

H. CON. RES. 251, H.R. 4118, AND H.R. 4249

MARKUP
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

MAY 4, 2000

Serial No. 106-161

Printed for the use of the Committee on International Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.house.gov/international_relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

67-826 CC

WASHINGTON : 2000

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York, *Chairman*

| | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania | SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut |
| JAMES A. LEACH, Iowa | TOM LANTOS, California |
| HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois | HOWARD L. BERMAN, California |
| DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska | GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York |
| CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey | ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa |
| DAN BURTON, Indiana | MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California |
| ELTON GALLEGLY, California | DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey |
| ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida | ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey |
| CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina | SHERROD BROWN, Ohio |
| DANA ROHRABACHER, California | CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY, Georgia |
| DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois | ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Florida |
| EDWARD R. ROYCE, California | PAT DANNER, Missouri |
| PETER T. KING, New York | EARL F. HILLIARD, Alabama |
| STEVE CHABOT, Ohio | BRAD SHERMAN, California |
| MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD, South Carolina | ROBERT WEXLER, Florida |
| MATT SALMON, Arizona | STEVEN R. ROTHMAN, New Jersey |
| AMO HOUGHTON, New York | JIM DAVIS, Florida |
| TOM CAMPBELL, California | EARL POMEROY, North Dakota |
| JOHN M. McHUGH, New York | WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT, Massachusetts |
| KEVIN BRADY, Texas | GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York |
| RICHARD BURR, North Carolina | BARBARA LEE, California |
| PAUL E. GILLMOR, Ohio | JOSEPH CROWLEY, New York |
| GEORGE RADANOVICH, California | JOSEPH M. HOEFFEL, Pennsylvania |
| JOHN COOKSEY, Louisiana | |
| THOMAS G. TANCREDO, Colorado | |

RICHARD J. GARON, *Chief of Staff*

KATHLEEN BERTELSEN MOAZED, *Democratic Chief of Staff*

HILLEL WEINBERG, *Senior Professional Staff Member and Counsel*

JILL N. QUINN, *Staff Associate*

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Markup of H. Con. Res. 251, a resolution commending the Republic of Croatia for the conduct of its parliamentary and presidential elections | 1 |
| Markup of H.R. 4118, The Russian-American Trust and Cooperation Act of 2000. A bill to prohibit the rescheduling or forgiveness of any outstanding bilateral debt owed to the United States by the Government of the Russian Federation until the President certifies to the Congress | 5 |
| Markup of H.R. 4249, The Cross-Border Cooperation and Environmental Safety in Northern Europe Act of 2000. A bill to foster cross-border cooperation and environmental cleanup in Northern Europe | 27 |

APPENDIX

Prepared statements:

| | |
|---|------------|
| The Honorable Benjamin A. Gilman, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York and Chairman, Committee on International Relations, statements on H. Con. Res. 251, H.R. 4118, and H.R. 4249..... | 32, 34, 40 |
| The Honorable Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, statement on H.R. 4118 | 43 |

Bills and amendments:

| | |
|--|----|
| Text of H. Con. Res. 251 | 46 |
| Amendment to H. Con. Res. 251 offered by Mr. Radanovich | 49 |
| Text of H.R. 4118 | 50 |
| Amendment to H.R. 4118 offered by Ms. Ros-Lehtinen (withdrawn) | 56 |
| Amendment to H.R. 4118 offered by Mr. Gejdenson (withdrawn) | 58 |
| Amendment to H.R. 4118 offered by Mr. Gejdenson (adopted) | 59 |
| Text of H.R. 4249 | 61 |
| Amendment (en bloc) to H.R. 4249 offered by Mr. Gejdenson (approved) ... | 72 |
| Vote tally on motion to adjourn | 74 |

H. CON. RES. 251, H.R. 4118, AND H.R. 4249

MAY 4, 2000

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:13 a.m. in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Benjamin A. Gilman, (Chairman of the Committee) presiding.

Chairman GILMAN. The Committee on International Relations meets today in open session to consider three items of business.

In the interest of time, I will save my opening remarks for the specific items, but will extend an opportunity to our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, to make any remarks he might desire at this time. Mr. Gejdenson, do you have an opening statement?

Mr. GEJDENSON. No.

Chairman GILMAN. The first matter to be considered is H. Con. Res. 251 relating to Croatia. The resolution is before the Committee. The clerk will report the title of the resolution.

CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 251

Ms. RUSH. House Concurrent Resolution 251, a concurrent resolution commending the Republic of Croatia for the conduct of its parliamentary and Presidential elections.

Mr. GILMAN. Without objection, the preamble operative language resolution be read in that order for amendment the clerk will read.

Ms. RUSH. Whereas, the fourth Croatian parliamentary elections held on January 3, 2000, marked Croatia's progress toward meeting its commitment—

Mr. GILMAN. Without objection, the resolution will be deemed as having been read and is open to amendment at any point. The resolution is under the jurisdiction of the full Committee, and I recognize the gentleman from California, Mr. Radanovich, who sponsored the resolution, to introduce the resolution to us.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for bringing this bill to markup.

I also want to offer an amendment to my own bill at this time, which is actually perfecting language. This language takes into consideration some minor concerns the Chairman had expressed, and I believe the resolution is stronger for it. I will proceed to explain this bill, including this perfecting language.

On February 15 of this year, I introduced H. Con. Res. 251 commending the Republic of Croatia for the successful conduct of its parliamentary and Presidential elections. The free and fair elections in Croatia and the peaceful and orderly transfer of power

from the old to the new government is an example of democracy to the people of other nations in the region and a major contribution to the democratic development of southeastern Europe.

President Mesic has pledged to bring this country into the European Union in 5 years, and even if this is an ambitious goal he is to be commended. President Mesic has promised, and has in fact undertaken some concrete steps, to end interference in Bosnia, to welcome returning Serb refugees, and to cooperate with the International Court in pursuing alleged Croat war criminals. He has also promised further privatization and media reform.

Although President Mesic and his new government face many difficulties, I am very optimistic that Croatia is on a new path, and I am hopeful that we will do our utmost to encourage them on this correct path.

My resolution also calls for United States support and facilitation of Croatia's goals for membership in the NATO's Partnership for Peace program and its accession into the World Trade Organization. I firmly believe that by supporting Croatia's membership in the PFP and its accession to WTO we will not only be making a sound investment in the future and in the stability of southeast Europe, but we will also be sending a clear message to other countries in the region of the benefits that come from choosing a democratic path.

Croatia was a tremendous ally to us last year during the Kosovo conflict, and as far as I am concerned they have more than demonstrated their loyalty to the United States. In my opinion, their membership in the Partnership for Peace program has already been earned and is long overdue. There is no question that we need a trustworthy ally in southeast Europe where we have spent an exorbitant amount of money and time.

Mr. Chairman, thank you again for bringing this important resolution before the Committee today, and I urge my colleagues to vote favorably. Thank you, sir.

Chairman GILMAN. Mr. Radanovich, we welcome you to offer your amendment at this time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you. I offer the amendment as a perfecting amendment.

Chairman GILMAN. The clerk will report the amendment.

Ms. RUSH. Amendment offered by Mr. Radanovich. Page 2, line 10, after privatization reform insert—

Chairman GILMAN. The amendment is considered as having been read. Mr. Radanovich is recognized for introduction of his amendment.

Mr. RADANOVICH. This is basically perfecting language, Mr. Chairman, and I believe it takes into account the minor concerns that you had expressed, and I believe the resolution is stronger for it.

Chairman GILMAN. The vote is on the amendment. All in favor of the amendment signify in the usual manner.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman GILMAN. The amendment is carried.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GILMAN. Mr. Bereuter.

Mr. BEREUTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to take this time to commend the gentleman for his amendment and the initial legislation that he offered here. I think it is appropriate. We are all very enthused about the change in direction in Croatia.

I would just mention that the last meeting of the Standing Committee of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, we, seeing the change in course in Croatia, have taken similar steps now to bring Croatia into associate member status, so this is certainly entirely consistent with it, and I thank the gentleman for his initiative.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Bereuter.

Are any other Members seeking recognition? Mr. Gejdenson.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Let me join my colleagues in expressing support for this resolution. Mr. Radanovich has taken the lead and done so in an area where in the former Yugoslavian Republic we are often here to review failures and continued frustration in a sense that we are not making progress sometimes, even though we may be involved in a righteous and worthy cause.

When you take a look at the participation in the election, when you look at the commitments made by the candidates, it really is clear that we have an important step forward here in the Balkans.

It is an indication that the flexibility that the Administration has had is productive at times, and clearly what we want to do is work with the Administration to try to develop the same kind of success elsewhere in the former Yugoslavian Republic, so I commend the gentleman for his efforts and hope that we would continue to work to try to bring a democratic institution, civil society and economic reform to the other areas that were once part of Yugoslavia.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Gejdenson.

Are any other Members seeking recognition? If not, I would like to note that the resolution as amended by its sponsor, Mr. Radanovich, is timely and appropriate, and I commend the gentleman for introducing this measure.

People of Croatia has suffered through several years of warfare and destruction, ethnic strife, economic stagnation. As the resolution points out, the elections held recently for the Croatian parliament and presidency were indeed conducted in a free, fair and democratic manner by all accounts that we have received.

Just as important, however, is the fact that those elections brought to power a government that appears intent on moving Croatia forward in all respects. Accordingly, we agree that it would be worthwhile for us to show our support for that new government in the form of this resolution.

The new Croatian government will face challenges in opening up its economy and in finding ways to insure that its support for ethnic Croats in leaving Bosnia does not lead Croatia to undermine the sovereignty of that state. It will face serious challenges in other areas as well.

The amended resolution, if approved by our Committee, will make it clear that success in meeting these challenges should be met by American and European support for Croatia's full entry into the European and transatlantic community of nations, including entry into NATO's Partnership for Peace program.

Now is the time for Croatia to build its new democratic future, and I think the resolution points to that fact. I congratulate and

it does congratulate the Croatian people for so clearly choosing the path of democracy in its recent elections.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GILMAN. Judge Hastings.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to know the Administration's position with reference to this matter, if it is at all possible.

Chairman GILMAN. Will a member of the Administration come up to the mike and identify yourself?

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GUESS. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to appear before the Committee today. My name is Michael—

Chairman GILMAN. Would you press your button?

Mr. GUESS. Let me try this again.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you.

Mr. GUESS. My name is Michael Guess. I am Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of Legislative Affairs in the State Department. Thank you again for the opportunity to come today before you.

Chairman GILMAN. Please proceed.

Mr. GUESS. Mr. Chairman, we very strongly support this resolution. We very much appreciate Congressman Radanovich's interest in Croatia. We also very much appreciate the support of both the Majority and the Minority in our partnership in trying to insure that Croatia continues to proceed along the democratic path and toward greater economic reform.

We agree entirely with the sentiments that this resolution expresses, including regarding the progress that has been made by the new democratic and reform minded government of Croatia. We fully support Croatia's membership in the World Trade Organization. We are working to help develop a NATO consensus in support of Croatia's membership in the Partnership of Peace, and we hope that that effort will bear fruit in the coming months.

We also agree very strongly that Croatia should continue and increase its work on refugee return, economic reform, media reform and cooperation with the international tribunal.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GILMAN. Thank you.

Judge Hastings.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you.

Chairman GILMAN. Any other Member seeking recognition? If not, the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Bereuter, is recognized now for a motion.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move the Chairman be requested to seek consideration of the pending resolution as amended on a suspension counter.

Chairman GILMAN. The question is now the motion. The gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Bereuter, as being here. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman GILMAN. All those opposed signify by saying no.

[No response.]

Chairman GILMAN. The ayes have it. The motion is agreed to. Further proceedings on this measure are postponed.

We will now consider H.R. 4118 relative to the Lourdes facility in Cuba and refinancing Russian debt. The Chair lies a bill before the Committee. The clerk will report the title of the bill.

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4118

Ms. RUSH. H.R. 4118, a bill to prohibit the rescheduling or forgiveness of any outstanding bilateral debt owed to the United States by the government of the Russian Federation until the President certifies to the Congress that the government of the Russian Federation has ceased all its operations at, removed all personnel from and permanently closed the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba.

