

DeFazio Kennedy (RI)
DeGette Kildee
Delahunt Kilpatrick
DeLauro Kind (WI)
DeLay King (NY)
DeMint Kingston
Deutsch Kirk
Diaz-Balart Kleczka
Dicks Knollenberg
Dingell Kolbe
Doggett Kucinich
Dooley LaFalce
Doolittle LaHood
Doyle Lampson
Dreier Langevin
Dunn Lantos
Edwards Largent
Ehlers Larsen (WA)
Ehrlich Larson (CT)
Emerson Latham
Engel LaTourette
English Leach
Eshoo Lee
Etheridge Levin
Evans Lewis (CA)
Farr Lewis (GA)
Fattah Lewis (KY)
Ferguson Linder
Filner LoBiondo
Fletcher Lofgren
Foley Lowey
Forbes Lucas (KY)
Ford Luther
Fossella Maloney (CT)
Frank Maloney (NY)
Frelinghuysen Manzullo
Frost Markey
Gallegly Mascara
Ganske Matheson
Gekas Matsui
Gephardt McCarthy (MO)
Gibbons McCarthy (NY)
Gilchrest McCollum
Gillmor McCrery
Gilman McDermott
Gonzalez McGovern
Gordon McHugh
Goss McIntyre
Graham McKeon
Granger McKinney
Graves McNulty
Green (TX) Meehan
Green (WI) Meek (FL)
Greenwood Meeks (NY)
Grucci Menendez
Gutierrez Mica
Gutknecht Millender-
Hall (OH) McDonald
Harman Miller (FL)
Hart Miller, Gary
Hastings (FL) Miller, George
Hayworth Mink
Hill Mollohan
Hilliard Moore
Hinchey Moran (KS)
Hinojosa Moran (VA)
Hobson Morella
Hoeffel Murtha
Hoekstra Myrick
Holden Nadler
Holt Napolitano
Honda Neal
Hookey Nethercutt
Horn Ney
Houghton Northup
Hoyer Norwood
Hulshof Nussle
Hunter Oberstar
Hutchinson Obey
Hyde Olver
Inlee Ortiz
Isakson Osborne
Israel Ose
Issa Owens
Istook Oxley
Jackson (IL) Pallone
Jackson-Lee Pascrell
(TX) Pastor
Jefferson Payne
John Pelosi
Johnson (CT) Pence
Johnson (IL) Peterson (MN)
Johnson, E. B. Peterson (PA)
Jones (OH) Pickering
Kanjorski Pitts
Keller Platts
Kelly Pomeroy
Kennedy (MN) Portman

Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard

Wilson
Wolf
Barr
Berry
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cubin
Cunningham
Duncan
Everett
Flake
Goode
Goodlatte
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hayes
Hefley

Woolsey
Wu
NAYS—46
Herger
Hilleary
Hostettler
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kerns
Lucas (OK)
McInnis
Otter
Paul
Petri
Phelps
Pombo
Rahall
Roemer

Wynn
Young (FL)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Stark
Stearns
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Toomey
Watkins (OK)
Weldon (FL)

NOT VOTING—6
Hastings (WA)
Johnson, Sam
Lipinski
Scarborough
Spence
Young (AK)

□ 2209

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2590, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-158) on the resolution (H. Res. 206) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2590) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 21

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 21.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules if a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or if the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

ILSA EXTENSION ACT OF 2001

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 1954) to extend the authorities of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 until 2006, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1954

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "ILSA Extension Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO LIBYA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(b)(2) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; 110 Stat. 1543) is amended by striking "\$40,000,000" each place it appears and inserting "\$20,000,000".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to investments made on or after June 13, 2001.

SEC. 3. REPORTS REQUIRED.

