AMENDMENT NOS. 2025, 2031, 2032, 2041, AND 2042, WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the pending amendments numbered 2025, 2031, 2032, 2041, and 2042 are withdrawn.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair. The Chair is absolutely correct. Mr. President, I believe there is a time agreement on this of 4 hours equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. There are 4 hours on the managers' time and the bill.

Mr. HELMS. Very well. Mr. President, before I begin, I will yield to the Senator from Montana to speak as in morning business.

I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to yield to the distinguished Senator 6 minutes, not to be charged to either side, at which time the time will begin running on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

GO GRIZ

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a critically important resolution. It will restore the honor of our country, and my State of Montana in particular, in the face of an impudent affront leveled against us by the Governor of West Virginia.

Let me begin with a question. What would possess as many as 5,000 Montanans to leave our beautiful State and travel to a small town in West Virginia—of all places—for the weekend?

There is only one answer—and that is Grizzly fever.

As I have proudly told many of my colleagues, the University of Montana Grizzlies are traveling to Huntington, WV, to take on the Thundering Herd of Marshall University in the NCAA, Division I–AA National Championship. And on Saturday night, they will come home to Missoula as the national champions.

It takes a good football team to get that far. But the Grizzlies are not just a good football team—they are a great football team.

How great are the Grizzlies, some may ask?

Great enough to have trounced their playoff opponents. During the three playoff games, the Grizzlies scored a total of 156 points. Their three opponents managed to score a paltry 14 points; and two out of the three playoff games were Grizzly shutouts.

And the Grizzlies are great enough to have what I believe is the finest quarterback in college football today. Dave Dickenson, from Great Falls, is a three-time first team academic all-American, a first team all-American quarterback, and Dave will probably receive the Walter Payton Award next week as the best Division I–AA player in America.

Many West Virginians—including my friends Senator BYRD and ROCKEFELLER—may take pride in Marshall's winning record up to this point. That is fine. I see nothing wrong with acknowledging the accomplishment of the second-best team. But Governor Caperton crossed the line when he signed a proclamation naming December 16—the day of the game—Marshall University Day.

Now, normally, I am a strong supporter of States rights. But Governor Caperton has gone too far. His proclamation is a slap in the face to me and every other self-respecting Montanan. And it is an insult to the good sense of every American who follows college football.

Mr. President, sometimes State governments make mistakes. And on occasions like this one, they are whoppers. The time has come for Congress to step in and set things right.

That is why I am introducing my resolution today. It would recognize the Montana Grizzlies as the new national champions by proclaiming all of next week Montana Grizzlies Appreciation Week. It would also declare the unfortunate, unjust, and illegitimate proclamation by the Governor of West Virginia null and void.

If you still doubt the need for this resolution, tune in on Saturday. The game starts at 10 Montana time—that's noon in Washington on ESPN. It will be a great game.

Mr. HELMS. I can see why the Senator was eager to make a speech and make a reference to Montana. I congratulate him.

FOREIGN RELATIONS REVITALIZATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HELMS. Here we are, Mr. President. As I was saying a few minutes ago, at long last, S. 908 is the pending business before the U.S. Senate—S. 908 being the plan to reorganize the State Department—a plan much maligned by all the bureaucrats who do not want to be folded into the State Department. They do not want to save any money. To their chagrin, it looks to me like we are going to save some money, not as much as we would have liked, but that is an issue we can work on in conference with the House. S. 908 was reported to the Senate more than 6 months ago, and I have never seen as many erroneous news reports about a piece of legislation in all of my 23 years in the Senate. The administration at every turn has vowed—and I use the administration's words—vowed to ''delay, postpone, obfuscate and derail'' S. 908. They made no bones about it. All of that was ignored by the great media of this country. There was just one Senator who was holding up the whole works—that fellow from North Carolina, HELMS—and they went after HELMS with a feverish attitude.

Our Democratic colleagues signed up and have refused to allow the Senate to work its will, but that did not make any difference to the news media. They reported that it was HELMS doing the holding up, when actually it was the administration and the Democrat Members of the Senate. Now, there was one Senator who was willing to negotiate and participate in the process, Senator KERRY of Massachusetts, to whom I shall forever be grateful.

It needs to be made clear that the Senator from North Carolina has never, never demanded that I get my way as press report after press report after press report claimed. I have never demanded that the Senate accept this authorization bill or that the administration agree to downsize Government by eliminating a few Federal agencies. I have never demanded that the Senate accept this authorization bill or that the administration agree to downsize Government and abolish some Federal agencies. I had hoped all of that would happen, and the bill was drafted for that purpose, but I never made any demand for anything—except that the Senate be allowed to vote on S. 908. I said from the very beginning, ''Let me have a vote and you will have your ambassadors.'' I have asked only that the Senate be allowed to conduct its legislative responsibilities and vote. Not once did I stipulate that S. 908 had to pass but just that it be voted upon. But the Democrats were afraid that if it were put up for a vote, the Senate would agree to abolish three Federal agencies—what a tragedy that would have been.

Since this process began months ago, the Foreign Relations Committee has acted on at least 58 of President Clinton's ambassadorial nominees—most of them political appointees, I might add. The committee has acted on six tax treaties and assorted other international treaties in that same time period. I have asked myself many times, what have we received in return? Until this date, nothing; nothing. There goes that obfuscation, delay, postponement, derailment.

I take issue with those in the administration and with my colleagues, especially the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], who at one point asserted that it was the ''height of irresponsibility to hold up nearly all other committee business over one piece of legislation.'' CHRIS DODD knows better than that, Mr. President. He is in charge of the political wing of the Democratic Party. He is perhaps experiencing a convenient amnesia, forgetting that as chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere in 1992, Senator DODD himself refused to schedule any subcommittee ambassadorial nomination hearings for an entire year. So when Senator DODD made his extravagant statement, I respond, ''Look who is talking.''

I could go on, but suffice it to say many of my Democrat colleagues have engaged in a bit of injured innocence when they weep such copious tears about the delay in Senate confirmation of several nominees. Now, were it not

for Senator KERRY's commitment, Senator KERRY of Massachusetts, his commitment to negotiate common ground, we would still this very afternoon be at an impasse. Everybody knows that there needs to be streamlining and consolidation of the whole Federal Government. It is one of the big reasons we have a $5 trillion debt hanging over the people of this country. Senator KERRY recognized early on and said, ''Yes, one or more of the three agencies stipulated in this legislation have outlived their usefulness.''

That is putting it the nice way. The truth of the matter is that all three of the agencies, ACDA [U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency], AID [Agency for International Development], and the U.S. Information Agency [USIA] need serious pruning and, in my opinion, should be put on the short list to be abolished. I note that in reference to USIA, it was never our intention to undermine our international broadcasting capability, such as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. But I repeat, the ancillary agencies that cost billions of dollars have got to be toned down. That is what this bill is all about.

I remind my colleagues that it was Secretary of State Christopher who proposed to Vice President GORE's much-publicized Reinventing Government Office that the United States was obliged to restructure the U.S. foreign affairs apparatus for the 21st century. Secretary of State Christopher himself advocated the elimination of the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Mr. President, Secretary Christopher went almost hat in hand down to Vice President GORE's office to plead that our foreign affairs apparatus needed a serious rethinking for the post-cold-war era. I remind my colleagues that is was Vice President GORE, the former U.S. Senator, who was chosen to be the No. 2 officer of this country and has spent much of his time in office proclaiming his intent to reinvent Government, to downsize Government, and to save the taxpayers money. I know of very few successful efforts of the Vice President in that regard, because somewhere along the line Vice President GORE, decided all of a sudden that the status quo was just fine, and Vice President GORE rejected out of hand Secretary of State Christopher's proposal. In doing so he became a captive of the very Federal bureaucracy he was supposed to reinvent.

By the way, this past January, it was the Vice President of the United States, AL GORE, who promised that he was going to save $5 billion in 5 years by cutting the U.S. International Affairs budget. S. 908, under the terms of the manager's amendment, mandates $1.7 billion in savings over 5 years. If $1.7 billion in savings ''jeopardizes the national interest'', what are we to have said about $5 billion? The local press would call such a draconian cut the policy of an isolationist if it were made by anybody on this side. They all applauded when the Vice President said it. But look at the facts. How did Mr. GORE come up with those figures? He yanked them out of thin air. Even Senate Democrats acknowledge that they cannot figure it out. They have asked for months—all of us have been asking for months—for the Vice President's proposals for all of these savings.

Finally, some of the more candid Senators on the other side of the aisle confessed. They admitted that the Vice President's plan had no basis in reality and it must have been the result of bad staff work down at the White House. So the emperor had no clothes.

It is worthy of note that the Vice President's book entitled ''Common Sense Government'' asserts that his recommendations on restructuring the U.S. foreign affairs agencies would be announced in the fall of 1995.

Mr. President, it is now the winter of 1995, and we are still waiting.

The fact is, we are never going to hear from him. We are never going to hear from his associates. They just do not have a plan. They do not know how to produce any savings. They do not have a clue. All they have are press releases, and those press releases, as it turns out, are not—and were not—worth the paper they were printed on last January.

S. 908, the committee's plan to abolish three Federal agencies and save $3 billion has been available to the administration in writing for more than 6 months.

By the way, I stress that the largest of these agencies—the Agency for International Development [AID]—is a temporary Federal agency, even though it was established a half century ago. Ronald Reagan used to say that ''There is nothing so near to eternal life as a temporary Federal agency.'' I think that is correct. The Clinton administration, the State Department, and the Vice President of the United States have yet to provide an alternative to S. 908. The administration has not even bothered to submit an authorization bill to the Congress this year.

So here we are. S. 908 is the pending business in the Senate. What goes around, comes around. As I indicated at the outset, 6 months after committee consideration of the bill, no thanks to the administration, the Senate Democrats have proposed an amendment to our bill.

Senator KERRY has just arrived on the floor. And I do not know whether he knows that I paid my respects to him while he was on the way over here. But I have, and I meant it. And I am grateful to the Senator.

The Kerry amendment, as I said earlier, mandates cost savings of $1.7 billion over 5 years. That is less than one-third of what Vice President GORE promised that he would save, and what S. 908 proposed to save at the outset. We are not saving enough in my judgment. Senator KERRY knows how I feel about that. We have been candid to each other. But I want to get started on this business of saving the taxpayers' money, and I think JOHN KERRY does as well.

I have had to console myself with the fact that saving the taxpayers $1.7 billion is better than saving the taxpayers nothing. Of course, it would have been far better if Senator KERRY had been permitted to fulfill his original offer in committee to abolish one agency and save $2 billion over 4 years. In fact, at the markup of S. 908, the able Senator from Massachusetts strongly stated that he was prepared to move forward on the one agency abolition, and that he would not back down on that proposal. I thinks it is too bad that he did.

Remember, Mr. President, the original intent of the pending bill, S. 908, was to abolish three agencies. The Democrat's compromise proposal was to maintain status quo—leave all three agencies fully functioning and just ask them to save a few billion dollars. The managers' amendment requires the President of the United States within 6 months to send up a plan to downsize, consolidate, and streamline. And, if the President fails to do it, three Federal agencies will be abolished just as we proposed in the beginning. The ball is going to be in the President's court. The clock on that 6 months starts ticking when S. 908 (or H.R. 1561) is enacted.

So as I said at the outset, Mr. President, here we are. While the main focus of this managers' amendment is on reauthorization, it needs to be borne in mind that this is a 4-year authorization bill for the Department of State.

Also, the managers' amendment modifies several other sections of the bill. For example, we agreed to modify some provisions relating to the U.S. relationship with the United Nations. One in particular that has bothered me is the provision restricting the share of U.S. intelligence with the United Nations. At the administration's insistence we have replaced that provision with a much less stringent one.

I, for one, agree with Senator SNOWE of Maine. The original provision was proposed by Senator SNOWE and it was much tougher. I agree with her that the administration should be required to make the case to Congress as to why it is crucial for the United States to share intelligence with the United Nations which includes in its membership countries such as Iraq and Cuba.

We also agreed to remove section 603 which is a provision dear and near to my own heart. The provision would provide asylum for immigrants who are fleeing the policies of their home countries that will force them to abort their unborn children or force them to be sterilized, as the case may be. The silver lining in this decision is that this provision is included in the House bill and, therefore, I expect to strongly support the House language in the House-Senate conference on this bill.

We modified section 604 to authorize payments from frozen Iraqi assets for United States claimants. A similar provision was approved in committee by a bipartisan vote of 10 to 8.

Section 168 restricting the issuance of visas to those who traffic in expropriated property was deleted at the behest of Senator DODD of Connecticut who has stated that he would prefer that issue be dealt with in the conference on the Cuban Liberty and Solidarity Act, H.R. 927.

Mr. President, another important aspect of this agreement is that the Senate will provide for the appointment of conferees upon final passage of this measure sending H.R. 1561—the House companion bill—to the House, and requesting a conference.

On Tuesday, the Foreign Relations Committee reported out—true to my promise—18 pending nominees, and the START II treaty.

The previous unanimous consent agreement provides for en bloc consideration of the nominees upon final passage of S. 908. The majority and minority leaders have agreed to make every effort to finish START II as expeditiously as possible.

A few more thoughts and I will be through.

Early next year the Foreign Relations Committee will begin active consideration of the Chemical Weapons Convention, including additional hearings and additional steps necessary to full committee consideration of this treaty by April 30. I feel obliged to assert that I remain opposed to the Chemical Weapons Convention. Until this administration comes forward with a public explanation of precisely how this treaty can be verified, which it cannot do and has not done yet, I cannot imagine that the Senate will be prepared to take action on the treaty. But that remains to be seen.

The road to redemption was not traveled in one day. It began with one step in the right direction, and that is where we find ourselves today. The Democrats have taken this step by recognizing the necessity of consolidating the U.S. foreign affairs agencies and agreeing to mandate cost savings and by concurring that the Secretary of State should be the primary foreign policy adviser to the President of the United States. Ultimately, the President and our Nation's foreign policy will benefit from this reorganization which has been endorsed by five former Secretaries of State, who, in the process, one after another, conferred with us and helped us in the drafting of the bill.

Let me say this, and I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

The world has changed dramatically during the past 10 years. The State Department has not. The issue of consolidation and restructuring is not going away this year, and it is not going away next year either. I pledge that. Brian Atwood, for example, will have to rethink his jubilant declaration this past October when he said, ''AID has survived a bruising political battle.'' That remains to be seen.

Down on the Archives building, not far from the Capitol, is a piece of marble that has the words, ''What is past is prologue.'' Somebody asked a friend of mine what that means, and he said, ''That means 'You ain't seen nothing yet.'''' So, Mr. Atwood, I would say, ''You ain't seen nothing yet.''

What has happened here is not the beginning of the end, it is the end of the beginning. Eventually—eventually—the American people are going to have their say. And to the length of my cable-tow, they also will have their way.