Chairman GILMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with. The clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Ms. RUSH. Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, Section 1, Short Title. This act may be cited—

Chairman GILMAN. Without objection, the bill is considered as having been read and is open for amendment of any part. The bill is under the jurisdiction of the full Committee.

I now recognize the gentlelady from Florida, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, for 5 minutes to introduce her bill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

While many of our Committee colleagues are already cosponsors of this legislation and are knowledgeable on its purpose, I would like to offer a brief overview about what the bill does.

The threat posed by Russia's facility at Lourdes is not new. The Freedom Support Act of 1992 clearly underscored the dangers to United States national security as it required the United States Government to reduce certain foreign assistance to Russia proportional to the amount that the Russian government provides to Lourdes.

Ensuing legislation reiterated this position. However, due at first to concerns about the new Russian democracy and market economy and later due to considerations relating to United States/Russian relations, this requirement has never been enforced. Eight years of talks, 8 years of providing the Russian Federation with billions of dollars in United States aid of one sort or another, 8 years of rescheduling the Russian debt at different intervals, and Lourdes remains a serious problem.

On May 5, 1998, in unclassified letters to Members of this Committee, Secretary of Defense Cohen stated, "I remain concerned with the signals intelligence facility at Lourdes," and, "the use of Cuba as a base for intelligence activities directed against the United States." In fact, evidence suggests that there has been an increase, not a reduction, of the threat posed by the Lourdes facility.

Coinciding with the February 7, 1996, order by then Russian President Yeltsin demanding that the Russian intelligence community increase its gathering of United States and other western economic and trade secrets, multiple open sources confirmed that the

Russian Federation began a multi-billion dollar upgrade and expansion of the Lourdes facility, which included, according to open sources and public statements by former United States officials, by Russian and Cuban defectors, the addition of satellite dishes, voice recognition facilities, more sophisticated computers for intercepting specific telephone numbers, faxes and computer data and the means by which to engage in cyber warfare against the United States.

In fact, some believe that the ongoing sophisticated and organized cyber attacks the Pentagon military computer systems were subjected to in early 1999 came from a country routing through Russian computer addresses. These attacks have been occurring since 1998 and are believed to stem from the Lourdes facility. Other public sources and reports refer to the jamming of U.S. FAA transmissions as an example of how Lourdes has used cyber warfare, which directly threatens the lives of Americans.

On November 5, 1998, a Moscow publication reported that the Lourdes espionage facility provides between 60 and 70 percent of all intelligence data about the United States, including highly sensitive military information about our armed forces. Such a penetration of closely guarded American military planning jeopardizes the lives of thousands of our men and women in uniform.

Some may dismiss the latter contention on the assumption that Russia, as an ally, would not compromise United States security in that fashion. However, I ask them to look at Russia's recent actions against Kosovo, Iraq, its reported arms transfers to China and Iran, its multiple penetration of the State Department.

I would further underscore the detailed information provided by Russian defectors and former Cuban intelligence officers confirming that the Russian Federation shares the data on the United States derived from Lourdes with the Castro regime and shares or sells the information to North Korea, to Iraq, to China and Iran, as well as individual groups which are hostile to the United States.

The use of Lourdes, however, according to academic studies and news reports, is not limited to secret U.S. military operations. Its targets include the interception of sensitive diplomatic, commercial and economic traffic and private U.S. telecommunications.

Informed public sources state that economic traffic intercepted includes Federal Reserve deliberations, planned U.S. mergers and acquisitions, competitive bidding processes, data which could be used to bankroll Russian global operations to the detriment of American equity.

The disdain for U.S. security extends into the private realm as revealed by the director of the Defense Intelligence Agency in August, 1996, who stated that Lourdes is being used to collect personal information about U.S. citizens in the private and government sectors. This means that one of our constituents could be a target, yet what are we doing to protect them?

By asking the American people to look the other way on the \$1.9 billion in outstanding loan guarantees under the Commodity Credit Corporation of USDA; by asking our constituents to forgive or re-schedule the \$602 million in unleased debt to the United States; by asking the United States taxpayer, who already contributes greatly to Russia's growth and development through foreign aid

programs; to disregard the \$2.17 billion in outstanding X/M bank loans and guarantees, the \$11.3 billion in insurance and the——

Chairman GILMAN. The gentlelady's time has expired. Please wind up your statement.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The \$22.9 million of claims in recovery, we are asking the American taxpayer to absorb the cost of Russia's espionage activity. Essentially we are asking them to indirectly subsidize Russia's spy operations.

By rescheduling or forgiving Russia's debt to the United States, we are freeing up funds for Russia to pay the Castro regime \$200 million to \$300 million a year for the continued operations of Lourdes. Not having to worry about paying its debt to the United States, the Russian government is then able to focus its resources on expanding and upgrading its operation at Lourdes so that it can better target and undermine United States national security, foreign policy objectives and political and economic stability. This cannot and must not continue.

The bill before us, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4118, affords us the necessary leverage to correct this situation. It holds the Russian government accountable for its actions. Trust must be earned. When the United States Government treats the Russian Federation as an ally and wishes to build upon existing relations, it expects the Russians to act in accordance. The Russian response to United States assistance and cooperation in the form of debt forgiveness has been to spy on and threaten the American people through its operation at Lourdes.

How can we go back to our district and look at our constituents, the good men and women who elect us because they trust that we will do the right thing by them and their children? How can we look into their eyes and——

Chairman GILMAN. The gentlelady's time has expired. I understand the gentlelady has an amendment.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GILMAN. Will you submit your amendment at this time?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I do, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman GILMAN. The clerk will report, and the clerk will distribute the amendment.

Ms. RUSH. Amendment offered by Ms. Ros-Lehtinen. Page 4, line 21, strike notwithstanding and insert——

Chairman GILMAN. The amendment is considered as having been read. Without objection, the gentlelady is recognized for submission of the amendment.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

In response to concerns about the need to afford the President discretion over this matter and the implementation of this bill, I am amending my bill to allow for a national security waiver. However, it asks that the President notify the Congress 10 days before suspending the provisions of this bill and certify to this Committee and to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the national security interests and foreign policy priorities are furthered by such a waiver.

It affords the opportunity to the President to submit portions of the certification in classified form if necessary. The waiver is limited to debt rescheduling because allowing a waiver for the forgiveness of debt would make this bill non-existent and would nullify any congressional oversight over this issue.

Last, due to the nature of debt rescheduling, the fact that rescheduling is multi-year, a waiver could provide the Russian Federation with multiple years of latitude without any United States leverage on the subject of Lourdes.

For this reason, I have included language in this amendment requiring periodic reports on United States national interests being furthered by the waiver on Russia's compliance with arms limitations and nonproliferation agreements and the status of Russian operations at Lourdes.

This is a fair balance, a comprehensive amendment that I hope our colleagues support, and I would like to remind our colleagues that just this week Secretary Albright stated during an unusual town hall meeting for State Department employees, that "If you are not professional about security, you are a failure. Forget that the Cold War ended. Our nation still has enemies."

Our secrets still need protecting, and the time to act is now to protect our secrets, our security, the American people. I hope that we can get our colleagues to vote for the bill and to support this waiver amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GILMAN. Mr. Gejdenson.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment at the desk.

Chairman GILMAN. The clerk will distribute the amendment. The clerk will report the amendment.

Ms. RUSH. Amendment offered by Mr. Gejdenson. Page 5, line 9, strike—

Chairman GILMAN. The amendment is considered as having been read. Mr. Gejdenson is recognized for the amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, there may be some confusion. It might be mine. It might be somebody else's. My amendment starts on page 1, strike lines 11 through 18 and make such conforming changes as may be necessary, and on page 2 strike lines 12 through 19.

Chairman GILMAN. The amendment is in error that the clerk read? Is that correct? Did you read the correct amendment?

The clerk will distribute the amendment. Will you please give the clerk a copy of the amendment?

Ms. RUSH. Amendment offered by Mr. Gejdenson. On page 1, strike lines 11 through—

Chairman GILMAN. The amendment is considered as having been read without objection. Mr. Gejdenson is recognized on his amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There are a number of issues here that, frankly, might be best discussed in a closed session, but for the discussion that we can have in open session I think the underlying issues here are very complicated. America's listening posts around the world are many, and I think it would be against America's national interest if at-

tempts to close our listening posts became the battleground between Russia and the United States.

I would argue, without giving away anything that is classified, that we are far more successful at gathering information, it is far more important to our worldwide operations and that exposing listening posts globally and having a public relations battle could endanger America's national security.

So first of all, I think that the issue itself is very complicated. There are many people who argued during the Cold War that, frankly, listening to each other, the major powers to each other's activities, provided some confidence that there were no surprise attacks lurking, that it actually helped allay fears and prevented what may have or might have turned out to be a disastrous confrontation.

I will discuss the entire bill at greater length later, but what is clear is that the gentlelady from Florida really provides no waiver at all because the waiver then proceeds to add conditions that really give the executive no waiver, so if you read the gentlelady's amendment you will find that it does not achieve the goal, and I will read Section C here. Such waiver will result in tangible steps taken by the government of the Russian Federation to cease its espionage activities at the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba.

So, for instance, say we had the situation where the President of the United States felt and the intelligence committees of the Congress agreed that it is in our interest to have this facility operational. You know, in these kinds of situations sometimes they get some disinformation as well, so that it gives you an opportunity to be listened to. You may be able to send messages that you want to send.

There are lots of reasons why the United States might want to keep this facility open, and so even if the President of the United States and the intelligence people and the Secretary of Defense all decided at the end of the day that this facility was important to keep open for national security reasons, the gentlelady's amendment precludes that action by the President of the United States.

What I simply do in the amendment that I have offered here is strike B and C for a start. If you want to focus on this, it seems to me, and we have done this with Democratic and Republican Presidents alike, is that Congress tells them what they think needs to happen somewhere, and then we give the President a waiver if the President of the United States has a significant national security interest, a national security interest waiver.

The gentlelady's amendment provides no such waiver because in the amendment it restates the condition in Section C, lines 15 through 18, that basically say even if the President of the United States finds it is in our national security interest not to get into this battle of closing listening positions, even if the President of the United States thinks it may be in our interest to keep this listening position open, he still cannot reschedule debt.

Now, if you go from there, the rescheduling of debt may not be a favor to the Russians. It is often the lender that wants to reschedule the debt because the lender wants to get repaid. Some of this debt actually goes back to lend/lease. I think about \$600 mil-

lion is owed to us from the old Soviet Union from World War II when we were jointly fighting the Nazis in Europe.

If the United States Government decides that having Russia not collapse economically is in our economic interest, if the United States decides it is in our economic interest to reschedule this debt and increase the likelihood that it will get repaid irrespective of our interest under this legislation, the President would have to prevent the rescheduling of debt.

Well, let's think about what happens in a Russia that goes into complete economic collapse. We all spent a lot of time here worrying about Russian scientists going to work for the Iranians and the Iraqis. We worry about Russian scientists going to work for the North Koreans. There are a lot of agendas before this country on national security.

I understand the gentlelady's focus on what happens at this one facility in Cuba, but let me tell you something. The Soviet arsenal is a far more dangerous threat to America, a Russia out of control. In legislation which I hope we will be able to get to today, I have legislation to deal with an immense problem in Russia of rusting and rotting submarines, some of them still with weapons systems in place.

Under the lady's legislation, if we need to reschedule some debt so we can address these issues that could create a nuclear cloud over northern Europe, we would not be able to do that rescheduling unless the President shuts down this listening facility, which the President may decide with his national security people it is in our best interest to keep open.

So it seems to me if you want to achieve what the gentlelady wants to achieve, which is to put pressure on the Russians to close this facility, and again, you know, I think we ought to spend a little more time with the Intelligence Committee discussing this issue. At least you ought to give the President of the United States the ability to say wait a minute, maybe we want to keep it open.

Two, maybe even if we want it closed it is more important to us to make sure the Russians do not disintegrate, that Afghanis and Pakistanis and all these countries that are on the terrorism list do not have access to all this nuclear technology coming out of Russia.

Let's focus on what is important to us. I forget. Is it 6,000 or 9,000 weapons that the Russians still have? What is important to the United States is keep the Russians stable enough so they are not aiming those weapons back at the United States.

To come up here with a resolution that does not give the President of the United States a real national security waiver seems to me to be outrageous, and I would hope that the Administration would be given an opportunity to come forward and express themselves.