Section 10 of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) REPORT ON EFFECTIVENESS OF ACTIONS UNDER THIS ACT.—Not earlier than 24 months, and not later than 30 months, after the date of the enactment of the ILSA Extension Act of 2001, the President shall transmit to Congress a report that describes—

"(1) the extent to which actions relating to trade taken pursuant to this Act—

"(A) have been effective in achieving the objectives of section 3 and any other foreign policy or national security objectives of the United States with respect to Iran and Libya; and

"(B) have affected humanitarian interests in Iran and Libya, the country in which the sanctioned person is located, or in other countries; and

"(2) the impact of actions relating to trade taken pursuant to this Act on other national security, economic, and foreign policy interests of the United States, including relations with countries friendly to the United States, and on the United States economy.

The President may include in the report the President's recommendation on whether or not this Act should be terminated or modified."

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF IRAN AND LIBYA SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.

Section 13(b) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking "5 years" and inserting "10 years".

SEC. 5. REVISED DEFINITION OF INVESTMENT.

Section 14(9) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; 110 Stat. 1549) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "For purposes of this paragraph, an amendment or other modification that is made, on or after June 13, 2001, to an agreement or contract shall be treated as the entry of an agreement or contract."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1954.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1954, the ILSA Extension Act. The Iran-Libya Sanctions Act requires that the executive branch consider sanctions against foreign firms that invest in the energy sectors of Iran and Libya. Its aim is to deprive those countries of revenues that they can use to foment terrorism against our Nation and its allies and to develop weapons of mass destruction. The act, which was initially passed in 1996, which I was pleased to sponsor, will expire on August 5.

On May 9, the Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia held hearings on the bill in draft form. On May 23 I introduced a bill, the ILSA Extension Act, together with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), that would renew the act for an additional 5 years. On June 13, the Committee on International Relations favorably reported H.R. 1954 by a record vote of 41 ayes and 3 noes. On July 13, the House Committee on Ways and Means unanimously adopted to adopt a 5-year renewal extension as well.

Bipartisan support for renewing ILSA is strong in the Congress. At the present time, we have 252 cosponsors in the House of Representatives, and in the Senate 74 Senators. Support for extension remains strong because Iran continues to threaten our national security by developing weapons of mass destruction and by supporting radical groups that support terrorism. Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, calls Israel "a cancerous tumor."

As for Libya, although Libyans stand convicted of killing Americans, Britons and others by bringing down Pan Am Flight 103, the Libyan Government has failed to take responsibility for its actions in this matter as required by the U.N. Security Council and to pay compensation to the victims' families.

Thus, we remain firm in our opposition to both countries.

Moreover, there is ample evidence that ILSA has delayed exploitation of Iran and Libya's energy resources and made their development more difficult and more expensive. As a result of this act, few major energy companies want to jeopardize their ties to the huge U.S. market in exchange for the difficult investment conditions that now prevail in both Iran and Libya.

Finally, ILSA does not affect any American companies. It is aimed solely at foreign companies that take advantage of our executive-order ban on U.S. investment in Iran and in Libya.

To prevent Iran and Libya from doing further harm, I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1954 to renew ILSA for an additional 5 years.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1954.

Mr. Speaker, let me first pay tribute to my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN); the bipartisan leadership of the House of Representatives, the Republican Leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), and the Democratic Leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT); my good friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); and over 250 colleagues who have seen fit to cosponsor this most important legislation.

□ 2215

The Iran-Libya Sanctions Act imposes sanctions on foreign companies that invest in either Iran or Libya's energy sector. It, therefore, limits those two nation's oil profits, which each of those countries is using to bankroll weapons of mass destruction and terrorist activities.

Now, the initial reasons for applying sanctions on Iran and Libya are as compelling today, Mr. Speaker, as they were 5 years ago when this body saw fit to impose these sanctions on these 2 dictatorial, terrorism-supporting nations.

Iran continues to support terrorism. Iran continues to develop weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, and it is fanatically opposed to the peace process in the Middle East and to the very existence of the only democratic nation in the Middle East, our ally, the State of Israel.

