

independence militias are no longer roaming the streets, pillaging and killing. I am convinced that everyone's hope is that the peacekeeping force will restore order to East Timor as soon as possible so that families may return and start the enormously difficult job of rebuilding and reconstruction.

The resolution before us endorses the policy of our administration to provide logistical and technical support for the multilateral force. We are always at our best, Mr. Speaker, when we speak with a bipartisan voice, and we do so on this issue. Given the humanitarian crisis in East Timor and the need to pave the way for a stable and independent East Timor, we must use whatever resources we have in the region to ensure the success of the peacekeeping mission.

I also strongly support the language in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, calling on the administration to suspend support for bilateral and multilateral assistance to Indonesia until the multilateral peacekeeping force is fully deployed, the refugees are able to return to their homes, order is restored, and human rights are respected.

The Indonesian military, Mr. Speaker, has blood on its hands for its behavior over the past few months. We must keep the pressure on the Indonesian Government to finally do the right thing.

Parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, let me indicate that I am working on companion legislation that will make the Indonesian Government fully responsible for all of the financial costs involved in this human tragedy. It is with the acquiescence and connivance of the Indonesian Government that East Timor has been destroyed, physically destroyed; and the cost of rebuilding this tiny entity should be borne entirely by the government of Indonesia.

My legislation will oppose any bilateral or multilateral aid through any instrumentality—the World Bank, the IMF, or other organizations, until the government of Indonesia fully accepts its financial responsibility for this sickening outrage that has unfolded on the island of East Timor.

I also wish to express my deep concern, Mr. Speaker, about the plight facing over a quarter million East Timorese refugees who are now in refugee camps in West Timor. There are reports that the militias are targeting East Timorese leaders in these camps. It is critical that international observers get full and complete access to these camps immediately.

I would also like to add my regret and concern for the failure of the Japanese Government to participate in the peacekeeping effort. Time is long overdue for Japan to get over the Second World War psychological issues. We have German troops in Kosovo, as we should. Germany is a democratic country accepting its responsibility in the international arena. It is long past due

for the Japanese Government to do the same. It simply makes no sense that, from the United Kingdom to the Philippines, countries are accepting their peacekeeping responsibilities in East Timor; but the most powerful democratic nation in Asia, Japan, meticulously stays out and stays away from all of these endeavors.

I am developing a letter to the Prime Minister of Japan, and I am asking all of my colleagues to join me in signing this letter, calling on him as a friend to recognize Japan's responsibility to participate in missions of this kind, not just financially, but with manpower.

The international community, Mr. Speaker, is now focused on the future, how to make the multilateral peacekeeping operation work effectively, but we must not forget the past. There must be an international inquiry into the atrocities which have been committed in East Timor, including those committed by both members of the militia and the Indonesian military.

Those who committed atrocities will have to face up to the consequences, and they will have to face an international tribunal as have the perpetrators of atrocities in the former Yugoslavia.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, not because I lack concern for the serious problems that the East Timorese are undergoing, and not for lack of humanitarian concerns for this group of people or anybody in the world. It is just that there is another side to the argument for us intervening. And, besides, we helped create the problem in Indonesia.

In the 1970's, we were very supportive of the Indonesian Government in their takeover of East Timor after it became independent from Portugal. So once again, here we are intervening.

I would like to advise my colleagues that we are not just endorsing a humanitarian effort to help people who are suffering. We are literally giving the President carte blanche to go and commit war in this area. We are committing ourselves to troops, and it is an open-ended policy.

We complained a whole lot about what was happening in Kosovo. And that operation has not ended. It is continuing. This is just another example of being involved, although with good intentions, but with unintended consequences just hanging around the corner. I would like to point out that some of those unintended consequences can be rather serious.

I would like to call my colleagues' attention to number 11 under the resolve clause, making these points. Number 11 says it "expresses support

for a rapid and effective deployment throughout East Timor of the United Nations Security Council-endorsed multilateral force." This means troops.

Our Security Council has already decided to send troops to East Timor. What we are doing today is rubber stamping this effort to send troops into another part of the world in a place where we have no national security interests. We do not know what victory means. We do not know what lies ahead.

In addition, under number 13, it "expresses approval of United States logistical and other technical support for deployment of a multinational force for East Timor." Troops, that is what it means, endangerment and risk that this could escalate.

Under number 13, there is another part that concerns me a great deal. In the 1970s, we passed the War Powers Resolution. Both conservatives and liberals, Republicans and Democrats endorsed the notion that Presidents should be restrained in their effort to wage war without declaration.

Once again, we are endorsing the concept that, if we just subtly and quietly endorse a President's ability and authority to go into a foreign country under the auspices of the United Nations, we do not have to deal with the real issue of war. But under 13(B), it explicitly restates the fact that a President in this situation can at least wage war for 60 days before we have much to say about it.

I think this is dangerous. We should be going in the other direction. This is certainly what was expressed many, many times on the floor during the Kosovo debates. But we lost that debate, although we had a large number of colleagues that argued for non-involvement. We are now entrenched in Kosovo, and we are about to become entrenched in East Timor, not under the auspices of the United States, but under the United Nations.

□ 1045

I do not see that the sanctity and the interests of the United States will be benefitted by what we are getting ready to do.

Number 16 under the resolved clause, "recognizes that an effective United States foreign policy for this region requires both an effective near-term response to the ongoing humanitarian violence in, and progress toward independence for, East Timor."

If we decide that we have to fight for and engage troops for everybody who wants to be independent, we have a lot of work ahead of us. And, in addition, in the same clause, "and a long-term strategy for supporting stability, security and democracy."

This is a major commitment. This is not just a resolution that is saying that we support humanitarian aid. This is big stuff. The American people ought to know it, the Members of Congress ought to know it.

This resolution became available to me just within the last 20 minutes. It

has been difficult to know exactly what is in it, and yet it is very significant, very important; and we in the Congress should not vote casually and carelessly on this issue. This is a major commitment. I think it is going in the wrong direction, and we should consider the fact that there are so often unintended consequences from our efforts to do what is right.

I understand the motivation behind this, but tragically this type of action tends to always backfire because we do not follow the rule of law. And the rule of law says if we commit troops, we ought to get the direct and explicit authority from the Congress with a war resolution. This, in essence, is a baby war resolution, but it is a war resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to commend my colleague from Texas for stating the case for isolationism and appeasement as eloquently as he has. It is appropriate when we are discussing a major international issue that the various positions be laid out clearly so we can make an intelligent decision.

In this century we have had numerous instances when in this body the voices of isolationism presented their case. And whenever they prevailed—and they prevailed from time to time—the cost in blood and treasure later on was infinitely greater than it would have been had the perpetrators of violence and human rights abuse—whether they were called Hitler or Saddam Hussein or the Indonesian militia or the thugs of Milosevic—had they been stopped early on, the cost would have been infinitely less in both blood and treasure.

Here now we have the case of East Timor. My friend from Texas, instead of placing the burden of blame on the thugs who have persecuted a small Catholic minority in a large Muslim nation, the largest Muslim nation on the face of this planet, blames the United States for contributing 200 individuals and providing logistical and technical assistance to an international peacekeeping armada. I could not disagree with him more strongly.

One of the great victories that I am sure we all cherished was the collapse of the Soviet empire. The Soviet empire and the threat it represented to civilized democratic peace-loving nations across the globe was clearly one of the greatest threats of the 20th Century. And it was the determination of the United States and our allies, in facing up to the mighty Soviet Union, that resulted in the collapse of the Soviet empire and the fact that large numbers of countries, from Poland to the Czech Republic, are now democratic and free, and three of them are now members of NATO.

Now, if we did not yield to the threats of the gigantic Soviet Union, a powerful nuclear nation with vast conventional forces, it would be intriguing to know why we should now yield to

the militia thugs in East Timor who are denying the Catholic population of that little island their right to live under rules and authorities and leadership of their own choosing. I have difficulty following the logic.

If the Soviet Union could be resisted by Democratic and peace-loving nations, it is hard to see why Milosevic should not be resisted in Kosovo and why the thugs of the militia in East Timor should not be resisted by democratic forces.

Let me also point out to my friend, as he well knows, it is our ally, Australia, which is carrying the bulk of the load in East Timor. That is as it should be. Australia is the most powerful military force in the whole region, and our friends in Australia willingly and proudly accepted their international responsibility. For the United States to bail out on this effort would undermine our long-term policy, conducted by Democratic and Republican presidents, supported by Democratically controlled and Republican controlled Congresses, of speaking out for and taking a stand on the matter of collective security.

I think it is important to realize that there is a common thread running through our opposition to the Japanese warlords in the Second World War, to Mussolini and Hitler, to the long regime of Joseph Stalin, and to other dictators ranging from Saddam Hussein through Milosevic to the militia, the thugs, in East Timor. To argue at the end of the 20th century that we should revert to isolationism is really a sorry spectacle. What it reveals is that nothing, nothing has been learned from the bloody experiences of this entire century, which so clearly demonstrate that neither appeasement nor isolationism are proper policies for the United States.

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

Mr. LANTOS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman makes a good case for the humanitarian needs of the people. My point is that sometimes our efforts do not do what we want.

For instance, the gentleman talks about the thugs that are in Indonesia, those who are violating the rights of the East Timorese. We have to realize that they have been our allies and we helped set up the situation. So our interventions do not always do what we want.

Also, the gentleman talks about the Soviets. We supported the Soviets.

Mr. LANTOS. Reclaiming my time, if I may, Mr. Speaker. If I may remind my colleague of history, it was President Ford and under President Ford's tenure that we acquiesced in the occupation of East Timor by the Indonesian military.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think the gentleman is absolutely correct.

But I happen to see these things in a very nonpartisan manner. So to turn this into a Republican versus Democrat issue, I think, I think, is in error.

I would like to suggest that the careless use of the word isolationism does not apply to me because I am not a protectionist. I believe in openness. I want people and capital and goods and services to go back and forth. When we trade with people, we are less likely to fight with them.

So the proposal and the program I am suggesting is a constitutional program. I believe it is best for the people. It has nothing to do with isolating ourselves from the rest of the world. It is to isolate ourselves from doing dumb things that get us involved in things like Korea and Vietnam, where we do not even know why we are there and we end up losing. That is what I am opposed to.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I must say to my colleague from Texas that we have heard voices in the last few days on the part of one presidential candidate calling our participation in the Second World War against Hitler a mistake. Now, this is a free country, and people can choose to accept any position that they are inclined to do so.

But let me state for myself that I think our participation in the Second World War was one of the most glorious aspects of the whole of American history. Our standing up to the regime of Stalin and other Communist dictators in the second half of this century is among the most glorious aspects of our history. The work of President Bush in pulling together a coalition in facing up to Saddam Hussein was an important and glorious chapter in our history.

And what we are seeing unfolding in East Timor now represents just another chapter in the determination of the American people and the American government to stand up to the horrendous dictatorships that still are present in many parts of this globe.

And I hope that as we enter the 21st century, this bipartisan policy of rejecting isolationism will continue.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time both sides have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond. To try to tie in World War II is not quite fair. I think the gentleman has to admit that we are not talking about that. Besides, I am talking as much about procedure as I am talking about the policy itself.

In World War II there was a serious problem around the world. It was brought to this Congress. We voted on