But it seems to me that, you now, when you look at your responsibilities as a Member of Congress, we have regional concerns. We have global concerns. There can be no greater concern for the United States at this stage than these global concerns.

We spent hours in this Committee worried about if the North Koreans developed one nuclear missile. I mean, what do we do if there is one missile coming toward California? Some people here

less friendly to California might not be concerned about that, but—

Chairman GILMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GEJDENSON. If I could have unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes?

Chairman GILMAN. Without objection.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There is nothing more important to America's national security than what happens inside of Russia, and if it means rescheduling \$600 million worth of debt that we gave them when they were fighting the Nazis to make sure there is some stability there so we can deal with rotting submarines and other issues in Russia, I think we have got the responsibility, if we want to be responsible legislators, if the President says he needs a national security waiver, we ought to give him that waiver.

So I would hope that my colleagues could support my amendment and then support the gentlelady's amendment, which I have some trouble with, but I would be willing to accept it if we give the President of the United States a real waiver, not what is in this, which is really no waiver at all.

Mr. BEREUTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I understand the nature of the gentleman's argument in his amendment, but is it possible that the gentleman, instead of striking the second part, page 2, lines 12 and 19, can still provide for some kind of report to the Congress?

I would not think you would necessarily find but if you are successful with the first half in deleting B and C that you would find a report objectionable. I wonder if there is some accommodation?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I would be happy to work something out on the second part with the gentleman or the gentlelady.

Mr. BEREUTER. The gentlelady.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I would just say that I think every 90 days is a little bit often. I mean, I think one of the dangers for this Committee and all committees in Congress is we demand more paper and reports than anybody actually looks at.

I mean, if you went to every 6 months to report, you know, that is not bad. Every 90 days, it seems to me—you know, I am not sure what we are achieving with every 90 days.

Mr. BEREUTER. Thank you.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GILMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

I am going to make a summary, a short statement, and then I will recognize the gentlelady. I regret that I am going to have to go on to another meeting. I am going to ask Mr. Goodling to chair the meeting.

I want to commend our colleague, the gentlelady from Florida, for her measure and my very strong support for it. I will ask that my first statement be made part of the record. I do oppose the gentleman's amendment. I support the gentlelady's amendment.

The Russian government is indeed providing large sums of money to the Castro regime in Cuba for the use of its facility in Lourdes. This bill points out that our own Defense Department has

estimated that Russia gives the Cuban government oil and other commodities valued at between \$100 million and \$300 million annually for the use of the Lourdes facility.

At a time when the Russian government is seeking outright forgiveness of much of its debt to our nation and to other governments around the world, when the Russian government is leaning on our nation to provide it with hundreds of millions of dollars from the sale of donated American food to pay Russian merchants and when Russia is leaning on us to help finance its arms reductions under START-1, while it spends hundreds of millions of dollars to fund a duty war in Chechnya, I think it is unacceptable that the Russian government continues to provide financial support to the Castro regime with subsidies such as this.

As this bill makes clear, we ought to tell the Russian government that there will be no rescheduling or forgiveness of its bilateral debt to our nation until it closes that facility. The fact is that the Russian government has benefited and benefited greatly from the debt relief we and the other members of the Paris Club and creditors who have already provided.

My colleagues, there is more to be concerned about with regard to the Russian facility at Lourdes than just Russia's willingness to pay Castro what it will not pay to its creditors. Secretary of Defense William Cohen has publicly stated that our Defense Department is concerned about this, "The use of Cuba as a base for intelligence activities directed at the United States."

A Russian intelligence defector has stated publicly that the significance of the Lourdes facility has grown since former Russian President Yeltsin secretly ordered Russian agencies to step up the theft of American economic and trade secrets in 1996.

When questioned in a public hearing about the Yelstin order to step up such commercial espionage, FBI Director Lou Freeh said that the expertise of Russian intelligence operations presents, "A very formidable, very ominous threat to our economy."

Once again I commend the gentlelady from Florida for working hard on this issue, and I urge the Members of our Committee to join in insisting that this kind of financial support provided to Fidel Castro by the Russian government come to a cessation, and I urge the Members of this Committee to join in insisting that our government act on the publicly stated concerns of our own officials by addressing the threat to our security that it poses.

I urge the adoption of this measure, and I recognize the gentlelady from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move we adjourn as it pertains to H.R. 4118.

Chairman GILMAN. The gentleman is not recognized at this time, and I yield the remainder of my time to the gentlelady from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry?

Chairman GILMAN. What is the gentleman's inquiry?

Mr. HASTINGS. Is it not that a motion to adjourn is germane at any time when offered by a Member?

Chairman GILMAN. At this point the question is not germane, and I yield the balance of my time to Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GILMAN. The gentlelady is recognized.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's agreement—

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman? A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GILMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Could you explain for this Member, who believes he has an understanding of parliamentary procedure, why a motion to adjourn is not in order at this time?

Chairman GILMAN. I am going to yield to our counsel.

Mr. WEINBERG. I would advise the Chairman that when a Member is recognized and has 5 minutes under the 5-minute rule, the Member cannot be interrupted for the purpose of receiving a motion to adjourn or, frankly, any other motion.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Is that the ruling of the Chair?

Chairman GILMAN. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Would the gentleman yield for one moment?

Chairman GILMAN. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you. So my understanding is that the gentleman from Florida's motion would be in order at the conclusion of the Chairman's time, which he is now yielding to the gentlelady from Florida.

Chairman GILMAN. That is correct.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I will withdraw my motion.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GILMAN. The gentlelady is recognized.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, the amendment before us, Mr. Gejdenson's amendment, says that the President can waive, but he does not have to give us any detailed reasons why. He is striking the part that says that the President shall offer an explanation, prepare and transmit to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Foreign Relations a report that contains a description.

My amendment says that the President can waive. We do not take that right from the President. The amendment allows a waiver, but it says that the President must explain why. I do not think that that is too much to ask. All we are doing is highlighting two critical national security priorities, which the gentleman's amendment would eliminate. And that is multilateral and bilateral non-proliferation and arms limitation agreements.

Can anyone argue that Russian compliance with the arms limitation and nonproliferation agreement is not a priority for this Committee, for the Foreign Relations Committee, for the United States Congress and indeed for the entire nation? The reports merely ask for the President to keep Congress updated on national security developments. I think it is part of our right and our responsibility as elected officials to always have U.S. national security in mind.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Are we to simply allow a waiver of this bill and to reschedule debt and not care about what happens in the interim? We have been talking about this for 8 years and have nothing to show for it but a supposed compliance of the Russians.

In fact, I asked Secretary Albright in February in this Committee if she had raised the issue with the new Russian president, and I have yet to receive a response from the Secretary about that. I do not know if the President would even comply with our periodic reports.

What are we doing to pressure Russia in order to comply with this? This is not foreign aid, and I would like to——

Mr. GEJDENSON. Will the gentlelady——

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN [continuing]. Remind my colleagues of this. It is debt that they owe to the United States.

I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you. I would say, you know, several things here. I do not have a problem with the report. I just think we are not productive in having that report every 90 days.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. We can make it 180. It is every whatever number of days we can come up with, and 180 is another number that we can——

Mr. GEJDENSON. If the bill——

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN [continuing]. After the transmission of the written certification. It is not every 90 days.

Mr. GEJDENSON. If the gentlelady will accept 180 days, I do not mind burying us with a little more paper. I would ask——

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I would be glad to go with 180 if the gentleman would like.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I would like unanimous——

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. But remember that your amendment is wiping out the reporting language altogether, so if you——

Mr. GEJDENSON. No.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN [continuing]. Would like to amend your amendment and put in the reports again, lines 12 through 19, and——

Mr. GEJDENSON. The gentlelady is saying that I have no amendment at that stage, so I guess what I am saying is this. How long has Lourdes been there? When did it start?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. It has not been as updated now as——

Mr. GEJDENSON. Right, but we have had——

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. The facility, the state-of-the-art technology that is in place now in Lourdes has just had a multi-million dollar operation and an update just recently of sophisticated technology.

It has not existed in this stage, Mr. Gejdenson, no. You cannot compare the Lourdes of today with the Lourdes even of 10 years ago.

Mr. GEJDENSON. And you cannot——

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. It has actually doubled in size. It is state-of-the-art technology. You cannot compare it even to what it was 10 years ago. Those have been in open reports. I am not saying anything that has taken place in our classified briefings.

The open reports have proven that this technology has improved substantially in the years that we have been winking and nodding at Russia and thinking that they are cooperating with us.

Mr. GEJDENSON. If I could say to the gentlelady, I would be happy to try to work something out with the gentlelady, but to say that the President has no waiver, which is what her bill does in its present form, is something I can't support.

I am very happy to drop—if the lady is interested in supporting my amendment, I am very happy to change it to 180 days, and that, it seems to me, is not so burdensome that as annoyed as State may be it is something they ought to be able to do, but I do think the President has to have a waiver.

We have had Presidents now for as long as this facility has been there. We have not thought this was such an issue of national security that they have gone out of their way to deal with it. If the gentlelady's position is—

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. The technology has been probably to the level of the existing technology at that time. Everybody—

Mr. GOODLING [presiding]. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Yes. It is the gentlelady's time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. If I could yield back the time? Also, if we could discuss lines 11 through 14? I think that you would agree that that helps us to understand the nature of the waiver.

I would have no difficulty in eliminating 15 through 18, but I believe that your amendment, if we were to keep lines 11 through 14, which is the essence of the underlying amendment that is before us, that is something that we really need because the waiver is getting at the multilateral and bilateral nonproliferation and arms limitation. I would not like to have that eliminated. Then we could go back to keeping the report and reporting language in my amendment.

If I could yield my time to Mr. Menendez of New Jersey?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Menendez.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the gentlelady. Am I to understand that you would accept as a—

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Who are you addressing, Mr. Menendez?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Excuse me?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Who are you addressing?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I am addressing you, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen. Am I to understand? I was going to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute to Mr. Gejdenson, and maybe we could all agree here, that would do two things.

That would give the President a national interest waiver, which you have as A, and that is lower than a national security waiver. Second, keep in B, take out C, which is the tangible steps, and, last, amend your 90 days to 180 days. Are those amendments that you would accept?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I would be agreeable to that. Not enthusiastically, but I would agree to that because of the concerns that Mr. Gejdenson has, and I think that is the kind of amendment that Mr. Gejdenson would be able to support because it gets to the waiver that he wishes for the President to make.

It gets to the reporting language that we would like, and it continues with the multilateral and nonproliferation language which is at the heart of the national security concerns for the U.S. residents.

Mr. MENENDEZ. If you would continue to yield, can I ask Mr. Gejdenson if that is something that he can accept that would meet his concerns about the President's flexibility, which clearly seems to me that at that point, with that struck out, he has all of the flexibility necessary and is less onerous on the State Department, but still meets I think our mutual goals of insuring that the Russians, as we continue to spend an enormous amount of money on their behalf, and they seem to spend hundreds of millions of dollars not only in payments to Castro for the spy station, but several hundred million more building him a second location; that we would ultimately give them the message, but give the President the flexibility.

I would hope the gentleman could accept that.

Mr. GEJDENSON. If the gentlelady will yield?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Yes. I will be glad to, Mr. Gejdenson.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I would say the gentleman from New Jersey again in a Solomon like effort may have been able to bridge our differences here.

The only thing that I would say here is that the issue in lines 12 through 14, so that we are not misinterpreting each other, is at the moment the Russians would argue that we are about to violate our agreements with them with the star wars efforts, so there is always some debate, and I want to make sure the language gives the President, even if there is a debate about any of those provisions, the President gets his national security waiver.

These are the points we ought to focus on that obviously we want them to fulfill their responsibility in nonproliferation and—

Mr. MENENDEZ. If the gentleman would yield one moment? This is not even a national security waiver, which would be a much higher standard.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I understand that.

Mr. MENENDEZ. This is a national interest waiver.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I understand that, but I want to make sure we are not miscommunicating here that we find ourselves in a position that we want to give the President that national interest waiver if he thinks that it is in the national interest to do that even if there may be some debate over some of these provisions.

I mean, I think that is the only issue. If that is acceptable to the gentleman, I think we should have the staff just draft up the language, and then I would not have a problem with that.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Well, it is the gentlelady's amendment, but certainly my understanding of it would go toward that direction, and I think that we would meet our mutual goals in that regard.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Just to make sure that we can summarize it in the correct way, we would continue to keep lines 11 through 14, and we would eliminate 15 through 18, and we would have the periodic reports 180 instead of 90, but we would have the periodic reports.