Let me say a word regarding Iran's record of terrorism, Mr. Speaker. In its most recent annual edition entitled *Patterns of Global Terrorism*, our Department of State describes Iran, "as the most active State sponsor of terrorism on the face of this planet." Even since ILSA, the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act, took effect, Iran has continued to assist terrorists in the murder of Americans. In announcing the indictments for the Khobar Towers tragedy, the 1996 bombing in Saudi Arabia that took the lives of 19 of our servicemen and servicewomen, Attorney General John Ashcroft said, "Elements of the Iranian government inspired, supported, and supervised" members of the Saudi Hezbollah, the group thought to be primarily responsible for the attack. The indictment makes clear Iran's deep involvement with the suspects themselves.

Iran also provides aid and training and resources to the most blood-thirsty terrorists in the world, Hamas, Palestinian's Islamic Jihad, Lebanon's Hezbollah, all of which share totalitarian goals. Iran's patronage of these Middle Eastern terrorist groups has been demonstrated repeatedly by scholars, by journalists, and by our own judiciary.

In 10 cases, Mr. Speaker, in recent years, U.S. courts have ruled in favor of U.S. citizens seeking damages from Iran as victims, or family members of victims, for Iran-backed terrorism. One of these cases involved a direct attack by a member of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards. The other nine involved attacks by Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad which were proven to our courts' satisfaction to be dependent on Iranian training, money, and arms.

Mr. Speaker, there is no sign of a let-up. According to the highly respected military affairs correspondent, writing just a few days ago on July 17, "Iran has transferred hundreds of tons of weapons, ammunition and other materials to Hezbollah through Syria in recent days." This highly respected journalist writes, "Iranian assistance via Hezbollah to Palestinian terrorist organizations that attack Israel is increasing and Hezbollah in turn is training Palestinian terrorists in Hezbollah bases in Lebanon's Bekaa Valley."

The list of murderous and terrorist actions carried out by Iranian-backed terrorists is endless. Sixty-three people killed, including 17 Americans, in the April, 1983 U.S. embassy bombing in Beirut. Mr. Speaker, 241 U.S. Marines killed in the barracks bombing in October 1983. I might mention parenthetically some of us visited with those Marines just days before they lost their lives because of Iranian-supported terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, 29 were killed in the 1992 bombing of the Israeli embassy in Buenos Aires. Sixty-six innocent men, women and children were killed in the 1994 bombing of the Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires. I have not even begun to exhaust the most infamous incidents. What about all the kidnapping, torture, and murders that are the daily fare of these groups, the casual violence that barely makes the headlines. All of this, Mr. Speaker, has occurred with active support of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

This disgrace has been going on for more than 2 decades now. It is quite a tradition that Iran has established, and the very least we can do is answer. That is what ILSA, the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act, does. It is our response to murder, our attempt to dry up some of the monies that nourishes this terrorist monster.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, Iran successfully tested an 800-mile range missile capable of delivering these catastrophic weapons of mass destruction against its neighbors, including potentially Turkey, Egypt, Jordan, and Israel. Now, Iran recently held an election for President and the winner was the incumbent, Mr. Khatami, the most reform-oriented of the candidates that the clinical establishment allowed to run.

As my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, one cannot just run for office in Iran. One must have the good housekeeping seal of approval of the ruling Ayatollah. The President in Iran is far less

powerful than Iran's chief clerical official, the supreme leader. Real control in that country is in the hands of the clergy. The security organizations, the judiciary, the media, and the military are all under the control of the Ayatollah.

Now, I have spoken mainly of Iran, but there is a lot to be said of Libya. This country, which for so long has been run in a dictatorial fashion, still refuses to accept responsibility for the downing of Pan Am 103 and refuses to provide compensation for the families of all those innocent victims.

I would like to say a word, Mr. Speaker, about the effectiveness of the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act. Some argue that ILSA has not had an impact on the Iranian economy. That, Mr. Speaker, is demonstrably false. Even Iranian officials, including the President of Iran, have acknowledged that our legislation has had an enormous economic impact. In a 1998 report to the United Nations, Iran complained that ILSA had caused "disruption of its economy, decline in its gross national product, and contributed significantly to the reduction of international investment in oil projects and cancellation of some contracts." That is precisely what we are after.

As one obvious example of ILSA's impact, I would like to point to the energy resources of the Caspian Sea. For several years now, Mr. Speaker, Iran, Russia, and Turkey have been vying to host the main export pipeline for newly discovered oil and gas in Azerbaijan. Several of the international energy companies involved in the region prefer to pipe their product through Iran to the Persian Gulf. Economically and geographically, clearly, that would be the way to go. The reason they have chosen not the Iranian route is our legislation. Amoco, Exxon, and others do not want to risk the sanctions imposed by this body.

Recently, BP Amoco agreed to export Azerbaijani gas through Turkey, a member of NATO, rather than Iran. No major pipeline for Azerbaijani oil has been built yet, but when it is, it will go through Turkey and not Iran, all of that thanks to our legislation.

I am very proud of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that our Committee on International Relations, with an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 41 to 3, saw fit to expand our legislation for an additional 5 years. The Bush administration attempted to cut the length of time of this extension to 2 years, and overwhelmingly, on a bipartisan basis, our committee rejected the Bush administration's proposal, as will this House, tomorrow morning when we vote on this matter.

This piece of legislation is one of the most important items we will pass during the current Congress directly related to our national security. I want to again thank all of my colleagues who have worked on this in the various committees where this legislation has been carefully considered.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a former staff associate on our House Committee on International Relations.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation to extend the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act. I want to applaud the leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), my former boss and now colleague, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), our ranking Democratic member, who is a leader for us all on the issue of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, Iran claims that it has a new moderate status, but all we see is the persecution of the Baha'is and Jewish minorities. We see terrorist bombings from the Beirut bombing to Khobar Towers. I want to make a special note for the life of John Phillips, a U.S. Marine from Wilmette, Illinois, that lost his life in the Beirut bombing.

Iran sponsors terrorism through its intelligence service, the MOIS. We saw that over 200 days ago the MOIS's wholly owned subsidiary, Hezbollah, kidnapped three Israeli soldiers.

□ 2230

For 200 days we have had no proof of life. For 200 days we have had no word on their condition. That is the current record of Iran today, a record added to by the launch of the Shahab-3 missile, a long-range missile with components from North Korea that we know is pointed straight at U.S. forces in the Persian Gulf and at Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, with this extension we send a message that a state that sponsors terrorism, that proliferates weapons of mass destruction, cannot do business as usual. I applaud the committee and urge adoption of this measure.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the previous speaker for his powerful and eloquent statement.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the distinguished senior ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for their leadership on this issue not just in bringing the extension bill to the floor but also in their work on the original bill in passing the Sanctions Act. It has been an extremely important tool that we have had available to us, and it has helped us enforce the sanctions against these two terrorist countries.

There is no mistaking that Iran and Libya both are countries that harbor terrorists and terrorist activities and have been involved in the production of arms of mass destruction.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that on the Committee on Ways and Means,

on which I have the honor of serving, we were able to also agree to a 5-year extension. I think the 5-year extension is a very important part of this legislation. It gives us the continuity of foreign policy against terrorist countries that extends beyond any one administration, that it is clear that this is not a matter that is of one administration's concern but this is our concern, our Nation's concern, and one policy that we want to be able to continue.

It is a tool that is available to the administration. It is a tool where the administration has plenty of flexibility under this statute, as we want the administration to have. But we want to make it clear that if one does business with terrorist states we do not want them doing business with us. We do not want our people supporting terrorist activities. That is what this legislation does. It speaks to our priorities. It speaks to what we believe in as a nation.

I am very proud to have joined my colleagues in this effort. It is a very important bill. It is one that I am sure will enjoy strong support in this body and has enjoyed strong support in both the committees that considered it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), from the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me. He spoke so eloquently that there is nothing left to say, because he so thoroughly covered the reasons why this bill ought to be supported.

I want to also commend my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), for his hard work and energy on this issue. I have no doubt that when we vote tomorrow it will overwhelmingly pass, because it deserves to pass. It is an important bill.

I am delighted to be back on the Committee on International Relations, where I voted for this bill, as did virtually the entire committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act is an act that is very, very important. We must resoundingly say no to terrorism wherever it rears its ugly head in any place in the Earth.

Iran and Libya are two countries that have been at the forefront of exporting terrorism. No one can deny that. Actions speak louder than words. Time and time and time again various countries, including our own, have felt the brunt of their terrorist activities. They also have weapons of mass destruction that they sell to rogue states, and they work hard to undermine anything that is decent throughout the world.

I am also delighted that this bill has been extended for 5 years, as was pointed out by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). That had been

questioned, and it is right to be extended for 5 years, because anything less would be a retreat.

We must be unequivocal. This Congress must be unequivocal, this Nation must be unequivocal, and our world must be unequivocal in saying no to terrorism.

I would have taken it one step further, if I had my total way. I would have included Syria on the list of nations that export terrorism and would have covered Syria with similar sanctions. But that was not to be. There will be other resolutions and other legislation covering Syria, which has a stranglehold on Lebanon, and Syria needs to get out of Lebanon.

But Hezbollah, which operates in Lebanon, is backed by the Iranians. They could not function if it were not for Iran and Syria, so it is important that we tell Iran that we are not going to tolerate their terrorism or their weapons of mass destruction.

The same with Libya. The world looks to the United States. We are the last remaining superpower in the world. If we stand for anything, it should be for human rights and squarely against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to join my colleagues in supporting ILSA, the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act, and let this Congress send a strong message to the world that terrorism and weapons of mass destruction used in a terrorist way will not be tolerated.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield my remaining time, 2 minutes, to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, since we have additional time, I am pleased to yield 3 more minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) for authoring this statute. I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for standing so strong against efforts to weaken this bill, standing as strong as the Athenians at Marathon after attack after attack to try to water down, weaken, or shorten this important act.

I want to associate myself with the comments of all previous speakers, because this bill is critical to American values and to our allies. But I want to point out that this is the most important thing we can do here in Congress to protect American national security, because in this century the greatest threats to our security are terrorism, and as the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and others pointed out, much of that originates in Tehran, and nuclear proliferation.

Iran is the country hostile to the United States most likely to develop nuclear weapons. It is the combination of those two threats, nuclear terrorism, that poses the single greatest combined threat to the safety of Americans.

What this bill does is it focuses on Iran's economy. Iran is not a small country with a huge amount of oil. It is not Abu Dhabi. It is a country with an increasingly large population and an economy that is not doing well. Iran will become a net importer of oil if it does not get western capital and western technology to expand and improve its oil fields.

Largely as a result of our actions here today and the actions taken by this Congress 5 years ago, Iran has not been able to obtain that capital and technology, and the vast majority of requests for proposals and requests to contract with western oil companies have been denied.

One can only imagine the nuclear weapons program that Iran could have financed if this bill had not been passed 5 years ago, and we must focus on extending it now for another 5 years.

The Iran-Libya Sanctions Act for the last 5 years has made it more difficult for the Iranian government to have the financial wherewithal to engage in an all-out program to develop nuclear weapons, and it must be continued.

Now, we are told that there is this new rise of moderates in Iran. There may be differences in Iran on domestic issues and cultural issues, but the so-called moderates and so-called extremists are united in two things, support for international terrorism and a belief that Iran should develop nuclear weapons. No amount of discord in Tehran should distract us from our need to make sure that that government does not have the assets it could use to develop nuclear weapons and to continue its support of terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who wonder whether our sanctions are successful. The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) quoted the statement of the government of Iran saying that, in fact, we have deprived that government of money, that we have adversely affected its gross national product.

More recently, the country of Sudan, subject to different sanctions, subject to the threat of sanctions here in this Congress, did not obtain investment from Canada's Tasman Oil Company because this Congress was merely considering sanctions, namely, delisting from the New York Stock Exchange of those who invest in Sudanese oil.

So sanctions have been successful, both in dealing with Iran and in dealing with Sudan. As to Libya, yes, we have not achieved the change of policy we would like, but why did Libya turn its two murderers over to international justice, or the two accused of murder, one who was convicted? Only because of international sanctions spearheaded by the United States.

Recently, there have been those who have asked us to extend this act for

only 2 years. If we had done that, it would have been such a sign of weakness as to give courage and strength to the most aggressive elements in Tehran.

I want to commend all of those who took a leadership role in making sure that this bill would be extended for 5 years. I look forward to an enormous affirmative vote tomorrow.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have two issues. The first is a technical one.

I would ask the gentleman, is it not the case that in the report of the Committee on International Relations accompanying H.R. 1954 it was the intention of the Committee in the last line on page 8 that the report states "Iran or Libya" rather than just "Libya"?

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

Mr. LANTOS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. That is my understanding of what the committee intended. The amendment to ILSA made by section 4 of H.R. 1954 applies both to Iran and Libya.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, if I may continue our colloquy, I would like to raise issues concerning recent developments of direct relevance to our discussion of ILSA. I am referring to major oil investment deals that both the Italian national oil company, ENI, and Japan's national oil company have recently announced.

As we know, the Italian company recently agreed to invest \$550 million in an Iranian oil field in a deal that will ultimately be worth well over \$1 billion. This deal is the first time that a foreign concern has been allowed to invest in an onshore Iranian oil field. It is also uniquely structured as a buy-back deal that could, if realized, serve as a model for future oil developments in Iraq.

It is now apparent, Mr. Speaker, that a number of foreign oil companies have been watching the Italian national oil company's growing investment in Iran, now totalling over \$2.5 billion, to determine whether it will elicit a U.S. response under the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Japan made a commitment last week through its oil company to invest in a gas field in Iran, indicating that foreign companies and their governments are increasingly confident that the United States will not impose the sanctions that Congress mandates, should these companies invest in Iraq. In fact, the Japanese trade minister himself defiantly stated when signing the deal in Tehran that Japan is not affected by U.S. pressure.

Both the Italian and the Japanese companies are not private entities acting independently of their government. The Japanese oil company is wholly-owned by the Japanese government, and the Italian government owns 36 percent of the Italian oil company.

Given this state of affairs, I urge President Bush to approach the Italian and Japanese governments to convince them to halt these morally repugnant investments.

□ 2245

Should these diplomatic initiatives fail, I believe President Bush has a moral obligation to impose sanctions on the relevant governments, as he is directed under ILSA, without waiver.

Would the chairman agree that it is now time for the United States to react firmly in the face of such flagrant disregard for international principles and both the spirit and the provisions of our legislation?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I too would like the President to act. Hopefully, President Bush will consider publicly stating that ILSA will be fully implemented, if these deals proceed forward, without any waivers. If we fail to act resolutely in these cases, the credibility of our Nation's foreign policy and international sanction regimes will almost certainly be undermined.

Mr. LANTOS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman very much for his strong and unequivocal statement.

And let me just add as a direct message to both the Italian and Japanese companies concerned, that should the administration not take appropriate action, we will come here with new legislation mandating sanctions against these companies or others that might take similar action.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his strong support of this measure and his being a cosponsor. As a ranking member of our committee, he has been an eloquent speaker and has been a long-time supporter of human rights in our committee and making certain that the world of nations abide by peaceful principles.

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the comments made in this colloquy and say that to those two companies, in addition to all of the sanctions outlined in ILSA, we should come back, if necessary, in this Congress, and mandate that those who violate ILSA's strict provisions are denied all access to American capital markets and that their stocks and bonds will not be listed on NASDAQ or the New York Stock Exchange.

We are studying those types of provisions in the Committee on Financial Services, and I am confident that we will have the votes to make sure that this access to American capital markets, which is increasingly important to Japanese and European companies,

will not be available to those companies that invest significantly in the Iranian petroleum sector.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of problems with this move to extend the Iran/Libya Sanctions Act.

First, the underlying Act places way too much authority both to make determinations and to grant waivers, in the hands of the President and the Executive Branch. As such, it is yet another unconstitutional delegation of authority which we ought not extend.

Moreover, as the Act applies to Libya, the authority upon which the bill depends is a resolution of the United Nations. So, any member who is concerned with UN power should vote against this extension.