I yield the floor, and I assume the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts wishes to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague. I was not here when he made some very generous comments about my participation in this, and I am appreciative of what I have been told that he said.

As I said the other night, for myself I want to thank the Senator from North Carolina for his patience and for his forbearance in this process. It has been a difficult process, as many have said, but I will say that in all of the dealings that he and I have had, there was never any rancor or any raising of voices. We argued and debated and pressed and pushed, both of us, for positions that we believed in. In the end, what we have here is a compromise, as it ought to be, and I think it is a fair compromise. I think it is a sensible compromise. It is a compromise that recognizes the changes that are sweeping over all of Government and Washington. It recognizes the imperative of that change, which no agency or entity of Government ought to be exempt from unless they can prove, beyond all doubt, that they ought to be.

Mr. President, I am pleased that Senator HELMS and I have reached agreement on a manager's amendment and that the months-long impasse over this bill and the nominees and other issues linked to movement on this bill has come to an end. The process has been long and at times trying. In the eyes of many it was about politics, not policy, but that is not the case. From the very beginning there have been real substantive disagreements over the consolidation language in this bill and over many other policy provisions, such as those mentioned by the distinguished ranking minority member, Senator PELL.

This managers' amendment is a compromise in every sense of the word. On the key issue of consolidation, Senator HELMS and his Republican colleagues on the committee agreed to accept my proposal which preserves the President's prerogative to determine how the foreign affairs agencies—that is the State Department, AID, USIA, and ACDA—will be reorganized. This proposal provides the President with flexibility. It does not abolish any agencies, unless the President fails to send a plan to Congress, but it does require the President to save $1.7 billion over 5 years through reorganization and consolidation. Recognizing that programmatic reductions are a byproduct of consolidation, it allows him to achieve up to 30 percent of that savings from programmatic reductions.

I believe that this proposal will result in some serious and beneficial streamlining and consolidation of our foreign affairs apparatus. In my view this is necessary in light of the cuts that are being imposed on the budget in all areas including foreign affairs. I share the concern of many of my Democratic colleagues about these cuts. The international affairs budget is only 1 percent of the Federal budget, and it is 1 percent well spent when one considers our needs and interests abroad. But like it or not, funding for foreign affairs programs has been declining over the last decade and will continue to decline under whatever agreement is reached for balancing the budget in the next 7 years. Against this reality, we must find a more efficient and cost-effective way to make and implement policy while still preserving critical programs. I think the approach we have in this bill will enable us to do that.

I recognize that some are concerned that the Senate position on consolidation, as reflected by this managers' amendment, will be reversed or changed in conference. Senator HELMS and I have agreed that the Senate conferees will operate under consensus with respect to the main elements of my consolidation proposal, that is mandatory cost savings, abolition of the agencies and the limitations as to where cost savings may be achieved. It is imperative that any changes in the Senate position on consolidation reflect agreement among all the Senate conferees because this issue is at the heart of the bill.

Senator HELMS and I have also agreed that we will work in conference to increase the authorization levels for the operating accounts of the agencies affected by this bill. We must ensure that the authorizations for these accounts are in concert with the savings we are seeking through reorganization and consolidation and that we do not undermine the President's ability to reorganize by decimating the operations of these agencies through the authorization process.

As we are all aware disagreements over this bill resulted for many months in inaction by the committee on 18 ambassadorial nominations, 4 FSO promotion lists, and the START II treaty. On Tuesday the Foreign Relations Committee favorably reported these items to the Senate. Once we act upon this bill, the nominees will be approved by the Senate en bloc pursuant to a

unanimous-consent agreement reached last Thursday. When the START II report is filed, the Senate, pursuant to another unanimous-consent agreed to last Thursday, will begin consideration of the treaty. I believe there is overwhelming support in the Senate for this treaty and I hope that we will be able to complete action before the Senate recesses. If we do not, however, the majority leader has given his commitment that we will finish action on START II at the beginning of the next session. I think these are positive developments, as is the procedure we have worked out for committee consideration and action on the Chemical Weapons Convention.

I am hopeful that with these positive steps, we can begin to restore the bipartisanship traditionally characteristic of the operations of the Foreign Relations Committee. The chairman has assured us that the committee will resume normal activities including scheduling of hearings and action on all currently pending nominees and other committee business. I believe all of us on the committee, Democrat and Republican alike, agree that this is in our joint interest and that of the country.

Mr. President, I think most of us approached the issue of how to deliver our foreign policy and how to implement the various missions of the various agencies that do deliver that foreign policy. Most of us approached this with a sense that we can do it more efficiently, that we have not patented perfection with respect to it. There are areas of waste. There are areas of duplication. There are areas where we can do some consolidating, possibly even some merging. But we also recognized that within that framework it is important to acknowledge and honor the prerogatives of a separate branch of Government, the executive branch.

So, some of us pressed very hard for the Presidential prerogative of being able to line up their own ducks, of being able to make a decision as to which agencies to conceivably consolidate, or what the order ought to be. I think most people feel, particularly in the arena of foreign policy, that is the fair prerogative of the President of the United States. We have preserved that prerogative in this compromise. So the principle of consolidation, the principle of merger, the principle of efficiency is embraced in the compromise, but the principle of the separation of powers and the Presidential prerogative in foreign policy is also embraced in this compromise.

In addition to that, I believe the level of savings represents a realistic beginning. I think the Senator is perfectly correct in saying the ultimate goal here is for all of us to respect the desires of the American people to have the most efficient expenditure of their tax dollar. This is their dollar and this is their Government, not ours. We represent them here.

So, there are many in this country who have second thoughts about some of those expenditures in the foreign field, but there are also many people who have enormous commitment to much of what we are trying to do abroad—for very little.

I always ask audiences when I am asked a question about foreign policy when I go home and talk to people in Massachusetts how much money they think we spend in foreign policy. It is fascinating to listen to the response. Many people have a quick response, 20 percent, 20 percent of our budget. More often than not, it is in the low sort of double digits: 12 percent, 11 percent, or the high single digits. Almost invariably, I would say 75 percent and higher of the number of hands that go up in an audience, will pick 4 percent, 5 percent, rarely less than 3.

I was at a teachers convention not long ago and only one teacher out of about 200 correctly picked the amount of money that we put into foreign policy in this country: 1 percent. Less than 1 percent of the total budget of the United States of America leverages our global interests.

That is not a totally fair assessment because obviously we invest in the Defense Department. That is a very big investment and that is a serious component of our projection of force abroad and our interests. But in terms of assistance to other governments, in terms of population, environment, the kinds of things we try to do with respect to international narcotics through the State Department and a host of those efforts, we are talking about 1 percent and less of the entire Federal budget.

Many of us on our side of the aisle are deeply concerned that in a world that is more global, in a world that is less centralized in its conflicts, where we no longer have the kind of bipolar, easily definable East-West tension that defined most of the history of this country since 1945, in that world there may well be more need to think about increasing things like the Foreign Commercial Service officers in various developing countries.

When I was in Hong Kong over a year ago, I was struck by the fact that in the Foreign Commercial Service in Hong Kong, the several people that we have there said to me, ''Senator, we are missing billions of dollars of contracts for our companies in America.'' Those billions of dollars of contracts translate into thousands of jobs. For every $1 billion of exports, there are 20,000 jobs created in the United States of America. They said to me, ''Because we only have,'' I think—I cannot remember the exact number, it was in the single digits—''Because we only have this few number of people here in Hong Kong, we cannot keep up with the requests for proposals. We cannot keep up with the meetings that we could be putting together for people to be able to be married to a deal.''

''If you people''—meaning us—he said, ''were to have enough foresight to just give us 10 more people, we would pay their salaries within 1 month.'' That seems to me to be a reasonable return on investment.

That seems to make sense, but that is not necessarily—and I underscore necessarily—what will happen with this budget. Could it happen? The answer is yes.

Under the consolidation, if the Secretary of State and the President were to decide that is an imperative and we ought to put more people into that than have some people on some other desk, we can make that happen. But I think most people feel many of those other desks are also competing with things ranging from international environmental accords to international questions of refugees to international questions of immigration to international questions of crime to international questions of terrorism, all of which in this less bipolar world present us with a whole different set of choices.

Mr. President, I do not want to go on at great length. I think our effort is to try to expedite this this afternoon. There is no reason at this point to speak at great length, but I do want to simply say, many people on our side of the aisle were deeply concerned about the level of reductions, and that is why we are starting out at the $1.7 billion. It may well prove that in the consolidation program that, hopefully, we will set up within the timeframe within this bill—I am confident that we may find there is rationale for doing more. And we may also find there is a clash of reality that is impossible and that this is, in fact, too significant.

Let me say also that Senator HELMS and I have agreed that we will work in the conference committee to increase the authorized levels for the operating accounts of the agencies that are affected by this bill. We have to ensure that the authorizations for these accounts are in concert with the savings that we are seeking through the reorganization and consolidation, and we do not want to undermine the President's ability to reorganize by decimating the operations of these agencies through the authorization process itself.

We are also gratified that part of this agreement now sees the ambassadors about to be eminently improved and the START II treaty to come to the floor, hopefully, within the next day or so, certainly within the next days.

I am particularly grateful for the commitment of the chairman to guarantee that the committee will act on the Chemical Weapons Convention, and it is obviously our hope that we will be able to either improve it or change it, if it needs improvement, but ultimately the full Senate will be able to act.

I share with my colleague from North Carolina concerns about it in its current form. There are issues of verification. There are legitimate reasons for the committee to want to do its business over the course of the next months.

Moving at this point in time, Mr. President, to a consideration of the START II agreement, for which I think there is extraordinarily small opposition within the Senate, if any, is very, very important in the context of events in Russia, the elections, and also our own interests in reducing some 4,000 strategic nuclear weapons from the arsenals of both ourselves and the former Soviet Union, including the SS–18, which was always the most imposing weapon that was pointed at the United States of America.

I think that moving forward on that treaty is enormously important, and it is one of the reasons why this compromise is so welcome.

I want to say, finally, that I think all of these steps are important, positive steps, which I believe, in the spirit that the chairman has described, can help to bring us back to a bipartisan, joint effort to try to utilize this committee to help address the major questions that we have in the country with respect to foreign policy, and I am confident that with all of our good efforts it can, in fact, do that.

Mr. President, it is my pleasure to yield to the distinguished former chairman, the ranking member of the committee, for his comments at this time.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator very much indeed.

Mr. President, I support the Managers Amendment to S. 908 negotiated by Senators KERRY and HELMS. I was opposed to S. 908 as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, and regretted at the time it was reported that the committee appeared to have abandoned a long tradition of bipartisanship in crafting the State Department authorization bill.

Consequently, I am pleased with the results of the negotiations that are reflected in this managers amendment. I congratulate Senator KERRY, who so ably managed this bill on behalf of the Democrats. He did this in a skilled, professional and brilliant way. I also congratulate Senator HELMS for his willingness to work with Senator KERRY and Democratic members of the committee to achieve this constructive resolution to many of the serious disagreements related to S. 908.

The managers' amendment makes significant improvements in the bill with respect to two critical areas: the reorganization of the foreign affairs agencies and those provisions related to the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

As we all know, much of the opposition to this bill focused on the mandatory abolition of AID, USIA, and ACDA and the transfer of some of their functions and personnel to the Department of State. I was particularly concerned that ACDA would be abolished because I feared that it would eliminate the independent voice on arms control issues that every President should have, and a concept which every President since President Kennedy has supported.

I am pleased that the compromise takes a different approach. No agencies are abolished, except in the event that the President fails to send a reorganization plan to the Congress. The driving force of reorganization is the requirement that the plan save $1.7 billion over 5 years. In my view this is the correct approach as it encourages the President to reorganize while at the same time preserving his prerogative to determine how that reorganization is done.

As reported by the committee, S. 908 also contained a number of troubling provisions designed to restrict U.S. participation in the U.N. system. For example, some placed conditions on the payment of our assessed contributions to the United Nations for membership and peacekeeping. The managers' amendment which Senators HELMS and KERRY are offering improves a number of these provisions and deletes others. I applaud these changes because we cannot exert leverage at the United Nations if we cannot fulfill our financial and other obligations in full.

Finally, with the adoption of this managers' amendment and the passage of S. 908, the Senate will proceed to the confirmation of a large number of ambassadors and the consideration of Start II. I have previously expressed my deep concern and regret over the holding up of the important business of the Foreign Relations Committee and the nation because of significant differences of opinion over just one piece of legislation, particularly if that one piece is unrelated to the main body of the legislation and other matters that are being held up.

In my 30 years of service on the committee and 8 years as chairman, this was unprecedented. With this action today, however, I am very optimistic that the new year will bring a return to the committee's traditional bipartisan approach to addressing the foreign policy issues before the Senate. We clearly will not agree on all these issues, but I hope we will agree to disagree and work where feasible to reflect the concerns of all members in the committee's deliberations. This managers' amendment, and the committee's 18 to 0 vote on Tuesday, December 12, to report the Start II treaty to the Senate, are examples of our potential for the new year. As ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I pledge to work with our chairman to address the issues before our committee in the new year in a bipartisan and constructive manner. Although we have agreed to disagree on many policy issues, we are friends and colleagues with a long-standing mutual respect for each other.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to register my opposition to S. 908, the State Department authorization and reorganization bill. Before I begin briefly to state my reasons, let me compliment both the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY, and the chairman of the full committee. I compliment the chairman, my friend from North Carolina, for being a consummate legislative craftsman. He held us hostage very effectively for a long time. I do not think we would even be talking about this compromise bill were it not for the fact that the START Treaty was held up, that all the ambassadorial nominations were held up, and that we asked Senator KERRY on our behalf to see if he could free them up. It reminds me of those buttons we used to have around here when we would have long sessions, ''Free The 89th Congress'' or free this or free that.

Well, this was ''free the Ambassadors'' and ''free our national security'' so we could have the ability to continue to destroy Soviet nuclear weapons and continue the rational arms control regime that was begun with President Nixon and went straight through the administration of President Reagan.

This is not a backhanded compliment. I think one of the most fierce and effective legislative foes one could have in this body is the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. I do think, however, that the way my friend from North Carolina went about this one was unprecedented, and I hope it is not repeated.

On that score, I wish to make it clear to my friend from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY, why, after all his hard work, I am still opposed to this bill. He did a great job. We are going to have a START II Treaty, God willing and the creek not rising, and we are actually going to put ambassadors out there after the rest of the world wondered where the devil they were.

Let me say at the outset that I admire the skill of both the gentlemen who have brought us this agreement. I do not, however, admire the product that has been brought.

No one disputes the need to constantly scrutinize our Federal bureaucracy to look for overlaps and redundancies and opportunities for streamlining.

In this case, though, the three agencies that I will now mention will, in my view, be emasculated by this bill. The Agency for International Development and the United States Information Agency effectively are mandated for closing. Most important in my view is the supreme irony that just as we finally are allowed by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to free up the START II Treaty, this bill would severely cut the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

All of the three agencies I have just mentioned have been streamlining themselves and cutting overlapping functions. All three of them have already been taking a good, hard look at their missions and have been responding to changing circumstances.

The Agency for International Development, for example, has pioneered enterprise funds, which have created

partnerships between the private sector and the Government.

USIA has attempted to utilize modern information technologies to spread the message of the United States to the rest of the world. It has also entered into local partnerships whenever possible to conserve funds.

Perhaps the biggest mystery to me is why the advocates of this bill think that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has outlived its usefulness. In the confusion of the current post-cold-war era, the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons has dramatically increased, not decreased—I repeat, dramatically increased.

Now more than ever, the critical independence of ACDA is needed to counter the natural tendency of the State Department to defer to bilateral relationships in sticky situations.

Another irony is that those proposing the cuts are the very ones who have been most critical of the State Department for allegedly having an instinct to become captives of the countries with which we deal.

ACDA has a proven track record of nonpolitical expertise, which we can ill-afford to lose at this time.

The situation at the State Department, which would absorb the agencies whose independence is to be sacrificed, is hardly any better. Mr. President, the Department of State, the principal vehicle for carrying out American foreign policy, has already been forced into debilitating reductions.

The international affairs budget is now 45 percent lower in real terms than it was in 1984. Altogether it represents only 1.3 percent of Federal spending. Over the past 3 years alone, the State Department's budget has been decreased in real terms by 15 percent at the same time the Department's responsibilities have increased with the emergence of new countries in the wake of the breakup of the former Soviet Union. Moreover, since 1993 there has been a 30-percent increase in passport issuances to U.S. citizens to travel abroad.

What has the result been? The State Department has taken the following actions to reduce the cost of conducting U.S. diplomatic and consular relations.

First, it has cut its total work force by 1,700 persons.

It has downsized the Senior Foreign Service by 19 percent. And here, Mr. President, I submit that we are wasting a precious national resource, the kind of expertise built up over the decades that in the short term simply cannot be replicated.

It has also reduced overseas allowances.

It has cut its administrative expenses by almost $100 million.

It has reduced expenditures on diplomatic security by 15 percent. And, Mr. President, I doubt anyone would claim that we live in a safer international environment.

It has had to cancel, which I find astounding, the 1995 Foreign Service examinations—I repeat, has had to cancel the 1995 Foreign Service examinations. That means, of course, that our country is cutting off any chance of attracting the best and the brightest of our college and university graduates into the diplomatic service this year. Talk about being penny-wise and pound-foolish. My goodness.

The State Department has been forced to slate 19 overseas posts for closure in fiscal year 1996. The list of these posts makes the hair of any internationally minded American stand on end. Permit me to elaborate a bit on this point, using Zurich, Switzerland, as an illustrative example of the folly that congressionally induced budget slashing has wrought. Zurich is, of course, Switzerland's largest city and its economic and financial center. In fact, it ranks as the world's fourth largest financial center. Many American multinational corporations have their regional headquarters there, including Dow, Kraft, General Motors, and many others. In the other direction, Switzerland was the second largest foreign direct investor in the United States in 1994.

So, Mr. President, what do we do? We close the consulate in Zurich, Switzerland, which does not make a lot of sense. I do not think it is a stretch to say that Zurich is a rather important city to American business. Apparently other countries also perceive Zurich's central position in international finance and trade; 59 other countries have consulates there. As one might expect, all of the other leading powers in the world have representation in Zurich, but smaller nations also consider it in their interest to be represented in Zurich—The Gambia, Lesotho, Mongolia, Nepal, Rwanda, the Republic of the Seychelles, Swaziland, Vanuatu. The list goes on.

Mr. President, with all due respect to our friends in The Gambia, Lesotho, Mongolia, Nepal, Rwanda, and so on, I find it rather incredible to believe that their governments can somehow find the funding that they need to keep consulates open in Zurich, and the United States of America, the world's only superpower and largest economic engine in the world, cannot. We cannot find the money to keep a consulate open in the vitally important city of Zurich, a consulate, I might add, that I have never visited.

But let me not be too Eurocentric, Mr. President. Another post slated for closing, thanks to congressional budgetary wisdom, is Medan, Indonesia. As you know, Indonesia, with a population of over 200 million people, is the fourth largest country in the world.

It is also the largest Moslem-majority nation on Earth. Its economy offers numerous opportunities for foreign investment. And Medan, after the capital Jakarta, is Indonesia's most important commercial center.

Other countries with consular offices in Medan include Belgium, Germany, Great Britain, India, Japan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Norway, the Russia Federation, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sweden, and Thailand. Why are they there? To do business.

So, Mr. President, after we take down the Stars and Stripes and close our consulate in Medan, what will happen when an American corporation eager to break into the Indonesian market goes to Medan? Our American corporate representative can walk down to the the Japanese consulate where the nice Japanese attache will undoubtedly be happy to help out with business contacts and other valuable information that the American corporation needs.

Although this bill is largely a creation of the majority party, there is plenty of blame to spread around. I regret to say that the administration, in its zeal to reinvent Government, has aided and abetted the feeding frenzy of the small Government ideologues.

To be fair, this bill can be viewed as but the logical culmination of a decade of denigrating the nonmilitary component of American foreign policy. Most of us, this Senator included, have voted for reductions in one area of foreign policy or another to spare what we deem to be more important programs.

But, Mr. President, this goes overboard. This bill goes far beyond what we have seen before. Previous cuts in the budget for carrying out our foreign policy, whether they were proven correct or not, were at least undertaken with a view toward strengthening the international role of the United States of America.

As I have demonstrated earlier, the agencies charged with executing our foreign policy have not been ''fat cats'' of the Federal budget, unwilling to change. On the contrary, Mr. President, they have absorbed massive cuts up to this point. I repeat, the international affairs budget is already, before we pass this bill, 45 percent in real terms below what it was in 1984. And as I have said, the State Department, USIA, ACDA, and AID have already implemented severe staff reductions. Moreover, we are talking about only 1.3 percent of Federal spending here.

So, Mr. President, I think it is totally false to assert either that our foreign policy agencies have not reformed themselves or that the very carrying out of our foreign policy is a ''big ticket'' item in the Federal budget.

No, Mr. President, the impetus for this proposed legislation is not rooted in demonstrated need. On the contrary, I am sorry to say, the bill has its genesis in a strain of isolationist thought that harkens back to the 1920's and 1930's, which many of us thought was but an unpleasant memory.

By imposing crippling budget cuts on three foreign affairs agencies that have served this country well for decades: the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the U.S. Information Agency, I think this bill virtually

assures their demise. That is part of the bill's purpose.

Moreover, Mr. President, the State Department, which would inherit the remains of those agencies, would itself be forced into yet another round of devastating cuts. Some of those consequences, as I have earlier indicated, would be absurdly funny were they not so tragic.

Mr. President, this bill represents backdoor isolationism pure and simple. At a time when international affairs has become more complex, its passage would signal to the world an American desire to simplify what cannot be simplified.

Combined with Republican-mandated cuts in the already meager foreign assistance budget, this bill would lead ineluctably in a few years to a situation in which the American President would have little choice in an international crisis between doing nothing and sending in the military. This bill, I believe, is the worst kind of ideologically-driven false economy. It is a dressed-up isolationist exercise. It is not worthy of a country that claims the mantle of world leadership.

I know that many of my colleagues share my deep misgivings about this Congress' evident desire to shrink America's international role. Opposition to this bill offers an opportunity to reassert the centrality of America's involvement in the world. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against S. 908.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am not going to debate the distinguished Senator from Delaware. I will say, he has a very selective memory. And like all of us, I suppose he remembers things that have not happened. But that is all right. The Senator forgot, for example, to mention the continuous efforts on our part to persuade the administration to engage in negotiations.

On August 11 of this year I had persuaded, through a friend in the White House, the White House to have the President invite me and our staff to the White House to brief the President on our legislative proposal. What it in fact proposed and what the critics of it said it would propose were two different things.

President Clinton was entirely gracious when we arrived. We did not meet him on the first floor. He took us up to the family quarters. And we spent 1 hour and 20 minutes demonstrating the details of the proposal. Vice President GORE was there, as was the Secretary of State, the White House Chief of Staff, and the Deputy National Security Adviser. I sat between the President and the Vice President, as a matter of fact. Several times during the briefing the President leaned over to me and said, ''Who could be against that? Who could be against that?'' disclosing clearly that he had not been informed about what the bill in fact proposed and now proposes.

Acting in his name had been a concert of the bureaucrats heading the three agencies, the three agencies that five Secretaries of State, plus Warren Christopher, the President's Secretary of State, had stipulated ought to be abolished and folded into the State Department because they had become anachronisms of a bygone era.

Senator BIDEN is also wrong about this bill having anything to do with the cancellation of the Foreign Service examination. The closing of diplomatic missions was not only a recommendation of the last two administrations, as I said in my opening remarks, but also of the President of the United States.

So it is unfair—and I know that the Senator from Delaware does not intend to be unfair—but he is following the same line that the news media have followed from the very beginning.

Why did five former Secretaries of State help us draft this bill and publicly endorse it? Why did the present Secretary of State go down to the White House and propose, in large measure or in some measure, what we are proposing with this S. 908? Those are things that the Senator from Delaware just smooths over. And I know he does not intend to be unfair because he is a fair individual. He and I came to the Senate the same day.

This bill is intended to strengthen the Secretary of State organizationally speaking. Warren Christopher wanted it done but he was rebuffed. Now, if you disagree with Mr. Christopher, that is your business, I will say to the able Senator from Delaware. But the fact is, there have been changes in this world, as I tried to emphasize in my own remarks. And the U.S. foreign policy apparatus must change with the times.

Let me address a statement that is so often made by the State Department and various others and political operatives who support the status quo. Senator KERRY said over and over again in his remarks that spending on the U.S. foreign affairs budget takes up only 1 percent of the Federal budget, I believe he said 1 percent. Well, the 1.3 is correct, but it is not incorrect to say that that is what is spent on operating the foreign policy apparatus because the foreign policy apparatus reaches out and utilizes the rest of Government, and the cost of what they reach out and get greatly increases that figure because the 1.3 does not include spending on foreign policy objectives from our domestic accounts. That figure does not include the money usurped from the Department of Defense. I mentioned the $2 billion spent on Somalia. I mentioned the nearly $2 billion that has been spent on Haiti, thus far, and much more is going to be spent in Haiti before we are through.

The Lord only knows how much is going to be spent in and on Bosnia; $2 or $3 billion has been mentioned. It is going to be at least that much, and probably substantially more. Thirty-two Federal agencies run almost $2 billion in international exchanges every year. The point is, the American people must not be deceived or misled into believing that we only spend 1.3 percent, or 1 percent, of the Federal budget on our foreign policy. It simply is not so, and that deception ought to be brought to an end.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I do not want to get into a debate with my friend, and there is nothing personal about what I said. Let me reiterate what I actually said. My criticism and compliment to my friend from North Carolina was not that he was original in what he has done, in the sense that he had support from like-minded former Secretaries, or even, at one time, from the present Secretary, or perhaps even from the President. My comments related not to him—it is not what he proposed but the fact that he denied us our ability to dispose of ambassadorial nominations and the START II Treaty.

My disagreement is not only with him on this legislation. I also mentioned the Secretary of State when we were referring to the State Department and the President of the United States. I think, with all due respect, all the supporters of this effort are being shortsighted. So the chairman is not alone in what I characterize as ''shortsightedness'' as it relates to what our policy should be. My reference to him was explicitly for his unique ability to fashion a way to get his point across in this case, which was by denying us the ability to dispose of the START II T treaty and dispose of ambassadorial nominations, all of which were ready to go. I complimented him on his ingenuity.

I have tried to learn from him. We have been here together since January 1973, and I have watched him, and Democratic predecessors, like the deceased Senator Jim Allen, and others, use their great skills to be able to get the results that they sought. I compliment him on it, but I think it is the wrong way to do it. I think it was a high price to be paid in order to get agreement.

So I want to be clear. He was not original in his notion that we should cut these consulates. He joined other, I think, wrong-headed proposals to close them. My reference to him was explicitly that I hope we do not have a repetition of shutting down the business of the committee while we arrive at a conclusion that is satisfactory to whoever the chairman is then.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has announced his retirement. The Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Delaware are seeking reelection. The Lord only knows, and our constituents know, whether both of us will be back, and the odds are that he may be back as chairman. But it is also possible that the Senator from Delaware may be back as chairman of the committee.

That is the only reference that I was making. It seems to me that what he did was legal use, in a senatorial sense, of the power of chairmanship, but I think unprecedented and, I hope, not to be repeated.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS. It is not a violation of the rules, and it is not undesirable unless the other guy is doing it to you. I remember when the other side was in the majority, with a different chairmanship. I must say that Senator PELL has always been a thoroughbred gentlemen. I have said that in many public forums, and I think he knows I mean it. I hope that some may later on think that I am a gentleman, too.

But I am interested in getting the job done. I reiterate, as I said at the very outset this afternoon, that this could have been handled months ago if the other side had been willing only to let the Senate speak on the bill. But, no, no, the first day when it came up, they brought out Mr. KENNEDY from Massachusetts to speak for 1 hour and 20 minutes on the minimum wage. Some things are hard to understand. But I figured out, after a while, that they were filibustering, that they did not want the Senate to speak its mind on this bill. It began there. But if we had had a vote, no Ambassador would have been held up. And if we let the Senate function as it is intended to function from now on, no Ambassador will be held up in the future.

I am going to use every technique that comes to my mind to try to do the best I can for my country. Now, if the Senator wants to talk about what it costs to operate the foreign policy establishment, we can get into details like, why did the United States State Department, or the foreign aid apparatus, have 600 people stationed in Cairo, Egypt, alone to give away money? Since I brought it up, they have reduced, somewhat, the number of people in AID, the Agency for International Development, stationed in Cairo. It is something over 400 now. But they did not do a cotton-picking thing about it until I began talking about it in this bill. I am going to do the best I can for what I believe in, and I know the Senator from Delaware feels the same way about it. We will do the best we can together.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, let me say that the way this situation developed is, the Senator from North Carolina, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, reported from the committee a reorganization bill on a 10–8 vote, a straight party-line vote. There was no bipartisanship on that issue. He then sought to bring that bill up on the floor and was not able to get 60 votes in order to invoke cloture. Now, pushing the other side to invoke cloture is not a tactic strange or unfamiliar to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. He is one of its more avid practitioners here in the Senate.

So I am not moved by the fact that his measure, in effect, was blocked because they were unable to produce the 60-vote margin. They tried to do it and fell short on two occasions. Not having been able to get his way on this important substantive matter about which there were great divisions, a lot of strong feelings, and a lot of differing views about what was appropriate, the Senator from North Carolina proceeded to take the ambassadorial nominees hostage. He shut down the work of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which he is the chairman, holding up such important matters as the START II treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention.

In other words, because he could not get his way on a substantive matter, he then refused for 4 months to allow the committee to carry out its functions and responsibilities. We were not able to do any business—no legislation, no nominations, no treaties. This is hostage-taking par excellence.

Then we are being told, you have to negotiate. The United States says to the world, if you take our people hostage we will not negotiate under those circumstances. We will not be coerced that way.

Now, I have never, in the time I have served here, encountered anything comparable to what has occurred in this instance, in terms of grinding the whole range of work to a halt—particularly by the chairman of a committee, which, after all, carries with it certain important responsibilities.

I remember the former chairman of the committee was on the floor when the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act was being subjected to this very tactic to which I made reference. It was like a rolling snowball. Anything that came along, the Senator from North Carolina encompassed within his rolling snowball and sought to hold hostage in order to increase his leverage to get his way on the reorganization measure.

So we encountered this with respect to the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, in addition to holding the ambassadors hostage, in addition to these treaties that were left to languish, in addition to whatever legislation was in the committee. In fact, at that time the former chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, said, ''I absolutely agree it is inappropriate to link MEPFA to the State Department legislation. I do not recall in the years I have been in the Senate, 35, or as chairman of the committee, any similar action being taken.''

I then said, ''Will the chairman yield on that point? When did the former chairman, if I may say, the very distinguished former chairman, go on the Foreign Relations Committee?'' Mr. PELL said, ''I think it was 1964.'' And I asked, ''So the Senator has been on it more than three decades?'' And Senator PELL said, ''Correct.'' And I inquired, ''Has my colleague ever seen anything comparable to what is now taking place?'' Senator PELL said, ''No, and that is the point that bothers me.'' I said, ''I thank the Senator,'' and Senator PELL went on to say:

> I think we should deal with the question of extension of MEPFA on its merits and the merits clearly lie with the quick passage of the short-term extension. We should not, as Senator Kerry noted, trifle with the peace process for the sake of reorganizing our bureaucracy. We should pass the MEPFA now with no linkage. In this regard, I am particularly struck by the words of the Senator from Maryland. I know I am correct in saying I am the only former Foreign Service officer in the Senate. Because the Foreign Service was only created in 1926 under the Rogers Act, I think I am the only Foreign Service officer ever to have served in the Senate. I would also point out this linkage that is being created by the chairman of the committee not only sets a bad precedent but is a linkage that should never have been made in the first instance. It has not been done in the past, and it would be a great sin to move this way now.

Now, I agree completely with those remarks of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. The Senator from North Carolina, unable to get the votes to invoke cloture—a process, as I indicated earlier, he has used himself repeatedly on the floor of the Senate—then decided to use that bill as leverage. He was saying, in effect, ''I will take every other aspect of business of the committee hostage. No ambassadors, no treaties, no legislation, no Middle East Peace Facilitation Act. You will have to come to terms with me on this reorganization.''

Now, looking at the national interests of the United States, the fact of the matter is that ambassadors and treaties, which are important to our Nation's interests and upon which we should have been acting, were delayed over the controversy with respect to this legislation.

Now, I understand the Senator wants his reorganization bill. A number of us disagree with that. Fine, I am ready to fight out that issue on that legislation. But, to change the pressures, to increase the leverage, he decided instead to do a hostage-taking action, which is exactly what occurred here.

Over the past 6 months there has been a long and growing list of ambassadorial nominees—currently 19—who had their hearings and were ready to be reported. Many of them had their hearings in July and have been waiting since then—it is now December—to be approved by the Senate. Meanwhile, the countries to which they would go have no American ambassadors on the scene, no heads of mission, no one coordinating the American presence in that country. Now, most of these ambassadors were career members of the Foreign Service, people who have committed themselves to serving our Nation in these very important ways. Mr. President, 15 of the 19 are career officers. They included nominees for a number of major posts, including Malaysia, Cambodia, Thailand, Indonesia,

Pakistan, Oman, Lebanon, and South Africa. Our former distinguished colleague, Jim Sasser, was nominated to go to China. Our relationships with all these countries have been suffering because we have no U.S. ambassadors there.

Why are the ambassadors not there? Not because questions are being raised about a particular ambassador and his or her qualifications, which of course is a legitimate reason. If someone is holding up an ambassador on the floor of the Senate because they do not think that person is qualified, or because of some other difficulty directly related to the nominee, that is a fight that ought to be fought with respect to that ambassador. None of that has happened here. No one was asserting that any of these ambassadors had any deficiency. They were all being held as a pressure tactic on the reorganization bill.

Hundreds of Foreign Service officers recommended for promotion were also being held up. These are career people. They have committed themselves to the Foreign Service. There is an established process by which they move forward within the Foreign Service. The promotion list comes to the Senate and we act on it. Yet all of them were being held up.

Obviously, this is an unfair situation to the individual nominees, who have absolutely nothing to do with the reorganization proposal by the Senator from North Carolina. In addition to being unfair to the nominees and their families, it is contrary to the interests of the United States.

We need to have our ambassadors out there in the field promoting U.S. interests such as human rights, conflict resolution, antiterrorism, counternarcotics cooperation, and increasing U.S. exports. We need them there to respond to incidents before they become crises, to assist U.S. tourists and business people, to promote U.S. goodwill, and to spread American values and ideals. The fact that they are not there and have not been there for a number of months causes friction in our diplomatic relations and erodes and undercuts the ability of the United States to influence developments around the world.

Mr. President, I am further concerned because I think that taking people hostage this way is yet another attack on the career Foreign Service, which is extremely unfortunate. In fact, we received a letter back in August from the American Academy of Diplomacy with respect to the ambassadors that were being held up. Let me just quote that letter, which was written to Chairman HELMS of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Academy has noted, according to press reports of August 2, that following a deadlock in the Senate on the State Department authorization bill, a hold would be placed on 17 ambassadorial nominations and that committee action was being canceled or postponed on 22 other nominations subject to Senate confirmation.
>
> The Academy has taken no position on the authorization bill which is currently in contention. But it does not believe the country's larger interests are served by linking action on that bill to the ambassadorial nomination process. Doing so would have the United States without appropriate representation in these countries at a time of dramatic, historic global change.
>
> We believe that decisions on America's diplomatic representation abroad, including both the timing of such action and the qualifications of those nominated, should be made strictly on the basis of our interests in the country involved.

Frankly, I think this willingness to make pawns out of ambassadorial nominees, most of whom, as I indicated, are career people, is a denigration of the career service.

I am increasingly concerned about the extent to which that is taking place and is engaged in by some of my colleagues.

At an earlier time, the Senator from Texas asserted that he favored deep cuts in spending for diplomatic activities to curb the department's alleged penchant for ''building marble palaces and renting long coats and high hats.''

Such an attack on our professionals is extremely unfair. They in fact are risking their lives. Some are losing their lives. Yet, we have Members of this body who attack them for supposedly wearing long coats and high hats and living in marble houses.

Ambassador Robert Frasure, who had so much to do with moving the efforts toward peace forward in the Balkans, lost his life in Bosnia. As the State Department spokesman put it, when Ambassador Frasure was killed ''he was riding in an armored personnel carrier and wearing a flak jacket, not striped pants.''

Ambassador Frasure's widow wrote a very moving letter to the Washington Post, in the course of which she said, in defense of her husband—it should have never been necessary for her to have to defend him—but in the course of which she said:

> Our diplomats are some of the finest, bravest, most courageous people I have ever met. In the past 10 years alone, my husband and I mourned the death of seven of our friends and Embassy colleagues.

She then listed them, and went on to comment about the remarks about long coats and high hats and marble palaces:

> I am outraged also because I remember the dangers as well as the many hardships our family endured in Bob's 20-year career.

That is from a very moving letter by Katharina Frasure, the widow of ambassador Robert Frasure who came to his untimely and much-grieved death in Bosnia.

In fact, over the past 25 years more American ambassadors than generals have been killed in the line of duty.

So I think we ought to treat the Foreign Service with a greater measure of respect. Holding up ambassadors for reasons unrelated to their qualifications or their mission is not the way we ought to be doing business here. And I regret that these able men and women were held hostage in order to increase the pressure and the leverage with respect to an unrelated piece of legislation.

In addition to the ambassadors, he also held hostage some very important treaties—the START II treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention. We passed amendments and resolutions right here on the Senate floor expressing our desire to see these treaties ratified and implemented at the earliest possible date.

As Spurgeon Keeney, the head of the Arms Control Association, recently wrote:

> Failure to complete Senate action promptly could delay for years the entry into force of these agreements with great disadvantage to U.S. security.

U.S. security is being disadvantaged by this holdup. The START II treaty, from all testimony and from all analysis, clearly serves our national interest. It is a very important measure in terms of reducing the nuclear arsenal, and bringing the nuclear danger under greater control. Yet, that treaty has been held up over this reorganization issue.

Let me turn to the substance of this bill. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY, labored under a very difficult assignment and under very trying circumstances. He has received a lot of unfair criticism, much of it from the other side. He was praised today, but along the way he was sharply criticized, which I think was very unfair to him.

The authorization levels in this legislation, in my judgment, impose such deep cuts in administrative expenses that we run the risk of having, as the American Foreign Service Association said, ''hollowed-out agencies''. They argued in a letter to the members of the committee that actually what was happening was a shift from streamlining agencies to hollowing-out agencies. And they then make the point, and I quote:

> It makes little sense to AFSA that at a time when American leadership and ideas are needed and welcomed throughout the world, we would undercut our ability to operate abroad. Lack of adequate funds and staff to actively represent its national interests abroad send the wrong message. The costs of fighting totalitarianism during World War II and the Cold War were extremely high. Having won those wars, we cannot now afford to turn our back on the world or sacrifice our hard-fought victories by failing to adequately fund diplomacy—our country's first, most cost effective, and least risky line of defense in these dangerous times.

The amount authorized here for diplomatic and consular programs at the State Department is $30 million below the level in the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations conference report, $60 million below the administration's request. These are funds needed to assist American travelers abroad, to process visas, to keep open consulates, conduct diplomatic affairs.

Funding for salaries and expenses at USIA is also cut drastically. The same

is true at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and at the Agency for International Development.

In my view, the cuts being proposed here are excessive and will result in impeding our ability to carry out U.S. foreign policy effectively overseas. I agree with the American Foreign Service Association's assessment that these cuts will lead to hollowed out agencies at the very time, with the end of the cold war, that there is an opportunity for the skillful and effective use of diplomacy. At the very time when American leadership and ideas are needed and welcomed throughout the world, we would undercut our ability to operate abroad.

I think this is an important issue. People get up on the floor and they make speeches about America's leadership in the world. Then they fail to provide the wherewithal, or the resources with which to exercise that leadership. Many seem to think that leadership only exists in the military sphere, not recognizing the important accomplishments that can be done in the political and diplomatic sphere, and the interaction between the political and diplomatic sphere and the military sphere.

In addition to these funding levels, which I think are a very basic failing with this legislation, there are other substantive provisions that remain deeply troubling. One section requires massive RIF's by USIA and AID in 1996 and 1997; in one instance by more than 50 percent. That, in effect, would finish the Agency. There has been no study of consequence to support the effort to abolish these agencies that is at all comparable with the studies that were made in establishing the agencies to begin with. If one goes back and looks at the process of analysis that was made when the decision was made to establish these agencies, and the rationale that was given—much of which I think remains valid, but if you want to argue that, fine—but there is no comparable counterpresentation to support eliminating the agencies.

Actually, there was a commission that recommended AID be eliminated, and now the head of that commission is in favor of keeping it, particularly on the basis of the very significant reforms that have been made at AID under its present administrator, Brian Atwood.

This legislation places onerous new conditions on our participation in the United Nations. It requires the withholding of 20 percent of our contributions to the United Nations, 50 percent of our contributions for assessed peacekeeping, and 100 percent of our contributions for voluntary peacekeeping, until an extensive list of certifications is made. The United States, unfortunately—I regret to say this—is now the largest deadbeat at the United Nations in terms of meeting its obligations. Yet we repeatedly turn to the United Nations in order to accomplish important objectives, in Cambodia, Angola, El Salvador, and on and on around the world. We should not forget that the United Nations cannot take any significant action if the United States does not concur with it because we can simply veto it in the Security Council.

There is a also very troubling provision in section 604 relating to Iraqi claims. This is a complicated issue. It has been the source of intensive negotiations, but it has very serious national implications.

Briefly, the situation is as follows. When Iraq invaded Kuwait, the United States froze all Iraq's assets in United States banks. The number of claims on those assets from U.S. veterans and business people far exceeds the amount of the frozen funds. Yet there is a provision in this legislation to allow a small group of claimants to come in and get 100 percent of their money, leaving less available for the veterans and other businesses who have equally valid claims. There will not be enough money left to go around for the rest of these people.

The Bankers Association for Foreign Trade wrote, calling the amended language ''bad public policy.'' They oppose it ''not only because it would give preference to a small, select group of unsecured creditors as against others similarly situated. More importantly, it would inevitably increase the cost of trade finance for U.S. exporters relative to their foreign competitors.''

I close by again expressing my respects to the Senator from Massachusetts for his hard work. I think the managers' amendment is an improvement to the bill itself. I do not for a moment contest that. But I still think that overall, this legislation is heading in the wrong direction. It may be less bad, and a lot of very skillful work was done by the Senator from Massachusetts to bring that about. It was an assignment, in effect, handed to him, to which I think he responded with great skill. But I do not think that this legislation warrants our support.

There is every expectation when it goes to conference it will only get worse. The House bill with which it will be conferenced includes a whole host of objectionable provisions.

So, in closing, I have a number of letters, some of which I will have printed in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SARBANES. The various private voluntary organizations that are engaged in overseas development, Bread for the World, Oxfam, InterAction, and other similar groups, all indicate their opposition to this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose it. I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

OXFAM AMERICA URGES REJECTION OF S. 908

As a privately funded development agency, Oxfam America supports self-help projects to combat hunger and poverty in 31 countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean. At the same time we believe it is very important that the US Agency for International Development maintain its ability to offer significant support for poverty alleviation, basic infrastructure, demining and health programs which are beyond the financial capacity of non-governmental organizations and which can determine the long-term success of smaller NGO efforts like those of our local partner organizations.

For these reasons Oxfam America is seriously concerned that under S. 908, the State Department authorization bill, USAID will share a five-year budget cut of $935 million with the State Department's other two independent agencies. Although we understand that this budget formula was devised as an alternative to a mandated merging of the three independent agencies, we fear that such cuts, on top of current year reductions, will destroy the US commitment to offer a meaningful level of fundamental development assistance to the poorest countries.