Mr. GEJDENSON. My understanding is just again, for instance, right now there is a debate whether the Russians are in compliance on the Conventional Forces in Europe as a result of the fight they

had in Chechnya. Now, I would assume as they move toward that resolution they will get in compliance, but again it was the gentleman's interpretation, the lady's interpretation, that if the President finds it in the national interest he can waive the implementation.

Mr. GOODLING. The gentlelady's time has ended 8 minutes and 43 seconds ago, and I would suggest——

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOODLING [continuing]. That I recognize Mr. Hastings while you people put together whatever this amendment is trying to be, and then——

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOODLING [continuing]. We can vote on that.

Mr. Hastings.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to preface my motion with just a very brief statement. As a Member of the Select Committee on Intelligence and, as a matter of fact, the only Member of the House to sit on the Intelligence Committee and the International Relations Committee, I am compelled to express serious reservations with the forum that we are choosing to discuss a matter that all Members ought have an opportunity to be very conversant about.

I do not in any way impugn the awesomeness of the problem that has been brought to us by my dear friend and colleague from Florida, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, but I do believe that it is inappropriate for us in light of the potential for serious national security concerns to go forward.

There are several Members that would like to be heard on this. I would prefer that we do that in a closed forum toward that end——

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HASTINGS [continuing]. As it pertains to this particular measure. Not the entire mark up, but as it pertains to H.R. 4118. I move that we adjourn and take this matter up in a closed forum.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOODLING. You have to move to adjourn the entire meeting. You cannot adjourn a portion of the meeting.

Mr. HASTINGS. So moved.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will yield.

Mr. GEJDENSON. So it is my understanding that you have now moved to adjourn? Simply to adjourn?

Mr. HASTINGS. Simply to adjourn since I cannot move as it pertains to the specific——

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Hastings.

Mr. HASTINGS [continuing]. Matter that I seek to have adjourned.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. May I speak to the motion, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HASTINGS. No.

Mr. GOODLING. By unanimous consent, you can speak on the motion. Would you wish to ask unanimous consent?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I wish to ask for unanimous consent to speak on the motion.

Mr. GOODLING. Is there any objection? If not, the gentlelady is recognized.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. If I could just refer to the——

Mr. HASTINGS. I object, Mr. Chairman.
 Mr. GOODLING. Then the question is on the motion to adjourn.
 All in favor give your consent by saying aye.
 [Chorus of ayes.]
 Mr. GOODLING. Those opposed, no.
 [Chorus of noes.]
 Mr. GOODLING. In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.
 Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a recorded for.
 Mr. GOODLING. Roll call is requested. Are there a sufficient show
 of hands for a roll call?
 [A show of hands.]
 Mr. GOODLING. Now we have sufficient. The clerk will call the
 role.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Gilman.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Goodling.
 Mr. GOODLING. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Goodling votes no.
 Mr. Leach.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Hyde.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Bereuter.
 Mr. BEREUTER. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Bereuter votes no.
 Mr. Smith.
 Mr. SMITH. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Smith votes no.
 Mr. Burton.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Gallegly.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.
 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Ms. Ros-Lehtinen votes no.
 Mr. Ballenger.
 Mr. BALLENGER. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Ballenger votes no.
 Mr. Rohrabacher.
 Mr. ROHRABACHER. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Rohrabacher votes no.
 Mr. Manzullo.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Royce.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. King.
 Mr. KING. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. King votes no.
 Mr. Chabot.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Sanford.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Salmon.
 [No response.]

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Houghton.
 Mr. HOUGHTON. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Houghton votes no.
 Mr. Campbell.
 Mr. CAMPBELL. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Campbell votes no.
 Mr. McHugh.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Brady.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Burr.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Gillmor.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Radanovich.
 Mr. RADANOVICH. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Radanovich votes no.
 Mr. Cooksey. Mr. Cooksey.
 Mr. COOKSEY. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Cooksey votes no.
 Mr. Tancredo.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Gejdenson.
 Mr. GEJDENSON. Votes aye.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Gejdenson votes yes.
 Mr. Lantos.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Berman.
 Mr. BERMAN. Aye.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Berman votes yes.
 Mr. Ackerman.
 Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Ackerman votes yes.
 Mr. Faleomavaega.
 Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Yes.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Faleomavaega votes yes.
 Mr. Martinez.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Payne.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Menendez.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Brown.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Ms. McKinney.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Hastings.
 Mr. HASTINGS. Aye.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Hastings votes yes.
 Ms. Danner.
 Ms. DANNER. Aye.
 Ms. RUSH. Ms. Danner votes yes.
 Mr. Hilliard.
 Mr. HILLIARD. Aye.

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Hilliard votes yes.
 Mr. Sherman.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Wexler.
 Mr. SHERMAN. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Sherman votes no.
 Mr. Wexler.
 Mr. WEXLER. Aye.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Wexler votes yes.
 Mr. Rothman.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Davis.
 Mr. DAVIS. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Davis votes no.
 Mr. Pomeroy.
 Mr. POMEROY. Aye.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Pomeroy votes yes.
 Mr. Delahunt.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Meeks.
 Mr. MEEKS. Aye.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Meeks votes yes.
 Ms. Lee.
 Ms. LEE. Aye.
 Ms. RUSH. Ms. Lee votes yes.
 Mr. Crowley.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Hoeffel.
 Mr. HOEFFEL. Aye.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Hoeffel votes yes.
 Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Gejdenson voted yes.
 Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to change my vote
 to no.
 Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Gejdenson votes no.
 Mr. Menendez did not vote.
 Mr. MENENDEZ. I vote no.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Menendez votes no.
 Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Rothman is not recorded.
 Mr. ROTHMAN. I vote no.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Rothman votes no.
 Mr. Ackerman.
 Mr. ACKERMAN. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Ackerman changes his vote to no.
 Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Faleomavaega is recorded as yes.
 Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I vote no.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Faleomavaega changes to no.
 Mr. Gilman.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Leach.
 [No response.]

Ms. RUSH. Mr. Hyde.
 Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the roll call be revoked.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Burton.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Gallegly.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Manzullo.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Royce.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Chabot.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Sanford.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Salmon.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. McHugh.
 Mr. McHUGH. No.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. McHugh votes no.
 Mr. Brady.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Burr.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Gillmor.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Tancredo.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Lantos.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Martinez.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Payne.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Brown.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Delahunt.
 [No response.]
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Crowley.
 [No response.]
 Mr. GOODLING. The clerk will report the tally.
 Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Payne did not vote.
 Mr. PAYNE. Yes.
 Ms. RUSH. Mr. Payne votes yes.
 The vote total is 10 ayes to 19 noes.
 Mr. GOODLING. The motion is not agreed.
 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have a compromise amendment worked out. I am glad Mr. Hastings did that motion. It gave us the time to work out an amendment.
 I just would like to tell our colleagues in reference to what my Florida colleague had said about why we were discussing this in an open forum and not in a closed session of the House Intelligence

Committee. I would like to point out that all of the issues being discussed here are within the jurisdiction of the International Relations Committee.

United States/Russia policy, Russian support for the Castro regime, debt forgiveness and rescheduling. All of those are in our purview, and all of the information that we have discussed—

Mr. GOODLING. Do you have an amendment?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN [continuing]. Has in fact been used as an open force, and I have an amendment at the desk. I have an amendment at the desk. While the clerk reads it, I would like to tell the Members that in fact briefings have been heard on this for many—

Mr. GOODLING. Would the gentlelady suspend until we see an amendment?

First of all, Mr. Gejdenson would have to withdraw—

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Gejdenson is going to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. He would have to do that first,—

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Yes.

Mr. GOODLING [continuing]. Then we have to distribute your new amendment and then you will debate that.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I will explain what it does while they are getting that.

Mr. GOODLING. First of all, I have to have Mr. Gejdenson remove his amendment. Would you like to do that?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you. I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, and I would like to particularly at this moment thank all my colleagues, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Menendez and the gentlelady from Florida, for the efforts to find compromise.

Mr. GOODLING. Is there any objection to the withdrawal of the Gejdenson amendment?

[No response.]

Mr. GOODLING. I would now ask—

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I am observing my right to object just to say that I am sorry that Ms. Ros-Lehtinen has had to compromise on her very fine original proposal and has been forced into a position to take a weaker—

Mr. GOODLING. I am now asking the gentlelady from Florida to withdraw her amendment.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am, and I will yield to Mr. Gejdenson.

Mr. GOODLING. I am asking you to withdraw your amendment.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am withdrawing my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOODLING. You are asking unanimous consent?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I would like unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment..

Mr. GOODLING. Is there an objection?

[No response.]

Mr. GOODLING. The gentlelady's amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I have a parliamentary inquiry just to get where we are, and that is my—

Mr. GOODLING. You may state your parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GEJDENSON. It is my understanding that the new amendment is the old amendment that I had modified, which I would

think would still go to the gentlelady's original amendment offered here today. Is that not correct?

If the gentlelady withdraws her amendment, I have to amend the original document. No? She is not withdrawing——

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am not withdrawing the underlying amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. OK. So it is the second way? Fine.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. My underlying amendment is still there.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I would offer this amendment, if the staff is ready to distribute the amendment, or am I the only one with a copy of it? Copies are being made as we speak.

Mr. GOODLING. Copies are being made, and we can distribute them.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I will ask unanimous consent to explain the amendment while they are doing that.

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes to explain the——

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOODLING. Who is——

Mr. MENENDEZ. It is Mr. Menendez.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Menendez.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, my parliamentary inquiry is this because we are all trying to get to the same goal. I believe the gentlelady still must maintain her amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. She has her original amendment.

Mr. MENENDEZ. It is still pending?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Yes.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Then thank you very much.

Mr. GEJDENSON. What this amendment would do is achieve the goals that we have discussed by in line 12 inserting after is substantially, striking lines 15 through 18, and changes on page 2, line 13, from 90 to 180 days.

Mr. GOODLING. Is that what the gentlelady understands?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Correct.

Mr. GOODLING. Is that what Mr. Menendez understands?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOODLING. Then I suppose we probably do not have to wait for the distribution of the amendment.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. If we could read the amendment in the bill, Mr. Chairman, as amended that would be great.

Mr. GOODLING. The professor wishes to see it, so we will hold until we receive the amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. You know, with this new system we could actually show the amendment on the screen.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I gave him the Spanish translation of it, and he is OK with it now.

Mr. GOODLING. We have decided that the gentlelady will merely offer this amendment the three of you have agreed to, and that will make things much more——

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. We can keep Mr. Gejdenson's name on it. There is no pride of ownership.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I do not care whose name is on it. Thank you.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Good. Do not put mine on it.

Mr. GOODLING. The amendment appears on the screen. Hopefully you can read it as it moves.

The vote now occurs on the amendment to the original. All those in favor give your consent by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Mr. GOODLING. Just a minute. They want to see the second part. We sure are getting our money's worth for this great invention.

The motion now is on the——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Excuse me. Is there a debate on this motion?

Mr. GOODLING. On the amendment to the motion as offered as by the young lady from Florida.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Is there a debate on this motion? Is there a debate on this particular motion?

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, it will take very much less time than that. I oppose the motion and just say that we noticed what we have put into this amendment unfortunately again, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen tried to give us something that was substantial, something that was real policy, and now we have before us an amendment that puts weasel words into this law.

Substantial compliance? Give me a break. Whenever we put words into this, what we are doing is just defeating the purpose of legislation in the first place, lying to our constituents that we are serious about a problem because we put words in that make the bill meaningless or unenforceable, which is what we just saw on the screen.

Substantial compliance instead of compliance? Who is going to determine that? I am sorry we have had to weaken this, Mr. Ros-Lehtinen. Your original proposal was much better.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you. The gentleman from California is prone toward exaggeration, and I am sure that——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Substantial exaggeration.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I think it is probably substantial, and significant as well.

I think it is a mistake to imply that somehow Members' language here is inclined to lie to the American people. I think, frankly, the discussion here was very clear to make sure the American people understood that we were looking for substantial because in these areas there are constant disagreements.

While the gentleman has a right to express his differences with that approach, I would say that, you know, it is not helpful for the gentleman to imply that we are lying to the American people, and I am sure the gentleman does not mean to. Maybe he does, but I think he does not mean to do that.

I think we had a different goal. We have come to an agreement, and the gentleman may have a different view.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I apologize if you were taking that as a specific to this situation, quite a critique on my part. I was critiquing the Congress as a whole, which puts weasel words into legislation and makes that legislation meaningless quite often, which I find is

a method of lying to constituents. However, I was not referring to anyone in this body today in this specific situation.

Mr. GOODLING. The vote occurs on the amendment offered by the gentlelady from Florida.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Menendez.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief.

I want to commend the gentlelady for negotiating an agreement that can produce bipartisanship, which I believe is a much stronger message to the Russians, that we are concerned about what they are doing in terms of spending hundreds of millions of dollars on spying on the United States, while at the same time spending an additional several hundred million dollars on creating a new spy station for the Castro regime, and at the same time sending the Russians a message that we are very concerned about what they are doing with nuclear and multilateral and bilateral nonproliferation and arms limitation agreements.

I do not believe, though your original offer might have been considered stronger, that this is by any stretch of the imagination weak to the extent that we are sending the Russians a very clear message.

I would hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would join the Ranking Democratic voting for his amendment and then ultimately the bill so that we could send that strong a message, which I think would be very clear, direct and very powerful.

Mr. GOODLING. The vote occurs on the amendment offered by the gentlelady from Florida. All in favor give your consent by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Mr. GOODLING. Those opposed, no?

[No response.]

Mr. GOODLING. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The ayes have it.

Are there any other amendments?

[No response.]

Mr. GOODLING. If there are no other amendments, the Committee may report the bill we have under consideration with a single amendment. The chair will make a unanimous consent request. Without objection, this Committee is deemed to have before it an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the bill as amended to this point.

Without objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute is deemed read. The previous question was ordered on the amendment, and the amendment is adopted.

If there are no further amendments, without objection the previous question is ordered. The gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Be-reuter, is recognized.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I object. I reserve the right to object. Is there no debate now on the final product of what we have?

Mr. GOODLING. I believe that we have had sufficient debate. It is not customary to have debate once we have gotten to this point.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I am reserving my right to object. I believe that it is customary to have a debate on what the final bill has turned out before we actually vote on it.

Mr. GOODLING. Well, unfortunately, if we read carefully we have the final version that appeared on this very expensive screen.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I will, if I could, explain my reservation?

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman has 30 seconds to explain his reservation.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right. Let me just say that we have heard what I consider to be some very absurd arguments today in this body, and especially absurd to have heard the proclamation that it is to our benefit to have a large Russian spy base so close to our shores and that we should basically look at that as a possible benefit.

Let me just say that either the Cold War is over or it is not over. If the Russians keep spending hundreds of millions of dollars on weapons systems or intelligence systems like they are and what we are discussing today that we should not be restructuring their debts. We should be not treating them as if they are friends and as if the Cold War is over.

With that said, I just wanted to make sure I put that on the record.

Mr. HASTINGS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I only have 30 seconds. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. I would merely put to the gentleman are you mindful that there is a potential for serious backlash against our intelligence community by virtue of legislation of this kind?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is true, and it is true with any time we take a stand on anything it is potentially there is a backlash.

In this particular case, restructuring the debt with a country that is spending hundreds of millions of dollars on weapons systems or intelligence systems aimed at the United States is worthy of that stand, and so I withdraw my objection, and you may proceed.

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee report the bill to the House with a recommendation that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GOODLING. The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Nebraska. Those in favor of the motion say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Mr. GOODLING. Those opposed say no.

[No response.]

Mr. GOODLING. The ayes have it, the quorum being present. The motion is agreed to. Without objection, the Chair or his designee is authorized to make motions under Rule 22 with respect to a conference on this bill or a counterpart from the Senate.

We are now ready for consideration of H.R. 4249, the Cross Border Cooperation and Environmental Safety in Northern Europe Act of 2000. The Chair lays the bill before the Committee. The clerk will report the title of the bill.

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4249

Ms. RUSH. H.R. 4249, a bill to foster cross border cooperation and environmental clean up in northern Europe.

Mr. GOODLING. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with. The clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Ms. RUSH. Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—

Mr. GOODLING. Without objection, the bill is considered as having been read and is open to amendment at any point. The bill will be—

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

Mr. GOODLING. No one wants to speak on it first?

[No response.]

Mr. GOODLING. I now recognize the gentleman from Nebraska. No. He was going to offer it. Go ahead and speak on it.

Mr. BEREUTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to speak on the bill.

One of the reasons I did not want to adjourn is I think this bill is exceedingly important and, as it is about to be amended, an entirely appropriate product. As my colleagues will know, it authorizes assistance from a variety of sources and gives the reasons. I certainly do support the initiative before us and projects under that initiative in areas such as civil society, law enforcement, and public health.

I think the bill also appropriately highlights the enormously dangerous problems of Russian nuclear waste in the area of Momansk and northeast Russia. There is an urgent need to address this very real potential environmental problem and to clean up this for all of us. I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut for offering this legislation.

The bill points out in Subsection 15 of Section 2 that it apparently has not yet been possible for the Russians to resolve the remaining differences over liability, taxation, assistance, privileges and immunity for foreign contractors and audit rights in regard to cleaning up this waste, the bill also concludes that such agreements are vital to continued provisions of assistance.

Before the gentleman and I talked, I had some concerns about an amendment he will offer that the United States appropriately should expect those agreements are made before we offer assistance. We should expect that they are made, and that those differences resolved, before the European Union is urged to provide assistance.

The gentleman is about to recommend that through his amendment and I think it is an outstanding and important effort. We may come to find that this is one of the more important bills that this Congress considers. We hope that is not the case. We hope there is not an environmental catastrophe in between, but the Russians have to get on with it, while we have to realize this is an international problem.

I thank the gentleman for his initiative, and I yield back.

Mr. GOODLING. Before I recognize the gentleman from Connecticut, I want to have some unfinished business finished.

The Chief of Staff is authorized by unanimous consent to make technical, grammatical and conforming amendments to H.R. 4118. Is there an objection?

[No response.]

Mr. GOODLING. If not, so ordered.

I now recognize the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, Mr. Gejdenson, for 5 minutes to introduce the bill.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would be happy to do that. There is a slide presentation to take advantage of our new facility, and I apologize for its length in advance. My staff was a little eager to use the new technology.

Many people I think believed that the rotting submarine force of the Soviet Union would just disappear at the end of the Cold War. This legislation seeks to address the problem through an important framework called the Northern European Initiative.

We can first take a look at the Nunn-Lugar program. It has already facilitated the destruction of 164 submarine missile launches, 46 submarine launch ballistic missiles and 12 strategic submarines. The risk remains with over 150 decaying submarines.

If you have seen some of the recent discussions in the press, in September, 1998, a Russian sailor hijacked a submarine. He died while trying to set fire to the torpedoes and to detonate them. In January 1999, a sailor tried to sell nuclear submarine reactor parts, and I think that created one explosion.

If you look at February 1999, a shipyard employee tries to sell radioactive material to North Korean agents, again creating a very dangerous situation. In January of 2000, a sailor almost caused a meltdown while stealing submarine components.

If you look at this next graph, it gives you a sense of where the immediate effect would be, but obviously with the winds it could really travel around the world, affecting almost everybody in the Northern Hemisphere and maybe eventually below.

We are very happy to see the Members being impressed by the very simple graphics on the board, and my sense is that silicon graphics will be here shortly to help us out and try to make it more interesting in the future. Again, there are almost 150 non-ballistic missiles, conventional submarines awaiting destruction. Thirty-five of these conventional submarines are waiting dismantlement.

What we have here is a piece of legislation that would help coordinate with the Europeans and press on the Russians to deal with the liability issues so we can deal with this nuclear threat. It also provides for a United States and Lithuania training programs and entrepreneurship from the countries in the region, the Baltic Lakes/Sea partnership program, and a number of other things to help develop the democratic institutions and civil societies of the region.

Clearly, the most important part, as Mr. Bereuter pointed out, is the threat of these rotting nuclear submarines. To that end, when it is appropriate I have an amendment that Mr. Bereuter actually helped draft.

Mr. GOODLING. I would ask unanimous consent to insert Chairman Gilman's message in the record. So ordered.

Is there anyone that wants to say something before this is moved into legislation?

[No response.]

Mr. GOODLING. If not, I recognize Mr. Gejdenson for an amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to move these en bloc. I think most Members already have the two pieces of paper. The first is technical in nature. The second clarifies what may have created some confusion in language that Mr. Bereuter included.

I would yield to Mr. Bereuter to explain his language.

Mr. BEREUTER. Thank you very much for your cooperation with the differences still remaining, the problems that are identified in your legislation in Subsection 15 of Section 2.

As I mentioned, I think it is important that we expect that our aid and those aid programs from the European Union that we are endorsing and encouraging be brought into impact after the Russians solve these differences that are identified in Subsection 15.

The gentleman's amendment does that, and I appreciate the effort. I urge the amendment's adoption, as well as the other adoption and urge that we do this en bloc.

Mr. GOODLING. The vote occurs on the amendment to the Gejdenson legislation. All in favor give your consent by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Mr. GOODLING. Opposed, no?

[No response.]

Mr. GOODLING. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it.

Are there any other amendments?

[No response.]

Mr. GOODLING. If there are no other amendments, the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Bereuter, is recognized to offer a motion.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Chairman be requested to seek consideration of the pending bill as amended on the suspension counter.

Mr. GOODLING. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska. Those in favor of the motion say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Mr. GOODLING. Those opposed, no?

[No response.]

Mr. GOODLING. The ayes have it. A quorum being present, the motion is agreed to. Without objection, the Chair or his designee is authorized to make motions under Rule 22 with respect to a conference on this bill or a counterpart from the Senate. Further proceedings on this measure are postponed.

The Committee will now adjourn.

[Whereupon, at 11:31 a.m. the Committee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X

MAY 4, 2000

Chairman Benjamin A. Gilman
Statement
International Relations Committee Mark-Up of
H.Con.Res. 251: "Commending the Republic of Croatia
For the Conduct of Its Parliamentary and Presidential
Elections"
Thursday, May 4th, 2000
10 A.M. 2172 Rayburn Building

I want to say that this resolution – as amended by its lead sponsor, Mr. Radanovich – is timely and appropriate and I commend the gentleman for introducing this measure. The people of Croatia have suffered through several years of warfare, destruction, ethnic strife, and economic stagnation. As the resolution points out, the elections held recently for the Croatian parliament and presidency were indeed conducted in a free, fair and democratic manner, by all accounts that we have received.

Just as important, however, is the fact that those elections brought to power a government that appears intent on moving Croatia forward in all respects. I therefore agree that it would be worthwhile for us to show our support for that new government in the form of this resolution.

The new Croatian government will face challenges in opening up its economy and in finding ways to ensure that its support for ethnic Croats in neighboring Bosnia does not lead Croatia to undermine the sovereignty of that state. It will face serious challenges in other areas as well.

The amended resolution, if approved by this Committee, will make it clear that success in meeting those challenges should be met by American and European support for Croatia's full entry into the pan-European and trans-Atlantic community of nations — including entry into NATO's Partnership for Peace program.

I am optimistic that Croatia's days of warfare and destruction are over. I am tremendously hopeful that it will now enter a stage of stability and prosperity. Now is the time for Croatia to build its new, democratic future. I think this resolution points to that fact — and congratulates the Croatian people for so clearly choosing the path of democracy in their recent elections.

I support the amended resolution.

Chairman Benjamin A. Gilman
Statement
Mark-up of H.R. 4118 – The “Russian-American Trust
and Cooperation Act of 2000”
House International Relations Committee
Thursday, May 4th, 2000
10 A.M. 2172 Rayburn House Office Building

I want to commend our colleague, the Gentlelady from Florida,
for her measure --- and to state my very strong support for it.

The Russian government is indeed providing large sums of
money to the Castro regime in Cuba for the use of its facility at
Lourdes. This bill points out that our own Defense Department has
estimated that Russia gives the Cuban government oil or other
commodities valued at between 100 and 300 million dollars annually
for the use of the Lourdes facility.

At a time ---

— when the Russian government is seeking outright
forgiveness of much of its debt to the United States and other
governments around the world;

— when the Russian government is leaning on the United States to provide it with hundreds of millions of dollars from the sale of donated American food to pay Russian pensions;

— when Russia is leaning on us to help finance its arms reductions under the START-I Treaty --- while it spends hundreds of millions of dollars to fund its brutal war in Chechnya —

I think it is unacceptable that the Russian government continues to provide financial support to the Castro regime with subsidies such as this.

As this bill makes clear, we ought to tell the Russian government that there will be no rescheduling or forgiveness of its bilateral debt to the United States until it closes that facility. The fact is that the Russian government has benefitted — and benefitted greatly — from the debt relief we and the other members of the “Paris Club” of creditors have already provided.

Russia's debt to the United States and the other members of the Paris Club has been rescheduled five times over the last eight years — in 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996 and 1999. The debt relief provided in 1996 alone allowed Russia to reduce its debt payment that year by over \$6 billion — reducing the annual payment from \$8.5 billion to \$2 billion! However, the Russian government is now demanding that the United States and the other creditors in the Paris Club simply write off another \$14 billion or so of its debt.

My colleagues, let me read you an interesting quote from the “Economist” magazine of February 19th:

“...Russia...seems to have established the convenient principle that it inherits the Soviet Union's assets but not its liabilities.”

That statement touches on an important point.

When Russia became independent in 1991, it declared that it was the rightful heir to all of the former Soviet Union's assets, including bank accounts, gold stocks, weapons, embassies — and facilities based around the world, both military and civilian. In return for international agreement to that demand, the Russian government took on itself the responsibility to pay the commercial and official debt of the former Soviet Union.

Now, however, while it continues to insist that it rightfully possesses and operates Soviet assets and facilities around the world, the Russian government insists that it must be freed from the financial obligations it took on at that time — and for which it has already received the extensive debt relief I have outlined. To reinforce its demands, the Russian government simply stopped meeting its payment obligations last year, and so, the Paris Club re-scheduled them yet again.

My colleagues, there is more to be concerned about with regard to the Russian facility at Lourdes than just Russia's willingness to pay Castro what it won't pay to its creditors.

Secretary of Defense William Cohen has publicly stated that our Defense Department is concerned about, and I quote:

“the use of Cuba as a base for intelligence activities directed at the United States.”

A Russian intelligence defector has stated publicly that the significance of the Lourdes facility has grown since former Russian President Yeltsin secretly ordered Russian agencies to step up the theft of American economic and trade secrets in 1996. When questioned in a public hearing about the Yeltsin order to step up such commercial espionage, FBI Director Louis Freeh said that the expertise of Russian intelligence operations presents, and I quote:

“a very formidable, very ominous threat to ... our economy.”

Once again, I want to congratulate the Gentlelady from Florida for working hard on this issue and on this bill.

As she knows, several Members of Congress wrote the President to ask that he take action to deal with this matter — or else refuse to join in further re-scheduling or forgiveness of Russia's debt to the United States until the Russian government closes and dismantles this facility. More than two months later, those Members have yet to receive an answer from the President.

I urge the Members of this Committee to join in insisting that this kind of financial support provided to Fidel Castro by the Russian government cease. I urge the Members of this Committee to join in insisting that our government act on the publicly-stated concerns of our OWN OFFICIALS by addressing the threat to our security that it poses.

I urge the adoption of this measure.

Chairman Benjamin A. Gilman
Statement
International Relations Committee Mark-Up of H.R. 4249 - "Cross-Border
Cooperation and Environmental Safety in Northern Europe Act of 2000"
Thursday, May 4th, 2000
10 A.M. 2172 Rayburn Building

H.R. 4249, introduced by our Ranking Member, the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Gejdenson, seeks to focus on United States and European Union policies toward Northern Europe, including the Baltic region and Northwestern region of Russia.

For my part, I have been concerned that the European Union, while recognizing the extensive problems in its own "backyard" --- in Northern Europe --- has yet to take action to provide the substantial aid that will be needed if those problems are to be addressed.

My colleague from Connecticut has been gracious in accepting my suggestions that his bill make it clear that the European Union must take the lead in addressing those problems and must, in particular, provide the substantial aid that will be needed to deal with them.

In my view, assistance provided by the United States should be viewed by the European Union as a supplement to its aid, not as a substitute for the substantial EU assistance that will be required. Still, I have no objection to the US lending a hand on those problems.

In fact, as the Gentleman's bill points out, the U.S. -Northern Europe Initiative has already been funded under our foreign aid program for three years now, since the President already has the authority under the "SEED Act of 1989" and the "FREEDOM Support Act of 1992" to provide such funding — and has used that authority. I believe the Gentleman's intent with the introduction of this bill is, in fact, to highlight his concern about the problems faced by the countries of Northern Europe.

I share that concern, but I would take this opportunity to point out that the United States has provided considerable aid to support reforms and address problems in the region — and that the United States has also endowed several foundations in those countries of the region where its aid program has been phased out.

Such U.S.-endowed foundations include:

- the Baltic-American Enterprise Fund;
- the Baltic-American Partnership Fund, and
- the Polish-American Freedom Foundation.

In addition, while our "FREEDOM Support Act" aid program, our "Nunn-Lugar" demilitarization program, our large food aid program, our enriched Uranium purchase program, and other forms of aid all continue today in Russia, we have also set up an Enterprise Fund in that country that, I am sure, will last for years to come.

It is my hope that this bill, if adopted by this Committee and this Congress, will signal our concern over remaining problems in the region of Northern Europe but will ensure that the European Union takes the lead in addressing those problems.

COMMITTEES:
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
GOVERNMENT REFORM

CHAIR:
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC
POLICY AND TRADE

VICE CHAIR:
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
WESTERN HEMISPHERE



Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN
18TH DISTRICT, FLORIDA

PLEASE RESPOND TO:
☐ 2180 RAYBURN BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-0918
(202) 225-3931
FAX (202) 225-5620

☐ DISTRICT OFFICE:
9210 SUNSET DRIVE
SUITE 100
MIAMI, FL 33173
(305) 275-1800
FAX (305) 275-1801

Statement by Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
on H.R. 4118- "The Russian-American Trust and Cooperation Act of 2000"
for mark-up session of the House Committee on International Relations
Thursday, May 4, 2000

While many of our Committee colleagues are co-sponsors of this legislation and are knowledgeable of its purpose, I would like to offer a brief overview at this time.

The threat posed by Russia's facility at Lourdes is not new. The Freedom Support Act of 1992 clearly underscored the dangers to U.S. national security as it required the U.S. Government to reduce certain foreign assistance to Russia proportional to the amount the Russian Government provides for Lourdes. Ensuing legislation reiterated this position. However, due, at first, to concerns about the nascent Russian democracy and market economy and later due to considerations relating to U.S.-Russian relations, this requirement has never been enforced.

Eight years of talks; eight years of providing the Russian Federation with billions of dollars in U.S. aid of one sort or another; eight years of re-scheduling the Russian debt at different intervals, and Lourdes remains a serious problem. In a May 5, 1998 unclassified letter to Members of this Committee, Secretary of Defense Cohen stated: "I remain concerned with the signals intelligence facility at Lourdes" and "the use of Cuba as a base for intelligence activities directed against the United States." In fact, evidence suggests there has been an increase, not a reduction, of the threat posed by the Lourdes facility.

Coinciding with the February 7, 1996 order by then Russian President Yeltsin demanding that the Russian intelligence community increase its gathering of U.S. and other Western economic and trade secrets, multiple open sources confirm that the Russian Federation began a multi-billion dollar upgrade and expansion of the Lourdes facility which included -- according to open sources and public statements by former U.S. officials, Russian and Cuban defectors -- the addition of satellite dishes; voice recognition facilities; more sophisticated computers for intercepting specific telephone numbers, faxes, and computer data; and the means by which to engage in cyberwarfare against the United States.

In fact, some believe that the ongoing sophisticated and organized cyber attacks the Pentagon's military computer systems were subjected to in early 1999 came from a country routing through Russian computer addresses. These attacks have been occurring since 1998 and are believed to stem from the Lourdes facility. Other public sources and reports refer to the

jamming of U.S. FAA transmissions, as an example of how Lourdes is used for cyberwarfare which directly threatens the lives of all Americans.

On November 5, 1998, a Moscow publication reported that the Lourdes espionage facility “provides between 60 and 70 percent of all intelligence data about the United States” – including highly sensitive military information about our armed forces. Such a penetration of closely-guarded American military planning jeopardizes the lives of thousands of our men and women in uniform.

Some may dismiss the latter contention on the assumption that Russia, as an ally, would not compromise U.S. security in that fashion. However, I ask them to look at Russia’s recent actions regarding Kosovo, Iraq, its reported arms transfers to China and Iran, its multiple penetration of the State Department. I would further underscore the detailed information provided by Russian defectors and former Cuban intelligence officers confirming that the Russian Federation shares the data on the U.S. derived from Lourdes with the Castro regime and shares or sells the intelligence to North Korea, Iraq, China, Iran, as well as individual groups who are hostile to the U.S.

The use of Lourdes, however, according to academic studies and news reports, is not limited to secret U.S. military operations. Its targets include the interception of sensitive diplomatic, commercial, and economic traffic and private U.S. telecommunications. Informed public sources state that economic traffic intercepted includes Federal Reserve deliberations, planned U.S. mergers and acquisitions, competitive bidding processes – data which could be used to bank-roll Russian global operations to the detriment of American equities.

The disdain for U.S. security extends into the private realm as revealed by the director of the Defense Intelligence Agency in August 1996 who stated that “Lourdes is being used to collect personal information about U.S. citizens in the private and government sectors.”

This means that any one of our constituents is a target. Yet, what are we doing to protect them?

By asking the American people to look the other way on the \$1.9 billion in outstanding loan guarantees under the Commodity Credit Corporation of USDA. By asking our constituents to forgive or re-schedule the \$602 million in Lend-Lease debt to the U.S. By asking the U.S. taxpayer, who already contributes greatly to Russia’s growth and development through foreign aid programs, to pay no attention to the \$2.17 billion in outstanding EXIMBANK loans and guarantees; the \$11.3 billion in insurance; and \$22.9 million in claims and recoveries, we are asking the American taxpayer to absorb the cost of Russia’s espionage activity. Essentially, we are asking them to indirectly subsidize Russia’s spy operations.

By re-scheduling or forgiving Russia’s debt to the U.S., we are freeing up funds for Russia to pay the Castro regime \$200 to \$300 million a year for the continued operation of Lourdes. Not having to worry about paying its debt to the U.S., the Russian government is then able to focus its resources on expanding and upgrading its operations at Lourdes so that it can

better target and undermine U.S. national security, foreign policy objectives, and political and economic stability.

This cannot and must not continue. H.R. 4118 affords us the necessary leverage to correct this situation. It holds the Russian government accountable for its actions. Trust must be earned. While the U.S. Government treats the Russian Federation as an ally and wishes to build upon existing relations, it expects the Russians to act in accordance. The Russian response to U.S. assistance and cooperation in the form of debt forgiveness has been to spy on and threaten the American people through its operations at Lourdes.

How can we go back to our Districts, look at our constituents -- the good men and women who elect us because they trust that we will do the right thing by them and their children -- can we look into their eyes and do nothing? The time to act is now. Vote for H.R. 4118.

106TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. CON. RES. 251

Commending the Republic of Croatia for the conduct of its parliamentary and presidential elections.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 15, 2000

Mr. RADANOVICH submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Commending the Republic of Croatia for the conduct of its parliamentary and presidential elections.

