator has directed funding authority over.

Now, while USAID administers programs in some of the countries, such as Jamaica and the Dominican Republic, the practical effect of this amendment would be to highlight the Caribbean as a region that deserves our special attention in the fight against the global AIDS pandemic. As we look at the Caribbean, we must focus on the fact that the prevalence rates are similar to what they were in sub-Saharan Africa before this unbelievable explosion.

Today, over 500,000 people in the Caribbean are estimated to be living with HIV and AIDS with prevalence rates in most countries ranging from 1 to 3 percent. While it is clear that Africa, as the epicenter of the AIDS pandemic, should be the focus of our global AIDS initiative, we must be very clear and aware that the Caribbean is poised to undergo a dramatic increase in the number of new AIDS cases, with estimates of over 1 million people infected by 2010.

The Caribbean has, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. Rangel) indicated, the second largest population of persons affected outside of sub-Saharan Africa with AIDS. And it is important that while he support AIDS prevention and treatment efforts in Haiti and Guyana, two of the hardest-hit countries respectively, we must also promote a regional response to the epidemic rather than a piecemeal two-country strategy. Such a response must also take into consideration the high volume of mobility within the Caribbean due to labor force shifts and the tourism industry.

We have a moral obligation to act not only because of the devastation that the AIDS pandemic has and will cause, but also because of our close connection to the Caribbean region and its people, as there are nearly 23 million Caribbean immigrants residing in the United States today; and over 10 million people from the United States visit the Caribbean annually.

The Rangel-Lee amendment does not preclude other countries from receiving funding. It does not authorize new funding, and will not alter the level of funding to go to the Caribbean. It merely adds CARICOM countries and the Dominican Republic to the list of countries the HIV/AIDS response coordinator will oversee so that we can better coordinate our response to the pandemic in the Caribbean region.

Mr. Lantos. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. Lee. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. Lantos. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Rangel-Lee amendment. I think it is a very constructive contribution to our global fight against AIDS, and I urge all of our colleagues to do so.

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

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

I stand claim the time in opposition, although I recognize the efforts and interests on the part of the gentleman from New York and the gentlewoman from California, and I respect the contribution just made by the ranking member of the committee. They want to focus more attention on HIV/AIDS in the Caribbean region. That is understandable. Actually, the authorizing legislation focuses not just on Africa, not sub-Saharan Africa only, but also specifically mentions the Caribbean, the only other part of the world mentioned beyond sub-Saharan Africa.

It is a growing problem in the island nations and the coastal countries of the Caribbean, no doubt about it; and this would add 13 countries to the list of two Caribbean countries already identified by the President as focus countries. Under PL 108-25, the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS Act, it provides the President with the authority to add additional countries to the list of countries under the purview of the coordinator.

I would have to say to the gentleman from New York that this does not expand the coverage because there are no
limits on the number of countries that may be assisted; but it does place those countries listed, illustrative countries, as being under the purview of the coordinator to give special attention. It actually puts more control by the White House on the coordinator than was the case with those that are listed. And if the gentleman expands that list, then we run the danger, I think, of diluting the focus of the HIV/AIDS. China could just as well be listed soon, unfortunately: Southeast Asia, certainly countries in the Caribbean. As you know, we are starting an emergency plan to an additional 14 countries in one critical area, and that is in expand our support for democratic government. The Sherman amendment supports the rights of the Iranian people to choose their system of government; and the United States condemns the brutal treatment, imprisonment and torture of Iranian civilians expressing political dissent. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we could adopt this amendment on voice vote, just as the Senate did, so as to eliminate a possible difference between the two bodies, as this bill goes to conference. I should also point out, Mr. Chairman, that I have a separate bill, H.R. 2466, that provides much more substantive support for democracy. It is called the Iran Democracy Support Act, and I would hope that on some occasion we would be on this floor debating that bill, and I invite my colleagues to cosponsor it. But for now let me urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for introducing this important amendment. The Iranian people continue to suffer under a theocratic, terror-supporting dictatorship. The Iranian regime has no qualms about situations where they can satisfy the theocracy. I think this is the least we could do in this bill is to provide real freedom, that they should have democratic, women's rights, democracy, and freedom, and that this is the view of this body is that Iranians deserve real freedom, that they should not be denied their freedom. I think this is the least we could do in this bill is to provide our support and put the United States on record in favor of minority rights, women's rights, democracy, and freedom for the people of Iran. I want to commend Senator BROWNBACK, who authored the very Sherman amendment supports Iran's right to choose their own system of government, and I want to thank my colleagues for adopting these words on a voice vote. Let me just summarize the provisions of this amendment. It contains, first, findings which state: "Iran is neither free nor democratic. Men and women are not treated equally in Iran, women are legally deprived of internationally recognized human rights, and religious freedom is not respected under the laws of Iran. Undemocratic institutions, such as the Guardians Council, thwart the decisions of elected leaders."

The Sherman amendment affirms that the Iranian people are fighting valiantly for freedom and democracy. The least we could do in this bill is to provide our support for democratic change are regularly met by the regimes-supported security forces and vigilante groups. I just last month the Iranian government acknowledged they arrested some 4,000 peaceful demonstrators. What was their crime? They wanted freedom. This amendment affirms that the view of this body is that Iranians deserve real freedom, that they should not be denied their freedom.

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

Mr. Chairman, our hearts go out to the people of Iran who are fighting valiantly for freedom and democracy. The least we could do in this bill is to provide our support and put the United States on record in favor of minority rights, women's rights, democracy, and freedom for the people of Iran. I want to commend Senator BROWNBACK, who authored the very Sherman amendment, and we hope he will take yes for an answer. Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for introducing this important amendment. The Iranian people continue to suffer under a theocratic, terror-supporting dictatorship. The Iranian regime has no qualms about situations where they can satisfy the theocracy. I think this is the least we could do in this bill is to provide real freedom, that they should not be denied their freedom. I think this is the least we could do in this bill is to provide our support and put the United States on record in favor of minority rights, women's rights, democracy, and freedom, and that this is the view of this body is that Iranians deserve real freedom, that they should not be denied their freedom.

Oppression in Iran is a humanitarian issue, but it is not only that. The existence of a dictatorial Iranian regime directly affects the security of the United States, and now faces an enemy with a rigid ideology which it backs through an unlimited use of terror, and it may soon have nuclear weapons.
Freedom in Iran is a nonpartisan issue. I strongly support this amendment and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting in favor of it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, re-claiming my time, I urge support for this amendment today. I urge my col- leagues to take a look at H.R. 2466, the Iran Democracy Support Act, for con-sideration on another day. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LAN-TOS) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the bal-ance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in House Report 108–206.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

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

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

The text of the amendment is as fol-lows:

Amendment No. 37 offered by Mr. MCKEON:

At the end of title VII of the bill, add the following new section and conform the table of contents accordingly:

SEC. 704. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE EXECUTION OF VIOLENT CRIMINALS FROM MEXICO TO THE UNITED STATES.

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

(1) The Mexican Supreme Court ruled in October 2001 that Mexico will not extradite criminals who face life sentences in the United States.

(2) Due to this ruling, the United States has been unable to prosecute numerous sus-pected criminals and criminals who committed in the United States if there is a possibility that these criminals will face life imprisonment.

(3) Therson or persons responsible for the April 29, 2002, murder of Los Angeles County Sheriff Deputy David March is be-lieved to have fled to Mexico to avoid prosecution.

(4) The attorneys general from all 50 States have asked United States Attorney General John Ashcroft and Secretary of State Colin Powell to continue to address this extra-dition issue with their counterparts in Mex-ico.

(5) The Governments of the United States and Mexico have experienced positive co-operation on numerous matters relevant to their bilateral relationship.

(6) The Mexican Minister of Foreign Af-fairs has been demonstrating to the Mexican Supreme Court the international ramifica-tions of the Court's October 2001 ruling.

(b) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States Government should encourage the Mexican Government to work closely with the Mexican Supreme Court to persuade the Court to reconsider its October 2001 ruling so that the possibility of life imprisonment will not have an effect on the timely extradition of criminal suspects from Mexico to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gen-tleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and a Member opposed each will con-trol 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act to address the issue of extradition, specifically as it per-tains to Mexico. The seriousness of this issue is best described by the following tragic story:

On April 29, 2002, over a year ago, Deputy David March, a 7-year veteran of the Los Angeles Sheriff's Depart-ment, was shot and killed in the line of duty. David March was 33 years old, a husband, a father, a son, a brother, a neighbor, a stalwart in our community. The suspect who took his life was a Mexican national, a convicted felon. He fled to Mexico to avoid prosecution.

Historically, the Mexican govern-ment has refused to extradite Mexican nationals who commit crimes and flee to Mexico unless there are assurances granted by the United States that the death penalty would not be sought. Then in October, 2001, the Mexican Su-preme Court ruled, in addition to the death penalty, they would not extra-dite criminals who also face life im-prisonment in the United States. For the crime that was com-mitted, one of those penalties would be required. As such, Deputy March’s killer roams free in Mexico; and the United States is unable to threaten a sentence commensurate with this murderer’s horrific crime.

It should be noted this is not an iso-lated case for it is estimated that more than 60 suspected killers from Los An-geles County alone are in Mexico, along with countless more individuals who are suspected of rape, child molesta-tion, attempted murder and other se-rious, violent crimes.

Mr. Chairman, this is an outrage. We cannot allow the most heinous criminals to escape justice. They must pay the penalties for their crimes, and the victims and their fami-lies must have reprieve through a judi-cious process.

I just imagine the turmoil that these families feel. David’s younger sister went to school with my youngest daughter, good friends growing up. It is a great family. Every day they have to get up knowing that their son, brother, husband, father, is no longer with them, and the person who committed the crime, that took his life, is free. It is just not fair.

As such, my amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the United States Government should work close-ly with and encourage the Mexican government to persuade its Supreme Court to reconsider this October, 2001, ruling so the possibility of life imprison-ment will not have an effect on the timely extradition of criminal suspects from Mexico to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gen-tleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentle-woman from California (Ms. WATERS).

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

...
Mr. Chairman, a few years ago, at the end of 20th century, the world community came together under the leadership of several of the world's most influential churches and created the Jubilee 2000 movement, a worldwide movement of the world's poorest countries. The Jubilee 2000 movement included the Catholic Church, the Episcopal Church, the World Council of Churches, Bread for the World, many other Christian, Jewish and other faith-based organizations, development experts, business leaders and labor unions also joined this diverse movement.

In 1999, Jubilee 2000 convinced the G-8 group of industrialized countries to develop the Enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative, known as HIPC, a program to significantly reduce poor country's debt. In 2000, Jubilee 2000 convinced the United States Government as well as the government of other countries to authorize this debt relief program and appropriate the funds to carry it out.

Unfortunately, the Enhanced HIPC Initiative has failed to provide a lasting solution to poor country debts. At least 10 heavily indebted poor countries are still spending more money on debt payments than they are on health care.

The goal of Jubilee 2000 was to completely cancel the debts of the world's poorest countries. We must do more to accomplish this goal. We must do more to proclaim Jubilee for the poorest of the poor.

Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 643, the Debt Cancellation for the New Millennium Act. This bill would urge the President to negotiate with the IMF and the World Bank to completely cancel 100 percent of the debts of the world's most impoverished countries who owe these institutions and give these countries a fresh start in the new millennium. This bill has 45 cosponsors.

H.R. 1298, the Global AIDS bill, included a debt relief provision, Title V, urging the administration to advocate deeper debt relief within the Enhanced HIPC Initiative. Title V states that the Secretary of the Treasury should immediately commence efforts with the IMF, the World Bank and other creditor countries to modify the Enhanced HIPC Initiative to reduce poor countries' debt. This reporting requirement also could provide an incentive for multilateral development institutions and other creditor countries to support proposals for deeper debt relief.

Deeper debt relief for the world's heavily indebted poor countries will remove a major obstacle to HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention, poverty reduction and economic growth. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Ms. WATERs. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the gentleman's amendment. It is sorely needed. I could not think of a more noble project than to assist Buddhist countries with huge debts with debt relief. This is a measure that deserves bipartisan support. I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for it.

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

Ms. WATERs. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment points to an important subject, the need for prompt implementation of the Act, and we certainly think that the Committee on International Relations and other relevant committees ought to receive periodic reports and hold hearings and briefings, if necessary.

The reporting provisions in the legislation require the Secretary of Treasury to inform the Congress of his progress in implementing the Act, but we have no objection to the amendment of the gentleman at this point. Unless we figure something differently, we are entirely supportive.

Ms. WATERs. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his words of support. I do not think there would be any other information which would lead to opposition to the amendment, and I thank the gentleman from California for his support and superb leadership on this committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does any Member rise in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERs).

The amendment was agreed to by Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon) having assumed the chair, Mr. BEREUTER, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole on the House of the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1950) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal years 2004 and 2005, to authorize appropriations under the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for security assistance for fiscal years 2004 and 2005, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENT TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFERENCE COMMITTEES ON H.R. 1308, JOBS AND GROWTH TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 1308.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1308 be instructed as follows:

The House conferences shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides immediate payments for taxpayers with children in the combat zone.

2. The House conferences shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions.

3. To the maximum extent possible within the scope of the conference, the House conferences shall be instructed to include in the conference report other tax benefits for military personnel and the families of the astronauts who died in the Columbia disaster.

The House conferences shall, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate.