

goods and services as of the date on which the international registration was canceled. Similarly, if the International Bureau does not renew an international registration, the corresponding extension of protection in the United States shall cease to be valid. Finally, the holder of an international registration canceled in whole or in part by the International Bureau may file an application for the registration of the same mark for any of the goods and services to which the cancellation applies that were covered by an extension of protection in the United States based on that international registration.

(J) The holder of an extension of protection must, within designated time periods and under certain conditions, file an affidavit setting forth the relevant goods or services on or in connection with which the mark is in use in commerce and attaching a specimen or facsimile showing the current use of the mark in commerce, or setting forth that any nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark.

(K) The right to an extension of protection may be assigned to a third party so long as that person is a national of, or is domiciled in, or has a "bonafide" and effective industrial or commercial establishment in a country that is a member of the Protocol; or has such a business in a country that is a member of an intergovernmental organization (such as the EC) belonging to the Protocol.

(L) An extension of protection conveys the same rights as an existing registration for the same mark if the extension and existing registration are owned by the same person, and extension of protection and the existing registration cover the same goods or services, and the certificate of extension is issued after the date of the existing registration.

Sec. 13403. Effective date

This section states that the effective date of the act shall commence on the date on which the Madrid Protocol enters into force with respect to the United States or 1 year after the date of enactment of the act, whichever occurs later.

TITLE IV—ANTITRUST TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2002

Sec. 14101. Short title

Section 14101 provides that this title may be cited as the "Antitrust Technical Corrections Act of 2002."

Sec. 14102. Amendments

Subsection 14102(a) repeals the paragraph in Section 11 of Panama Canal Act, prohibiting ships owned by persons who are violating the antitrust laws from passing through the Canal.

Subsection 14102(b) adds a new Section 3(b) to the Sherman Act to clarify that Section 2 of the Sherman Act applies to the District of Columbia and the territories.

Subsection 14102(c) repeals Section 77 of the Wilson Tariff Act and also eliminates several cross-references to Section 77 in five other statutes (the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Packers and Stockyards Act, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and the Deep Seabed Hard Mineral Resources Act). These cross-references occur in definitions of the term "antitrust laws" in the other statutes and do not change the substance of those statutes.

Subsection 14102(d) corrects an erroneous section number designation in the Curt Flood Act passed in 1998. It makes no substantive change.

Subsection 14102(e) inserts an inadvertently omitted period in the Year 2000 Information and Readiness Disclosure Act. It makes no substantive change.

Subsection 14102(f) repeals the Act of March 3, 1913, requiring that depositions in Sherman Act equity cases brought by the government be held in public.

Subsection 14102(g) repeals section 116 of the Act of November 19, 2001.

Section 14103. Effective date; application of amendments

Subsection 14103(a) provides that the changes shall take effect on the date of enactment.

Subsection 14103(b) provides that the change made by subsection 14102(a) shall apply to cases pending on or after the date of enactment.

Subsection 14103(c) provides that the change made by subsections 14102(b), (c), and (d) shall apply only to cases commenced on or after the date of enactment.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER,
HENRY HYDE,
GEORGE W. GEKAS,
J. HOWARD COBLE,
LAMAR SMITH,
ELTON GALLEGLY,
JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
BARNEY FRANK,
BOBBY SCOTT,
TAMMY BALDWIN,

(*Provided*, That Mr. BERMAN is appointed in lieu of Ms. BALDWIN for consideration of sec. 312 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference.)

HOWARD BERMAN

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of secs. 2203-6, 2206, 2210, 2801, 2901-2911, 2951, 4005, and title VIII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

BILLY TAUZIN,
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS,
JOHN D. DINGELL,

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of secs. 2207, 2301, 2302, 2311, 2321-4, 2331-4 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

PETER HOEKSTRA,
MICHAEL N. CASTLE,
GEORGE MILLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PATRICK LEAHY,
TED KENNEDY,
ORIN HATCH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1646, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 545 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 545

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and

against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 545 is a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 1646, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for 2002 and 2003, and against its consideration.

The underlying legislation has taken on a new meaning, Mr. Speaker, this year. The United States is leading a worldwide war against terrorism. This is a very difficult task, which requires a careful combination of strength as well as diplomacy. The legislation that we will consider today supports the needs of President Bush and his administration to conduct the foreign relations of the United States while keeping our citizens abroad safe from harm.

It provides \$13.8 billion in fiscal year 2003 to help achieve these goals, including \$5.2 billion for counterterrorism assistance to our allies and \$1.6 billion for security at our embassies abroad.

I am very pleased to see that this report includes increased authorization levelings for human rights monitoring as part of our effort in Congress to promote human rights around the world. This legislation also requires State Department officials to work to reform the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, whose membership includes some of the world's worst human rights violators.

The underlying legislation will also help promote our Nation's message of freedom and support for democracy by providing new authorities to our international broadcasting entities, with an emphasis on those countries whose governments obviously do not permit freedom of the press.

I am pleased to see a continued commitment to our friends in Israel. Every country under international law has the right to designate its capital city. In fact, however, this has not been the case with Israel. This legislation requires compliance with existing U.S. law that recognizes Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, which has been the capital of that country since 1950.

This legislation also enacts the Middle East Peace Commitments Act of 2002, which requires the President to formally determine whether the Palestinian Authority is complying with its commitments under international

agreements, including the absolute renunciation of terrorism and violence.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, we continue to support our democratic allies around the world. For example, Taiwan has demonstrated its continued commitment to a democratic path even under the constant threat just miles off its shores. The administration has shown that they have a clear understanding of Taiwan's security needs by requesting four Kidd class destroyers which this bill provides for.

Mr. Speaker, as we continue our efforts to prevent future acts of terror, it is important that we provide the administration with the necessary tools to continue to bring the world's community on board. I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member, and all the members of the Committee on International Relations for in effect making the tough decisions required to produce thoughtful legislation that meets our most important priorities in this field, the field of foreign affairs.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this straightforward rule, non-controversial rule as well as this very important underlying legislation.

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

□ 1445

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for granting me the customary time for debate, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the House is able to review and act on the conference report on H.R. 1646, the fiscal year 2002 and fiscal year 2003 authorizations for the Department of State; and I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), his distinguished ranking member, for moving the conference process along; and I thank all the conferees for their work.

The rule providing for debate is the standard rule for a conference report. It waives all points of order against the conference report and against consideration. It provides that the conference report shall be considered as read and it allows for 1 hour of debate equally divided. As such, this rule should be supported.

This bipartisan bill has much to commend it. It authorizes \$8.6 billion for the operations of the State Department and related agencies in fiscal year 2003, slightly more than the level approved in the House version of the bill. The measure's funding level includes a substantial increase for the State Department as requested by the administration.

I do want to clarify that this is not a foreign aid authorization bill which would involve the authorization of our bilateral development economic and se-

curity programs. This bill primarily authorizes funding for the State Department programs, multilateral aid administered by the State Department such as international peacekeeping funds and refugee assistance and U.S. information programs such as freedom broadcasting to the Middle East and Asia.

Most importantly, this bill authorizes \$564 million for worldwide security upgrades to protect U.S. diplomatic missions and personnel abroad. It also strengthens the authority of the United States to fight terrorism as well as strengthening our commitment to Israel and peace in the Middle East, reform at the United Nations, the survival of a democratic Taiwan, the promotion of religious freedom, and protection for the victims of human trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of this body could find at least one provision in this bill that runs counter to his or her convictions about what is best for U.S. policy. For example, this bill authorizes \$25.9 million for broadcasting Radio and TV Marti to Cuba. Since TV Marti reaches no one in Cuba, I find it a particulars waste of Americans' hard-earned tax dollars. There is a shocking lack of accountability in Radio Marti's professional conduct and broadcast content. Often, it broadcasts news to Cuban households many hours after such news has already been broadly reported by other sources, including sometimes even Cuban government programs such as in the case of Jimmy Carter's recent address to the Cuban people. I know that the Committee on International Relations has been looking into the lack of effectiveness of Radio and TV Marti, and I hope that this waste of U.S. taxpayer dollars will soon be remedied.

The conference report also includes a total of \$5.2 billion to fund security assistance provisions, including counterterrorism and other military assistance to our allies. This section of the bill facilitates access by U.S. pilots to the Gulf Air Warfare Center in the United Arab Emirates and authorizes funding for the destruction of surplus weapon stockpiles in the former Soviet Union, Africa, and elsewhere. It also includes a new program to forgive certain Russian debts in exchange for investments in nonproliferation programs.

My colleagues will detail many of these key provisions, but I would like to take a few moments just to highlight a few. This bill serves as the vehicle for the release of funds previously appropriated for back payments of U.S. dues to the United Nations. The Omnibus Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2000 provided \$926 million for U.S. back payments to the United Nations. However it conditioned the release of these funds on enactment of an authorization bill that specified U.N. agreement to certain reforms, including a decrease in the percentage of assessed U.S. contributions to the organization. These

conditions were successfully negotiated by former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations Richard Holbrooke.

In May of 2001, the House passed its version of H.R. 1646 and authorized both the release of the \$582 million and a third installment of \$244 million. However, 2 weeks before the House considered the bill, the United States lost its seat on the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. The House responded by adopting an amendment conditioning release of the remaining installment on the return of the U.S. to the commission. Since then the United States has regained the seat. This bill, therefore, authorizes the third and final installment owed to the United Nations.

This bill also completes the process of U.N. reform under which U.S. dues to the United Nations will be reduced from 25 to 22 percent, providing American taxpayers with \$2 billion in savings. In addition, this bill modestly increases the level of U.S. contributions for U.N. peacekeeping, raising it from 25 to 27 percent.

At a time when the United States is asking so much of the United Nations, it is important that we put in place the financial and legal structure that will ensure the U.S. remains a responsible and accountable leader of this singular international body.

I am also very pleased to see a number of important programs authorized in this bill. Among these is the inclusion of the Tibet Policy Act, which requires the State Department to create an office for a special coordinator for Tibetan issues. It also requires the U.S. to undertake a number of initiatives to improve the condition of human rights and religious freedom for the Tibetan people and encourage dialogue between the Chinese Government and the Dalai Lama over the future of Tibet. It also calls for the release of the 11-year-old Panchen Lam from detention by China, an act that would significantly increase confidence among the international community about China's commitment to respect the culture and religion of the Tibetan people.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), my colleague and the ranking member, should be commended for his leadership on this issue along with our colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK). This bill will also enact the East Timor Transition to Independence Act, which authorizes economic aid for East Timor and provides a framework for a strong bilateral relationship between the U.S. and the world's newest nation. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), ranking member, as well as the efforts of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), for their long leadership in support of freedom and human rights in East Timor.

The conference report also requires the State Department to report to Congress on the extent to which the British Government has implemented the recommendations for police reform in Northern Ireland listed in the Patten Commission's report. The establishment of a new, nonpartisan police is critical to the implementation of the Good Friday Peace Accords and bringing peace and genuine security to the people of Northern Ireland. It also emphasizes the importance of continuing the decommissioning of weapons by all Irish armed groups and the investigations of the murders of Rosemary Nelson, Patrick Finucane, and Roberts Hammill. So many of our colleagues have worked long and hard to secure a just and lasting peace in Northern Ireland, and we are all appreciative of the leadership on this provision of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Finally, the conference report agreement also extends and strengthens authorizations provided for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, it requires the State Department to maintain a special envoy for Sudanese issues; authorizes \$5 million for a special court to try war criminals and human rights abusers in Sierra Leone; it requires annual country reports on the use of children as soldiers; and it requires the State Department to report to the Congress on U.S. efforts in Colombia to promote alternative development, recovery, and resettlement of internally displaced persons, judicial reform, and the peace process and human rights. It also requires reports on the activities of U.S. private contractors involved in counter-narcotics programs in Colombia, an issue brought so compellingly to the attention of the House by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill that is long overdue, and I urge my colleagues to approve the rule and adopt the conference report on H.R. 1646.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to object to some language that is in this conference report having to do with assistance to Lebanon. There was an attempt early on with an amendment to eliminate most of the money for Lebanon, and I guess wiser heads prevailed.

I want to offer my thanks to the chairman of the full Committee on International Relations for working out an arrangement that will allow for the country of Lebanon to be authorized for \$35 million. The language I ob-

ject to is that they have carved out \$10 million that cannot be used for the country, \$10 million of the \$35 million, until there is a certification from the President that a certain group that is in the country is no longer a threat. I think this is a mistake to have this kind of language in there. The country of Lebanon is 3 million people. It is a peace-loving country. It is caught in the switches between other countries who are involved in disputes. To single out this country for this kind of certification I think is without merit. I wish the language were not in there.

The \$35 million is walking-around change compared to the money that is authorized for a lot of other countries. Lebanon certainly does not deserve this kind of treatment from this Congress. I know there are people in the administration, particularly in the State Department, who have strong objections to the way that Lebanon is being treated. I, too, have strong objections, and I wanted to make those objections known. I intend to vote for the rule. I know that the chairman and others have worked very hard to put together a good conference report; but my objection for the country of Lebanon needs to be noted here. Again, this to me is just an opportunity to take a very unjustified criticism of a country that has tried to work with the United States, has tried to work with other countries in the region. I object to the language, and I hope at some point people will come to respect the country of Lebanon and what the leaders there are trying to do.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state my very strong support for the conference report on the International Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 2003. I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), as well as Senator BIDEN and Senator LUGAR, for their hard work to support the State Department at a time when alliances and international partners matter most.

By paying more of our back dues to the United Nations, we are finally stepping up to the plate and being a responsible partner in this great international organization we helped create.

This bill also makes a bit of history by authorizing a new way to protect the United States from the threat of weapons of mass destruction: debt-for-security swaps.

In June, the leaders of the G-8 nations agreed to fund nonproliferation programs at \$20 billion over the next 10 years and stated that debt-for-program exchanges should be used to stop the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons.

Several months ago I introduced the first bipartisan nonproliferation legislation in the 107th Congress with the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the gentleman from Wis-

consin (Mr. GREEN), and the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the Russian Federation Debt Reduction for Nonproliferation Act for 2002, that would authorize the President to forgive a portion of Russia's outstanding debt to us in exchange for Russia using that money to lock down loose nuclear weapons and material.

Our colleagues in the House and Senate went a step further, including a debt-swap provision in the State Department authorization bill. Debt-for-security swaps are an important development. They will help Russia reduce its outstanding debt, involve Russia and the rest of the G-8 countries in programs that directly improve U.S. national security, and extend burden-sharing to our allies.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to seize this existing and unique opportunity to use a tool that would both help stabilize the Russian economy and find new sources of funding for the critical programs that keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of Saddam and al Qaeda. I encourage Members to vote for this bill.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for his very important efforts on this legislation. I also join in commending the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for reporting out this very important State Department authorization. This, as we know, covers a wide range of issues; and I would like to take just a moment to focus on one particular issue, and that has to do with the new degree of flexibility which is being put into place to deal with our war on drugs.

We know that President Uribe from Colombia is here in the United States. He met with President Bush today and met with a number of us yesterday. I believe that efforts are being made by leaders in Latin America to deal with the tremendous scourge of drugs that have been flowing into this country.

□ 1500

But we had a very antiquated structure for certification, decertification, was something that went on. In fact, it was very, very poorly crafted and I believe that it played a role in exacerbating rather than improving the situation. The language that is included in this conference report provides, as I mentioned, a degree of flexibility. So it basically uses the two words "demonstrably failed" in describing what it is that countries would have done who are dealing with this issue.

So the point is, we need to congratulate, encourage and support those nations which are helping us deal with

the illegal drug problem that we have faced as a Nation. I particularly want to congratulate President Fox who has faced a great deal of challenges in his country. He has come forward and in dealing with this question, there is the horrible Tijuana-based Arellano Felix drug cartel. Under President Fox's leadership, two of the very powerful members of that cartel have been arrested. There are other ongoing efforts taking place between the United States and Mexico. I believe that the language that is now incorporated in this conference report will help us further deal with this difficult challenge.

I want to congratulate all those involved in this very important effort and to say that I strongly support the rule that is being managed by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) and the conference report that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) will be managing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and I must say that I support most of the provisions of the conference report. I am concerned, though, and I do object to one provision with regard to India. In section 1601 of the legislation, the President is required to submit a report to Congress with regard to U.S. efforts relative to nonproliferation benchmarks. There is mention in that regard of both India and Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that India should be mentioned and specified in this report for the following reasons: First of all, in the House version of the bill we did not include India. India was included at the behest of the Senate. And if you think about it, since 1998, when India and Pakistan both tested nuclear weapons, India has had very good relations with the United States and has had numerous discussions on the issue of benchmarks for nonproliferation. Right now basically there is no disagreement between the United States and India in that regard. India has stated very dramatically that it has put in place a moratorium on further testing of nuclear weapons. India has also been very adamant about a policy of no first use of nuclear weapons, which is certainly not the case with regard to Pakistan. For that reason, I do not think we need to include India in any further negotiations or in any report that would have to be submitted on behalf of the President.

I am not quite sure why it was the case that the conference report did not adopt the House version of the bill, which I think made a lot more sense than the Senate version, and I did want to raise an objection at this time because I think that once again our policy is somehow reflecting that if Pakistan is included then India has to be included as well. I think that does not make sense under the circumstances.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I urge my colleagues to approve this rule and to approve the conference report.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I again would like to thank Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS for leading the Committee on International Relations to a very, not only successful but I think admirable and commendable result in this legislation. This is, as I stated before, very important legislation. By virtue of the fact that it is in effect consensus legislation in that it is supported in a bipartisan way by an overwhelming majority obviously of the committee, but also I am sure later by the House, it does not I think in any way minimize the importance and really the brilliance of the result.

This country, the Nation, the United States of America, has not only a role in leadership, a leadership role in the world but constantly has to be developing ways to implement that leadership on behalf of protection of democracies and the spreading of the values of freedom. This legislation goes a long way in once again doing that, and so it is legislation that I strongly support and urge my colleagues to as well.

I think that if there is a chairman and ranking member whom I certainly look at and admire for their clarity and their leadership and their vision, it is the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations. I would like to reiterate not only my thanks but my admiration for both of them. This is another example of why I think we all thank them and admire them. The issue was brought out of the fact that this legislation, for example, supports broadcasting to the oppressed people of Cuba, and it does and I am very proud of that. Despite the fact of the opposition of some folks such as the gentleman who expressed opposition once again to broadcasting to the oppressed people of Cuba, the overwhelming majority on a bipartisan basis of this Congress has supported and has continued and continues to support that broadcasting and the efforts to offer news and information as well as assistance to that people only 90 miles from our shores that have been suffering for over 40 years oppression. Again, if there is a leadership of a committee that I think demonstrates on a bipartisan basis in terms of the chairman and the ranking member clarity and lack of confusion with regard to dictators and tyranny and oppression, it is the leadership again of Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS.

I think this is legislation that we can all be proud of, Mr. Speaker. Again, I strongly support it and the rule, which is eminently fair and permits obviously all Members to express any points of view that they may have on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). Pursuant to House Resolution 545, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 23, 2002 at page H 6422.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 1646, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003. This comprehensive foreign policy legislation will give the President and the Secretary of State the tools they need to conduct a foreign policy that strengthens the security of the United States, protects American interests and promotes American values.

Mr. Speaker, it is traditional that in matters of foreign policy the Congress leaves the President and the Secretary of State some flexibility. This legislation respects that tradition, but it also sets limits, both on the amounts that may be spent and on the purposes for which they may be used. It identifies foreign policy priorities and it requires that Congress be kept informed.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report reaffirms and strengthens the authority of the U.S. officials to combat terrorism and to protect our embassies and the people who work in them. It also reaffirms and strengthens the United States' commitment to the survival of Israel and to a just peace in the Middle East, to United Nations reform, to the continued existence of a democratic Taiwan, and to religious freedom and other fundamental human rights.

To be specific, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will enhance our national security by authorizing \$1.6 billion for security at our embassies and other United

States missions abroad and by providing new law enforcement authorities for the diplomatic security agents who are charged with the protection of these missions. It will also authorize new counterterrorism assistance to countries that are helping us in this global struggle, and provide new authorities for the State Department's Bureau of Verification and Compliance, which monitors compliance by foreign governments with arms control agreements in order to stop the flow of weapons of mass destruction to terrorists and to rogue regimes.

The conference report also reaffirms and strengthens our commitment to freedom and democracy by setting aside funds for enhanced human rights monitoring, extending the life of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, providing for enhanced U.S. diplomatic efforts to promote human rights in Tibet and Vietnam, and requiring State Department officials to work for reform of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights whose membership now includes some of the world's worst human rights violators.

This legislation would also complete the process of United Nations budget reform which we began several years ago under which the U.S. dues to the U.N. will be lowered from 25 percent to 22 percent of the total. Our contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations will also be reduced through the end of fiscal year 2004 and thereafter will be capped at 25 percent. In addition, 15 provisions promote sound financial and management practices at the U.N. and its affiliated agencies.

The conference report will strengthen our bilateral relationship with important allies, such as Israel and Taiwan. It not only provides enhanced antiterrorism assistance for Israel but also contains provisions to spur compliance with existing U.S. law recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. The conference report also includes the Middle East Peace Commitments Act of 2002, which requires the President to determine whether the Palestinian Authority is complying with its commitments under international agreements, including the renunciation of terrorism and violence, and to report to Congress on what actions will be taken in the event of non-compliance. The legislation also authorizes the transfer to Taiwan of four Kidd class destroyers, as requested by the Bush administration, and requires that Taiwan be treated for purposes of military assistance as though it had been designated as a major non-NATO ally.

□ 1515

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill contains important provisions to protect a variety of other vital American interests. For instance, it requires a plan from the State Department for improving the recruitment of veterans into the Foreign Service, as well as a report

on steps taken by the U.S. Agency for International Development to ensure that the bidding procession is fair to small businesses in the United States. The legislation will require senior State Department officials in the law enforcement bureau to have some experience with law enforcement and/or international counternarcotics efforts, and it will require the State Department to report to Congress on foreign governments that refuse to extradite criminals for prosecution in the United States or to comply with the Hague Convention on International Child Abduction, as well as on joint cooperative efforts to eradicate opium in Colombia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important legislation.

I would like the record to show what a pleasure it was to work with the ranking Democrat, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), whose cooperation and vision has added greatly to the end product.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, for his most gracious words.

Mr. Speaker, let me at the outset congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations on bringing this conference report to the floor. Since this matter last came before the House, a myriad of procedural and substantive issues blocked the path of this bill. At every turn, the outstanding leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) brought us closer to our shared goal, and today an important and very substantive bill is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill blends the very best features of the original House-passed measure and the Senate amendments. The conference report authorizes funds for the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States of America and funds urgent U.S. priorities, such as the security of our embassies abroad, broadcasting to the Middle East and Asia to communicate our values and points of view to foreign audiences, protection of refugees, and scores of other issues.

Perhaps most significantly, Mr. Speaker, our bill takes a huge step towards normalizing our relations with the United Nations. It allows payment of our remaining arrears payments to the U.N. and clears our debts with a host of other smaller, but important, international organizations.

In addition, our bill includes a new authorization that clears the way for the United States to begin paying our bills on time instead of a year late. Because of late payments, the U.N. has been forced to adopt unsound budgetary practices. Our legislation will help put the United Nations and other international organizations on a proper and businesslike financial footing.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly delighted that the conference report includes language on the reentry of the United States into UNESCO, the United Nations Economic, Social and Cultural Organization. Several of us have been working for years to bring about this result, and I am truly pleased that in his speech before the United Nations on September 12, President Bush added his support for this critical initiative. The conference report now reflects this new consensus, which is truly bipartisan, to rejoin this important organization, so that the voice of the United States will be loud and clear in UNESCO.

Our actions are particularly timely, as we are in the midst of working with the United Nations to enforce U.N. Security Council resolutions aimed at Iraq. Our bill clearly demonstrates Congress' commitment to multilateralism, and it offers a vote of confidence in the United Nations. It is now time for the United Nations to prove itself worthy of such confidence by defending its principles and enforcing its resolutions. With the passage of this bill, the United States will have done its part. Now the Members of the United Nations Security Council must do theirs.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other important features in this bill, and I would like to highlight some of them.

Our bill authorizes U.S. counterterrorism and nonproliferation assistance as well as military assistance to recent and future NATO entrants and some of our key allies in the war against terrorism.

The bill also includes a trailblazing initiative to strengthen nonproliferation programs in Russia while retiring that nation's huge Soviet-era debt. Under our initiative, the United States will forgive that debt, and Russia will use the savings to pursue programs, such as securing its stocks of weapons-grade uranium and plutonium from terrorists and state sponsors of terrorism.

The bill has numerous important provisions on the Middle East, including the stopping of illegal weapons transfers to the Palestinians and ensuring that the PLO is abiding by the commitments it made almost a decade ago in 1993 to stop the use of violence and to negotiate peacefully. Our bill reaffirms United States policy that Jerusalem is the undivided and eternal capital of the State of Israel.

I also note that a compromise provision on Lebanon included in the conference report will create a real incentive for that government to deploy its forces along its own national frontier in areas currently controlled by Hezbollah, a terrorist organization. Our bill provides for new exchange programs for Sudanese oppressed by war and for scientists who conduct research on HIV-AIDS.

Our legislation, Mr. Speaker, provides that the Secretary of State should establish programs to train scientists and public policy experts on

ethical issues relating to drug trials, allowing governments in developing countries to evaluate any trials by foreign pharmaceutical companies on their citizens.

I am particularly pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report contains the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, legislation I introduced along with my good friends and colleagues, Senator FEINSTEIN, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK). This legislation is the first piece of comprehensive Tibet legislation ever enacted in the Congress of the United States, and it will send a strong signal to the Chinese Government that the United States has not forgotten the plight of Tibet and its people. Our legislation will promote human rights and religious freedom in Tibet, and it will ensure the development sponsored by international institutions benefits the people of Tibet.

The conference report also contains measures I introduced, along with the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. KENNEDY) and many others, to help the people of East Timor. After more than 2 decades of brutal Indonesian rule in East Timor and the enormous devastation subsequent to East Timor's vote for independence, our legislation will ensure that East Timor's people get the assistance they need to get back on their feet.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, our act provides for ensuring that those who commit crimes against humanity are not treated with impunity. In particular, we provide U.S. funding for the Special Court in Sierra Leone, which will deal with the human rights atrocities from that country's deadly civil war and authorizes a new U.S. rewards program to help apprehend those that the Special Court indicts.

Our legislation reauthorizes funding for victims of human trafficking, extends the life of the Commission on International Religious Freedom, and ensures that human rights are more fully integrated into the State Department's policy considerations.

Mr. Speaker, this is a major piece of legislation, crafted in a truly bipartisan manner with a great deal of statesmanship on the part of many Members. But I particularly want to pay special tribute to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for his leadership on this most important legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, but I have a serious reservation that I would like to discuss. I speak as chairman of the

Subcommittee on Drug Policy and co-chair of the Speaker's Drug Task Force to express my concern with the permanent modification to the annual drug certification process contained in this bill.

The annual certification process is one of the strongest tools that we have as a Nation to ensure full cooperation from other nations with our efforts to control international narcotics traffic by conditioning U.S. foreign aid on such full cooperation. I believe that this is a reasonable and basic condition on the use of taxpayer dollars. Clearly, American workers should not be asked to subsidize the programs of foreign governments that will not help us stop drug traffic.

As a practical matter, we have also heard scores of anecdotal reports that the threat of decertification often has been the only real means for American officials serving abroad to get meaningful cooperation on matters such as extradition, law enforcement, and many other means of controlling the drug trade.

In fact, I was part of the Presidential delegation down to the swearing in of the new President of Bolivia; and outgoing President Ciriaco de la Cruz made a special pitch to me and the other members of the delegation. Do not compromise this regulation. He said it was the only tool that they really had in Bolivia to take them down from supplying one-third of our cocaine down to about 2 percent, and he said that this was the most effective tool.

I appreciate very much the work that the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and his staff did to minimize what I believe will be a permanent weakening of the certification process in this legislation. I was disappointed that the administration supported weakening the certification standard from fully cooperating, which has been proven to work successfully over several years, to leaning toward a new standard that would only decertify those countries that have failed demonstrably to make substantial efforts to cooperate.

Instead of the burden falling on countries who want American aid to cooperate completely with our efforts, we will now presume in many cases that the foreign nations are cooperating, and the State Department will have to prove that they are not doing so. No major drug source or transit country should ever presume that it is entitled to American money, and this body certainly should not enshrine such a presumption into law.

I am particularly concerned that it appears that the administration and the other body were determined to weaken the standard to satisfy a single foreign country. I worked with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), who has long been involved with this statute, to propose an alternative. The alternative would have kept the current standard for decertification, but only would have publicly named those coun-

tries who are not fully cooperating, instead of the entire majors list, which will still be made public under the modified law.

□ 1530

We believe that this would have addressed the concerns of the nations. They have talked to me on every visit down to Central and South America, and they are concerned about this listing and seeming to have to go through a proving process, but it would only have listed those who are not fully cooperating, and would have still maintained our option to enforce tough sanctions.

I am still baffled that the administration would not work with us on this compromise which I believe is far superior to the provision in the bill today.

I am pleased, however, that the conferees agreed to change the certification reporting date back to September 15 from early November, which had been proposed in the original version of the bill. An early November report would have essentially removed any congressional role from the process.

I also strongly support the bill's provision allowing the President to use the old "fully cooperating" standard in making certification determination as he sees fit. I fully encourage the administration to use this standard as the basis for its determinations in the coming year, rather than the weaker "demonstrably failed" standard included in this bill. The traditional standard has been successful for many years as a tool for our foreign policy and has reflected congressional intent for many years on the proper standard to be applied in allocating taxpayer dollars. Unfortunately, the new standard seems only to reflect an agreement between the administration and a few select Members of Congress.

Let me give one specific example. If a Nation does not cooperate with us on extradition, one of the toughest and most important things, does that mean that they have demonstrably failed, or does it mean they are not fully cooperating? Clearly, they would not be fully cooperating, but it is not clear that they would have demonstrably failed. So at the margins of the real world, unless the administration takes the fully cooperating standard, we are in a real box here.

My question would be, is this going to be our new standard on terrorism? Is this going to be our new standard on human rights? If not, why is it different on drugs than it is on human rights and terrorism? I know that it has been offensive for us to list all of these different countries and try to make them prove the case, but we need something more than "demonstrably failed" and we need something that enables and gives the administration the flexibility. I hope they will exercise what they have been given in this bill, because there is nothing more tragic

right now going on in America, thousands of people dying on our streets because of drug abuse and the cocaine and heroin and methamphetamines and BC Bud pouring into this country, and I hope that we do not back up on this administration on drug policy.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), my good friend and our distinguished colleague.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Israel-Arab Peace Partners Program, which is reauthorized in H.R. 1646. The Israel-Arab Peace Partners Program is a program that I helped to create in 1999 with my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN). I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for his leadership on this program and for his help to ensure that it was reauthorized in this bill and that it receives proper funding in the appropriations process. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) very much for his support and for his effort, as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who has been very supportive of the effort as well.

The Israel-Arab Peace Partners Program authorizes a \$750,000 pool of grant money within the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs to fund public and private non-profit organizations for people-to-people activities with participants from Israel, the West Bank, Arab countries, and the United States. Through this program, American organizations link up with Israeli, Arab, and American partners to exchange skills and ideas on issues such as health care, the peace process, the environment, and education. By working on issues of common interest to all, people of the region are able to form bonds that cross borders and build trust and skills that not only helps each of their individual communities, but also helps bring them closer to peace. In addition, it brings American citizens and organizations in contact with people from a region where the United States plays such a crucial role.