Whereas the fourth Croatian parliamentary elections, held on January 3, 2000, marked Croatia's progress toward meeting its commitments as a participating state of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and as a member of the Council of Europe;

Whereas Croatia's third presidential elections were conducted smoothly and professionally and concluded on February 7, 2000, with the landslide election of Stipe Mesic as the new President of the Republic of Croatia;

Whereas the free and fair elections in Croatia, and the following peaceful and orderly transfer of power from the old government to the new, is an example of democracy to the people of other nations in the region and a major

contribution to the democratic development of south-eastern Europe; and

Whereas the people of Croatia have made clear that they want Croatia to take its rightful place in the family of European democracies and to develop a closer and more constructive relationship with the Euro-Atlantic community of democratic nations: Now, therefore, be it

1 *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate*
2 *concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that—

3 (1) the people of the Republic of Croatia are to
4 be congratulated on the successful elections and the
5 outgoing Government of Croatia is to be commended
6 for the democratic standards with which it managed
7 the elections;

8 (2) the United States should support the efforts
9 of the new Government of Croatia to increase its
10 work on refugee return, privatization reform, media
11 reform, and further cooperation with the Inter-
12 national Criminal Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia
13 (ICTY) to set an example to other countries in the
14 region;

15 (3) the Congress strongly supports Croatia's
16 commitment to western democratic standards and
17 will give its full support to the new Government of
18 Croatia to fully implement democratic reforms;

19 (4) the United States continues to promote
20 Croatian-American economic, political, and military

1 relations and recognizes Croatia as a loyal partner
2 in south central Europe; and
3 (5) taking into consideration Croatia's contribu-
4 tions as a committed partner in the region, the Con-
5 gress recommends establishing strategic partnership
6 with the Republic of Croatia and supports its mem-
7 bership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's
8 Partnership for Peace program and its accession
9 into the World Trade Organization.

AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. 251
OFFERED BY MR. RADANOVICH

Page 2, line 10, after “privatization reform,” insert
“, accession to the World Trade Organization”.

Page 2, strike line 19 and all that follows through
line 9 on page 3 and insert the following:

1 (4) the United States continues to promote
2 Croatian-American economic, political, and military
3 relations and welcomes Croatia as a partner in the
4 cause of stability and democratization in south cen-
5 tral Europe;

6 (5) the United States and the Republic of Cro-
7 atia should work to establish a strategic partnership
8 to include Croatia’s entry into the North Atlantic
9 Treaty Organization’s Partnership for Peace; and

10 (6) the countries of the European Union should
11 develop closer relations with Croatia and, in par-
12 ticular, should help to expedite Croatia’s accession
13 into global and regional trade organizations, includ-
14 ing the World Trade Organization.

106TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4118

To prohibit the rescheduling or forgiveness of any outstanding bilateral debt owed to the United States by the Government of the Russian Federation until the President certifies to the Congress that the Government of the Russian Federation has ceased all its operations at, removed all personnel from, and permanently closed the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 29, 2000

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

A BILL

To prohibit the rescheduling or forgiveness of any outstanding bilateral debt owed to the United States by the Government of the Russian Federation until the President certifies to the Congress that the Government of the Russian Federation has ceased all its operations at, removed all personnel from, and permanently closed the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

1 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

2 This Act may be cited as the “Russian-American
3 Trust and Cooperation Act of 2000”.

4 **SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

5 The Congress makes the following findings:

6 (1) The Government of the Russian Federation
7 maintains an agreement with the Government of
8 Cuba which allows Russia to operate an intelligence
9 facility at Lourdes, Cuba.

10 (2) The Secretary of Defense has formally ex-
11 pressed concerns to the Congress regarding the espi-
12 onage complex at Lourdes, Cuba, and its use as a
13 base for intelligence activities directed against the
14 United States.

15 (3) The Secretary of Defense, referring to a
16 1998 Defense Intelligence Agency assessment, has
17 reported that the Russian Federation leases the
18 Lourdes facility for an estimated \$100,000,000 to
19 \$300,000,000 a year.

20 (4) It has been reported that the Lourdes facil-
21 ity is the largest such complex operated by the Rus-
22 sian Federation and its intelligence service outside
23 the region of the former Soviet Union.

24 (5) The Lourdes facility is reported to cover a
25 28 square-mile area with over 1,500 Russian engi-

1 neers, technicians, and military personnel working at
2 the base.

3 (6) Experts familiar with the Lourdes facility
4 have reportedly confirmed that the base has multiple
5 groups of tracking dishes and its own satellite sys-
6 tem, with some groups used to intercept telephone
7 calls, faxes, and computer communications, in gen-
8 eral, and with other groups used to cover targeted
9 telephones and devices.

10 (7) News sources have reported that the prede-
11 cessor regime to the Government of the Russian
12 Federation had obtained sensitive information about
13 United States military operations during Operation
14 Desert Storm through the Lourdes facility.

15 (8) Academic studies assessing the threat the
16 Lourdes espionage station poses to the United
17 States cite official United States sources affirming
18 that the Lourdes facility is being used to collect per-
19 sonal information about United States citizens in the
20 private and government sectors, and offers the
21 means to engage in cyberwarfare against the United
22 States.

23 (9) It has been reported that the operational
24 significance of the Lourdes facility has grown dra-
25 matically since February 7, 1996, when then Rus-

1 sian President, Boris Yeltsin, issued an order de-
2 manding that the Russian intelligence community in-
3 crease its gathering of United States and other
4 Western economic and trade secrets.

5 (10) It has been reported that the Government
6 of the Russian Federation is estimated to have spent
7 in excess of \$3,000,000,000 in the operation and
8 modernization of the Lourdes facility.

9 (11) Former United States Government offi-
10 cials have been quoted confirming reports about the
11 Russian Federation's expansion and upgrade of the
12 Lourdes facility.

13 (12) It was reported in December 1999 that a
14 high-ranking Russian military delegation headed by
15 Deputy Chief of the General Staff Colonel-General
16 Valentin Korabelnikov visited Cuba to discuss the
17 continuing Russian operation of the Lourdes facility.

18 **SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON BILATERAL DEBT RESCHEDULING**

19 **AND FORGIVENESS FOR THE RUSSIAN FED-**

20 **ERATION.**

21 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the
22 President—

23 (1) shall not reschedule or forgive any out-
24 standing bilateral debt owed to the United States by
25 the Government of the Russian Federation, and

1 (2) shall instruct the United States representa-
2 tive to the Paris Club of official creditors to use the
3 voice and vote of the United States to oppose re-
4 scheduling or forgiveness of any outstanding bilat-
5 eral debt owed by the Government of the Russian
6 Federation,
7 until the President certifies to the Congress that the Gov-
8 ernment of the Russian Federation has ceased all its oper-
9 ations at, removed all personnel from, and permanently
10 closed the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba.

11 **SEC. 4. REPORT ON THE CLOSING OF THE INTELLIGENCE**
12 **FACILITY AT LOURDES, CUBA.**

13 Not later than 30 days after the date of the enact-
14 ment of this Act, and every 120 days thereafter until the
15 President makes a certification under section 3, the Presi-
16 dent shall submit to the Committee on International Rela-
17 tions of the House of Representatives and the Committee
18 on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report (with a classi-
19 fied annex) detailing—

20 (1) the actions taken by the Government of the
21 Russian Federation to terminate its presence and
22 activities at the intelligence facility at Lourdes,
23 Cuba; and

1 (2) the efforts by each appropriate Federal de-
2 partment or agency to verify the actions described in
3 paragraph (1).

F:\M6\ROSLEH\ROSLEH.014

Adopted

H.L.C.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4118
OFFERED BY MS. ROS -LEHTINEN

Page 4, line 21, strike "Notwithstanding" and insert
"(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding".

Page 5, after line 10, insert the following:

1 (b) WAIVER.—

2 (1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive
3 the application of subsection (a) (1) if, not less than
4 10 days before the waiver is to take effect, the
5 President determines and certifies in writing to the
6 Committee on International Relations of the House
7 of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign
8 Relations of the Senate that—

9 (A) such waiver is necessary to the na-
10 tional interests of the United States;

11 (B) the Government of the Russian Fed-
12 eration is in compliance with multilateral and
13 bilateral nonproliferation and arms limitation
14 agreements;

15 (C) such waiver will result in tangible steps
16 taken by the Government of the Russian Fed-
17 eration to cease its espionage activities at the
18 intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba.

with respect to rescheduling of outstanding bilateral debt

[and

Substantially

[.

1 (2) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—If the Presi-
 2 dent waives the application of subsection (a)(1) pur-
 3 suant to paragraph (1), the President shall include
 4 in the written certification under paragraph (1) a
 5 detailed description of the facts that support the de-
 6 termination to waive the application of subsection
 7 (a)(1).

8 (3) SUBMISSION IN CLASSIFIED FORM.—If the
 9 President considers it appropriate, the written cer-
 10 tification under paragraph (1), or appropriate parts
 11 thereof, may be submitted in classified form.

12 (c) PERIODIC REPORTS.—The President shall, every
 13 days after the transmission of the written certification
 14 under ~~paragraph (1)~~, prepare and transmit to the Com-
 15 mittee on International Relations of the House of Rep-
 16 resentatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of
 17 the Senate a report that contains a description of the ex-
 18 tent to which the requirements of subparagraphs (A)
 19 ~~through (C) of paragraph (1)~~ are being met.

180]
 Subsection
 (b)(1)]

and (B) of subsection (b)(1)

offered by Mr. Greiderson
Amendment to the Amendment to H.R. 4118

(2)
withdrawn

Offered by Ms. Ros-Lehtinen

On page 1, strike lines 11 to 18, and make such conforming
changes as may be necessary.

On page 2, strike lines 12 to 19.

F:\AM6\ROSLEH\ROSLEH.014

H.L.C.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4118

OFFERED BY ~~Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN~~
Gjenderson

Page 4, line 21, strike "Notwithstanding" and insert
 "(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding".

Page 5, after line 10, insert the following:

1 (b) WAIVER.—

2 (1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive
 3 the application of subsection (a)(1) if, not less than
 4 10 days before the waiver is to take effect, the
 5 President determines and certifies in writing to the
 6 Committee on International Relations of the House
 7 of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign
 8 Relations of the Senate that—

9 (A) such waiver is necessary to the na-
 10 tional interests of the United States;

11 (B) the Government of the Russian Fed-
 12 eration is in compliance with multilateral and
 13 bilateral nonproliferation and arms limitation
 14 agreements; and

15 (C) such waiver will result in tangible steps
 16 taken by the Government of the Russian Fed-
 17 eration to cease its espionage activities at the
 18 intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba.

with
respect
to
rescheduling
of
outstanding
bilateral
debts

and

Substantially

1 (2) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—If the Presi-
 2 dent waives the application of subsection (a)(1) pur-
 3 suant to paragraph (1), the President shall include
 4 in the written certification under paragraph (1) a
 5 detailed description of the facts that support the de-
 6 termination to waive the application of subsection
 7 (a)(1).

8 (3) SUBMISSION IN CLASSIFIED FORM.—If the
 9 President considers it appropriate, the written cer-
 10 tification under paragraph (1), or appropriate parts
 11 thereof, may be submitted in classified form.

12 (c) PERIODIC REPORTS.—The President shall, every
 13 ~~10~~ days after the transmission of the written certification
 14 under ~~paragraph (1)~~, prepare and transmit to the Com-
 15 mittee on International Relations of the House of Rep-
 16 resentatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of
 17 the Senate a report that contains a description of the ex-
 18 tent to which the requirements of subparagraphs (A)
 19 ~~through (C) of paragraph (1)~~ are being met.

180]
 subsection
 (b)(1)]

and (B) of subsection (b)(1)

106TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 4249

To foster cross-border cooperation and environmental cleanup in Northern Europe.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 12, 2000

Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself and Mr. LANTOS) introduced the following bill;
which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

A BILL

To foster cross-border cooperation and environmental cleanup
in Northern Europe.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4 This Act may be cited as the “Cross-Border Coopera-
5 tion and Environmental Safety in Northern Europe Act
6 of 2000”.

7 **SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.**

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

1 (1) Northern Europe is an increasingly vital
2 part of Europe and one that offers great opportuni-
3 ties for United States investment.

4 (2) Northern Europe offers an excellent oppor-
5 tunity to make progress toward the United States vi-
6 sion of a secure, prosperous, and stable Europe, in
7 part because of—

8 (A) historical tradition of regional coopera-
9 tion;

10 (B) the opportunity to engage Russia in
11 positive, cooperative activities with its neighbors
12 to the west;

13 (C) commitment by the Baltic states to re-
14 gional cooperation and integration into western
15 institutions; and

16 (D) longstanding, strong ties with the
17 United States.

18 (3) The United States Northern Europe Initia-
19 tive (NEI) provides the conceptual and operational
20 framework for United States policy in the region, fo-
21 cused on developing a regional network of coopera-
22 tion in the important areas of business and trade
23 promotion, law enforcement, the environment, en-
24 ergy, civil society, and public health.

1 (4) A central objective of the United States
2 Northern Europe Initiative is to promote cross-border
3 cooperation among the countries in the region.

4 (5) A wide variety of regional and cross-border
5 projects have been initiated under the United States
6 Northern Europe Initiative since the Initiative was
7 established in 1997, including the following:

8 (A) A United States-Lithuanian training
9 program for entrepreneurs from Belarus and
10 Kaliningrad.

11 (B) The Great Lakes-Baltic Sea Partnership
12 program that is being implemented by the
13 Environmental Protection Agency.

14 (C) A Center of Excellence for Treatment
15 of Multidrug-Resistant Tuberculosis in Riga,
16 Latvia.

17 (D) A regional HIV/AIDS strategy being
18 developed under United States and Finnish
19 leadership.

20 (E) Multiple efforts to combat organized
21 crime, including regional seminars for police officers
22 and prosecutors.

23 (F) Programs to encourage reform of the
24 Baltic electricity market and encourage United
25 States investment in such market.

1 (G) Language and job training programs
2 for Russian-speaking minorities in Latvia and
3 Estonia to promote social integration in those
4 countries.

5 (H) A mentoring partnership program for
6 woman entrepreneurs in the northwest region of
7 Russia and the Baltic states, as part of broader
8 efforts to promote women's participation in po-
9 litical and economic life.

10 (6) Norway, Sweden, and Finland have made
11 considerable efforts to provide assistance to the
12 newly independent Baltic states and to the North-
13 west region of Russia. In particular, the United
14 States notes the request placed before the European
15 Union by Finland in 1999 for the creation and ex-
16 tensive funding by the European Union of a "North-
17 ern Dimension" Initiative to substantially address
18 the problems that now exist in Northern Europe
19 with regard to economic development, protection of
20 the environment, the safety and containment of nu-
21 clear materials, and other issues.

22 (7) The United States commends the endorse-
23 ment of the "Northern Dimension" Initiative by the
24 European Council at its meeting in Helsinki, Fin-
25 land in December 1999 and calls on the European

1 Union to act on that endorsement through the provi-
2 sion of substantial funding for the Initiative.

3 (8) While the European Union, its member
4 states, and other European countries should clearly
5 take the lead in addressing the challenges posed in
6 Northern Europe, in particular through appropriate
7 yet substantial assistance provided by the European
8 Union, the United States-Northern Europe Initia-
9 tive, and this Act are intended to supplement such
10 efforts and build on the considerable assistance that
11 the United States has already provided to the Baltic
12 states and the Russian Federation. Partnership with
13 other countries in the region means modest United
14 States investment can have significant impact.

15 (9) The United States Northern Europe Initia-
16 tive's focus on regional environmental challenges is
17 particularly important. Northern Europe is home to
18 significant environmental problems, particularly the
19 threat posed by nuclear waste from Russian sub-
20 marines, icebreakers, and nuclear reactors.

21 (10) In particular, 21,000 spent fuel assemblies
22 from Russian submarines are lying exposed near
23 Andreyeva Bay, nearly 60 dangerously decrepit nu-
24 clear submarines, many in danger of sinking, are
25 languishing in the Murmansk area of Northwest

1 Russia, whole reactors and radioactive liquid waste
2 are stored on unsafe floating barges, and there are
3 significant risks of marine and atmospheric contami-
4 nation from accidents arising from loss of electricity
5 or fire on deteriorating, poorly monitored nuclear
6 submarines.

7 (11) This waste poses a threat to the safety
8 and stability of Northern Europe and to countries of
9 the Eurasian continent.

10 (12) Under the Cooperative Threat Reduction
11 Act of 1993 and the United States Northern Europe
12 Initiative, the United States has provided assistance
13 to Russia to address these environmental challenges.

14 (13)(A) In addition, the Environmental Protec-
15 tion Agency has facilitated the expansion and up-
16 grading of a facility for the treatment of low-level
17 liquid radioactive waste from the decommissioning of
18 nuclear submarines docked at naval facilities in the
19 Arctic region of Russia.

20 (B) The Environmental Protection Agency has
21 also initiated a project to construct an 80-ton proto-
22 type cask for the storage and transport of civilian-
23 controlled spent nuclear fuel, much of it damaged
24 and currently stored onboard an aging vessel an-
25 chored in Murmansk Harbor. Currently in the de-

1 sign phase, this project is scheduled for completion
2 in 2000.

3 (14) Working with the countries in the region
4 to address these environmental problems remains
5 vital to the long-term national interest of the United
6 States.

7 (15) The United States and other countries are
8 currently negotiating a number of agreements with
9 Russia which will provide internationally accepted
10 legal protections for the United States and other
11 countries that provide nuclear waste management
12 assistance to Russia. Regrettably, it has not yet been
13 possible to resolve remaining differences over liabil-
14 ity, taxation of assistance, privileges and immunities
15 for foreign contractors, and audit rights.

16 (16) Concluding these agreements is vital to the
17 continued provision of such assistance and to the
18 possible development of new programs.

19 (17) With the election of Russian President
20 Vladamir Putin, the opportunity presents itself to
21 surmount these problems, to conclude these out-
22 standing agreements, and to allow assistance pro-
23 grams to move forward to alleviate this problem.

24 (18) United States Government agencies are
25 currently studying whether programs under the Co-

1 operative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 can address
2 cleanup and decommissioning of tactical submarines.

3 (b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to dem-
4 onstrate concrete support for continued cross-border co-
5 operation in Northern Europe and immediate efforts to
6 assist in the clean up of nuclear waste in that region.

7 **SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

8 It is the sense of Congress that—

9 (1) the United States Northern Europe Initia-
10 tive is a sound framework for future United States
11 involvement in Northern Europe;

12 (2) the European Union should move expedi-
13 tiously to authorize and fund the proposed “North-
14 ern Dimension” Initiative at appropriate yet sub-
15 stantial levels of assistance;

16 (3) the United States should continue to sup-
17 port a wide-ranging strengthening of democratic and
18 civic institutions on a regional basis to provide a
19 foundation for political stability and investment op-
20 portunities, including cross-border exchanges, in
21 Northern Europe;

22 (4) the United States should demonstrate con-
23 tinued commitment to address environmental secu-
24 rity challenges in Northwest Russia, in cooperation
25 with partners in the region; and

1 (5) recently-elected Russian President Vladamir
2 Putin should rapidly conclude pending nuclear waste
3 management agreements to enable assistance pro-
4 grams to go forward.

5 **SEC. 4. SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES NORTHERN EUROPE**
6 **INITIATIVE PROJECTS.**

7 (a) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS FROM EAST EURO-
8 PEAN AND THE BALTIC STATES ASSISTANCE.—Of the
9 amounts available for fiscal year 2001 to carry out the
10 provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the
11 Support for Eastern European Democracy (SEED) Act
12 of 1989 for assistance and for related programs for East-
13 ern Europe and the Baltic States, not less than
14 \$2,000,000 shall be used for projects described in sub-
15 section (c).

16 (b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS FROM INDE-
17 PENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION AS-
18 SISTANCE.—Of the amounts available for fiscal year 2001
19 to carry out the provisions of chapter 11 of part I of the
20 Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Freedom for Rus-
21 sia and Emerging Eurasian Democracies and Open Mar-
22 kets Support Act of 1992 for assistance for the inde-
23 pendent states of the former Soviet Union and related pro-
24 grams, not less than \$2,000,000 shall be used for the
25 projects described in subsection (c).

1 (c) PROJECTS DESCRIBED.—The projects described
2 in this subsection are United States Northern Europe Ini-
3 tiative projects relating to environmental cleanup, law en-
4 forcement, public health, energy, business and trade pro-
5 motion, and civil society.

6 **SEC. 5. REPORT ON ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY.**

7 Not later than 180 days after the date of the enact-
8 ment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation
9 with the heads of other appropriate Federal departments
10 and agencies, shall prepare and submit to the Congress
11 a report on—

12 (1) the threat to the environmental security of
13 the countries of Northern Europe and other coun-
14 tries of Europe and Asia presented by Russian ma-
15 rine nuclear reactors, waste, and contamination; and

16 (2) identifying the possibilities for new and ex-
17 panded United States and multilateral assistance
18 programs for environmental clean-up in Northwest
19 Russia, including technical exchanges and private-
20 public partnerships.

21 **SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.**

22 In this Act:

23 (1) NORTHERN EUROPE.—The term “Northern
24 Europe” means the northwest region of the Russian
25 Federation (including Kaliningrad), the Republic of

1 Belarus, the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of
2 Latvia, the Republic of Lithuania, the Kingdom of
3 Denmark, the Republic of Finland, the Republic of
4 Iceland, the Kingdom of Norway, the Republic of
5 Poland, and the Kingdom of Sweden.

6 (2) UNITED STATES NORTHERN EUROPE INI-
7 TIATIVE.—The term “United States Northern Eu-
8 rope Initiative” means the framework agreement es-
9 tablished in 1997 between the United States and the
10 countries of Northern Europe to promote stability in
11 the Baltic Sea region and to strengthen key institu-
12 tions and security structures of the United States
13 and the countries of Northern Europe.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4249
OFFERED BY MR. GEJDENSON

Page 6, strike line 10 and all that follows through line 13 (and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly).

Page 7, strike line 24 and all that follows through line 2 on page 8 and insert the following:

1 (17) The United States Government is cur-
2 rently studying whether dismantlement of multi-pur-
3 pose submarines is in the national interest.

Amendment to H.R. 4249
Offered by Mr. Gerderson

Page 9, after Line 4, insert
the following (and make such conforming
changes as may be necessary)

"(6) Assistance to Russia on
nuclear waste management should
only be provided after issues
related to liability, taxation of
assistance, privileges and immunities
for foreign contractors, and audit
rights have been resolved."

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**Recorded Vote**

Date: 5/4/00

Time: 11:02 a.m.

Room: 2172

Markup of: H.R. 4118, To prohibit the rescheduling or forgiveness of any outstanding bilateral debt owed to the United States by the Government of the Russian Federation until the President certifies to the Congress that the Government of the Russian Federation has ceased all its operations at, removed all personnel from, and permanently closed the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba.

Description of vote: Hastings motion to adjourn.

| Name and State | Yes | No | P | Name and State | Yes | No | P |
|-------------------------------|-----|----|---|----------------------------|-----|----|---|
| Benjamin A. Gilman, NY, Chair | | | | Sam Gejdenson, CT | | X | |
| William F. Goodling, PA | | X | | Tom Lantos, CA | | | |
| James A. Leach, IA | | | | Howard L. Berman, CA | X | | |
| Henry J. Hyde, IL | | | | Gary L. Ackerman, NY | | X | |
| Doug Bereuter, NE | | X | | Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, AS | | X | |
| Christopher H. Smith, NJ | | X | | Matthew G. Martinez, CA | | | |
| Dan Burton, IN | | | | Donald M. Payne, NJ | X | | |
| Elton Gallegly, CA | | | | Robert Menendez, NJ | | X | |
| Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, FL | | X | | Sherrod Brown, OH | | | |
| Cass Ballenger, NC | | X | | Cynthia A. McKinney, GA | | | |
| Dana Rohrabacher, CA | | X | | Alcee L. Hastings, FL | X | | |
| Donald A. Manzullo, IL | | | | Pat Danner, MO | X | | |
| Edward R. Royce, CA | | | | Earl F. Hilliard, AL | X | | |
| Peter T. King, NY | | X | | Brad Sherman, CA | | X | |
| Steven J. Chabot, OH | | | | Robert Wexler, FL | X | | |
| Marshall "Mark" Sanford, SC | | | | Steven R. Rothman, NJ | | X | |
| Matt Salmon, AZ | | | | Jim Davis, FL | | X | |
| Amo Houghton, NY | | X | | Earl Pomeroy, ND | X | | |
| Tom Campbell, CA | | X | | William D. Delahunt, MA | | | |
| John M. McHugh, NY | | X | | Gregory W. Meeks, NY | X | | |
| Kevin Brady, TX | | | | Barbara Lee, CA | X | | |
| Richard Burr, NC | | | | Joseph Crowley, NY | | | |
| Paul Gillmor, OH | | | | Joseph M. Hoeffel, PA | X | | |
| George Radanovich, CA | | X | | | | | |
| John Cooksey, LA | | X | | | | | |
| Tom Tancredo, CO | | | | | | | |

Totals: YES: 10 NO: 19 PRESENT: 0