Furthermore, the sanctions are being extended from a period of five years to ten years. If the original five year sanction period has not been effective in allaying the fears about these governments why do we believe an extra five years will be effective? In fact, few companies have actually been sanctioned under this Act, and to the best of my knowledge no oil companies have been so sanctioned. Still, the sanctions in the Act are not against these nations but are actually directed at "persons" engaged in certain business and investments in these countries. There are already Executive Orders making it illegal for US companies to undertake these activities in these sanctioned countries, so this Act applies to companies in other countries, mostly our allied countries, almost all of whom oppose and resent this legislation and have threatened to take the kinds of retaliatory action that could lead to an all out trade war. In fact, the former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft recently pointed out how these sanctions have had a significant adverse impact upon our Turkish allies.

Mr. Speaker, I support those portions of this bill designated to prohibit US financing through government vehicles such as the Export-Import Bank. I also have no problem with guarding against sales of military technology which could compromise our national security. Still, on a whole, this bill is just another plank in the failed sanctions regime from which we ought to loosen ourselves.

The Bush Administration would prefer this legislation to expire and, failing that, they prefer taking a first step by making the extension last for a shorter period. In this I believe the Administration has taken the correct position. For one thing, there have been moves, particularly in Iran, to liberalize. We harm these attempts by maintaining a sanctions regime.

I also have to point out the inconsistency in our policy. Why would we sanction Iran but not Sudan, and why would we sanction Libya but not Syria? I hear claims related to our national security but surely these are made in jest. We subsidize business with the People's Republic of China but sanction Europeans from helping to build oil refineries in Iran.

There has been a real concern in our country regarding the price of gasoline. Since these sanctions are directly aimed at preventing the development of petroleum resources in these countries, this bill will DIRECTLY RESULT IN AMERICANS HAVING TO PAY A HIGHER PRICE AT THE GASOLINE PUMP. These sanctions HURT AMERICANS. British Petroleum and others have refused to provide significant investment for petroleum extraction in Iran because of the uncertainty this legislation

helps to produce. The tiny nation of Qatar has as much petroleum related investment as does Iran since this legislation went into effect. Again, this reduces supply and raises prices at the gas pump.

Will the members of this body return to their district and tell voters "I just voted to further restrict petroleum supply and keep gas prices high"? I doubt that.

Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the legislative realities as regards this legislation and the powerful interests that want it extended. However, it is not just myself and the Bush Administration suggesting this policy is flawed. The Atlantic Council is a prestigious group co-chaired by Lee Hamilton, James Schlesinger and Brent Scowcroft that has suggested in a recent study that we ought to end sanctions upon Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come for us to consider the U.S. interest and the benefits of friendly commerce with all nations. We are particularly ill-advised in passing this legislation and hamstringing the new Administration at this time. I must oppose any attempt to extend this Act and support any amendment that would reduce the sanction period it contemplates.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Iran-Libya Sanctions Extension Act. I do not believe that now is the time to end the provisions set out under ILSA. While I hope that the internal situation in Iran and Libya may one day merit lifting the provisions of ILSA, it does not appear to be the case at this time. Recognizing the tenuous nature of peace in the region, and our continued support of our ally, Israel, I believe we must support the Iran-Libya Sanctions Extension Act.

Iran is still actively seeking to obtain weapons of mass destruction (WMD) assisted by China, Russia, and North Korea. Such a threat to our allies, such as Israel, and to international peace and security is not indicative of a state concerned with immediate reform. According to the State Department, Iran remains an active state sponsor of international terrorism. Any state that resorts to terrorism is cowardly and certainly deserves no special consideration. I also would like to stress that Iran continues to commit human rights abuses, particularly against members of certain religious faiths.

Libya has not yet compensated the families of the victims of Pan Am flight 103. Libya also continues to harbor and foster terrorism and is likely seeking weapons of mass destruction.

Given these realities and many others, I again do not believe now is the time to end sanctions on Iran and Libya.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1954, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to 10 U.S.C 4355(a), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mrs. TAUSCHER of California.
There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. COBLE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEFazio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. INSLEE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I will assure those Members, and especially the staff here this evening, that I will give them something to look forward to, and that is that we will probably not go half the time available to me, but I do appreciate the opportunity.

I wanted to address an issue of concern to me, and it is an issue that I have risen before to discuss here on the floor of the House and I think certainly deserves our attention again this evening, and that issue is immigration, and specifically the problems created by massive numbers of people coming into the United States illegally.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, a trial balloon was floated. It was floated by a working group that was appointed for the purpose of coming up with some proposals to deal with the issues of immigration, illegal immigration to the United States, and a variety of other related issues. That trial balloon was a proposal, and the proposal was to provide amnesty for up to 3½ million Mexican workers.

Now, I say it is specifically designed for Mexicans who are here in the United States. It is not Guatemalans, it is not Haitians, it is not any other nationality, it was for 3½ million Mexican people here in the United States illegally, and it was to essentially just give them amnesty if they had been here a long enough period of time. Well, that trial balloon was met with a great deal of resistance, to say the least. Certainly our office received many, many calls. I am sure the offices of many Members of the House and Senate were similarly affected by this trial balloon, and the response was almost unanimously in opposition to such a proposal.

There is a basic fairness issue here, a fairness issue that I think most Americans see. And it does not matter how one feels about the whole issue of immigration in general, those who are pro-immigrant, as I think most of us are. As a matter of fact, I think all of us have to be very cognizant of and very sensitive to the fact that we are all here as a result of someone's decision to come to the United States at some time in the recent past. Even those of us in the country who identify themselves as Native American probably came here, their ancestors, over a land bridge from Asia. So we are all in one way or another immigrants to this country.

The issue of immigration in general is not the point in this case. The point in this case is whether or not we are going to simply ignore the fact that people have chosen to violate the law of the United States to come here and then be rewarded for that action by being given amnesty. Now, we recognize that that, as I say, is at least unfair. I think most people would agree that it offends their sense of justice. And it should. It should.

What would happen if we would suggest that any other kind of crime be treated in such a manner? If someone comes here, if they were in the United States and involved with some criminal activity, and for a long enough period of time and they did not get caught, would we simply say, King's X, it is okay, they were able to avoid the authority long enough, so we should give them amnesty? Well, we do not do that. Of course not. And we should not do that in this case, and I think a majority of Americans feel the same way.

Well, as a result of the kind of reaction that that proposal had, we saw that today another proposal has been floated. This one is designed to be a "compromise proposal," and it says, all right, we will not just go ahead and grant three, four million people, and by the way it will be far more than that when all is said and done, but let us just take their numbers for the time being, we will not grant three to four million people amnesty who are here illegally just because they are here illegally, we will establish some sort of guest worker program into which these people can enroll and then we will grant them amnesty.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is really not a compromise. That is really not something anybody can get too excited about and say, oh, in that case, absolutely, all right, I see that it is worthy of doing. It is, of course, exactly the same proposal. We are simply going to reward illegal behavior by providing amnesty if they have been here long enough.

The other interesting aspect of this whole thing, Mr. Speaker, is that we have tried this before. The idea of giving amnesty to people who are here illegally and who have been here for a long time, or some period of time anyway, and can prove that they have paid rent here or a variety of other criteria that we establish to determine how long someone is here illegally, has been tried before. In 1986, we did this, exactly the same plan, and it was a result of the fact that people were concerned about the massive number of people who were coming across our borders illegally. And in order to get a handle on that and to strike a compromise with people who want massive immigration, people who essentially frankly want to essentially erase the borders, in order to strike a compromise with them and to not look as though we were being too antagonistic to these people who have arrived here and come in here illegally, we decided to have an amnesty program.

That was 1986. We adopted exactly the same thing. And it was designed to stop the flow of illegal aliens into the country. At that point we were going to get a handle on it and say, okay, if someone is here, if they have been here a long time, we are going to give them amnesty. Eventually they can become a citizen of the United States, even though they broke our laws to get here.

Well, of course it did not work. As anyone may have guessed, to suggest