I think it is important to note the wide range of well-respected groups that have participated in the program over the last few years. Brandeis University, Catholic Relief Services, Fairfax County Public Schools, St. Michael's College, Arava Institute for Environmental Studies, Seeds of Peace, American-Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Conflict Management Group, and American University. Some of these groups already have well-established programs in the Middle East; for others the Israel-Arab Peace Partners Program provides an opportunity to begin programs that will grow in the years to come. The more groups we can

aid in establishing ties in the region, the better chance we have to build a long lasting network of organizations which are working toward professional development, community exchanges, and peace.

This summer I was able to meet with a group of 20 Israeli, Palestinian, Jordanian, and American students who were here in Washington to participate in a program funded through the Israel-Arab Peace Partners Program. Amid all the senseless killing and suffering going on in the Middle East, I was amazed to see this group of students come together to study the environment. For many of the Israeli students, it was their first time meeting an Arab person their age and vice versa. After working together on month-long, environmentally-focused internships all across this country, these students began to see each other not just as Arabs or Israelis or Americans, but as colleagues and friends. They were able to understand a little bit better what it was like to live as an Israeli or an Arab in the Middle East.

This understanding and the real life professional skills that they learned from each other and through their internships was, to me, a ray of hope amid all the devastation in the Middle East, and it really was an honor to see people from the Middle East, from Israel, from the Palestinian Authority, from Arab countries coming together in the midst of all of the horror that is existing there, talking about the environment, talking about how people can work together to make the entire region a better place in which to live.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very strongly supportive of this effort. I think the relatively small amounts of money that we are spending here to bring people together who are living amidst all of the horror that is going on in the Middle East, to have Arabs talking to Jews talking to Christians, is exactly what we should be doing. I would hope that this becomes a step forward in continuing to have the United States fund programs like this.

Again, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their strong support.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the learned gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

I would like to highlight one provision in this conference report that I think is critical and underscores why there needs to be a consistent, government-wide policy when it comes to dealing with victims of terrorism.

In the first half of 2002, Congress introduced several legislative initiatives to allow all victims of terrorism equal opportunity to recover damages from the assets of terrorists and State spon-

sors of terrorism. The purpose of the bill is to allow victims of terrorism to obtain justice and, simultaneously, to hold accountable those who commit and support terror. Provisions have passed both the House and the other body by a recorded vote of 81 to 3.

The proposed language included in the State authorization conference report will allow only two victims to receive compensatory damages for acts of international terrorism from the frozen assets of designated State sponsors of terrorism and completely ignores what Congress has attempted to achieve this year on behalf of all of the victims. Now, this is not to take away from the victims of terrorism. It is important. They suffered, they suffered greatly, and they are entitled to compensation. But what this underscores and highlights really is important, because all of those folks who may have suffered the same set of circumstances, even worse in some cases, from the same groups of terrorists or those who sponsor terrorism, have been shut out and denied the same level of justice that others on a piecemeal approach have obtained.

In light of what has happened in the last year, where potentially we are looking at thousands of victims of terrorism, is it not about time that an American citizen who suffers from the hands, the violent hands of a terrorist or those who sponsor terrorism and is able to obtain a judgment where the assets are frozen should be entitled to the same set of rights? Instead, what we have, and I hope it does not continue, but unless we pass it in the two competing bills in the House and the Senate, it will; unless we do something about it, each year there will be victims, and whoever can hire the best attorney or the best lobbyist will find its way into one of these conference reports. As long as that continues, there will be families and victims of terrorism who will be denied the same set of compensatory damages. I do not think it is right, I do not think it is just. I just want to bring that out to underscore why we need to pass it for all Americans who are entitled to the same set of rights and opportunities when it comes to justice.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), my good friend and distinguished colleague.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1646, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act and, in particular, language in the bill on Russian Federation Debt for Nonproliferation. I want to applaud the conferees for including this very important language on ways to reduce the threat of weapons of mass destruction in the final conference report.

The demise of the Soviet empire ushered in a new post-Cold War period and

a very real sense of urgency with regard to the former Soviet Union's weapons stockpile. It has become tragically clear that new threats have emerged and terrorists and the States that sponsor them are actively in search of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons technology and materials.

During the last 11 years, the Nunn-Lugar program, which was launched to reduce threats from the former Soviet Union, has done much to dismantle these stockpiles. However, continuing economic and social weaknesses in Russia, coupled with an eroding early warning system, poorly secured Russian weapons materials, and poorly paid Russian weapons scientists and security personnel increase the threat of mass destruction on an unprecedented scale if such materials fall into the hands of terrorists or rogue nations.

Now, more than ever, we must make a fundamental shift in the way we think about the spread of weapons of mass destruction and our own national security. Using Russia's debt to the United States as a funding mechanism for programs addressing the inadequate security of the Russian weapons stockpile is an innovative approach we must explore.

The Russian Federation Debt Reduction for Nonproliferation Act, which I coauthored with the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH), will provide a means to forgive the loans and credits owed to the United States by Russia in exchange for cooperation with U.S. efforts to monitor and reduce weapons-usable nuclear material, nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, and the facilities where they may be built.

Securing Russia's arsenal is a massive challenge, but not an impossible one. While the cost of a terrorist attack on the United States involving Russian expertise or smuggled Russian nuclear chemical or biological materials is staggering, funding for these simple measures that can prevent these attacks is sensible and urgent, and I urge Members' support.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I yield back the balance of my time, I would just like to express my appreciation to Committee staff for the exceptionally effective work that they have put into this legislation. Legislation of this scope and magnitude could never be completed without the dedicated effort of our staff.

The Republican staff of the Committee on International Relations worked with us in a bipartisan way. I want to express my particular gratitude to Kristen Gilley, Walker Roberts and Joseph Rees of the majority staff.

I want to acknowledge the efforts of all of the members of the Democratic staff, since in a bill of this scope, everyone had a hand in the final product. Four people deserve particular recognition.

David Abramowitz, our Democratic Chief Counsel has devoted enormous effort to the

successful completion of this bill. We have greatly benefited from his solid legal and political judgement.

David Fite, played a critical role in the security provisions of this bill, and I want to thank him for his outstanding contributions.

Nisha Desai was heavily involved in the initial drafting and adoption of this bill. She has since left our staff, but her contribution was significant.

Peter Yeo, Deputy Democratic Staff Director, as always played an extremely helpful role in bringing this legislation to completion.

In addition, I want to express thanks to Art Rynearson of the Office of Senate Legislative Council, who helped assure that the substances of the legislation was accurate and accomplished what we intended. He is one of these many unsung heroes who makes this institution function, as we owe him our thanks.

Mr. Speaker, I again congratulate the Chairman of the Committee, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to signal my intent to support H.R. 1646, the State Department Authorization Act. It is a good bill with many provisions that will aid the State Department in its mission around the world.

However, I also must express my deep disappointment at the inclusion of Section 1224 regarding assistance to Lebanon. Section 1224 withholds \$10 million of the Economic Support Fund allocated to Lebanon for the Fiscal Year 2003 and for all subsequent years unless and until the President certifies that the armed forces of Lebanon have been deployed to the internationally recognized border between Lebanon and Israel and that the government of Lebanon is effectively asserting its authority in the area in which such armed forces have been deployed.

I do not oppose the goal of extending Lebanese control to southern Lebanon. Unfortunately, this provision does absolutely nothing to further that goal and will in fact hinder any progress. The U.S. should continue to press the Lebanese and Syrian governments on this point. The people of Lebanon will only know long-term peace and stability when Lebanon is willing and able to assert its independence. The U.S. must continue to press for full compliance with UN Security Council Resolution 425. However, this provision will not lead us toward this goal.

I have supported efforts to expand U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) activities in southern Lebanon following the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces. However, far from supporting Hezbollah, this assistance undermines that terrorist organization by eliminating the desperate conditions that so many cite as a reason that region is a terrorist haven.

I have received repeated assurances that U.S. money only goes through American nongovernmental organizations to support projects that provide clean water, medicine, agricultural assistance and other basic humanitarian needs. None of this money goes to the Lebanese government or to any terrorist organization.

With these facts in mind, it makes no sense to me to withhold funding that undermines terrorist control of southern Lebanon. Until the grip that Hezbollah has on that region is weakened, the government of Lebanon will not be able to deploy armed forces to the border.

Unfortunately, Section 1224 only punishes the people of Southern Lebanon rather than offer a solution to the security needs of Israel.

I will vote for the bill, but it is my hope Congress will revisit this issue in future legislation.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I support the inclusion of Section 213 in H.R. 1646, the Department of State Authorization Act Conference Report. This section of the conference report repeals Section 738 of the 2001 Agriculture Appropriations Act, which gave unwarranted special treatment to foreign agriculture attachés. Both the State Department and the Office of Management and Budget support repealing Section 738, and H.R. 1646 does just that.

In 1978, Congress, with the support of the Office of Management and Budget, endorsed the State Department as the sole manager for overseas property. In 1990, Congress directed State to implement a uniform housing policy for and with the input of all agencies overseas.

That system worked. It has the support of OMB, the General Accounting Office, and apparently had the support of Congress. But last year, a little-noticed section of the Agriculture Appropriations Act changed the system for one agency: the Foreign Agriculture Service.

The provision required the State Department to obtain FAS approval to sell property originally purchased to house FAS employees overseas. Moreover, FAS gained the right to occupy new residences permanently.

That provision created an exception for one agency, an exception that if copied by other agencies would disrupt the equitable management of overseas property. Overseas property management would lose much needed flexibility and make the housing of overseas personnel more difficult and costly.

At my request, GAO looked into this matter. In a July 11th letter, GAO concluded the "restrictions on the sales of residences purchased for agricultural attachés do not appear to be in the government's best interests. As the single manager for overseas property, State is responsible for implementing cost-effective decisions about the sale of unneeded overseas real estate and using sales proceeds for the government's highest priorities. . . . [T]he restrictions weaken efforts to improve management of the government's overseas properties and conflict with congressional and executive branch efforts to establish State as the single real property manager."

The properties at issue are not just regular old houses. In Cairo, the residence is a 4,200-square-foot, two-level house with four bedrooms, three bathrooms, two living rooms, a dining room, two kitchens, a sunroom, a breakfast room, and terraces. In Vienna, the residence is a 3,500-square-foot, three-story villa with six bedrooms, three bathrooms, a terrace, breakfast room, basement, and garage. Both houses exceed established housing standards.

This unsound FAS exception is delaying the sale of these valuable properties, a sale that could net at least \$2.1 million. The provision may also complicate the sale of other properties, such as an underutilized property in Bangkok worth \$50 million.

The State Department manages 3,500 properties in more than 220 locations overseas and has had the authority to sell those properties since 1926. Proceeds from sales are used to acquire and maintain other properties. In the wake of the 1998 embassy bombings in

Kenya and Tanzania and other terrorist attacks, proceeds from these sales are used to ensure the safety of our embassies and personnel abroad. Providing special treatment to FAS prevents the State Department from implementing some of the measures necessary to protect our diplomatic personnel.

Mr. Speaker, the letter from GAO, "Current Law Limits the State Department's Authority to Manage Certain Overseas Properties Cost Effectively" (GAO-02-790R, July 11, 2001) follows. A more complete version of the letter is available at <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d02790r.pdf>.

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,

Washington, DC, July 11, 2002.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,

Chairman, Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International Relations, Committee on Government Reform, House of Representatives.

Subject: Current Law Limits the State Department's Authority to Manage Certain Overseas Properties Cost Effectively

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of State is the central manager for real estate at U.S. embassies and consulates and has the statutory authority to sell properties and use the sales proceeds to acquire and maintain other overseas properties. Section 738 in the fiscal year 2001 Agriculture Appropriations Act prohibits State from selling residences purchased to house agricultural attachés without approval from the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) and requires the department to use the proceeds from such sales to purchase residences for these attachés. Legislation currently before the Congress would repeal section 738.

At your request, this report discusses the effect of section 738 on State's management of overseas properties. We examined this issue as part of our review of the Department of State's performance in identifying and selling unneeded overseas real estate. In conducting this assignment, we interviewed officials and analyzed records at the Department of State, FAS, and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

RESULTS IN BRIEF

Section 738 limits the Department of State's authority to implement cost-effective decisions about sales of unneeded overseas property and the use of sales proceeds. Because of section 738's restrictions, State has delayed two property sales valued at nearly \$4 million that appear to be in the government's best interests. FAS is concerned that if section 738 is repealed, selling these properties will result in increased costs for FAS since it would have to lease housing for attachés who previously lived rent-free in government-owned housing. State acknowledges that this could occur but save its financial analysis shows that selling the houses benefits the government as a whole. Although section 738 applies only to residences purchased for agricultural section 738 applies only to residences purchased for agricultural attachés, OMB and State are concerned that it could lead to fragmented and less cost-effective management of overseas property if other agencies seek similar treatment for their senior representatives. In our view, section 738's restrictions do not appear to be in the government's best interests.

This report suggests that the Congress may wish to consider repealing section 738. State officials, commenting on a draft of this report, said they agreed with the report's information and conclusions regarding the negative effects of section 738 on overseas property management. FAS officials reiterated their view that repealing section 738 could result in increased costs for FAS. We

believe that if the section's repeal and sale of residences used by agricultural attachés increases FAS costs, the Department of Agriculture can request that the Congress consider providing additional funds for FAS operations.

BACKGROUND

The Foreign Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of State to sell overseas properties that are used to support diplomatic and consular operations in foreign countries. The Department of State manages about 3,500 government-owned properties—including embassy and consular office buildings, housing, and land—at more than 220 overseas locations. The law authorizes the Secretary to use the proceeds from the sale of overseas properties to acquire and maintain other overseas properties and requires the Secretary to report such transactions to the Congress with the department's annual budget estimates. The Secretary has delegated this authority to State's Bureau of Overseas Building Operations.

Over the years, as a result of congressional and OMB actions, overseas property management has been consolidated under State. In 1978, the Congress endorsed State as the single manager for overseas property and asked OMB to prepare a proposal for implementing this concept. In 1979, OMB issued a report that supported the concept of single management and acquisition planning for overseas property under State. OMB noted that the Congress was strengthening and broadening State's existing role as the central manager for overseas property. In 1990, the Congress directed State to establish and implement a uniform housing policy for agencies' overseas personnel. Resulting new overseas housing regulations, issued in 1991 and 1992 with the agreement of the foreign affairs agencies and the Department of Defense, reinforced State's authority to act as the single manager for overseas property. These authorities show that the Congress and the executive branch had intended that State should manage overseas property in a consolidated, integrated manner and that doing so would be in the government's best interests. We have supported this concept since the 1960s because it is more effective, efficient, and economical than having multiple property managers.

Since 1997, State has increased efforts to identify and sell unneeded overseas real estate in response to congressional direction and our recommendations. As part of this effort, State sold two residences occupied by agricultural attachés for about \$855,000 and proposed selling three others for more than \$4 million. FAS argued that these properties were purchased to house its attachés; and consequently, FAS should have a say in approving the sales and in determining how the sales proceeds should be used. As a result, FAS sought and the Congress enacted legislation that requires State to obtain FAS approval to sell residences purchased to house agricultural attachés. Additionally, State must use the proceeds from such sales to acquire other suitable residences for agricultural attachés (not necessarily at the same post), and FAS has the right to occupy these properties permanently. According to FAS, State manages 13 properties purchased for agricultural attachés.

SECTION 738 LIMITS STATE'S AUTHORITY TO MAKE COST-EFFECTIVE DECISIONS ON CERTAIN PROPERTIES

Section 738 of the fiscal year 2001 Agriculture Appropriations Act limits State's authority to sell unneeded property by making sales decisions contingent on FAS approval. Proposed sales of residences in Cairo, Egypt, and Vienna, Austria, illustrate the potential

limitations. Although selling these properties appears to be in the U.S. government's best interests, State has postponed these sales because of concerns about section 738. In October 1998, the State Inspector General reported that the Cairo and Vienna residences were larger than housing standards allow, were underutilized, and should be sold. According to State records, the Cairo residence is a 4,200-square-foot, two-level house with four bedrooms, three bathrooms, two living rooms, a dining room, two kitchens, a sunroom, a breakfast room, and terraces. The Vienna residence is a 3,500-square-foot, three-story villa with six bedrooms, three bathrooms, a terrace, breakfast room, basement, and garage. These residences are larger than the housing standards allow. Figures 1 and 2 show photographs of the Cairo and Vienna residences.

State financial analyses suggest that selling the Cairo and Vienna residences would yield net benefits for the government of at least \$2.1 million. In addition, using a measure of investment performance, State determined that selling the two residences was a substantially more efficient use of government resources than continued ownership. In February 2001, FAS informed State that it approved the sale of the Vienna residence on condition that the sales proceeds were used to purchase a replacement residence in Vienna and new residences for agricultural attachés at two other posts. Because FAS's proposed use of the proceeds would not address the government's highest priority overseas property needs, State officials decided to postpone the Vienna sale pending repeal of section 738. State subsequently postponed the Cairo sale for the same reason.

State and OMB believe that the sales proceeds should be used to meet the government's highest priority needs. According to its long-range facilities plan, State seeks to reinvest sales proceeds where there is the greatest need or the most opportunity to reduce government operating costs. This plan notes that, in recent years, most sales proceeds have been earmarked for specific capital construction projects, such as building secure embassies. In future years, State plans to use sales proceeds to purchase additional residential housing. Within this broad priority, State plans to direct these proceeds to several objectives: (1) Buying residential properties in locations that offer the greatest rent savings to contain leasing costs, (2) buying earthquake resistant residential properties in seismic areas to address safety issues, and (3) buying key diplomatic properties. Although we did not assess State's priorities or use of proceeds from property sales, its approach is consistent with recommendations we made in 1996 regarding using sales proceeds for the highest priority overseas facility needs.

FAS believes that the sales proceeds should be used to purchase replacement and additional residences for agricultural attachés—not to purchase properties according to State's priorities. FAS said that past sales had displaced two of its attachés from government-owned housing, forcing it to pay about \$400,000 over the past 5 years to lease replacement residences. FAS is concerned about having to cut its program budgets to fund additional leases for replacement housing. In addition, FAS complained that it had insufficient advance notice of the proposed sales and had difficulty freeing up funds to pay for replacement housing for displaced attachés.

State acknowledged that FAS may have to lease replacement residences if section 738 is repealed and the two residences are sold. However, financial analyses of the proposed sales considered these costs in determining

that they were cost effective for the government. State also acknowledged that unanticipated sales could cause short-term budgetary disruptions. As a result, in June 2001, assuming repeal of section 738, State offered to pay for leasing replacement housing until FAS could build these costs into its budget in cases where State disposed of the properties with less than 2 years' advance notice. In January 2002, FAS responded that, before agreeing to any sales, it would require State to provide appropriate government-owned replacement housing within 2 years and expect State to make every effort to ensure that sales did not affect FAS's budget. FAS's letter did not address the repeal of section 738. In April 2002, FAS officials told us they were reluctant to accept State's offer because it did not address the long-term budgetary effect of the sales and allowed State to retain control over the use of the sales proceeds.

According to State, if section 738 remained in effect, it could be a complicating factor in the future sale of a compound in downtown Bangkok that could be worth as much as \$50 million. In 1998, the State Inspector General reported that the compound—a 15-acre wooded site located in a prime commercial area that contains five executive residences (one occupied by the agricultural attaché) and several other facilities—was underutilized and should be sold. Before the 1997 Asian financial crisis, State had planned to sell the compound and use the proceeds to finance the construction of new facilities at the post, including housing for more than 200 embassy families that would reduce post lease costs by about \$73 million over 10 years. Recognizing the changed economic conditions, State reported that further study is needed to determine the appropriate time to sell the compound and the appropriate use of the sales proceeds.

State and OMB Support Repealing Section 738; FAS Opposes Its Repeal

State and OMB support legislation currently before the Congress that would repeal section 738. They argue that its restrictions on State's authority seriously weaken centralized management of overseas properties because they essentially establish a separate executive housing program for FAS and subordinate governmentwide priorities to agency priorities. For example, FAS could disapprove the sale of oversize or high-value residences purchased for agricultural attachés while State was selling residences purchased for ambassadors, deputy chiefs of mission, consuls general, and senior representatives of other foreign affairs agencies. State reported that, between 1997 and 2002, it sold 17 executive residences for about \$38 million and is planning to sell 15 additional residences for about \$20 million. Additionally, State and OMB pointed out that other foreign affairs agencies and Defense have experienced budgetary effects from the sale of such residences. In these cases, agencies must weigh housing costs in deciding whether to station their employees overseas. State and OMB are also concerned that unless section 738 is repealed, other agencies may seek similar legislation, leading to more fragmented property management and unequal and uneconomical housing policies at taxpayer expense.

FAS opposes repealing section 738. FAS argues that section 738 maintains Agriculture's entitlement to residences purchased to house its attachés. FAS believes that repealing section 738 would allow State to ignore what FAS believes was the Congress' intent in providing funds to purchase these residences, while imposing substantial budgetary costs on FAS.

CONCLUSIONS

Section 738's restrictions on the sales of residences purchased for agricultural

attachés do not appear to be in the government's best interests. As the single manager for overseas property, State is responsible for implementing cost-effective decisions about the sale of unneeded overseas real estate and using sales proceeds for the government's highest priorities. However, for residences purchased to house agricultural attachés, implementation of State's decisions is contingent on FAS approval and priorities. Although its analysis shows that selling the Vienna and Cairo residences would be financially advantageous to the government, State does not plan to proceed with these sales if section 738 remains in force. We recognize that, if section 738 is repealed, selling these residences may affect FAS's budget. However, FAS's budgetary concerns need to be weighed against the government's overall benefits from these sales—which include disposing of unneeded property and reinvesting the proceeds where they provide the greatest return. In addition, the restrictions weaken efforts to improve management of the government's overseas properties and conflict with congressional and executive branch efforts to establish State as the single real property manager.

MATTER FOR CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION

In light of our findings, Congress may wish to consider repealing section 738 of the fiscal year 2001 Agriculture Appropriations Act.

AGENCY COMMENTS AND OUR EVALUATION

State officials, commenting on a draft of this report, said the report fairly and accurately represents their positions on the negative effects of section 738 and the reasons they support its repeal. They said it is in the government's interest to have a single property manager with the authority to sell unneeded properties and reinvest the proceeds where they will produce the greatest benefits. State officials reiterated their concern that, by according FAS special treatment, section 738 threatens the centralized management of overseas property and is unfair to the staff of other foreign affairs agencies and Defense.

FAS official reiterated their concern that repealing section 738 could result in additional annual lease costs for FAS and that FAS would need additional budget resources to maintain its current level of services overseas. FAS officials also questioned whether section 738 would fragment overseas property management, stating that only Defense was in a position to assert similar claims to overseas housing.

We continue to believe that, in considering whether to repeal section 738, budgetary concerns need to be weighed against the government's interests in selling these residences and maintaining a single property manager with the authority to sell unneeded properties and reinvest the proceeds where they will produce the greatest benefits. If the section's repeal and subsequent property sales increase FAS costs, Agriculture can request that Congress consider providing more funds for FAS operations. Additionally, we agree with State that section 738 accords FAS preferential treatment and that other foreign affairs agencies and Defense will likely seek similar treatment for their overseas executives. We believe this would weaken centralized overseas property management, which we have long supported because it is more effective, efficient, and economical than a noncentralized approach.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

To determine the effect of section 738 on State's management of overseas property, we analyzed applicable laws, regulations, and guidance that provide State's authority to sell properties and use the proceeds. Key laws, regulations, and guidance include the

Foreign Buildings Act, section 738 of the fiscal year 2001 Agriculture Foreign Affairs Manual. We also examined past GAO and State Inspector General reports on overseas property management. We analyzed State and FAS records that summarized their assessment of the effect of section 738 on State's authority to buy and sell overseas properties and act as the single manager for overseas property. We discussed section 738's effect with appropriate State, FAS, and OMB officials. We examined State's rationale for selling the properties in Cairo, Vienna, and other locations, including State's financial analyses of the proposed sales, OMB guidance on evaluating asset sales, and State's fiscal year 2002 to 2007 long-range buildings plan. We did not access the accuracy or reliability of the property appraisals or other underlying data used in State's analyses or the priorities and objectives in its long-range plan.

We conducted this review from April to July 2002 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

We are sending copies of this report to other interested congressional committees, the Secretaries of Agriculture and State, the FAS Director, State's Director of Overseas Buildings Operations, OMB, and other interested parties. Copies will be made available to others on request. In addition, this report will be available at no charge on our Web site at <http://www.gao.gov>.

If you have questions about this report, please contact me at 202-512-4128 or by e-mail at fordj@gao.gov. John Brummet, Michael Rohrbach, Ed Kennedy, Richard Seldin, Janey Cohen, and Stephanie Robinson made major contributions to this report.

Sincerely yours,

JESS T. FORD,

Director, International Affairs and Trade.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of this important legislation. I say "reluctant", not because of what is in the bill, but because of what is not in the bill. This bill could have been a much better product, and it strongly underscores why the American people should think long and hard about which party should be in control of this great institution come November.

It is unconscionable that we are debating this bill today only because Speaker HASTERT and Majority Whip DELAY threatened to throw this entire bill in the waste can unless it excluded a non-binding, "Sense of the Congress" resolution stating merely that the United States should re-engage in the international effort to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that have led to global warming. Were this to continue unabated, the consequences could be so dramatic that we can barely imagine them today.

The language that was forcibly removed by the Speaker and the Majority Whip already was passed by the full House. Its arbitrary removal by the anti-environmental House Republican leadership shows not only how radical things have gotten around here, but more importantly that they do not want the American people to know anything about their radical, anti-environmental agenda—certainly not with just over a month before the mid-term elections.

Second, the perennial underfunding of State Department operations had become a international embarrassment due to the short-sighted cuts forced by our friends on the other side of the aisle. Now we can say that some relief is on the way, although many Americans would be embarrassed to see the awful conditions of some of our diplomatic facilities

abroad. Let me remind the all too-eager hawks in the Majority and in the Administration that diplomacy is truly the first line of defense.

Second, I am glad to have joined with my colleague from Alabama, Mr. HILLIARD, the Congressional Black Caucus and the Asian-Pacific American Caucus, in developing language in this bill to ensure that the State Department makes progress in its recruitment and promotion of minorities to its senior-most ranks. Our language makes clear that Congress is looking for results in the recruitment and promotion of minority professionals. It provides \$2 million to increase minority recruitment in the Department and requires the Department to track its results with a database.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) reported in a long-term study that despite years of effort from Congress, the State Department has failed to make any significant progress in the recruitment and promotion of qualified minorities to senior management positions. For example, the State Department—along with the Federal Emergency Management Agency—actually promoted fewer minority managers in 1999 than in 1990.

While having more minorities take the foreign service exam is a step in the right direction, that is but a small step, and only one among many more steps needed, to rectify the severe under-representation of qualified Hispanic Americans, African Americans and Asian-Pacific Americans in the foreign affairs agencies. All three caucuses join together to urge President Bush and Secretary of State Powell to ensure that we, at long last, get on with the business of obtaining results in minority recruitment and promotion at the State Department and the foreign affairs agencies.

If the State Department is to make progress, minorities must have a seat at the table. And that means, among other things, a seat at the table at the promotion boards and the selection boards—the entities that placed officers in senior positions. We will look for results and we will continue with these efforts until we see results.

Third, this bill includes the “Iran Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act”, a bill I first introduced in 1998, and whose passage could not be more timely than today. In response to Iran’s efforts to develop the Bushehr nuclear power plant in the Persian Gulf, the language I introduced requires the U.S. to withhold proportional assistance to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for programs and projects of the Agency that go toward the development of the Bushehr plant if the Secretary of State were to determine that it is inconsistent with US nonproliferation policy, helps Iran develop nuclear weapons expertise, or is a cover of acquisition of sensitive technology. We must keep a watchful eye on IAEA activities in Iran—one of the nations that President Bush singled out as part of the “axis of evil” that threatens our way of life. While I have no interest in cutting off all IAEA assistance to Iran, it is ludicrous for the U.S. to support—even indirectly—a plant which clearly poses a threat to the United States and to stability in the Middle East.

Finally, this bill provides language I was glad to sponsor to provide the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) with a modest increase for the first time in years. This vital and cost-effective organization promotes the

fundamental American values of democracy and human rights abroad. By leading many efforts in the struggle for freedom worldwide, NED enjoys strong bipartisan support as it advances our national security. From Lech Walesa in Poland to Nelson Mandela in South Africa to human rights activists in Nigeria to civil society leaders in Mexico, NED and its core institutes have assisted grassroots organizations that have helped bring about peaceful transitions to democracy.

Mr. Speaker, despite the outrage committed by the majority on global warming, for the reasons I have mentioned, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1646, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to commend Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS for their diligent efforts in producing a bill which will truly assist in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

There are a few specific provisions in the conference agreement which I would like to draw attention to. The first is the Middle East Peace Commitments Act. This section requires the President to report to Congress on the Palestinians adherence to their commitments to resolve their conflict with Israel through exclusively non-violent means. If the President cannot report to Congress that the Palestinians are complying with their commitments to peace, and unless the President utilizes a national security waiver, the legislation requires the imposition of one or more of the following sanctions: the denial of visas to PLO and Palestinian Authority officials; the downgrading of the status of the PLO office in Washington; the designation of the PLO, the PA, or any of their constituent groups or arms as Foreign Terrorist Organizations; or the cut-off of all non-humanitarian aid to the West Bank and Gaza.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with the U.S. policy to date isn’t that we’re disengaged—far from it. The problem is that for all our effort, we haven’t gotten any commitment to peace from the Palestinians. It doesn’t seem to matter how many envoys and senior policy makers the President sends to meet with Palestinian leaders, these visits have failed to produce any change in Palestinian behavior. With the adoption of these sanctions, Congress is sending a strong message to the Palestinians that America’s never-ending supply of last-chances has run out.

Another important provision in the conference report concerns Taiwan. Last year, President Bush altered arms sales discussions between the U.S. and Taiwan from once a year to an as needed basis. The experience with this policy has thus far been satisfactory and has removed a major irritant in U.S.-PRC relations by removing the focus an annual meeting between the U.S. and Taiwan provides. However, in order to ensure Congress’s historic role in assessing Taiwan’s defense needs under the Taiwan Relations Act, the bill requires that the Administration consult with the Congress twice annually regarding Taiwan’s defense needs. This provision will ensure that the Congress retains its unique role in determining the types and quantity of defense articles and services that should be provided to Taiwan.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the conference report authorizes the final payment of our U.N. arrearage. For too long the late payment of our dues has set an example for other nations to follow and has caused serious budget problems for the U.N. At a time when the President has challenged the United Nations to be a forceful advocate for peace and security, or risk irrelevance, it helps for us to demonstrate that we support the U.N. by putting our money where our mouth is.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS for their extraordinary work on this measure and I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, Section 1601 of the State Department Authorization Conference Agreement addresses nuclear missile nonproliferation in South Asia. I have reservations about the provision. U.S.—India relations are strong and both countries are looking forward to an enhancement and expansion of their economic, political and strategic potential. The engagement between our two nations continues to be mutually beneficial. In light of this tangible bilateral progress being made, and India’s long-standing commitment to regional and global peace and security, provisions of Section 601 create an unnecessary diversion in the steadily strengthening bilateral relationship between the U.S. and India.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1646, 21ST CENTURY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 483) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make technical corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 1648, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

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

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 483

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal