

Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Foreign Relations Authorization, FY2003: An Overview

Updated September 20, 2002

Susan B. Epstein, Coordinator
Specialist in Foreign Policy and Trade
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Foreign Relations Authorization, FY2003: An Overview

Summary

Congress is required by law to authorize the spending of appropriations for the State Department and foreign policy activities every two years. The authorization process dovetails with the annual appropriation process for the Department of State (within the Commerce, Justice, State and Related Agency appropriation) and foreign policy/foreign aid activities (within the foreign operations appropriation).

The Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2003 (H.R. 1646/S. 1401/S. 1803) authorizes, among other things, the Department of State's operations and programs, arms sales to Taiwan and funding for Tibetan refugees, and U.S. assistance to Colombia; it also includes a sense of Congress that global climate change is of significant importance to U.S. national security, the economy and health. Both H.R. 1646 and S. 1803 contain authorization for security assistance, as well.

Congressman Hyde introduced H.R. 1646 on April 27, 2001. The House International Relations Committee reported the bill May 4, 2001 (H.Rept. 107-57). The House passed the bill, as amended, on May 16, 2001 by a recorded vote of 352-73.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed its foreign relations authorization bill by unanimous voice vote on August 1, 2001. The Committee filed its report (S.Rept. 107-60) on September 4, 2001. With a crowded schedule after the September 11th attacks, the Senate did not take up the authorization bill. Rather, within the context of the Commerce, Justice, State (CJS) appropriation (section 405, P.L. 107-77) Congress waived the requirement for authorization prior to the State Department spending its appropriations as is required by law.

On May 1, 2002 the Senate amended its version of H.R. 1646 by substituting S. 1803 (the Security Assistance Act) language.

The House and Senate conferees met September 18, 2002. The legislation is expected on the House floor the week of September 23, 2002.

Contents

Most Recent Developments	1
Background	1
Key Issues	2
Arms Sales to Taiwan	2
Colombia Assistance	3
China-U.S. Policy	5
Drug Certification Procedures	6
East Timor	7
Family Planning, Abortion Restrictions, and the Mexico City Policy	8
Global Warming	10
HIV/AIDS	11
Human Rights – Child Soldiers, Trafficking, Human Rights and Democracy Fund	12
IMET in Lebanon	13
Iran Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 2001	14
Jerusalem – U.S. Embassy	15
State Department and International Broadcasting Issues	16
Deputy Secretary of State for Management	16
Right-Sizing Overseas Posts	16
Consular Activities	17
Minority Recruitment at State	17
Private Funding for Exchanges	18
International Broadcasting in the Middle East	18
U.N. Issues	18
UNESCO	18
U.N. Arrears	19
Appendix	21
State Department Authorization History	21

List of Tables

Table 1. State Department and Related Agencies Appropriations and Proposed Authorizations	22
--	----

Foreign Relations Authorization, FY2003: An Overview

Most Recent Developments

The Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2003 (H.R. 1646/S. 1401/S. 1803) would authorize the Department of State's operations and programs through FY2003, and would establish U.S. policy on: Colombia assistance, global warming, and arms sales to Taiwan, among other measures. Congressman Hyde introduced H.R. 1646 on April 27, 2001. The House passed the bill, as amended, on May 16, 2001 by a recorded vote of 352-73. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed its version of the authorization legislation by a unanimous voice vote on August 1st. The Committee filed its report (S.Rept. 107-60) on September 4, 2001. Conferees met on September 18, 2002. More details will be provided in future updates of this report.

Background

The foreign relations authorization legislation provides authority for the State Department and related foreign policy agencies to conduct foreign policy activities and programs in the coming year. It authorizes foreign policy programs and enacts changes in U.S. foreign policy. It also serves as a vehicle for Congress to influence executive branch management of foreign policy. Foreign assistance activities, such as authorization for the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), U.S. development/economic, and military assistance are also typically included in the foreign authorization legislation, since Congress has not passed a foreign *assistance* authorization bill since 1985.

By law, authorization of foreign policy agencies and programs is required prior to expenditure of foreign policy appropriations. In effect, the authorizing legislation sets spending ceilings for the foreign policy agency appropriations. (See Table 1 below.) Prior to 1995, Congress had reauthorized U.S. government foreign policy agencies and activities in the foreign relations authorization legislation every two years until 1994 (P.L. 103-236, April 30, 1994). Since then Congress has not passed a stand-alone foreign relations authorization bill, but has waived the requirement or included authorization in appropriation laws. (See *State Department Authorization History* in the Appendix.)

Key Issues

The foreign relations authorization legislation typically provides authority for State Department spending for such activities as salaries and other operating expenses, passport and visa processing, embassy activities, as well as foreign service benefits. In addition, the legislation often becomes a convenient vehicle for numerous foreign policy-related issues, such as nonproliferation, human rights, international family planning policy, and Foreign Service issues. Congress can influence U.S. foreign policy toward specific regions or countries as well. Some key issues in the authorization legislation of the 107th Congress follow.

Arms Sales to Taiwan¹

In the 107th Congress, some Members have called for regular and senior consultations with Taiwan and a role for Congress, after President Bush announced on April 24, 2001, that he would drop the annual arms talks process with Taiwan in favor of normal, routine considerations on an “as-needed” basis. The Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY2003 (H.R. 1646), passed in the House on May 16, 2001, contains provisions on arms sales to Taiwan. First, H.R. 1646 includes authority (in Section 851) for the President to sell the 4 Kidd-class destroyers to Taiwan, not as Foreign Military Sales, but Excess Defense Articles (EDA), under Section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA). Second, in the House International Relations Committee, an amendment proposed by Representative Brad Sherman resulted in Section 813 to require that Taiwan be treated as the “equivalent of a major non-NATO ally” for defense transfers under the AECA or the Foreign Assistance Act, while the language stops short of designating Taiwan as a major non-NATO ally. According to the Member’s office, the provision would show tangible support for Taiwan’s defense, provide it with status similar to that given to Australia, New Zealand, and Argentina, offer it the “right of first refusal” for EDA, and treat it with enhanced status for anti-terrorism assistance, cooperative research and development projects in the defense area, and expedited review in satellite licensing. Some observers say that authority exists under the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) to provide defense assistance to Taiwan. Third, Representative Gary Ackerman introduced an amendment (Section 814) to require the President to consult annually with Congress and Taiwan about the availability of defense articles and services for Taiwan (the consultations with Taiwan to occur at a level not less than that of the Vice Chief of General Staff, as has been the case, and in Washington).

The Senate’s Foreign Relations Authorization Act (S. 1401), introduced and placed on the calendar on September 4, 2001, would require the Administration to brief Congress every three months on discussions between any Executive agency and Taiwan on arms sales (Section 603). The Committee on Foreign Relations said that it wished to ensure that consultations between the Executive Branch and Congress on arms sales to Taiwan and the congressional role are maintained (S.Rept. 107-60). On May 1, 2002, the Senate incorporated S. 1803 in H.R. 1646 and passed it. The

¹ Written by Shirley Kan, Specialist in National Security Policy, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

Senate's version (Section 701) authorizes the President to sell the four Kidd-class destroyers to Taiwan.

There are other relevant legislation. The National Defense Authorization Act for FY2002 (P.L. 107-107), enacted December 28, 2001, authorizes the President to transfer (by sale) the four Kidd-class destroyers to Taiwan (Section 1011), under Section 21 of the AECA. The Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for FY2002 (P.L. 107-115), enacted on January 10, 2002, brought unprecedented close coordination between the Executive and Legislative branches on arms sales to Taiwan. Section 573 requires the Departments of State and Defense to provide detailed briefings (not specified as classified) to congressional committees (including those on appropriations) within 90 days of enactment and not later than every 120 days thereafter during FY2002. The briefings are to report on U.S.-Taiwan discussions on potential sales of defense articles or services to Taiwan. The Senate's Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for FY2003 (S. 2779), introduced and placed on the calendar on July 24, 2002, would continue the requirement, from FY2002 into FY2003, for briefings on arms sales to Taiwan (Section 569).

Also see CRS Report RL30957, *Taiwan: Major U.S. Arms Sales Since 1990*, by Shirley Kan.

Colombia Assistance²

The House International Relations Committee reported out H.R. 1646 (Foreign Relations Authorization for FY2002-FY2003) on May 4, 2001, with four reporting requirements on Colombia and a prohibition on the issuance of visas to illegal armed groups in Colombia. This bill was passed by the House on May 16, 2001, without additions or modifications in conditions on counter-narcotics and other assistance to Colombia and regional neighbors under the Andean Regional Initiative. The required reports, reflecting the concerns of Members at that time, well before the September 2001 terrorist attacks, relate to the elimination of Colombian opium, the effects of Plan Colombia on Ecuador, alternative development and resettlement programs, and the "Colombianization" of counter-narcotics activities.

Section 204 requires the Secretary of State, through the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement, to submit, not later than 60 days after enactment, a report which outlines a comprehensive strategy to address the crisis of heroin in the United States due to opium originating from Colombia, including destruction of opium at its source.

Section 211 requires the Secretary of State, through the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement, to submit, not later than 60 days after enactment, a report which outlines a comprehensive strategy to address the spillover effect of Plan Colombia on Ecuador.

² Prepared by K. Larry Storrs (Specialist in Latin American Affairs) and Nina M. Serafino (Specialist in International Security Affairs), Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

Section 213 (a) requires the Secretary of State to submit within 180 days of enactment, and every 180 days thereafter, a report on State Department funded and authorized activities to promote alternative development, recovery and resettlement of internally displaced persons, judicial reform, the peace process, and human rights. This report would include summaries of activities undertaken during the previous 180 days, estimated timetables for the next period, an explanation of any delays in meeting planned timetables, and an assessment of steps to be taken to correct such delays.

Section 213 (b) states that U.S. policy “encourages” the transfer of counternarcotics activities in Colombia now carried out by U.S. businesses under agreements with the State Department to Colombian nationals, “in particular personnel of the Colombian antinarcotics police, when properly qualified personnel are available.” It also requires the Secretary of State to report within 90 days of enactment and subsequently not later than March 1 on the counternarcotics activities carried out by U.S. businesses under State Department agreements. The report must include the names of such businesses, the total State Department payments to each business, a statement justifying the agreement, an assessment of risks to personnel safety and potential involvement in hostilities incurred by employees of each such business, and a plan to provide for the transfer of these activities to Colombians.

Section 236 prohibits the issuance of visas to any alien who the Secretary of State determines has wilfully provided direct or indirect support to either of the two leftist guerrilla groups (the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, or FARC, and the National Liberation Army, or ELN) or to the rightist United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC); or “has wilfully conspired to allow, facilitate, or promote the illegal activities of any of those groups. A waiver is provided for cases where a visa “is necessary to support the peace process in Colombia, for urgent humanitarian reasons, for significant public benefit, or to further the national security interests of the United States.”

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported out S. 1401 (the Senate version of the Foreign Relations Authorization for FY2002-FY2003) on September 4, 2001, with a provision in section 606, similar to a provision in the House version of the bill, requiring the Secretary of State to submit to appropriate congressional committees within 60 days after enactment a report that outlines a comprehensive strategy to eradicate all opium at its source in Colombia. In action following the September 2001 terrorist attacks, the Senate approved H.R. 1646 on May 1, 2002, after incorporating the text of a Senate measure on security assistance (S. 1803) approved in December 2001, rather than S. 1401.

For more information, see CRS Report RL31383, *Andean Regional Initiative (ARI): FY2002 Supplemental and FY2003 Assistance for Colombia and Neighbors*, by K. Larry Storrs and Nina M. Serafino.

China-U.S. Policy³

Both the House and Senate versions of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of FY2003 contain a number of provisions relating to the People's Republic of China (PRC). The more substantive and detailed China-related provisions of each bill deal with U.S. policy and practices toward Tibet and Taiwan.

According to the Senate Committee report on S. 1401 (S. Rept. 107-60), that bill "would set policy guidelines for United States' efforts to preserve the distinct identity of the Tibetan people and would require the President to report on those efforts." New Tibet-related provisions common to both authorizing bills include: attempting to open a U.S. consular office in Lhasa; Tibetan language training for U.S. foreign service officers; expansion of the responsibilities of the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China (CECPRC) to include monitoring and reporting on the status of dialogue between the Chinese government and the Dalai Lama and his Tibetan government-in-exile; U.S. support in international organizations for economic development on the Tibetan Plateau; \$500,000 in FY2003 for the "Ngawang Choephel Exchange Programs" (the former "programs of educational and cultural exchange between the United States and the people of Tibet"); and separate entries for Tibet in various mandated reporting requirements. These Tibet provisions are similar to (although not as extensive as) provisions in separate legislation, The Tibetan Policy Act of 2001 (H.R. 1779 and S. 852), introduced by Representative Tom Lantos and Senator Dianne Feinstein, respectively. The authorizing bills differ in certain other respects, such as in the \$2,000,000 in funding H.R. 1646 accords in fiscal years 2002 and 2003 for migration and refugee assistance for Tibetan refugees; and the statutory authority that H.R. 1646 provides for the position of Special Coordinator for Tibetan Affairs (as opposed to current practice of having a presidentially appointed position).

Both bills also contain provisions on Taiwan that would make changes in current U.S. practice and have an affect on U.S.-China relations. Provisions dealing with Taiwan are particularly sensitive to Beijing because of the latter's view that the bill's language seeks to make U.S. security relations with Taiwan more formal and routinized. The language in S. 1401 requires that the State Department (in consultation with the Department of Defense) provide quarterly briefings on the status of any U.S.-Taiwan discussions with respect to Taiwan's potential weapons purchases from the United States. Those who are concerned about not contributing to an erosion of U.S.-China relations point out that the United States does not have official relations with Taiwan, and that Washington terminated its mutual defense treaty with Taiwan in 1980. For its part, H.R. 1646 provides that for the purposes of U.S. arms sales, Taiwan should be treated as the equivalent of a major non-NATO ally. H.R. 1646 also requires that the President consult with Congress about Taiwan's request for – and the President's decision and reasoning on – various sales of defense articles and equipment to Taiwan.

For more information, see CRS Issue Brief IB98018, *U.S.-China Policy*.

³ Prepared by Kerry Dumbaugh, Specialist in China Policy, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

Drug Certification Procedures⁴

Under Sections 489-490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, the President has been required since the mid-1980s to certify by March 1st that illicit drug producing and drug-transit countries are cooperating fully with the United States in counter-narcotics efforts in order to avoid a series of sanctions. If the President is unable to fully certify a country, or to determine that a less-than-fully-cooperative country should be given a certification in the national interest, certain sanctions apply, including the withholding of most U.S. foreign assistance and sales financing, and U.S. opposition to loans for the country in the multilateral development banks. The sanctions would also apply if the Congress, within 30 calendar days, passes a joint resolution of disapproval to overturn the presidential certification; however, the resolution would be subject to presidential veto. Congressional attention in this area often focused on Mexico, and resolutions to disapprove the certification of Mexico have been introduced in many years but never fully enacted.

Over the years, spokesmen from many countries have complained about the unilateral and non-cooperative nature of the drug certification requirements, and have urged the United States to end the process and to rely upon various multilateral methods of evaluation that have been developed. Mexico particularly expressed dissatisfaction with the process, even though it was regularly certified as being a fully cooperative country. Following the July 2000 election of opposition candidate Vicente Fox as President of Mexico, a number of legislative measures were introduced to modify the drug certification requirements, and these initiatives were mentioned when President Bush and President Fox met in Mexico in mid-February 2001, and in the United States in early September 2001.

S. 1401, the Foreign Relations Authorization for FY2002-FY2003, reported out by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on September 4, 2001 (S.Rept. 107-60), contains proposed modifications to the drug certification procedures in Title VII, Subtitle D, Reform of Certification Procedures Applicable to Certain Drug Producing or Trafficking Countries. The provisions in Subtitle D are similar to provisions in S. 219, previously reported out by the Committee on April 5, 2001, that focus attention primarily on the worst offending countries subject to sanctions. Under Section 742 of S. 1401, the existing drug certification procedures would be suspended for a 3-year trial period, and interim procedures would be established. In place of the existing procedures, the President would be required to identify by October 1 of each year major drug-transit or major illicit drug producing countries, and to designate each country that has failed demonstrably, during the previous 12 months, to make substantial efforts to adhere to its obligations under international counternarcotics agreements (multilateral and bilateral) and other standards. U.S. assistance would be withheld from any designated countries unless the President determined that the provision of assistance was vital to the national interest of the United States or until the countries made substantial counter-narcotics efforts. Section 743 expresses the sense of Congress that the United States should at the earliest feasible date in 2001 convene a multilateral conference of relevant countries to develop multilateral drug

⁴ Prepared by K. Larry Storrs, Specialist in Latin American Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

reduction and prevention strategies, and urges the President to request legislative changes to implement the strategies. Section 744 adds the requirement to report on major drug trafficking organizations in the yearly International Narcotics Control Strategy Report (INCSR) detailing the performance of individual countries. Section 745 amends the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act to allow judicial review of executive branch decisions to freeze the assets of suspected drug kingpins.

The House International Relations Committee reported out H.R. 1646 (Foreign Relations Authorization for FY2002-FY2003) on May 4, 2001, without any provisions on drug certification, and the measure was passed by the House on May 16, 2001. The Senate approved H.R. 1646 on May 1, 2002, after incorporating the text of a Senate measure on security assistance (S. 1803) approved in December 2001, rather than S. 1401.

While congressional action on the Foreign Relations Authorization bills is pending, the drug certification requirements were temporarily modified by enactment of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for FY2002 (H.R. 2506/P.L. 107-115). This measure waived the drug certification requirements for FY2002, and required the President to designate only countries which had demonstrably failed to meet international counter-narcotics obligations. In action on the Foreign Operations Appropriations for FY2003, the bill (S. 2779) reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee in July 2002 would extend through FY2003 the suspension of the U.S. drug certification requirements enacted last year.

For further information, see CRS Report RL30892, *Drug Certification Requirements and Proposed Congressional Modifications in 2001*; CRS Report RL30950, *Drug Certification Procedures: A Comparison of Current Law to S. 219 and S. 1401 as Reported*; CRS Report 98-174, *Mexican Drug Certification Issues: Congressional Action, 1986-2001*; and CRS Issue Brief IB10070, *Mexico-U.S. Relations: Issues for the 107th Congress*, by K. Larry Storrs.

East Timor⁵

East Timor formally became independent on May 20, 2002. The United States established diplomatic relations with the new state and supports a continued United Nations presence in East Timor. However, the United States withdrew the handful of U.S. military personnel involved in the U.N.-sponsored peacekeeping force that remains in East Timor, led by Australia. (The U.S. contribution never amounted to more than 50 personnel.) This leaves 80 American police officers advising on the formation of East Timorese police. The Bush Administration has budgeted \$19 million in economic aid to East Timor for fiscal year 2003. The aid program supports East Timor's coffee industry, the country's main export. It also includes democracy support targeted at the judiciary, law enforcers, non-governmental groups, and the media. A U.S. military aid program will provide for East Timorese what the State Department describes as "a small International Military Education and Training (IMET) program."

⁵ Prepared by Larry Niksch, Asian Specialist, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

East Timor has receded in U.S. priorities in policies toward Indonesia. The Bush Administration has pushed hard in Congress to secure a softening of congressional restrictions on U.S. contacts with the Indonesian military in the interests of cooperation against terrorism. These restrictions were placed in foreign operations appropriations in late 1999 in response to the Indonesian military's instigation of large-scale violence in East Timor following the August 1999 referendum vote for separation from Indonesia. The Administration has allocated \$50 million in training programs for the Indonesian police and military, and Indonesia likely will receive additional funds contained in appropriations for counter-terrorism training for foreign military organizations. Congress also has removed the restriction on Indonesian military participation in the IMET program.

For further information, see CRS Report RL30975, *East Timor Situation Report*.

Family Planning, Abortion Restrictions, and the Mexico City Policy⁶

The debate over international family planning policy and abortion began nearly three decades ago when Congress added a provision to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 prohibiting the use of U.S. appropriated funds for abortion-related activities and coercive family planning programs. During the mid-1980s, in what has become known as the "Mexico City" policy (because it was first announced at the 1984 Mexico City Population Conference), the Reagan, and later the Bush, Administrations restricted funds for foreign non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that were involved in performing or promoting abortions in countries where they worked, even if such activities were undertaken with non-U.S. funds. President Clinton in 1993 reversed the position of his two predecessors.

During the past six years, the House and Senate have taken opposing positions on the Mexico City issue. For FY2000, however, Congress linked approval of U.N. arrears payments to White House acceptance of modified Mexico City restrictions. In order to remove the obstacles to U.N. arrears payments, President Clinton reluctantly agreed to the abortion restrictions, marking the first time that Mexico City conditions had been included in legislation signed by the President. Because the President could waive the restrictions up to a certain point, there was no major impact on USAID family planning programs in FY2000, other than the loss of \$12.5 million in population assistance that the legislation required if the White House exercised the waiver authority. For FY2002, Congress again came to an impasse over the international family issue and agreed to allow the new President to set policy early in 2001. Under the FY2001 Foreign Operations measure, none of the \$425 million appropriation could be obligated until after February 15, 2001.

Subsequently, on January 22, 2001, two days after taking office, President Bush issued a memorandum to the USAID Administrator reinstating in full all of the requirements of the Mexico City Policy in effect on January 19, 1993. The President said that it was his "conviction that taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for

⁶ Prepared by Larry Nowels, Specialist in Foreign Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

abortion or advocate or actively promote abortion, either here or abroad.”⁷ A separate statement from the President’s press secretary said that President Bush was “committed to maintaining the \$425 million funding level” for population assistance “because he knows that one of the best ways to prevent abortion is by providing quality voluntary family planning services.” The press secretary further emphasized that it was the intent that any restrictions “do not limit organizations from treating injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions, for example, post abortion care.”⁸ On February 15, the day on which FY2001 population aid funds became available for obligation, USAID issued specific policy language and contract clauses to implement the President’s directive. The guidelines are nearly identical to those used in the 1980s and early 1990s when the Mexico City policy applied.

Critics of the certification requirement oppose it on several grounds. Some argue that it will reduce quality health care for women in developing nations by denying U.S. funding to some of the most experienced and effective organizations. These critics further believe that family planning organizations that do remain eligible for U.S. aid will cut back on services because of uncertainty over the full implications of the restrictions and their desire not to risk losing access to USAID funding. Thus, opponents contend that the Mexico City policy may actually lead to more abortions overseas. Critics also believe the new conditions will undermine relations between the U.S. Government and foreign NGOs and multilateral groups, creating a situation where the United States challenges their right to decide how to spend their own money and imposes a so-called “gag” order on their ability to promote changes to abortion laws and regulations in developing nations. The latter, these critics note, would be unconstitutional if applied to American groups working in the United States. From an administrative standpoint, they say it increases USAID costs to manage family planning programs because of the additional paperwork and is likely to delay implementation of projects.

Supporters of the certification requirement argue that even though permanent law bans USAID funds from being used to perform or promote abortions, money is fungible; that organizations receiving American-taxpayer funding can simply use USAID resources for permitted activities while diverting money raised from other sources to perform abortions or lobby to change abortion laws and regulations. The certification process, they contend, stops the fungibility “loophole.” They further note that the Mexico City policy does not stop organizations from continuing their family planning operations overseas. It merely requires them to adhere to the conditions or to carry out their programs without U.S. Government support.

In the first several votes on the issue in 2001, the House International Relations Committee adopted (26-22) an amendment to H.R. 1646 by Representative Lee that would overturn the Mexico City policy. The Lee amendment, which incorporated the text of H.R. 755, would not subject foreign groups to different restrictions imposed

⁷ White House. Memorandum for the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development. January 22, 2001. Found at [<http://www.whitehouse.gov/press/releases/20010123-5.html>].

⁸ White House. Restoration of the Mexico City Policy. January 22, 2001. Found at [<http://www.whitehouse.gov/press/releases/20010123.html>].

on U.S. NGOs concerning the use of non-USAID funding for advocacy and lobbying activities. It further directed that foreign NGOs would not be ineligible for U.S. grants solely on the basis of health or medical services provided with non-USAID funding so long as these activities were not in violation of the laws of the country in which the groups operated and would not violate U.S. law if provided here. On May 16, however, the full House voted (218-210) to delete the Lee amendment from H.R. 1646. The Administration had said President Bush would veto H.R. 1646 if the committee language on Mexico City policy remained in the bill.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee did not address the international family planning issue when it marked up its version of the Foreign Relations Authorization bill on August 1. The Senate panel, however, on the same day reported favorably S. 367, legislation identical to H.R. 755 and the text added by the House International Relations Committee to H.R. 1646.

Reportedly, House and Senate conferees did not raise international family planning issues during their deliberations, and the final bill contains no language related to this matter. Meanwhile, the Foreign Operations Appropriations FY2003 bill, as reported in the Senate (S. 2779) and the House (H.R. 5410), include several provisions related to population assistance, the Mexico City policy, and U.S. contributions to the U.N. Population Fund (UNFPA). It is likely that Congress will debate a range of international family planning issues when those bills are considered by the House and Senate.

For more detail, see CRS Report RL30830, *International Family Planning: the Mexico City Policy*; and CRS Issue Brief IB96026, *Population Assistance and Foreign Policy Programs: Issues for Congress*.

Global Warming⁹

Both H.R. 1646 (Section 745) and S. 1401 (Sec. 778) express a “Sense of Congress Relating to Global Warming.” The two bills express a number of similar findings, including reviews of the scientific findings of the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and threats to various ecological and agricultural systems, and the U.S. participation in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Both bills state the sense of Congress that the United States should demonstrate international leadership in mitigating global warming threats by taking action to achieve reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, and by continuing to participate in international negotiations with the objective of completing the rules and guidelines for the Kyoto Protocol in a manner that is consistent with the interests of the United States and that ensures the environmental integrity of the protocol. The wording of the bills in these sections is not identical, and there are some items in each that are absent in the other, but they share most of the same concepts such as the contribution of human activities to global climate change, and “the need for American business to know how governments worldwide will respond to the threat of global warming.”

⁹ Prepared by Susan R. Fletcher, Senior Analyst in International Environmental Policy, Resources, Science and Industry Division.

The Kyoto Protocol, completed in 1997, and signed but not ratified by the United States, includes legally binding requirements for 38 industrialized nations to reduce their emissions of 6 greenhouse gases, including the predominant one, carbon dioxide, which is released by burning of fossil fuels and wood. Under this protocol, the U.S. reduction would be 7% below 1990 levels of emissions as an average over the period 2008-2012. Since this bill passed the House, President Bush has indicated that although it is his intention to remain engaged in the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and related international negotiations, the United States rejects the Kyoto Protocol and will not participate in it. The U.S. Senate is on record in S.Res. 98, passed in 1997, rejecting a treaty that does not include developing countries or that would harm the U.S. economy—the two major objections to the Kyoto Protocol that President Bush has identified. Therefore, the provisions that state the United States should pursue the objective of “completing the rules and guidelines for the Kyoto Protocol...” could be interpreted as recommending a modification in the policy articulated by President Bush.

For additional information, see the CRS Issue Brief IB89005, *Global Climate Change*.

HIV/AIDS¹⁰

The House-passed version of H.R. 1646 contains fairly limited provisions on the HIV/AIDS pandemic affecting sub-Saharan Africa and other parts of the world. The House International Relations Committee has dealt comprehensively with HIV/AIDS in another bill, the Global Access to HIV/AIDS Prevention, Awareness, Education, and Treatment Act of 2001 (H.R. 2069), which passed the House on December 11, 2001. The Senate passed its own version of this bill on July 12, 2002, and notified the House of its action on July 15. However, H.R. 2069 has yet to go to conference.

Section 731 of H.R. 1646 states the sense of the Congress that the United Nations be urged to adopt an HIV/AIDS mitigation strategy as a component of peacekeeping operations. In part, this provision may reflect concern over the role of conflict in creating chaotic conditions, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, that foster the spread of HIV. When peacekeeping operations are deployed, many argue, it is essential that they immediately launch programs to combat HIV/AIDS, which may already be affecting a significant portion of the population. This provision may also partly reflect the concern that peacekeepers could serve as vectors for the HIV virus. The United Nations Security Council held a debate on this topic on January 19, 2001, at the insistence of then-U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Richard Holbrooke. The representative of India, which has contributed troops to many peacekeeping operations, expressed resentment at the “imputation that peacekeepers are necessarily at risk or carriers of the disease,” while others noted that many countries lack the resources to test for HIV infection.¹¹ A December 2001 General Accounting Office report found that the United Nations has taken a number of steps

¹⁰ Prepared by Ray Copson, Specialist in African Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade Division.

¹¹ Christopher S. Wren, “U.N. Council Addresses HIV/AIDS in Its Forces,” *New York Times*, January 20, 2001.

to reduce the spread of HIV during peacekeeping operations, but that several challenges remain.¹²

Section 732 states the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of State should establish an HIV/AIDS task force to coordinate U.S. international AIDS programs. Section 5 of the House-passed version of H.R. 2069 deals with this issue in greater detail, and states that the President “shall” establish an interagency HIV/AIDS task force headed by the Secretary of State. The Senate-passed version of H.R. 2069 also includes extensive provisions on policy coordination. Some might maintain that legislation on a task force is no longer needed, since President Bush has appointed Secretary of State Powell and Secretary of Health and Human Services Thompson to co-chair a cabinet-level HIV/AIDS task force. The Cabinet-level task force is backed up by an interagency policy coordinating committee (PCC). Moreover, Dr. Jack C. Chow, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Health and Science, and Special Representative of the Secretary of State for HIV/AIDS with the rank of Ambassador. Nonetheless, coordination remains an issue, with some observers expressing concern that there is no single point person or agency with clear responsibility for leading the U.S. response to the global pandemic.

For further information, see CRS Issue Brief IB10050, *AIDS in Africa*.

Human Rights – Child Soldiers, Trafficking, Human Rights and Democracy Fund¹³

H.R. 1646 as passed by the House included a number of provisions relating to human rights issues. Section 101(B) earmarked \$20 million in FY2003 for the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (increasing funding from \$12 million in FY2000 and FY2001) and section 206 makes those funds available for positions at U.S. posts abroad which are primarily responsible for monitoring human rights developments. These provisions were supported by the House Committee on International Relations and were not debated on the floor.

Title XI (section 1103), The Freedom Investment Act of 2001, made available for FY2004 and each fiscal year thereafter not less than 1 percent of the amounts made available to the Department of State under Diplomatic and Consular Programs for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor to monitor human rights activities and developments. Section 1104 of the Act also established and authorized \$27 million for each of FY2002, FY2003, and FY2004 for a Human Rights and Democracy Fund to be administered by the Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor. The Fund was to support defenders of human rights, assist victims of human rights violations, respond to human rights emergencies, and promote and encourage growth of democracy. Section 1105 expanded the reporting requirements for the annual country reports on

¹² *United Nations Faces Challenges in Responding to the Impact of HIV/AIDS on Peacekeeping Operations*, GAO Report GAO-02-194, December 12, 2001.

¹³ Prepared by Vita Bite, Analyst in International Relations, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

human rights to include information for each country with respect to which a determination has been made that extrajudicial killings, torture or other serious violations of human rights have occurred and what steps the United States has taken to encourage an end to such practices. The Freedom Investment Act was sponsored by Representative Lantos and was agreed to on May 16th without debate as part of an en bloc amendment.

Two other provisions included in the en bloc amendment are related to human rights. Section 707 required that the annual human rights country reports include information on the use of child soldiers (persons under age 18). Section 708 authorized \$15 million for FY2003 to provide assistance for victims of trafficking and violence in other countries. Representative Jackson-Lee and Representative Sanders sponsored sections 707 and 708, respectively.

IMET in Lebanon¹⁴

The House adopted an amendment (H.Amdt. 39) to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY2002-2003 (H.R. 1646) on May 16, 2001, which dealt with U.S. military and economic assistance to Lebanon. The amendment passed the House by a vote of 216-210 and was incorporated into the bill as Sec. 863: Assistance to Lebanon. H.R. 1646 did not become law.

Section 863 stated that the President shall not provide international military education and training (IMET) assistance to the armed forces of the Government of Lebanon unless the President certified to the appropriate congressional committees that the armed forces of Lebanon had been deployed to the internationally recognized border between Lebanon and Israel and that the Government of Lebanon effectively asserted its authority in the area in which such forces have been deployed. It also stipulated that if the President had not made the certification within 6 months after the date of the enactment of the Act, the President shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a plan to terminate economic support fund (ESF) assistance to Lebanon.

If enacted into law, Section 863 potentially could alter U.S. policy by terminating two assistance programs to Lebanon. In recent fiscal years, IMET grants to Lebanon have amounted to \$600,000 per year. ESF funds for Lebanon have increased from \$12 million in FY1999 to an estimated \$35 million for FY2002. The President requested \$32 million for FY2003. The USAID mission in Lebanon currently divides ESF funds into three major program areas: reconstruction and expanded economic opportunity; increased effectiveness of selected institutions that support democracy; and improved environmental practices.

The provisions to terminate military and economic assistance to Lebanon stem from the political and security vacuum that has existed in south Lebanon since Israel withdrew from its self-declared "security zone" on May 24, 2000. Although Lebanon deployed a small mixed force of army and police units to some of the formerly

¹⁴ Prepared by Clyde Mark, Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade Division.

Israeli-occupied areas, it did not deploy any forces to the international border with Israel, in part because Lebanon claims that Israel has not withdrawn fully from Lebanese territory. The area in question is called the Shabaa farms, occupied by Israel, and claimed by Lebanon and Syria to be Lebanese territory. Israel, supported by the United Nations, claims the Shabaa farms area is Syrian territory, and therefore not subject to Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon. Israel and Lebanon remain stalemated over the issue. (See CRS Report RL31078, *The Shib'a Farms Dispute and Its Implications*.) The Hizballah organization uses the absence of Lebanese troops to maintain a military presence near the international border with Israel and to initiate cross-border engagements with Israeli troops.

Supporters of Section 863 in H.R. 1646 view the provisions to terminate military and economic assistance to Lebanon as a means of pressuring Lebanon to deploy its troops to the international border with Israel, thereby potentially filling the political and security vacuum in south Lebanon, reducing the influence of Hizballah, curbing its military operations against Israel, decreasing Syrian influence in Lebanon, and increasing regional security. Opponents of the provisions tend to argue that Syria exercises a great degree of influence over or controls Lebanese defense and foreign policy through its estimated 20,000-25,000 troops and intelligence agents stationed in the country. Many analysts believe that Syria, which is reported to support logistically and encourage ongoing Hizballah military operations against Israel, will not allow Lebanon to deploy its troops to the Israeli border until after an Israeli-Syrian bilateral peace treaty. Therefore, opponents of the provisions tend to view Lebanon's ability to fulfill the conditions for presidential certification as impractical and point to the potential damage to U.S.-Lebanese relations if these assistance programs are terminated. For example, cessation of IMET assistance would reduce U.S. contact with Lebanon's emerging military leadership.

For further information, see CRS Issue Brief IB89118, *Lebanon*, and CRS Report RS20634, *South Lebanon: Economic Reconstruction*.

Iran Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 2001¹⁵

This provision is virtually identical to a bill introduced in the 106th Congress, H.R. 1477, which passed the House by a vote of 383-1 and was reported to the full Senate. H.R. 1477 did not receive Senate floor action. A similar bill, H.R. 3743, passed the House in the 105th Congress, by a vote of 405-13, and did not receive any Senate action. The primary effect of the legislation would be to change Section 307 of the Foreign Assistance Act by making the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) subject to cuts in U.S. *voluntary* contributions. Currently, Section 307 exempts the IAEA from proportional cuts in U.S. contributions to international programs that work in Iran and in other countries named in that section.¹⁶ The legislation provides for a waiver if the Secretary of State determines that the IAEA

¹⁵ This section was prepared by Kenneth Katzman, Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

¹⁶ The other countries (or movements) named in Section 307 are Burma, Iraq, North Korea, Syria, Libya, Cuba, and the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

assistance to Iran will not help any Iranian effort to develop a nuclear weapon, or if the assistance is needed to ensure nuclear safety.

Between 1995 and 1999, the IAEA's Technical Assistance and Cooperation Fund provided over \$1.5 million in technical assistance to Iran's civilian nuclear power program, including a reactor being built by Russia near the Iranian port city of Bushehr. Most of that assistance consists of training in nuclear safety. U.S. voluntary contributions (approximately \$18 million in 1999) provide almost 32% of that Cooperation Fund's annual budget. U.S. assessed contributions to the IAEA, which would not be affected by the legislation, provide about 25% of the total annual IAEA budget.

Members and outside experts who support the legislation maintain that a cut in U.S. voluntary contributions would not prevent the IAEA from continuing work in Iran, but that U.S. funds should not be devoted to a nuclear project the United States fundamentally opposes. Members who support the legislation note that, in 1999, the IAEA began devoting part of its program to helping Iran develop skills to explore for uranium, expertise that would only increase U.S. concerns about Iran's potential to develop a nuclear weapon. An alternate view is that reducing U.S. contributions would limit U.S. influence over IAEA assistance to the Bushehr project, an Iranian civilian nuclear power project at the city of Bushehr, Iran. According to critics, this could hinder the U.S. ability to monitor the Bushehr project to ensure it is not serving any nuclear weapons program. Others believe that the United States should support IAEA assistance to the Bushehr project because the IAEA will contribute to its safe operation and because Iran, according to the IAEA, is abiding by its commitments as a party to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and therefore qualifies for assistance. Supporters of the legislation note that it provides for a waiver of the contribution reduction if the conditions sought by both advocates and opponents are met.

For further reading, see CRS Report RL30551, *Iran: Arms and Technology Acquisitions*.

Jerusalem – U.S. Embassy¹⁷

Section 235(a) of H.R. 1646 repeated the congressional position that the U.S. embassy in Israel should be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. P.L. 104-45, of 8 November 1995, set a May 31, 1999 deadline for moving the embassy, but also provided a Presidential waiver in Section 7 that Presidents Clinton and Bush exercised to delay the move. U.S. administrations opposed the move because they believed the permanent status and control of the city should be decided through negotiations and not through unilateral action. Congress supports the Israeli contention that Jerusalem belongs solely to Israel.

Section 235(b) of H.R. 1646 would have mandated that the Jerusalem consulate should be under the supervision of the U.S. Ambassador to Israel, Section 235(c) stated that U.S. publications should name Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, and

¹⁷ Clyde Mark, Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

Section 235(d) allowed U.S. citizens born in Jerusalem to list Israel as their birthplace. The three subsections reflect further congressional support for the current Israeli contention that Jerusalem is non-negotiable Israeli territory. The September 1993 Declaration of Principles that Israel signed stated that the status of Jerusalem would be negotiated.

For more background, see CRS Report RS20339, *Jerusalem: The U.S. Embassy and P.L. 104-45*.

State Department and International Broadcasting Issues¹⁸

In addition to providing the required authority for the State Department and related agencies to spend specified levels of appropriations (see Table 1 for appropriation and authorization levels), H.R. 1646 and S. 1401 contained measures ranging from “right-sizing” American embassies, to allowing private funding for educational exchange programs, to promotion of minority hiring in the Department of State, to funding for a Middle East Radio Network of Voice of America. Following are selected issues in the authorization legislation regarding the Department of State, its personnel and programs, and international broadcasting.

Deputy Secretary of State for Management. Expressing concern for the multi-layered management and perceived inadequate attention to management issues at the Department of State, Congress required within the State Department FY2001 Appropriations Act (Section 404, P.L. 106-553) the creation of a new Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources position. Section 303, S. 1401 would eliminate the provision. The Senate Committee expressed full confidence in Secretary of State Powell and Deputy Secretary Armitage to carry out the Department’s management functions without the creation of a new position.

Right-Sizing Overseas Posts. In the late 1990s, two different reports recommended “right-sizing” American overseas posts.¹⁹ The idea of maintaining an appropriate level of staff and expertise at each overseas post that reflects the needs and importance of that post to U.S. foreign policy could reduce program and security expenditures and improve U.S. effectiveness overseas. For example, in the past, some have criticized the large U.S. embassies in European countries, while some posts in Asian or Middle East countries of arguably greater strategic concern are much smaller with less expertise for the needs of that region.

Section 302 of H.R. 1646 required that the Secretary of State establish a task force on right-sizing overseas posts. A preliminary report within 60 days of enactment of this legislation would be required to be submitted to the appropriate

¹⁸ Prepared by Susan Epstein, Specialist in Foreign Policy and Trade, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

¹⁹ *America’s Overseas Presence in the 21st Century*, by the Overseas Presence Advisory Panel, November 1999 (sometimes referred to as the Kaden report, as it was chaired by Lewis Kaden, a partner of Davis, Polk & Wardwell law firm); and *Equipped for the Future, Managing the U.S. Foreign Affairs in the 21st Century*, by the Project on the Advocacy of U.S. Interests Abroad, October 1998.

congressional committees. The report is to include the status, plans, and activities of the task force and must include: 1) the objectives of the task force; 2) measures for achieving the objectives; 3) the official of the Department with primary responsibility for the issue of “right-sizing”; and 4) the plans of the State Department for relocation of staff and resources based on changing needs at overseas posts and in Washington, D.C. The Secretary must submit task force progress reports to congress every six months throughout 2003.

An interagency working group would also be established to draw up plans for “right-sizing” U.S. overseas presence. This working group would have the same reporting requirements and schedule as the task force.

Section 302 of S. 1401 also contained “rightsizing” language. It required the Department to establish both an internal and an interagency task force to review issues of overseas presence rightsizing overseas posts and report on their findings.

Consular Activities. The State Department, within its FY2002 budget requested that machine readable visa fees become a permanent appropriation for State. In FY2000 the fees amounted to an allocation of \$327.9 million for State’s budget. In FY2001 the estimate allocation is \$395.1 million. The FY2002 estimate is \$478.9 million and the FY2003 request is for \$642.7 million.

Section 231, H.R. 1646 would authorize these offsetting collection fees for the Department through FY2003, setting the FY2002 allocation at \$414 million and FY2003 at \$422 million.

Section 231, S. 1401 authorizes machine readable visa fees for FY2003.

Minority Recruitment at State. For years, the Department of State has received criticism regarding the under representation of minorities on its staff, particularly in the Foreign Service. In 1980 Congress required the Secretary of State to establish a minority recruitment program for the Foreign Service and report on minority recruitment activities to Congress annually.²⁰ Some Members of Congress continued to express concern regarding State Department minority recruitment and hiring activities and Congress required the Secretary of State to report on these activities and progress in 1998 and 1999.²¹ Within the Commerce, Justice, State, and Related Agencies Appropriations for FY2001(P.L. 106-553) Congress provided \$1 million to establish a partnership with specified colleges for promoting minority hiring. Secretary Of State Powell has supported increasing minority hiring saying, “America overseas should look like America at home.”

Section 101(B)(iii) provided \$2 million in FY2003 for minority recruitment. Section 342 required the Secretary of State to report to Congress presenting the numbers and percentages of minorities who, 1) take the Foreign Service exam, 2) are hired for Foreign Service positions, at each FS grade, and 3) are hired for Civil

²⁰ The Foreign Service Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-465), Section 105(d) and Section 1201.

²¹ Foreign Relations Authorization Act (P.L. 105-277).

Service positions. Section 343 required the Secretary to establish a database to report on minority recruitment efforts over time.

Private Funding for Exchanges. Secretary of State Colin Powell stated in his April 26, 2001 testimony before the House Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations subcommittee, "I believe cultural exchanges are an essential component of a successful foreign policy, particularly for nations like Russia which are just now learning how to become democracies."

H.R. 1646 listed a number of findings, including that funding for international educational and cultural exchanges had declined in recent years, and that the U.S. private sector should be encouraged to assist. Section 402 authorizes the Secretary of State to establish private, nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations to encourage participation and financial support from U.S. corporations and other private sector entities for international cultural, arts, and educational exchanges. The Secretary is authorized to solicit funds, designate a program to receive the funds, appoint members of a board of directors to administer the private entity, and make recommendations for specific programs to be the focus of the entity. This section also would provide \$500,000 for FY2003 for administrative costs of such private, nonprofit entities. Each entity established under this provision would be required to report annually to Congress on its funding and activities; its financial transactions would be subject to an independent audit.

International Broadcasting in the Middle East. Even prior to the September 11, 2001 attack, both Congress and the Broadcasting Board of Governors have shown increasing interest in broadcasting to the Middle East. In P.L. 105-277 Congress authorized Radio Free Iran and Radio Free Iraq. In 2001 VOA set aside about \$6 million for Arabic programming. After September 11th, Congress provided \$12.25 million in supplemental funding to support VOA broadcasts in Arabic, Farsi, Pashto, Dari, and Urdu and to support RFE/RL broadcasts in Arabic, Farsi, Tajik, Turkmen, Uzbek, Kazakh, Krygyz, and Azeri. In addition, Congress provided authority for the Administration to establish a new Radio Free Afghanistan (P.L. 107-148).

For more detail on the Department of State and related agency appropriations, see CRS Report RL30926, *State Department and Related Agencies FY2002 Appropriations*.

U.N. Issues²²

UNESCO. On September 12, 2002 President Bush announced that the United States will return to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Renewed U.S. participation is expected to begin in FY2004.

²² Prepared by Vita Bite, Analyst in International Relations, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

H.R. 1646, as passed by the House, authorized appropriations for U.S. contributions to international organizations including (section 104) \$944.067 million for U.S. assessed contributions to international organizations, (section 105) \$844.139 million for assessed peacekeeping operations, (section 107) \$186 million for voluntary contributions to international organizations plus an additional \$120 million for UNICEF for FY2002 and such sums as may be necessary for these organizations for FY2003. The House funded international organizations at the level requested by the Bush Administration, adding \$10 million more for UNICEF and including \$59.8 million in each of FY2003 to cover the U.S. return to UNESCO.

Representative Leach sponsored a House International Relations Committee amendment authorizing funding to allow the United States to return to UNESCO. This amendment was adopted by the Committee on a vote of 23 to 14. The Committee report (H. Rept. 107-57) included the views of thirteen members who opposed rejoining UNESCO and urged the House to reconsider the Committee recommendation. During floor debate Representative Tancredo sponsored an amendment to strike the provisions authorizing funding for UNESCO which he described as an organization in search of a mission. He pointed out that currently the U.S. contributes \$2-3 million annually to UNESCO in voluntary contributions to cover projects the U.S. believes to be worthwhile. If the United States rejoins, it would be obliged to fund “the good and the bad alike.” Representative Leach opposed the amendment arguing that UNESCO had reformed – that it was a credible international body. The amendment was rejected by a vote of 193 to 225.

For additional information on UNESCO see CRS Report RL30985, *UNESCO Membership: Issues for Congress*.

U.N. Arrears. Conferees on H.R. 1646 reportedly agreed on a plan to pay the third and final installment (\$244 million) of U.S. arrears to international organizations. In its version of H.R. 1646, the House also amended the conditions (Helms-Biden agreement) for release of the second and third installment of U.S. arrears to international organizations. The House increased the maximum level for the U.S. peacekeeping assessment (to 28.15% from 25%). In the meanwhile, free standing legislation, P.L. 107-46 (S. 248) was enacted raising the maximum peacekeeping assessment level to 28.15%. This allowed payment of the second installment (\$582 million) of U.S. arrears. H.R. 1646 as passed by the House also placed additional conditions on release of the third and final installment of U.S. arrears (\$244 million):

- ! the Secretary of State must certify that the United States has regained a seat on the U.N. Commission on Human Rights;
- ! the Secretary has made a determination or issued an analysis on voting by secret ballot in the United Nations and its specialized agencies;
- ! and the General Accounting Office (GAO) has to submit to Congress a detailed accounting of U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations from 1990 through 2001.

For additional information on U.N. arrears, see CRS Issue Brief IB86116, *U.N. System Funding: Congressional Issues*.

Appendix

State Department Authorization History

Authorization of State Department appropriations are required by law every two years. Typically, the authorization is passed in the first year of a new Congress for the following even/odd year authority.

FY1973–P.L. 93-126

FY1975–P.L. 93-475

FY1977–P.L. 94-350

FY1978–P.L. 95-105

FY1979–P.L. 95-426

FY1984-1985–P.L. 98-164

FY1986-87–P.L. 99-93

FY1988-89–P.L. 100-204

FY1990-91–P.L. 101-246

FY1992-93–P.L. 102-138

FY1994-95–P.L. 103-236

Government shutdown–Nov. 1995–Jan. 1996

FY1996–P.L. 104-134, Sec. 405 (appropriations legislation)

FY1997–P.L. 104-208, Sec. 404 (appropriations legislation)

FY1998–waived in appropriations bill for FY1998

FY1998–State Dept authorization was passed in the omnibus appropriations bill, Nov. 1998–P.L. 105-277

FY1999–P.L. 106-113, (H.R. 3427), appendix G of consolidated appropriations Act/D.C. appropriations legislation

FY2001–authorization requirement waived (Section 405, P.L. 107-77)

Table 1. State Department and Related Agencies Appropriations and Proposed Authorizations
(millions of dollars)

	FY1998 Enacted	FY1999 Enacted	FY2000 Enacted	FY2001 Enacted	FY2002 Enacted*	FY2002 vs FY2001 %change	House H.R.1646	Senate S. 1401
State Department								
Diplomatic & Consular Program	1,730.0	1,661.6	2,823.8	3,167.2	3,630.1	14.6%	3,705.1	4,103.2
Salaries and expenses	363.5	354.2	--	--	--	--	--	--
Worldwide Security Upgrades			(254.0)	(409.1)	(487.7)	(19.2%)	(487.7)	(564.0)
Democracy, Human Rights and Labor	--	--	--	--	--	--	(16.0)	--
Minority recruitment	--	--	--	--	--	--	(2.0)	--
Ed & cultural exchange prog. (USIA)	197.7	200.5	204.2	231.6	237.0	2.3%	242.0	286.0
Fulbright Academic Exchange	(101.9)	(107.4)	(109.4)	(123.4)	(118.0)		(125.0)	--
Office of Inspector General	27.5	28.5	27.4	28.4	29.0	2.1%	29.3	30.4
Representation allowances	4.2	4.4	5.8	6.5	6.5	0.0%	9.0	9.5
Protec.-missions & officials	7.9	8.1	8.1	15.4	9.4	-39.0%	10.0	10.5
Embassy security/constr/maintenance	397.9	1,081.1	739.4	1,077.6	1,274.0	18.2%	**900.0	**1,000.0
Worldwide security upgrades	--	(785.7)	(313.6)	(661.2)	(816.0)	(23.4%)	475.0	522.6
Emergency-diplo. & consular services	5.5	17.5	5.5	5.5	6.5	18.2%	15.5	16.3
Repatriation loans	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.0%	1.2	1.3
Payment American Inst. Taiwan	14.0	14.8	15.3	16.3	17.0	4.4%	17.0	17.9
Foreign Service Retirement Fund	129.9	132.5	128.5	131.2	135.6	3.4%	--	--
Capitol Investment Fund	86.0	158.6	79.7	96.8	203.0	109.7%	210.0	231.0
International Organ. & Conf.								
Contributions to international organizations	955.5	933.6	880.5	868.9	850.0	2.2%	944.1	913.9
Contributions to international peacekeeping	256.0	219.4	498.1	844.1	844.1	0.0%	844.1	844.1
U.N. Arrearage payments		475.0	351.0	--	--	--	--	--

CRS-23

	FY1998 Enacted	FY1999 Enacted	FY2000 Enacted	FY2001 Enacted	FY2002 Enacted*	FY2002 vs FY2001 %change	House H.R.1646	Senate S. 1401
Total International Commissions	44.0	45.8	48.7	56.1	60.5	12.7%	61.3	64.2
Related Appropriations								
The Asia Foundation	8.0	8.3	8.2	9.2	9.3	1.1%	15.0	15.0
National Endowment for Democracy	30.0	31.0	30.9	30.9	33.5	8.4%	36.0	40.0
East-West Center	12.0	12.5	12.5	13.5	14.0	3.7%	13.5	15.0
North-South Center	1.5	1.8	1.8	--	--	--	4.0	--
Reagan-Fascell Democracy Fellow						--	1.0	--
Eisenhower Exchange	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0%	--	--
Israeli Arab Scholarship	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4	33.3%	0.8	--
Refugees	650.0	640.0	625.0	698.5	705.0	.9%	815.0	750.8
Total State Department	4,923.3	6,031.3	6,496.4	7,299.7	8,066.6	10.5%	8,348.9	8,871.7
International Broadcasting								
Capital Improvements	40.0	13.2	11.3	--	25.9	--	16.9	--
Broadcasting Operations	391.5	362.4	388.4	--	428.2	--	428.2	--
Broadcasting to Cuba	(22.1)	22.1	22.1	--	24.9	--	25.0	--
Radio Free Asia	(25.0)	--	--	--	--	--	(30.0)	--
Middle East Broadcasting							15.0	--
Total International Broadcasting	431.5	397.7	420.2	450.4	479.0	6.4%	485.1	506.7
TOTAL State & Broadcasting	5,354.8	6,429.0	6,916.6	7,750.1	8,545.6	10.3%	8,834.0	9,378.4

*FY2002 enacted numbers do not include funds provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act (P.L. 107-38).

**Authorized up to \$900 million by P.L. 106-113 through FY2004.