

East-West Center is intended to establish an Ocean Resources Institute to figure out the best way to use the great marine wealth in the Pacific in a way that is economically and environmentally sound. And the Asia Foundation, which has been in Indonesia for almost half a century, was one of the most important groups doing civic education before the Indonesian elections. They are also heavily involved in helping small to medium-sized businesses, especially those owned by women, get on their feet and keep going, even during Indonesia's economic crisis.

The money that would be provided here is well justified and will be well used. Join me in demonstrating your support for a responsible investment with a long-term payoff. Vote against these cuts.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to the Sanford amendment to HR 2415, which seeks to delete \$5.5 million in funding from the East-West Center, \$1 million from the North-South Center, and \$7 million from the Asia Foundation.

These institutions are small but very cost-effective. They complement the foreign policy objectives of the United States by providing another dimension of engagement with leaders in Asia, the Pacific, and Latin America and help to increase the mutual understanding and cooperation that is essential for constructive relationships among the nations of these important regions.

The East-West Center is the only national program that has a strategic mission of developing a consensus on key policy issues in U.S.-Asia Pacific relations through intensive cooperative research and training. Many who initially came to the Center as students or researchers have risen to positions of power and influence in government, academia, business, and the media in countries throughout Asia and the Pacific. These opinion leaders formed deep ties with the Center and understand first-hand the value of democracy, an open society, and a free press.

The Center has earned the trust and respect of the nations of this region and enjoys a prestige disproportionate to its small size. We cannot afford to continue to starve this unique and valuable institution.

I urge all my colleagues to defeat the Sanford amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 247, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) will be postponed.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R.

2415) to enhance security of United States missions and personnel overseas, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 995, TEACHER EMPOWERMENT ACT

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-240) on the resolution (H. Res. 253) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1995) to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to empower teachers, improve student achievement through high-quality professional development for teachers, reauthorize the Reading Excellence Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AMERICAN EMBASSY SECURITY ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 247 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2415.

□ 2030

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2415) to enhance security of United States missions and personnel overseas, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. MILLER of Florida (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 2030

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 106-235 had been postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in Part B of House Report 106-235.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 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:

Part B amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. PAUL:

Page 16, strike line 5 and all that follows through line 17 on page 21, and insert the following: None of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) are authorized to be appropriated for a United States contribution to the United Nations, any organ of the United Nations, or any entity affiliated with the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 247, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield half of my time to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) and ask unanimous consent that she be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) will be recognized for 2½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes the authorizations in section 106 for all U.N.-related operations. We have a bill here tonight dealing with embassy security, U.S. embassy security, and we are all very concerned about it.

But in typical fashion, about all we have been offered so far has been just to put more money into our embassies and never raising the question about why our embassies might be more vulnerable. My amendment deals with that, because I would like to deal with the foreign policy involved with our commitment to the United Nations.

There are many in this Congress who readily admit they are internationalists. I readily admit that I am not an internationalist when it comes to political action and warmongering. Therefore, I think much of what we do in foreign policy makes ourselves more vulnerable. If we look at the two most recent bombings in Africa, these were brought about by our own foreign policy.

Those supporters of internationalism generally accuse those of us who are opposed to it by saying that we are isolationists. This is not true. I am not an isolationist. But I do believe in national sovereignty. I happen to sincerely believe that one cannot become an endorser of some form of internationalism without some sacrifice of our own sovereignty. I think this is the subject that we must address.

I believe in free trade. I do not believe in protectionism. I am not a protectionist. I think people, goods, and services and ideas should flow across borders freely. But when it comes to our armaments, under the guise of the U.N. orders or NATO orders, I do not believe this should be called something favorably as internationalism and

those who oppose that as being isolationists.

I object to imposing our will on other people. I believe this is what we so often do. When we do that, we build hatreds around the world. That is why our embassies are less secure than many other nations. This is why we are bombed. We bomb Iraq endlessly. No wonder they hate us.

Iran right now, they have dissidents in the street; but they are blaming America, because there was a time when we put our dictator in charge of Iran as we have done so often around the world. Yet they only can come back by making our embassies vulnerable. It might be wiser for those countries that we cannot protect our embassies to put in a computerized operation because, in this day and age, we do not have to have embassies in the countries that are so dangerous.

But it is not the lack of security that is the problem, it is our type of policy that prompts the hatred toward America. I suggest we should look at some of this U.N. activity.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL). I know that many of us are often frustrated with the U.N. and especially some of its activities. But I do believe that the amendment does risk throwing the baby out with the bath water.

The amendment would effectively take us out of the U.N., while it has its blemishes, and the previous amendments certainly underscored my concern that the UNFPA, for example, has been absolutely complicit in the forced abortion program in the People's Republic of China; and I do believe a calibrated focused approach like that is the way to make our point. But look at some of the good things that the U.N. has done again with blemishes and all.

I will never forget, back in the early 1980s, I was in El Salvador when the United Nations Children's Fund, UNICEF, under Jim Grant, working with the Catholic church, working with the Duarte government, and working with the FMLN, the Communist insurgency, headed days of tranquility. Hundreds of thousands of children were immunized against the world's leading killers of children and those that extract or impose a great morbidity on young lives. Pertussis, tetanus, all of these diseases were wiped away from these kids, and because of these immunizations. The U.N. played a very, very important role in that.

Look at the world food program which provides necessary foods to children and families, the victims of torture. Our subcommittee, and I offered the bill, it became law, provided an additional amount of money to the U.N. voluntary fund for torture to help the people who suffer from torture. There are 400,000 former torture victims living in the U.S. with posttraumatic

stress and all kinds of other problems. Many hundreds of thousands abroad, they need our help.

Then when it comes to such things as peacekeeping, yes, it is flawed. The UNPROFOR was a very flawed deployment, but there are many that had been successful.

I would just remind Members that, when we had the Gulf War, the U.N. played a pivotal position in mobilizing, especially through the Security Council, our efforts to try to mitigate the abuses of Saddam Hussein.

While I deeply respect the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), I do think it overreaches, and I would hope that Members would vote it down.

But remembering that it does have its problems, the U.N. certainly is not a perfect organization, it is far from it, but it does have some agencies and things that do some very, very good things. I missed it, but on refugees, the UNHCR is vital to proceeding refugee protection and assistance.

So I do ask Members to vote "no".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) will have the right to close.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not addressing the imperfections of the United Nations. I am addressing the imperfection of our policy with the United Nations, which is a lot different.

We ignore the rule of law; we ignore international law when it pleases us. We did not accept the United Nations role when it came to Kosovo. We did not even accept NATO when it came to Kosovo. What we did, we just totally ignored it.

We invaded a sovereign nation. We did not abide by the rules of the United Nations. Then when we needed rescue from our policy, then we go limping to the United Nations to come in and please save our policy in Kosovo.

That is what I object to. I think that we should not renege and turn over our sovereignty to these international bodies. I believe there is motivation for this. When our commercial interests and financial interests are at stake, yes, we do get involved in the Persian Gulf; yes, we do get involved in Eastern Europe. But do we get involved in Rwanda? No, we do not. We ignore it.

So I say that we should have a policy that is designed for the sovereignty of this Nation; that we should not have troops serving under the United Nations; that we should not pretend to be a member of the United Nations and pretend to be a member of NATO and then not even follow the rules that have been laid down and that we have agreed to.

Generally, we always make our problems worse. Our wars are endless, and our occupations are endless. Someday we are going to have to wake up and design a new policy because this will not stop as long as we capitulate to the use of the United Nations and try to sacrifice our sovereignty to these international parties.

Now, this does not get us out of the United Nations. It is a step in that direction, obviously. But it is a step in the right direction because I think it is the proper use of our military if we do not capitulate and put it under NATO and put it in the United Nations. We need to use our military strictly in the defense of U.S. sovereignty.

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

Mr. Chairman, I agree that bad diplomacy does make us more vulnerable. But this amendment represents the height of bad diplomacy. We should be trying to pay our more than \$1 billion debt that we owe to the United Nations. Great nations should pay their bills.

Unfortunately, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) compounds our shame by introducing an amendment to eliminate all funds for the United Nations, an action that would effectively end U.S. participation in the U.N. Make no mistake, this would spell the demise of the world's most universal forum.

Why would anyone want to kill an organization that has brought food to the starving, help to the homeless, pure water to the thirsty, health to the diseased, stability to peoples in conflict, and free elections to the oppressed?

But this is not just about altruism. Withholding funds from the U.N. would harm collective efforts to deal with threats that cut across borders, from terrorists to organized crime, and from drug traffickers to environmental damage.

Poll after poll has shown that Americans want to participate in solving global problems, but they do not want to do it alone. Americans want to share the burden of responsibility with the peoples of other nations, and we can best do that through the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, the very introduction of this amendment sends a message to the world that there are Americans who live in fear, fear of others and fear of the loss of control. I believe that this fear is a greater threat than that posed by the United Nations.

The children of the 21st century deserve a world of peace, stability, and prosperity across the globe. The United States cannot achieve this dream alone. However, with an effective United Nations, the dream can become a reality.

I suggest that my colleagues should not kill this dream, but kill this amendment.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Paul amendment which will prohibit all authorizations for appropriations from the United States to the United Nations or any entity affiliated with the United Nations. This is an irresponsible amendment which, if passed, would do severe damage to the United States ability to conduct foreign policy, and to humanitarian efforts around the world.

The United Nations, while not perfect, is a forum where member states can come together to work for peaceful solutions to international problems. Currently, the U.N. is operating 16 peacekeeping missions in different countries which are upholding cease-fires, ensuring free and fair elections, monitoring troop withdrawals, deterring violence, and creating free countries. These endeavors deserve our support, not our condemnation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would do damage to U.N. humanitarian efforts around the world which I have seen in such places like Sudan, North Korea, Bosnia, and Kosovo. I have seen first hand the U.N.'s humanitarian work through organizations like the World Food Program, U.N. Development Program, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, and UNICEF. The U.N. is a leader in humanitarian and development work. It has helped to eradicate smallpox, provide safe drinking water for over one billion people, deliver aid to millions of refugees, and generate a worldwide commitment to the needs of children.

Mr. Chairman, the Paul amendment should be defeated soundly because if it is passed, it would show that the United States simply does not care about the U.N.'s humanitarian work around the world or its efforts to find peaceful solutions to international problems.

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

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 247, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

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

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. BEREUTER:

Page 35, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 211. LEASE-PURCHASE AGREEMENTS.

Whenever the Department of State enters into lease-purchase agreements involving property in foreign countries pursuant to section 1 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act (22 U.S.C. 292), budget authority shall be scored on an annual basis over the period of the lease in an amount equal to the annual lease payments.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to raise a point of order on the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 247, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BE-

REUTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this Member offers this amendment for one simple reason, a glitch in the current interpretation, or the misinterpretation, of the Budget Act has resulted in a situation where Americans overseas are needlessly being placed at risk.

There is no question that many of America's diplomatic facilities are at risk from terrorist attack. Recommendations were made in 1985 by the Inman Commission to significantly upgrade security and replace outdated facilities. But a decade and a half later, only 15 percent of the U.S. embassies meet Inman standards.

The reason is that it takes decades to go through the labyrinth of bureaucracy associated with the U.S. government constructing a new embassy. The addition to the Moscow embassy took almost two decades. The State Department has been considering additions to the terribly outdated Beijing chancery for almost a decade, and construction has yet to begin.

There are many, many facilities that do not receive much-needed attention because the few contractors the State Department relies upon are overwhelmed.

In desperation, our U.S. ambassadors are taking it upon themselves to cut through the red tape, contacting private engineering firms to develop plans for necessary embassy upgrades. The notion is that private firms are able to construct diplomatic facilities that meet the Inman standards, and then lease the facilities to the United States.

□ 2045

Such lease-purchase arrangements for facilities built by the private sector would eliminate the likely delays caused by the tortuous, slow State Department bureaucracy, where decisions on embassy construction literally require decades.

According to the Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, "The bottom line is I can get more embassies built faster if the private sector was doing the construction with its own money."

This Member's amendment would permit budgetary scoring of leased properties on an annual basis. This amendment permits the speedy construction of more secure diplomatic facilities.

I would tell my colleagues this has, in fact, long been the intent of this body. Section 134 of the Foreign Relations Act for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 spoke directly to this problem. According to that legislation, "Whenever the Department of State enters into lease-

purchase agreements involving property in foreign countries, the Department shall account for such transactions in accordance with fiscal year obligations."

Regrettably, the administration has written an opinion stating that this provision of law does not alter Office of Management and Budget scoring rules. OMB is steadfastly opposed to lease-purchase scoring on an annual basis. Rather, they insist the entire value of the lease be scored on the first year of the lease. As a result, there is no incentive to engage in lease-purchases and we lose a highly creative approach to addressing our security concerns.

This Member's amendment simply would permit scoring of lease-purchase properties on an annual basis. If this amendment is offered, we will have secure embassy facilities years earlier. Thus, the security of U.S. diplomatic personnel overseas will be dramatically increased.

The bottom line is this: The current OMB interpretation of lease-purchase scoring regulations needlessly endangers American lives overseas. This Member would ask his colleagues to work to address this situation by allowing lease-purchase scoring on an annual basis. And I urge my colleagues to support the Bereuter amendment on embassy construction.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations for a very, very fine amendment. I would hope the Committee on the Budget would not object, but it looks like they may.

We need safe embassies now, Mr. Chairman, and our diplomatic personnel overseas need and deserve that security. Moreover, the image of the U.S. should not be one of easy vulnerability. Where our posts are not secure and cannot be made secure, we need to build safe posts as soon as we can.

The fastest way to build them is for the private sector to put up the money and build them. We then lease-purchase over the years. The current rule requires us to score the whole multi-year lease-purchase in the first year. This amendment, instead, allows us to score only the annual expenditure. This change will expedite the necessary and urgent construction of safe posts without increasing any costs.

The scoring of lease-purchase properties on an annual basis was already included in the Foreign Relations Act for fiscal years 1994 and 1995, yet the administration has opined otherwise.

So I support this amendment of my colleague from Nebraska. It is a good amendment, it is common sense, and we should support it.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply state that the previous

act I mentioned, PL 103-236, made it very clear that the Congress intended that we were going to overrule the Budget Act that will be cited here in a few seconds, and the President's signing statement simply flew in the face of that clear legislative intent. So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Although I am not in opposition to this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Without objection, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment on embassy construction proposed by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), and I urge the House to adopt it.

This amendment goes perfectly with the Embassy Security Act. The goal of the act is to provide serious money to improve embassy security. This amendment allows that money to be spent in a serious and intelligent way.

Instead of having to charge off the entire cost of leasing buildings to own the first year, the Department of State could have these costs scored annually based on the amount of the leased payments. That is not a radical idea. It is how we all buy houses here.

If people in the United States had to have enough money up front to pay for their houses in the year they bought them, hardly anyone would own a house. The State Department is in the same situation. That needs to change if we are going to get moving fast on security. And if we do not get moving fast, more people will get hurt.

To be serious on embassy security, we need this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support the BEREUTER amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) insist on his point of order?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

I object to the amendment under section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment violates section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 306 prohibits the consideration of any amendment that is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget and which is offered to a bill that was neither reported or discharged from the Committee on the Budget.

The amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska modifies the budgetary treatment of certain leases entered into by the State Department. The budgetary treatment of such leases prescribed in the Balanced Budget Act

and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, which is, pursuant to clause 1 of House Rule X, within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget.

Under current law and existing scoring procedures, the Federal Government is required to appropriate the full cost of any multi-year lease of office space in the fiscal year in which it enters into the lease agreement. This amendment permits the State Department to commit the Federal Government to a long-term lease agreement with an appropriation for only the first year of the cost of the lease. However, once the lease is agreed to, the Federal Government is saddled with a long-term financial commitment.

So I do object to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BEREUTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. It is my intention to attempt to amend the Budget Act to permit for lease-purchasing by the State Department for embassies and consulates and related facilities, but I do reluctantly, with great regret, acknowledge that a point of order does pertain against the amendment under the rule.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman that we look forward to working with him to reconcile any concern he has.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 11 is not offered at this point.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13, printed in Part B of House Report 106-235.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Page 35, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 211. REPORT CONCERNING THE DIPLOMATIC INITIATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA.

No later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees assessing the diplomatic initiatives of the United States and other interested parties in the period leading up to and during the war in Kosovo. The report shall be written by an independent panel of experts (from the National Academy of Sciences). The report

shall give particular consideration to the Rambouillet negotiations, diplomatic initiatives undertaken by representatives of Russia, Cyprus, Finland, United States congressional members, other United States citizens, and other parties. The report analysis will evaluate the role of diplomacy in ending the war and compare the final agreement with various proposed agreements dating from before the commencement of the bombing campaign.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 247, the gen-

tleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed, and I know of no opposition to this, but I would ask to claim the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) will control the time in opposition.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

My amendment is a simple amendment. It is not a controversial amendment. It would commission the Secretary of State, after 1 year, to submit an independent study of the diplomatic initiatives undertaken by the United States and other parties involved in the Balkans. It would carefully examine the role of diplomacy in the Kosovo conflict in the Balkans.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who has done yeoman's work on diplomacy related to this with the Duma.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to rise to applaud the distinguished member for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that we look back at the Kosovo crisis and see what steps were taken, those that we are not aware of, in an effort to find a diplomatic solution.

As I am well aware, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) spent countless hours himself trying to find a diplomatic way to end this crisis. I saw his efforts firsthand. I know of his contacts, I have applauded him for that publicly.

I think it is important that we ask the administration to go back and look at what lessons can be learned from this situation, what kinds of, perhaps, opportunities we may have missed, what kinds of things worked well. Because there were successes and, perhaps, failures in both regards in terms of this crisis, and it is important to look back to see what we can do differently if a similar crisis occurs in the future.

The gentleman and I were both involved, with nine of our colleagues, in trying to find a diplomatic solution. The Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle were as aggressively involved as were Members on my side to trying to find an alternative to the bombing that occurred as a way of solving the crisis.

So I think the amendment is well worded, it is well intended, and I think it will be an overall help to future administrations. I applaud the gentleman

for the effort he has undertaken, and hope that my colleagues on this side of the aisle would accept the amendment and work with the gentleman to see that his ultimate report is, in fact, issued so this body can learn lessons from the Kosovo crisis.

Mr. Chairman, I want to also thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my distinguished chairman, who has also been a tireless advocate for finding peaceful solutions to international crises, and I look forward to adding my support to the vote on this amendment.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to first say that my work on this amendment was inspired by the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who saw a very important moment in the history of the Kosovo conflict and rallied Members from both sides of the aisle to a higher level of participation, and I want to publicly thank him not only for supporting the amendment but also for his almost singular leadership in this House on behalf of peace. So I thank him for his support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Ohio for his amendment and for the wonderful work that was done during this period of crisis that we have recently faced. I want to lend my voice of support for the work that the gentleman does, his efforts on behalf of peace and on this amendment, and I thank him for introducing it.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, but also want to thank the gentlewoman from Georgia for her support and for her participation and her efforts over the past year.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how much time remains.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I agree with my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), who has sponsored this amendment calling for a study of the role of diplomacy regarding the Kosovo conflict, and I want to thank him for his very thoughtful amendment. Everything he does is thoughtful, and this is just another example.

I personally voted against military action, Mr. Chairman, and history will someday give us a clue and perhaps some real answers as to whether or not diplomacy before the conflict was working and whether diplomacy during the conflict was responsible for ending the conflict.

I support the notion of an independent panel to examine this. We have ample reason for concern that a report

by the administration about its own policies would simply be a defense or an apology for those policies and little more. This administration certainly has a record of paying, at best, lip service to congressional initiatives in foreign policy.

I would also like to say that the report must, in addition to considering the question of diplomacy versus military intervention, assess the situation on the ground in Kosovo to which the international community was seeking to respond. The ideas of conflict resolution, preventive diplomacy, and negotiated settlements are theoretical concepts, and they do not incorporate the notion that one side might not have had one ounce of good will and instead had a clear willingness and desire to commit genocide instead.

Finally, diplomatic initiatives are supposed to be motivated by good intentions, and most are, but the report should consider that not all motivations are good. Having just returned from St. Petersburg session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, many of us were subject to a heavy dose of Russian propaganda which, among other things, alleged that there was no dissent here to the administration's policies. That is obviously false, and I must say I would not want to see Russian initiatives to have been considered well intentioned just because they were diplomatic.

As a critic of the NATO action, I do not want to see a report which would simply vindicate my own beliefs. It must also assess whether diplomatic alternatives in dealing with a regime with a track record like that of Slobodan Milosevic might have made a just solution to the Kosovo crisis all the more elusive. Otherwise, the report would be no different than the latest administration proclamation of the wisdom of its ways.

Having said this, Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the gentleman's thoughtful amendment and I recommend the full House adopt it.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I wish to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his thoughtful and analytical approach to this important question. I also want to thank him for his leadership on human rights, which has animated his support not only for this amendment but for his work in so many vital areas in this Congress.

□ 2100

I am very pleased to have the support on both sides of the aisle.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER) having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2415) to enhance security of United States missions and personnel overseas, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H.Res. 225) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 255

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and he is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: Mr. BLUNT of Missouri.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HONORING ASTRONAUT PETE CONRAD

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the sad occasion of the recent loss of a great American hero. Pete Conrad truly embodied our Nation's preeminence in space exploration and the progress of our Nation's space program.

As a lifetime fan of space exploration, I have been inspired by Captain Conrad's achievements in space and devotion to building America's space program.

I recently had the honor of meeting this great man, a brief meeting that I will never forget. In the short amount of time we spent together, I sensed the passion and dedication he held for our Nation's space program. As I shook his hand to say goodbye, I knew that I had just met a true American hero.