Further, we are aware that passage of S. 908 will result in conference with H.R. 1561—a bill which incorporates a foreign aid authorization for the first time since 1985. We understand that in addition to a 30 percent across-the-board cut in development assistance, H.R. 1561 includes many regressive foreign aid authorization measures. With passage of S. 908, the Senate would therefore face compromise with such provisions without ever having debated and passed its own foreign aid authorization legislation.

From Oxfam America's perspective, S. 908 poses an unacceptable threat to the United States' ability to significantly reduce hunger, misery and human underdevelopment as the 21st century dawns.

Oxfam America urges senators to vote against the passage of S. 908.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, December 11, 1995.

VOTE NO TO S. 908, THE FOREIGN RELATIONS REVITALIZATION ACT

National Wildlife Federation opposes S. 908, The Foreigns Revitalization Act because:

The US cannot continue to call itself a world leader if it passes this Bill. Humanitarian and environmental assistance are investments in the future. They have consistently paid off for the US in the past, and have been vital to maintaining the US as the leader of the free world. As the US withdraws from development assistance, its standing in the international community, its influence in multilateral organizations, its voice and vote will be worth less and less. For altruistic and for self-interested reasons, we need to stay engaged in the world. Foreign aid is a crucial part of this engagement.

It would cripple the US Agency for International Development. The latest compromise offered by Senator Helms would necessitate such heavy cuts to programs and operating expenses at the US Agency for International Development that even if it continues in existence it will be unable to carry out its mission. This will signal to the international community that the US shrugs off its commitments to poverty alleviation around the world, to building democracy and to conserving natural resources. The US will be diminished by this withdrawal from the developing world, and our long-term interests will suffer.

The bill micro-manages US foreign policy. Although the compromise version would not mandate a reorganization of USAID, the savings goal of $1.7 billion in five years with only 15% coming from State Department means that USAID will have to be sacrificed.

This sort of reorganization is the prerogative of the Executive branch.

The House companion Bill, HR 1561 is unacceptable for many reasons, including draconian cuts to sustainable development programs, the inclusion of the Mexico City Policy, and elimination of funds for the Inter-American and African Development Foundations. The passage of S. 908 increases the likelihood that provisions of HR 1561 would become law.

Vote ''No'' on S. 908, the Foreign Relations Revitalization Act.

BREAD FOR THE WORLD,
Silver Spring, MD, November 21, 1995.

Senator PAUL SARBANES,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: As the Senate Foreign Relations Committee proceeds in negotiations over a manager's amendment to S 908, the Foreign Relations Revitalization Act of 1995, Bread for the World urges you not to make any deal that would force the merger of the U.S. Agency for International Development into the State Department or otherwise severely weaken its capacity to carry out long-term development.

We are concerned that the committee has agreed to terms which, even without directly eliminating USAID, might indirectly accomplish this end by requiring a $1.7 billion cut to administrative costs over five years. Because cuts to the State Department would be limited to 15 percent, or $255 million, the burden of the budget cuts will fall heavily on USAID, the agency with the largest operating and program budget among the three agencies in question. Such deep cuts could cripple USAID's ability to manage programs, maintain an overseas field presence, and exercise leadership in the donor community. They would also yield greater authority on aid decisions to the State Department, thus subordinating long-term efforts to reduce hunger and poverty to short-term political pressures. Furthermore, the agreement encourages Senator Helms in his strategy to hold foreign policy matters, however urgent, hostage to his demands.

We ask you to raise these concerns with Senator Kerry and to vote against S 908 when it comes before the full Senate. It is important to have a strong show of opposition to the bill, even if it passes, since a large margin of victory would eliminate the possibility of a Presidential veto.

Although Bread for the World adamantly opposes reorganization proposals that compromise USAID's independence, we have long supported reform that would improve the quality and efficiency of U.S. development aid in reducing poverty and promoting fair, democratic development. The agency has made significant progress toward this goal under current Administrator Brian Atwood. Yet the task is far from complete. Thus, we urge the committee to exercise greater oversight over USAID's internal reform initiatives.

Finally, we encourage the committee to return to the critical task of redefining the broad purposes of U.S. foreign aid for the post-Cold War world, rather than to focus simply on slashing foreign aid budgets and eliminating aid agencies. Last year, the committee, under your able leadership, made significant headway in rewriting the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act. Regrettably, the process was never concluded. But far-reaching global economic and political changes and recurring crises demand that it not be further delayed.

Sincerely,

DAVID BECKMANN,
President.

BANKERS' ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN TRADE,
Washington, DC, December 13, 1995.

POSITION PAPER ON SECTION 604 OF S. 908

The Committee's final proposed version of Section 604 of S. 908 does not mitigate the threat to U.S. exports implicit in this special interest legislation.

The current version of Section 604 continues to change established letter of credit law and practice by proposing to grant holders of advised letters of credit the status of secured creditors, which under present letter of credit law inures only to holders of confirmed letters of credit.

This outcome is bad public policy not only because it would give preference to a small, select group of unsecured creditors as against others similarly situated. More importantly, it would inevitably increase the cost of trade finance for U.S. exporters relative to their foreign competitors.

This unfortunate result flows from the fact that even in its final form, Section 604 sets the damaging precedent of giving advised letters of credit holders the same security status as holders of confirmed letters of credit.

If banks are forced by Section 604 to face unanticipated risks by issuing advised letters of credit, they will have to charge more for this method of trade finance to guard against similar loss in the future. The increase in cost will be substantial and would be an added burden for U.S. exporters that their overseas competitors will not have to pay.

This is why the Treasury Department continues to oppose Section 604 and has stated so for the record. It is also why OMB has indicated its opposition on behalf of the Administration.

Trying to find a compromise version on Section 604 is like trying to compromise the difference between certified checks and ordinary checks. The only solution is to delete the provision from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Wyoming is waiting, and I will just take a couple of quick moments, if I may.

Mr. SIMPSON. Please.

Mr. KERRY. First of all, I thank the Senator from Maryland for his kind comments about the difficult task with respect to this. He has been there before many times on a number of pieces of legislation. There is nobody more skilled than the Senator from Maryland at dealing with that.

I think the comments from the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Delaware are extremely important. As manager for this side, I in no way dismiss or diminish the concerns that they have expressed. Those concerns underscore the difficulties that not only we faced in getting here, but they also make very, very clear the limitations on where we can travel in the course of the conference. I want to underscore that to my colleagues.

If this legislation moves in any way in the direction that the Senator from Maryland and Delaware have described, then this Senator is going to be disposed to find great difficulty in not only passing a conference report but, if a conference report comes to the Senate, in seeing this legislation pass the Senate. That is a very large hurdle indeed which it yet faces.

So it is my hope we will work to continue the process of improving it. I have that assurance from the Senator from North Carolina. It is with that understanding and hope—''hope springs eternal,'' for at least this Senator—it is my hope we will be able to continue improving this legislation as we go forward from here, and I look forward to doing that.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Wyoming.

Does the Senator from North Carolina yield time to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HELMS. I certainly do, Mr. President.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I thank my friend from North Carolina. I will not transgress greatly on the time remaining to him.

Let me speak clearly, I hope, on an issue which is, I think, very critical, and it comes up in the House version of this legislation and at this level with regard to the present legislation.

I call to my colleagues' attention a front-page article in the November 4 issue of the Washington Times, a piece by Michael Hedges describing a pattern of the most serious abuse in the admission of refugees under the so-called Lautenberg amendment.

First, let me say my friend, Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG, is a very able legislator, a friend, a person I very much enjoy working with. I have tried to resist this legislation from its inception. But, nevertheless, the Senate felt we should go forward. And now it has been for more than 6 years since the so-called Lautenberg amendment first provided a very dramatic exception to the definition of a refugee in the Refugee Act of 1980.

The Refugee Act of 1980 was sponsored by Senator TED KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I was rather new on the scene in those years and found it to be a great learning experience to watch it crafted, to see what occurred as it was put on the statute books.

The provision of the law, the Lautenberg amendment, created a presumption—now, this may be inside baseball and I know how that works in this place, but this is big-time understanding. If we cannot get this understood by the American people, we will not get it unraveled.

The provision provided a presumption of refugee status for certain groups in the Soviet Union—this is the former Soviet Union—who ''assert'' a claim of persecution or discrimination and that would make them a ''refugee.'' That has been now extended three times since 1989 and is due to sunset at the end of this fiscal year, September 30, 1996.

In the House-passed State Department reauthorization, there is yet a further 2-year extension of the so-called Lautenberg amendment. When I speak of the amendment, I do not speak of its sponsor, I speak of its intent and what has happened with it.

What we have now is the fact there is no longer any Soviet Union. They are our finest friends, the former Soviet Union. So we are going to continue now, according to the House version, this rather embarrassing mockery of our refugee laws until the end of fiscal year 1998.

The Soviet immigration program has become terribly distorted. There is even evidence that Russian mafia members and other criminals are now beginning to use this system, and why would they not? It is in disarray. But, most importantly, Mr. President, how in the world can we explain our posturing around the world about our rare and wonderful friendship and alliance with the present Russian Government and the present independent states and the Commonwealth and the present affection between President Yeltsin and President Clinton—and we do that everyday—while pretending in some cruel way that somehow people coming out of there are still refugees? That cannot fit. It simply makes absolutely no sense. But, of course, it would not be the first time in this remarkable city.

I would not suggest in any possible way that we are forgetting the lessons of the past or the persecution of Jews in the former Soviet Union and throughout the world or the lessons of the Holocaust, but please know—and if we cannot understand this, we are all in trouble—please know that each and every one of those people will be processed on a case-by-case basis in an orderly way, all in accordance with the 1980 Refugee Act, the creation of Senator KENNEDY and other innovative legislators, and a piece of very humane and responsible legislation.

What does it do? It provides that if one is a refugee—that is a person fleeing persecution or having a well-founded fear of persecution based on race, religion, national origin, membership in a political organization or social group—a very clear description; it is the U.S. description; it is the U.N. description. Such a person would then be designated as a refugee and that would be done on a case-by-case basis.

All of those in the former Soviet Union, whether they be Jews or Pentecostals, Christians, Evangelicals, or persons persecuted for their political views, will have the same opportunity as all other true refugees around this world to enter the United States as a refugee. But the Lautenberg amendment and that program must end.

With absurdities like this being extended year after year, it is no wonder that people scoff at our immigration and refugee laws. Let us end it now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article I referred to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 4, 1995]

VAST SOVIET REFUGEE FRAUD DETAILED—INS MEMOS CATALOG MISUSE OF LAUTENBERG AMENDMENT

(By Michael Hedges)

A U.S. policy of granting refugee status to Jews, Pentecostals and other religious minorities in the Soviet Union and its successor states has been widely abused, according to confidential government documents.

Internal Immigration and Naturalization Service memos indicate that by 1993 only about 0.5 percent of those entering the United States as refugees under the Lautenberg Amendment met the classic persecution requirements.

As early as 1991, INS officials in Moscow detailed serious problems with the amendment, which gave religious minorities refugee status, putting them ahead of the millions seeking to immigrate to the United States.

A ''cottage industry'' developed to defraud the United States under the relaxed refugee standard, according to memos obtained by Scripps Howard News Service. One says that by 1993 ''astronomical fraud'' was occurring.

About 300,000 refugees have entered the United States under the amendment since 1989.

Law enforcement experts say they fear the lenient standards have contributed to a burgeoning criminality in the United States on the part of the immigrants.

A high-ranking INS official wrote in March 1992, ''There is a tremendous sense of injustice adjudicating claims under the Lautenberg amendment.''

Some standard immigration applicants have been waiting more than 15 years, according to Richard Day, chief Republican counsel for the Senate Judiciary Committee's subcommittee on immigration and refugee affairs. For example, there are Filipinos with family in the United States who were granted immigrant visas in 1977 who are still waiting to enter the country.

To be declared a refugee is to jump to the head of the line and have taxpayers pay your air fare and resettlement costs—an average of $7,000 per refugee.

The standard procedure for being declared a refugee requires a well-documented fear of persecution—torture, death or jail. Relatively few who met those requirements made it into the United States after 1980 because a ceiling limited the number each year to around 100,000.

In 1989, as the Soviet Union began to crumble, Sen. Frank Lautenberg, New Jersey Democrat, proposed a change to protect Jews, Pentecostals and other religious minorities by denoting them refugees from religious persecution.

One high-ranking federal official involved says it was a good policy in the beginning because there were deserving refugees. That former administrator grew disillusioned.

''Clearly, by 1991, fraud and abuse was rife, and our policy had become a rubber stamp,'' he said.

Critics of the law say one clear sign that many receiving such status are not genuine refugees fleeing imminent persecution is that 27,000 given visas as ''persecuted refugees'' haven't bothered to leave for the United States.

INS memos say the policy has blocked the escape of many who are truly persecuted.

''The irony is that there are plenty of cases from the former Soviet Union which could qualify [as persecuted refugees],'' noted a top INS official in Moscow in December 1993.

''However, these cases stand little chance . . . as they do not fit into one of the Lautenberg categories.''

The INS declined to discuss the memos. Requests for additional information were referred to the agency's Freedom of Information Act office. An FOIA request filed in August is pending.

At one point in 1992, INS officials in Moscow tried to toughen the standards.

''The reality . . . was there were some category applicants who were not able to assert a fear of persecution or a credible basis for such fear,'' an INS official from Moscow cabled Washington on March 31, 1992.

But, the memo noted, ''certain interest groups were not able to tolerate even a small percentage of denials and eventually INS succumbed to their demands.''

The standards were further relaxed, officials said.

Arnold Liebowitz, lobbyist for the Hebrew Immigration Aid Society, said he believed the INS and Jewish lobby groups just had an ''honest disagreement'' about the degree of threat facing Jews in the Soviet Union.

''I think there has always been in the INS a feeling that the Jews in the Soviet Union really didn't have much of a problem.'' he said.

Mr. Liebowitz denied his group or others pushed to have the standards relaxed to guarantee that no Jews would be denied refugee status. He said his group believes there is still a need for the Lautenberg Amendment.

Roy Godson, a counterterrorism expert, said, ''There were criminals entering the country and no one was doing anything about it. Some of the gangsters were Jewish, and they took advantage of [the amendment].''

Efforts to defraud the INS were widespread, officials said in internal memos.

''Category fraud is relatively easy to perpetrate,'' wrote Leonard Kovensky, INS director in Moscow, in a memo sent through Rome to Washington.

He said people showed up at INS offices with passports clearly indicating their family ties were all ethnic Russian, but by claiming ''one maternal grandmother was Jewish,'' they had to be offered visas.

''The leader of a Pentecostal group has informed INS that many of those scheduled as Pentecostals are not Pentecostals at all,'' Mr. Kovensky said. ''Many reliable sources have told us of a cottage industry which has sprung up which gives applicants classes on how to successfully pass their INS interview.''

A 1991 INS study showed ''a continued decline, indeed drastic decline, in the quality of refugee claims,'' according to an agency memo sent to Washington. Another study, in 1993, found that of 624 applying as refugees, ''only three cases would have qualified under worldwide standards, an approval rate of one half of one percent.''

Under the Lautenberg standards, ''ninety-one percent were approved, 4 percent were placed on hold and only 5 percent were denied.''

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, this confirms the very serious concerns I have always had about the program. According to the article, INS memorandums and other communications describe the fraud and abuse in the program which, after only 2 years, became a rubber stamp for admission to the United States as a refugee of almost any person in the former Soviet Union who ''claimed'' or asserted to be a Jew or Pentecostal or persecuted Evangelical, Christian or other category.

The startling part of it is, the article notes, by 1993 only about one-half of 1 percent of those entering the United States as refugees under the Lautenberg amendment actually have a well-

founded fear of persecution on account of their religion.

The problem is if the INS had the audacity, or perhaps the gumption, to deny even a small percentage of the applicants, the ''groups,'' the interest groups would continue to demand an ever more lenient consideration of these so-called refugee claims. The result of these demands is that we see a lower standard being applied to applicants for this very special program.

Mr. President, many of the persons being admitted under this amendment are excellent immigrants. They bring diversity to our immigrant flow, many are well educated, and will be productive members of our society. We all like to hear that. I do, too.

However, many others will require public assistance, some for the rest of their lives. We now know of situations where people will bring aged parents here and immediately place them on the public support system.

Still others, according to Hedges' article, are frauds, complete frauds who should not be here at all, or criminals. But the important point I want to make for my colleagues is that all of these persons enter as refugees. This means, and there is a tremendous difference between a refugee and an immigrant, this means they can receive not only Federal assistance with the costs of their airline tickets to come here, they will also receive special refugee cash and medical assistance after they arrive.

Further, there are private agencies that receive them at the airport and are paid $670 per person for each of these 40,000 to 50,000 so-called refugees who arrive every year under this program. Those are called R&P grants. I do not think the people of America even understand that there is $670 per person from the taxpayers to receive and place these people. R&P: reception and placement. They do not understand at all.

Occasionaly it was not even all expended—take in the refugees, place them, spend $150, $200 or $300, put the rest of the money in the account of their group. Congressman MAZZOLI and I broke up that playhouse some years ago, and I would like to think that does not occur anymore. But they would stockpile refugee funds because they did not need all that money.

People do not understand that part of it. This is, as I say, inside baseball. But I would trust my colleagues, particularly those who are conferees on the State Department reauthorization and reorganization bill, will insist on the Senate position and strike any provisions which would further extend this now thoroughly discredited program. Its original intent may have been met. It surely does not serve us well now.

And if you still do not believe it, then here is a figure for you. There are 40,000 people in the former Soviet Union who have been designated as refugees, presumed to be so under the Lautenberg amendment, who have not come yet. They are still there. They are ''arranging things.'' They have been there for 6 months or a year or longer because they are still searching for the best deal for themselves to stay, or to come as a refugee. How do you come in a way where the Federal Government of the United States pays you the most money to get you here.

But, ladies and gentlemen, you cannot be a refugee and then hang around in your country. A refugee is a refugee is a refugee. It means a person fleeing persecution, and it means immediate fear. It does not mean you wait around to decide whether to go to southern California at your pleasure. That is not a refugee. And if Americans cannot understand that, we will have more such Proposition 187's and all that goes with it.

Mr. President, I would certainly call upon the Attorney General to take a very hard, close look at this program. I would like to have a report from them, from the Attorney General, from the Justice Department, from the INS and from the State Department. And I know what it will likely be. Hopefully, we will be able to get some breath of reality into the situation. To ensure that, there is a very simple thing, and the simple thing is a screening program, a case-by-case screening, just exactly what was called for in the 1980 Refugee Act, and put it in Moscow or elsewhere to ensure that persons with criminal records are not entering our country as refugees under this discredited program because if this article is at all accurate, it is well apparent that this program requires the most careful scrutiny.

I will be speaking on it from time to time. It will rise apparently like a Phoenix, as it does, and then you are not supposed to come and say anything against it because then you are against refugees, and you are really quite a foul fellow, and that is not who I am. But we are going to deal with that. We are going to deal with it realistically because you either are a refugee or you are an immigrant. And if you are a refugee, it will be a case-by-case determination under the Refugee Act of 1980. And if you are really a refugee, can you really be one from the present Commonwealth of the Newly Independent States, the former Soviet Union, because these are our finest allies, our friends.

It is like someone said to me the other day: What are we going to do with refugees from Mexico? I said if that is where the debate has gone, then everybody has rocks in their head or wax in their ears. There are no refugees from Mexico. How can one be a refugee from Mexico, a democracy, our remarkable neighbor to our south.

So those are the twisted terms we get to play with in this particular arena, and I hope that we can at least for the American public's edification and clarity try to describe what those terms are and what a refugee really is. And it certainly cannot be presumed that there are 40,000 of them coming per year from the former Soviet Union. That makes no sense whatsoever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to yield myself 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the legislation before us. I have listened with some interest to the latest discussion here, particularly to the Senator from Maryland decrying the decision of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to withhold action on several items prior to this, that have been before this committee.

I am fairly new at this thing, my first year on this committee. I have, however, paid some attention to it, with years in the House watching. And I guess I am a little surprised at the conversation. I recall others talking about this idea of holding hostages. It seems to me that the other side of the aisle, apparently at the insistence of the President, has made a conscious effort to avoid moving forward with this State Department authorization bill that they promised to filibuster to death.

Time and time again we have read internal memos from the administration declaring their intent to stall the bill at any cost. I think my colleagues will recall the phrases they have used—obfuscate, derail, delay. I certainly would have liked to have seen some of the Ambassadors in their posts. We have them before my subcommittee. I was anxious that they go forward, partly because I thought they were very excellent candidates, partly because I think we ought to have someone there.

Of the 18 nominations, the majority were designated to serve in countries within the jurisdiction of my subcommittee, Eastern Asia and Pacific Affairs. Indonesia, the People's Republic of China, and APEC were without representation. But as important as these posts are, Mr. President, passing a State Department authorization was and is more important. Yet, the Senate was denied the opportunity to vote one way or another on the issue because it was held hostage by the Democrats.

I guess I was a little surprised at this last discussion that has been going on. Hostage takers, Mr. President? What about the senior Senator from Massachusetts who took over 2 hours to speak about the minimum wage debate during the course of considering this bill in an effort to stall it. What about the White House that refused to meet with the chairman to discuss a compromise position? What about the officials at AID who, rather than rationally discussing the bill and offering their alternatives, instead waged guerrilla warfare against any compromise?

These are the hostage takers, Mr. President, not the senior Senator from

North Carolina. The American people, who deserve a bureaucracy that is cost conscious and responsive to the times and streamlined, were held hostage.

I remind my Democrat friends that it is probably not useful to cast blame on who is holding whom hostage. As I mentioned, I am fairly new to this thing, but I have to observe that it appears many who are not new are very, very resistant to change, to even considering change in the way we have been doing things.

When you take a look at the results of some of the things we have done in terms of reorganization of the State Department, in terms of the operation of some of these units, we obviously need to make some changes. If you do not make some changes, there is no reason to expect different results.

So, Mr. President, I am very much in favor of this bill. I am very much in favor of the efforts that are being made here to assign some responsibility, to assign more accountability, to make this State Department just like the rest of the departments —more responsive, more efficient, more effective.

For the first time in almost everything we do here in the Federal Government, we are having an opportunity to analyze what they are doing and make some evaluations in terms of how these things are working in terms of some oversight. That is part of the job of this Congress.

But too often we get built in to what happened because it is what happened 10 or 15 years ago; it has always been that way, so we cannot change it. You know we cannot change it; just put some more money in, that probably will do it. That has been the notion.

That is what is unique and exciting and different about this Congress. We are having an opportunity to do some evaluating, to set some priorities, to make some changes, to cause things to be changed, to expect different results from what is happening.

So, Mr. President, I strongly support this bill. I hope Members of this Senate will vote affirmatively and we can move out of this hostage-taking mode that we have been in. You can assign the hostages to whomever you choose. I assign mine to the other side of the aisle in holding this bill hostage.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

Mr. HELMS. I yield such time as the Senator may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina, and I congratulate him on obtaining floor time for this bill and finally getting it to a point where it is going to pass. It really is an excellent initiative that deserves the support of the Senate and the House, and hopefully will end up being signed by the President. It has been a long time coming, as has been mentioned by a number of speakers, and it is long overdue.

We are, after all, almost 4 years into the post-cold-war period, and yet we still function with a State Department, an AID and ACDA organization, not to say anything of USAI and Voice of America, that are clearly creatures created and designed for responding to a worldwide ideological confrontation with the Soviet Union. As has been mentioned many times in this debate, that is no longer the case; and yet the momentum of those departments go forward as if it were the case, in many instances.

I come to this debate because I have the great good fortune to be, through no cause of my own, but luck basically, chairman of the Commerce-State-Justice Appropriations Committee, which basically must fund the ideas which come from the Foreign Relations Committee, which is so ably chaired by the Senator from North Carolina and so ably by such an able ranking member as the Senator from Rhode Island.

Therefore, as the person responsible for the appropriations activities relative to the State Department, I take seriously the proposals of the Foreign Relations Committee because they are obviously going to guide the actions of the appropriating committee. It is our intention and has been our intention as the Appropriations Committee to essentially support and work with the Foreign Relations Committee as they pursue and reform and reorganize the State Department.

I strongly support the basic concept which was created by, initiated by, and now has been instituted by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in his proposal as presented in this bill, which is essentially that the State Department, ACDA, and AID must rethink their roles, so that, hopefully, we will see a bringing together of these various agencies in a manner which will lead to a more efficient, focused, and effective delivery of their mission.

I happen to strongly be of the view, as I know the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is—really I am of this view in large measure because of the education which I received while being on the Foreign Relations Committee, at the feet of the chairman and the ranking member—I am of the view that we need to give the Secretary of State more control over these various agencies so that we have a more coordinated policy.

It is not a unique view, actually, held by Republicans only. It happens to be a view that at least initially was held by, I believe, the Secretary of State, and, I suspect, in the quiet of his office when he is not being confronted by the requirement of public policy positions pressed upon him by other members of the administration, he still agrees with that view and agrees with it strongly.

It was a view which, initially at least, was supported by the Vice President in his proposals for reinventing government; that is, that we should give the Secretary of State, the person who logically is the prime spokesman and policymaker on behalf of the President of the United States, the authority to manage the foreign policy of the country. That means the authority to manage two major agencies which now function as independent satellites of the Department and, in some cases, extraordinary satellites.

But this bill does not go so far as to direct how it is done precisely. Rather, I believe this bill takes the very logical approach of allowing the Department to report back and design a program which accomplishes the goals which I think are well set out, which is that more focus be given through the Secretary of State in controlling and managing the various functions of our international policy. Also, it proposes that in this exercise of reorganization we save some money, not a request which is illogical.

There is no question but that there is a great deal of overlap, there is a great deal of duplication, there is a great deal of atrophied agencies within these various departments which were produced and created for the purposes of addressing issues of the cold war and which are no longer serving a viable function and which, in many instances, could easily be reduced or at least consolidated in a manner which would deliver more efficiency and refocus them more effectively and which would save dollars.

The proposal which has come forward is to save, I think, $1.7 billion over, I believe, 7 years, if I am correct. And if I am not, I will be happy to stand corrected. I guess it is 5 years. I would note that this is not a reach. In fact, in the appropriations bill which was just recently passed by this Senate, we saved $500 million just in the year 1996; $65 million through rescissions, $435 million by reducing spending activities within these various departments.

So we are clearly on the path to this level of savings. In fact, when it was reported at the initial proposal, which the Vice President's group, I believe, was dealing with and which had been put forward by various members of the administration, it would save, I think, approximately $5 billion during this same timeframe. I was supportive of that number and happened to believe that number is an attainable number, $5 billion rather than the $1.7 billion which is in this authorization bill.

I hope as we move down the road toward this reorganization, that should this $1.7 billion become the number that is focused on or settled on, that the Department might even, in a gesture of good will, try to exceed that number and go closer to the $5 billion which was originally thought of.

I can tell you right now, at least at the appropriating level, we are going to be looking for numbers at a little higher level because we think it is certainly doable. But I strongly congratulate the chairman of the committee for having gotten us on the road to what I think is a long overdue, but very effective as presently proposed, attempt to reorganize departments which were designed

to address one issue, the cold war, and which now are not functioning effectively addressing a new issue, which is the world as we know it today.

Today when we think of the threats that confront this Nation and the issues of international policy, we should be thinking about things like population excesses and thinking about things like environmental concerns. We should be thinking about things like availability of food. We have to worry about ethnic conflicts, and we have to worry about religious conflicts—totally different issues of philosophy, totally different issues of real threat to our country or real threat to stability around the world than what we confronted under the regime of the cold war. Thus, we need to reinvent the agencies which address that, and in this bill the chairman and the Committee on Foreign Relations has taken a major stride toward doing just that.

So I congratulate the committee. I look forward to continuing to follow the guidance of the committee as we move forward in the appropriations process.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair. I am grateful to the chairman of the Subcommittee on State-Commerce-Justice appropriations, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, for his kind remarks. And I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, I had to take a telephone call on a very important matter involving North Carolina. But while I was talking, I heard Senator SARBANES. I like Senator SARBANES. I do not like everything he says. Sometimes he reminds me of a pregnant cobra, but I know he feels deeply what he has said, and I know he thinks it is correct. But the trouble is that it is not correct. I think Senator SARBANES, if he will forgive me, forgets that at the close of the Bush administration, the Democrats held up 12 ambassadors that President Bush had sent to the Senate. They were not given hearings. They were given no consideration for 6 months—6 months. They, frankly, said, ''We do not want any ambassadors appointed by a Republican President.''

So it is not exactly a novelty to hold up an ambassadorial nomination, or a group of them. But I know that Senator SARBANES did the best he could with his argument. But this business of fairness is in the eye of the beholder. You do the best you can in the Senate when you have a strong and effective opposition, such as Senator SARBANES. And, of course, it was Senator SARBANES who was micromanaging, to a certain extent, I believe, the negotiations between Senator KERRY and me. That is all right. I have no objection to that. Senator SARBANES has been around this Senate for a while, and he is entitled to be recognized for his seniority.

Now, President Clinton, let me remind anybody who heard Senator SARBANES' criticism that, just last week, after Senator KERRY and I reached our final agreement—and we reached a ''final'' agreement a number of times during these negotiations, but last week, when it was the final-final agreement, there came the White House saying, ''We have one little thing more we want to do.'' It was the White House, do you not see, Mr. President, that held the ambassadors hostage because they delayed any action on negotiations because they wanted to include a guarantee that a nominee to the Environmental Protection Agency be confirmed by the Senate in order for this agreement between Senator KERRY and me to occur. Well, I said, ''I have nothing to do with that nomination, and I will defer to the majority leader.'' I think they worked it out with Mr. DASCHLE and others.

Now, let me say again that I was ready at any time—and I said so repeatedly—to have a vote. I did not ask to be assured of this or that; just let the Senate vote. Senator SARBANES was unyielding on that. He did not do so publicly, but he was unyielding that I was not going to get a vote because, as he has said, he does not like this bill. He thinks we are not spending enough money on the foreign policy apparatus as it is. He is in contradiction of the opinion of the American people, who pay the taxes. Senator SARBANES and I only pay a small part. But the people who pay the bulk of it do not agree with him, and maybe they do not agree with me. I do not have any pull one way or another.

I suppose it ought to be said, in all fairness, that there are good ambassadors and there are some who are not so good. Various Senators have had various experiences with how embassies are not run by the ambassadors but are run by the ambassador's assistant. I have about reached the point that I wonder if having an Ambassador in Paris is essential, because is it not an anachronism in a day when we have such instant communication. When we sent Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson over to Paris, they had to go over on a ship, and they had to understand the administration's policy on this, that, and the other. But I do not think that the relations with China went to pot because Jim Sasser was held up. Somebody said that Jim Sasser is a nice guy and he was a good Senator. I like him and all that. But U.S. relations with Beijing did not go to pot because Jim Sasser was not over there. As a matter of fact, somebody commented that China was making a number of concessions while we had no Ambassador.

So it is OK to take a hit at HELMS. I am used to it, but those taking the hit better look at the history of what both parties have done when they have been in the majority.

Now, I confess that I may be the first chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee who does not really care what the editors of the New York Times feels about foreign policy. I do not run to the Washington Post to say, ''Please, is this all right?'' I try to use my own instincts and try to base my judgments on what I think the American people want in terms of decisions.

If Senator SARBANES does not like that, that is fine. The Council on Foreign Relations is not going to run the Foreign Relations Committee as long as I am chairman of it. I say that with all due respect to the organization.

As far as letters inserted in the RECORD, I could put 50 pages of letters into the RECORD right now, Mr. President, from people all over the country, who have written to me and said, ''Jesse, hang in there.'' So we can all play that game and insert letters from lots of organizations. I can insert letters from businessmen, who say, ''You are doing the right thing.'' So it is a matter of opinion. Some of it may be partisan, some of it may not be.

I do not know that it is entirely useful to excoriate another Senator with whom you disagree. I say again, I like PAUL SARBANES, and I thought our relationship was better than it apparently is. Foreign Service officers and ambassadors are expressing strong, unequivocal support for this bill.

So I do not want to hear all this ''moaning and puking,'' as Shakespeare put it, about how we are tromping on the Foreign Service. I have not done it, and I am not going to do it. They have been some of the loudest advocates of the reorganization of the State Department. Five former Secretaries of State have said this is a great piece of legislation. They helped us with various points on it. Warren Christopher went down and tried to sell it to AL GORE, who was busily announcing in press release after press release that he was going to ''reinvent'' Government.

So it is time we stopped talking and start doing something. I am not going to go any further. I think enough has been said on that.

END STRENGTHS

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, section 141 of the bill deals with end strengths for the Foreign Service and the Senior Foreign Service in the State Department, USIA, and AID. We had similar language in the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994–95. However, the end strengths in section 141 of this bill are based on the original consolidation language which would have abolished AID, USIA, and ACDA, rather than the new language we have agreed upon. We addressed this problem in part in the managers amendment by deleting subsections (c) and (d) of section 141. However, to be consistent with the new consolidation approach, we need to revise the end strengths in subsections (a) and (b).

Mr. President, I would ask the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee if he is willing to work with me to correct this problem in conference?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am prepared to do that. So the numbers reflect the intent of the conference report.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the chairman.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I understand that a colloquy was entered into earlier, which I believe misstates the legal status of a provision in this bill. May I inquire of the Democratic manager, who determines the validity of a claim submitted under section 604(a) relating to Iraq claims?

Mr. KERRY. It is my understanding that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission determines the validity of all claims submitted to it regardless of past litigation.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I will be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, under section 604(b), I understand that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is authorized to receive and determine the validity of claims of United States persons against the Government of Iraq and its instrumentalities. May I assume that claims which have been reduced to judgment in Federal district court are valid?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, yes. A judgment obtained in Federal district court will be considered a valid claim. Clearly there could be no more valid claim than a judgment received through the adjudication process.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, may I further assume that such judgments and their amounts, having been certified as valid, will receive expedited processing for payment?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, yes. It is our expectation that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission will establish an expedited procedure to pay such claims, given that their validity is not in question.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina and appreciate his management of this bill.

EXPROPRIATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I wish to discuss with the distinguished manager, the senior Senator from North Carolina, section 168 of S. 908. First, I want to commend the Senator for his leadership on behalf of all U.S. citizens who have suffered expropriations throughout the world. The Senator has been a great champion for these Americans whose rights have been trampled by foreign governments.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for her kind words, and I am happy to discuss section 168 of S. 908 with her. Section 168 would exclude from the United States aliens who have expropriated U.S. property or who traffick in such property. As the Senator knows, this provision has been deleted from the pending bill at Senator DODD'S request because it is included in the House-passed version of H.R. 927, and he would prefer that it be addressed in that bill. Senate conferees will be named for H.R. 927 immediately upon Senate passage of S. 908.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I have been trying to help resolve an egregious expropriation executed by the Dominican Republic's military against Western Energy, Inc. Western Energy is headquartered in my State and operated an important liquid petroleum gas facility in the Dominican Republic until the military took over in April 1994.

Our Ambassador to the Dominican Republic should be commended for her efforts to resolve the expropriation suffered by Western Energy. The names of the persons involved are well known because the case is prominent and, I am told, has caused great outrage and shame over the Government's action. Would my distinguished colleague join me in encouraging the U.S. Ambassador to inform the affected persons that promptly upon enactment of section 168 in H.R. 927 they will be excluded from the United States until the Western Energy case is satisfactorily resolved?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, section 168 reflects the frustration with the lack of progress in resolving property claims, especially in the Western Hemisphere. The Dominican Republic is among the worst offenders, and the distinguished Senator from Texas can count on my support.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I intend to vote against the State Department authorization bill and I want to briefly explain why. But before I do, I want to commend the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY, for the herculean efforts he made to resolve an impasse that has prevented confirmation of over a dozen American ambassadors as well as Senate ratification of the Start II treaty.

Senator KERRY believes, as I do, that the foreign policy apparatus of this country needs reform. There is duplication, lack of coordination, and money has been wasted. I know the compromise we are voting on today reflects his best effort to address these problems, without doing grievous damage to the agencies that administer foreign policy.

But while I commend Senator KERRY for the thankless job of bringing to closure the tedious and often acrimonious negotiations over this legislation, I will vote against this bill because I do not believe that blackmail should be rewarded in the U.S. Senate. I will also vote no because although this managers' amendment is a significant improvement over the bill as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, I believe it will weaken U.S. diplomacy, not strengthen it.

Senator SARBANES has spoken eloquently on this and I want to associate myself with his remarks. What we have seen is the immobilization of the Foreign Relations Committee for the better part of this year. The fact that there has not been a foreign aid authorization bill since the mid-1980's has not made any difference. But the committee does have certain important responsibilities, including ambassadorial nominations and reporting treaties for ratification.

I could list any number of Foreign Service officers who serve this country every day with incredible professionalism and bravery. Yet because the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee could not force the Senate to support his effort to eviscerate portions of the foreign policy apparatus of the U.S. Government, he refused to permit the committee to carry out functions that are crucial to this country. It has caused countless problems for both American foreign policy, and American citizens who have needed assistance overseas.

There are other problems with this bill which do not merit our support. It contains authorization levels that will cause grave problems for U.S. leadership and U.S. representation overseas. It requires deep cuts in the operating expenses of the foreign policy agencies, including U.S. AID, in our contributions to the United Nations, and in our foreign exchange programs.

In conference, it is a virtual certainty that the bill will get worse, not better. Senator SARBANES has already pointed out that the same people who favor slashing resources for diplomacy voted to add $7 billion to the defense budget, over and above the quarter of a trillion dollars requested. This entire bill authorizes less than that increase to the defense bill.

Senator KERRY'S efforts resulted in significant improvements in the bill that was originally reported by the committee. I also want to say that I do not question the motives of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I agree with his goal to cut the cost of these agencies, and to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy. They need streamlining. But I cannot agree with these methods.

I vote to reject them, not reward them.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, as chair of the International Operations Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over the issues contained in the legislation, I rise in support of this bill.

It is regrettable that this bill is coming up today with a managers' amendment drafted by Senate Democrats that will have the effect of undoing the Foreign Relations Committee's main work on this legislation. Lacking a sufficent level of support to actually make these changes by a majority vote, the Senate minority has insisted in changes in this bill that could not pass under normal legislative procedures.

Although a freshman Senator, I have more than a decade of experience with these issues. I have worked on the State Department authorization bill

since 1985, when I became ranking member of the House International Operations Subcommittee. Continuing this role in the Senate, this is the sixth State Department authorization process in which I have served as a Republican manager of the legislation.

I would like to thank the chairman of the full committee, Senator HELMS, for his perseverance with this legislation. That we have this bill back before the Senate today is in large part due to his stalwart support of the legislative process.

I would like to also thank the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator PELL, for his graciousness, comity, and belief in the legislative process. I would note that Senator PELL—the former chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—was the only member of the other party to support cloture when this bill was last before the Senate on August 1. This kind of steadfast support for the role of the authorizing committees will be sorely missed in the Senate after his retirement next year.

I would also like to thank the majority leader for his strong support for this bill, and the other Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee for their votes and their support when it was most critically needed.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the work of the staff, particularly the committee's staff director, Adm. Bud Nance. He has brought dedication and integrity to every aspect of his efforts, and he has greatly assisted the work of the committee.

The bill before us today authorizes the budget and operations of the foreign affairs agencies, establishes policies for our participation in international organizations, and strengthens U.S. standards for our participation in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

As reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee, this bill would have implemented an innovative restructuring plan first proposed at the beginning of this year by Secretary of State Warren Christopher. I note with regret that this is no longer the case. The original version of this bill would have terminated three independent foreign affairs agencies, and achieved $3 billion in savings over four years by consolidating the functions carried out by those agencies into the Department of State. The three independent foreign affairs agencies are: the U.S. Information Agency, which deals with the public relations aspects of our foreign policy; the Agency for International Development, which runs our foreign assistance programs; and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which conducts diplomatic activities related to arms control and nonproliferation.

This bill no longer explicitly requires bringing under the direct control of the Secretary of State the activities of these three existing independent agencies. The bill, however, does mandate to the President that he achieve over five years $1.7 billion in savings at least 70% of which must come from the elimination of duplication and bureaucratic downsizing.

This is less than half of the savings contained in the committee bill, and about $500 million less in savings from Senator KERRY's own amendment that failed to pass during committee markup. I would also note that at committee Senator KERRY proposed the mandatory elimination of at least one agency, at the President's discretion. As I mentioned, this bill, with passage of the Kerry managers' amendment, no longer requires the consolidation of any agencies into the Department of State.

To any who believe that the bill's original $3 billion in savings over four years is excessive, or even the current $1.7 billion in savings over five years, I would to point out that on January 26 Vice President Gore issued a press release announcing the second phase of the ''National Performance Review.'' That press release announced, and I quote:

> It is anticipated that the overall review of international affairs programs and agencies will result in savings of at least $5 billion over 5 years and a substantially enhanced capacity to deliver more effective programs overseas and provide value to the American taxpayer.

The problem is that now, 11 months later, the Vice President still has not presented his plan for saving $5 billion over 5 years through restructuring and consolidation of our foreign affairs agencies. In fact, the Administration has refused to even present to Congress its normal legislative request for the foreign affairs agencies. And that is the first time this has happened in the 10 years I have worked on this legislation.

So in the absence of any positive Administration proposal, all we are mandating in this bill is that the Administration develop and implement a proposal for saving $1.7 billion over 5 years, not the $5 billion over 5 years that the Vice President promised at the beginning of this year. Frankly, I believe that we can do more, and the original bill did do more. But at least this is a first step toward that goal.

I hope that once the President is forced to begin looking at even this modest level of bureaucratic downsizing, even this Administration will recognize the wisdom of Secretary Christopher's original plan for consolidating the functions of all three independent foreign affairs agencies into the Department of State. Let me just give a small example of the reasons why the original consolidation would improve the formulation and conduct of American foreign policy.

On October 12 my office received a State Department inspector general report that reviewed the activities of the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs. That report discusses efforts to identify and eliminate redundancies between this State Department bureau and ACDA.

This is an effort that we should certainly all applaud, but without a formal consolidation between the two entities, a total elimination of duplication would either deprive the Secretary of State of any expertise over arms control issues, or rob ACDA of any diplomatic capabilities to conduct sensitive arms control negotiations. It would further isolate important arms control and nonproliferation considerations from the formulation of American foreign policy. Or, in the words of the State Department inspector general:

> If [the State Department] were to relinquish a significant portion of its nonproliferation functions, the overall effects could be counterproductive.

This is a perfect illustration why merging the functions of these three independent agencies into the Department of State is needed not just to save money, but to improve the flexibility and coordination of American foreign policy in the post-cold-war era.

And this is not just my own opinion, the opinion of Chairman HELMS, or the collective opinion of the other body, which has included Christopher's consolidation plan in its own State Department authorization bill. This consolidation proposal is also supported by five former Secretaries of State and two former National Security Advisers.

Mr. President, I would like to now discuss the reason for their support.

The world has changed dramatically in the last decade, and with it the demands on our foreign policy structure. Gone is the cold war—and the certainty of a single opposing force in our foreign relations. Gone, too, is the highly focused foreign policy we once waged against an expansionist and authoritarian Soviet Union and its satellites.

We face a new imperative: to maintain a strong and aggressive foreign policy, while streamlining our operations, achieving cost savings, and meeting the new criteria of a changing world. Consolidation among our foreign affairs agencies is an idea whose time has come.

In the aftermath of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the reigniting of ethnic strife that had been kept bottled up by the cold war, we live in a new world. But it is not necessarily a safer world. The reason five former Secretaries of State support this concept is the need to integrate the important public diplomacy, arms control, and foreign assistance aspects of American foreign policy into our basic policy formulation process.

For example, currently the independent Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is primarily responsible for nonproliferation policy. But concerns about nuclear proliferation frame our relations with a range of countries around the world, from North Korea, to Pakistan, to Iran. It would enhance, not detract, from this important goal of American foreign policy for it to be integrated into the policy formulation

process at State. It is far too important to be an afterthought considered only later in the interagency process.

And by better coordinating public diplomacy with policy, we can directly benefit the conduct of our Nation's foreign relations. Public relations play an increasingly important role in a world that is increasingly democratic. But currently, our public diplomacy expertise rests in the independent U.S. Information Agency. Does it enhance the formulation of American foreign policy to consider its impact on world public opinion only after the fact?

Similarly, there is a great need to more closely tie our foreign assistance programs to policy goals intended to directly advance our national interests. And there is a desperate need to cut back on AID's huge administrative structure that today consumes vast amounts of our humanitarian and developmental aid funds.

Out of a $2.3 billion developmental aid account, AID spends $600 million on its formal operating expenses account. This is 25 cents for every developmental dollar. But in reality, AID's administrative costs are much higher because AID's formal operating expenses only count 5,000 out of its 9,000 employees worldwide. The missing 4,000 are AID contract employees who are paid out of program funds, not operating expenses.

There are other important aspects to this legislation. The bill contains many management improvements sought by the administration. I regret that what State Department initiatives are included in this bill had to come to us informally, as the administration even to this day has refused to submit a formal legislative request.

The bill also puts into permanent law many of the international peacekeeping reforms that were first enacted in our last bill.

Let me also briefly mention a few of the initiatives I have included in this bill.

I have included the text of the Terrorist Exclusion Act, which I first introduced in the House 2 years ago, and which I have reintroduced this year with Senator BROWN as my original cosponsor. This provision will restore the pre-1990 standard allowing denial of a U.S. visa for membership in a terrorist group.

Another provision would codify existing embassy visa terrorist lookout committees. These committees were established by the State Department in 1993 under the Visas Viper Program. However, recent GAO and IG reports indicate that these committees have become moribund. My provision would require the terrorist lookout committees to meet regularly and become more active.

I have also included the requirement for two GAO studies. One would look at the extent to which the activities of four long-standing grantees duplicate activities carried out by the U.S. Government. These groups are the Asia Foundation, the East-West Center, the North-South Center, and the National Endowment for Democracy.

A second study would look at the question of whether the North-South Center used U.S. funds to engage in improper lobbying effort in support of the North American Free Trade Agreement. I am particularly concerned about a publication the Center sent to Members of Congress during the NAFTA debate, entitled ''Assessment of the North American Free Trade Agreement.''

Mr. President, as I have expressed in the past, I know that there has been a great deal of anxiety among the dedicated, hard-working employees of our foreign affairs agencies. That concern comes not just over this bill, but over the generally recognized need to downsize our Federal work force as we move to a balanced budget. I believe that all of us need to do everything we can to remember the human dimension of what we are trying to achieve.

This bill contains broad early retirement and buyout authorities, and we have taken every step we know how to take to make the transition as easy as possible to a streamlined foreign policy structure. This bill also gives the President extraordinary authority to formulate his own transition plan, limited only by the bill's mandated savings target.

Mr. President, the bill before us is an important bill, and I hope that in conference it will become even better. The Foreign Relations Revitalization Act gives credit to our Chairman, to our committee, and to all of the Senators who have supported it since its inception.

I urge its adoption, and I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I want to lend my support to the compromise version of S. 908, the State Department Authorization bill.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator HELMS, and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY, and their staffs, for the many hours they devoted to the long, hard negotiations that were necessary to reach this compromise.

In particular, I want to recognize the efforts of the Senator from Massachusetts. He inherited a difficult, perhaps even thankless, task, and pursued it with his usual diligence, dedication, and wisdom. He had to balance the concerns of many of his colleagues, and of the Administration, while negotiating a very controversial bill. I believe the consolidation compromise he has struck with the Chairman is a good one, a workable one, and a fair one. I want to thank him for his efforts and commend him for his work.

The plan that emerged from the negotiations is a reasonable one. It requires the Administration to submit a plan to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies, but it gives them flexibility to decide how to do so effectively and responsibly.

They are tough standards that the Administration must meet. Within six months they must submit a reorganization plan to the Congress which achieves $1.7 billion in savings over five years. If Congress deems the plan to be unsatisfactory, we can pass a resolution of disapproval and force the Administration to submit a more acceptable plan.

But most importantly, the compromise does not require the Administration to eliminate USAID, USIA, or ACDA. They may decide to do so. But this bill gives the Administration an opportunity to figure out a way to achieve real savings and reform, without necessarily abolishing three valuable agencies that do important work: development and disaster assistance, negotiating and monitoring of arms control agreements, and international broadcasting and exchanges. This flexibility is the key.

The passage of this bill today will produce some other positive developments, many of them long overdue. With the disposition of S. 908, the Senate will be able to confirm 18 ambassadorial nominations and hundreds of foreign service officer promotions. We will also be able to consider the START II treaty before the end of this session, and the Chemical Weapons Convention in the spring.

Of all embassies that are waiting for ambassadors, I think none is more important than the one in Beijing, China, where our former colleague, James Sasser, will become United States Ambassador. I am confident that our country will be well served by the job that he, and the other nominees, will do in their new posts.

Finally, I do want to note that even with the consolidation compromise, there remain a number of provisions in S. 908 that I find deeply troubling. Several of them have to do with China.

Section 606 declares that the Taiwan Relations Act should supersede the three U.S.-China joint communiques as the basis of U.S. policy toward China and Taiwan.

Section 608 calls Tibet an ''occupied sovereign country, and Section 609 requires that the President appoint a Special Envoy for Tibet.

Section 415 requires USIA to submit a plan to create a Radio Free Asia.

Section 611 erects an unnecessarily labyrinthine procedure for screening products that may have been produced by forced labor in China.

These provisions and others combine to create an unnecessary provocation in our relationship with China, at a time when the relationship is still recovering from a recent crisis. They threaten to undermine our One China Policy, which is the basis of the relationship, and to exacerbate tensions when we should be trying to ease tensions.

I look forward to working with my colleagues who will serve on the House-Senate conference on this bill, with the goal of removing or rewriting these provisions. I consider the successful resolution of these matters to be critical to my consideration of whether or

not to support the conference report on this bill.

I am also hopeful that the consolidation plan will not be modified in conference. I am aware that the plan in the House bill does require the elimination of USAID, USIA, and ACDA. If the Senate compromise agreement is substantially altered in conference to reflect the more draconian House plan, it will be difficult, if not impossible for me to support the conference report.

Having said that, I believe it is important to get the State Department Authorization bill to conference, and I intend to support the bill today.

Mr. HELMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have just been informed that the Acting Secretary of State has taken an action that seemed to me to be a direct affront to the Foreign Relations Committee and to the future of relations between the United States and Taiwan, the Republic of China. The Acting Secretary has just named three men to sit on the board of the American Institute in Taiwan, under a procedure that is not normal. Under a longstanding agreement between the Department of State and the committee, specifically between the then-chairman of the committee, Mr. Church, and then-Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, the Department of State is to notify the committee of appointments to the board. Under the terms of the agreement, the committee is to be able to voice its concerns about any of these appointments and these concerns are to be satisfied before the Department proceeds with the appointments. Today, the Acting Secretary of State abrogated that agreement, in my judgment. Now, since 1979, the committee's role in the appointment process was that the committee could have an opportunity to voice its concerns about any individuals appointed to the board of the American Institute in Taiwan, our de facto embassy. We do not recognize Taiwan as a nation. I think we should, speaking as one Senator, but we do not. The American Institute in Taiwan is our de facto embassy.

These concerns were to have been worked out through the department before the appointees are identified. I have just been informed that the department has proceeded with three appointments the day before the committee was scheduled to meet these gentlemen, for the first time. Mr. President, this action, I believe, is an especially strong affront in light of the fact that this very week the Department of State is receiving confirmation of 18 of its ambassadorial appointees and four Foreign Service officer promotion lists.

I am astounded by this decision and have determined that the committee will hold a hearing on the role of the American Institute in Taiwan at which we will compare its role today to the role agreed to previously when it was established in the late 1970's or early 1980's, whenever it was.

AMENDMENT NO. 3100

(Purpose: To authorize the transmittal of a reorganization plan or plans streamlining and consolidating the Department of State and the independent foreign affairs agencies, to make technical amendments to the bill, and for other purposes)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] for himself and Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment numbered 3100.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this amendment has been agreed to on both sides.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, let me just clarify with the Senator, it is my understanding the amendment is pending.

Mr. HELMS. Yes.

Mr. KERRY. With the amendment pending, once accepted, the order of business will be to pass the bill and immediately subsequent to the bill being passed we will proceed to the Ambassadors, is that correct?

Mr. HELMS. That is correct.

Mr. KERRY. How much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 54 minutes and 45 seconds, and the Senator from North Carolina has 39 minutes and 44 seconds.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I see two Senators on my side who are on their feet. We would like to yield back some time.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield 2 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. I ask that 5 minutes be yielded to me.

Mr. KERRY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I listened with interest in the Cloakroom to my friend from North Carolina and what he had to say in response to the Senator from Maryland. The Senator from Maryland can surely take care of himself and respond in any way he thinks is appropriate, but at one point we all say things that we sort of slip and say and do not mean.

He made reference to our nominee to China, former Senator SASSER as ''needing a job.'' I inform the Senator that not only does Senator SASSER not need a job, he is doing financially much better now than he did when he was here. He needs no job. This is a public service to which he has agreed to return, and I am sure the Senator did not mean to imply anything by what he said, but I want the RECORD to make it clear. Senator SASSER does not need a job—it is for those of us, including the President, who think we need Senator SASSER to come back to public service. I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I listened with a great deal of interest to the Senator from North Carolina.

First of all, let me say that in the last 6 months of the Bush administration we confirmed 63 ambassadorial nominees. The Senator said there were 12 that were not confirmed. So that would be 63 out of 75, which is 84 percent.

The Senator has allowed no ambassadors to be confirmed—not 10 percent, not 20 percent, not 40 percent, not 60 percent, not 80 percent, not 84 percent. None. None at all.

Some of the nominees that were not confirmed at the end of the Bush administration were not ambassadorial nominees, but nominees to commissions and boards. In any event, the Senator said there were 12 that were not confirmed. Sixty-three were confirmed over the last 6 months of the Bush administration, 84 percent.

The Senator from North Carolina has held everyone hostage. He will not allow any of them to go through, even though we have very important national interests with respect thereto.

The Senator was given two votes in the Senate in trying to get to his reorganization bill—votes of 54 to 45. The Senate refused to invoke cloture and to go to that legislation. Having been thwarted in that sense, the Senator then set out on his hostage strategy and held up the ambassadors and held up the treaties, in my view putting at risk very important national security interests.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column from the Arms Control Association newsletter following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, in that newsletter it says:

Prompt Senate approval of START II—the treaty that would reduce the Russian strategic threat to the United States from some 8,000 to 3,500 nuclear warheads—is becoming increasingly doubtful despite overwhelming bipartisan congressional support. Senator JESSE HELMS (R-NC), asserting his power as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is holding this important treaty, as well as the Chemical Weapons Convention, hostage to passage of unrelated legislation. Failure to complete Senate action promptly could delay for years the entry into force of these agreements with great disadvantage to U.S. security.

And I underscore that concluding phrase ''with great disadvantage to U.S. security.''

Finally, I say to my colleague from North Carolina that, as chairman of the committee, it seems to me, the Senator has certain responsibilities. To hold the balance of the work of a committee hostage because the Senator has not been able to get his way on a particular piece of legislation is not a very efficient way to carry out the work of the committee.

Obviously, it was a tactic used to heighten pressure, in a sense, a coercive tactic. And I very much regret that it occurred.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Arms Control Today, Oct. 1995]

HOLDING U.S. SECURITY HOSTAGE

(By Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr.)

Prompt Senate approval of START II—the treaty that would reduce the Russian strategic threat to the United States from some 8,000 to 3,500 nuclear warheads—is becoming increasingly doubtful despite overwhelming bipartisan congressional support. Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC), asserting his power as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is holding this important treaty, as well as the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), hostage to passage of unrelated legislation. Failure to complete Senate action promptly could delay for years the entry into force of these agreements with great disadvantage to U.S. security.

By refusing to schedule any meetings, Helms has stopped all action before his committee in an effort to force the administration to accept his plan to integrate into the State Department three independent agencies, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), the Agency for International Development and the U.S. Information Agency. Senate approval of START II, which Helms has not opposed, could be obtained with little or no opposition as soon as a formal committee markup of the resolution of approval can be scheduled. But until Helms relents, the United States cannot demonstrate to Russia and the world its support for reductions in strategic nuclear forces.

The multilateral CWC, which will ban development, production and stockpiling of chemical warfare agents as well as their use, may require a final hearing to resolve some questions. But, under the able leadership of Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN), the necessary resolution of approval should be easily obtained. Because many countries are awaiting U.S. ratification, Senate inaction prevents the early entry into force of this agreement, which universally bans possession and use of the ''poor man's nuclear weapon.''

Senator Helms is reportedly willing to reduce the ransom to only two of the three threatened agencies with the choice left to the administration. The White House has properly declined to bargain with hostage-takers and vowed not to yield on this issue. However, the longer this standoff lasts, the less likely any action will occur in time to influence favorable Russian action on either treaty.

The prospects for START II ratification in the Russian Parliament are much more precarious than in the U.S. Senate, notwithstanding Helms' maneuvering. A narrow window of opportunity for action appears to exist for the next month or two before the Russian Parliament adjourns to prepare for mid-December elections. While the makeup of the next Parliament cannot be predicted, it may well be even more nationalistic and more hostile than the present body to proposed NATO expansion, military action against the Bosnian Serbs and reduced U.S. economic support.

President Boris Yeltsin has strongly endorsed START II, subject only to the condition that the ABM Treaty remain in force. Although members of the Russian Parliament have attacked the agreement as biased against Russia, support for the agreement from the Russian military has helped counter much of the criticism. The military recognizes that it does not need and cannot afford its current strategic force structure and appreciates the value of maintaining strategic parity with the United States. Faced with a more nationalistic Parliament and U.S. endorsement of a national ABM system, the Russian military cannot be expected to carry the torch for START II into the post-Yeltsin era.

Delay invites unanticipated, disruptive events to intervene. Progress on a comprehensive test ban was interrupted by external events in the Eisenhower, Kennedy and Carter administrations. START I was signed by President George Bush in July 1991, but entry into force was delayed until December 1994. START II, signed by Bush in January 1993, has been delayed first by the problem of resolving the nuclear status of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine, and now by the actions of a single cantankerous senator. A future Russian Parliament may be the next barrier. But Russia's uncertain future is all the more reason to move promptly to pin down these gains for U.S. and international security before unanticipated events make START II's entry into force impossible.

These truly bipartisan treaties, which were negotiated and signed by former President Bush and nurtured by the Clinton administration, must not be casually sacrificed as hostages in guerilla political warfare. The Senate Republican leadership has a clear obligation to persuade Helms to release them without further delay so the Senate can perform its constitutional role in foreign policy. If the Republican leadership acquiesces in this exhibition of irresponsible personal politics, it will not only have relinquished its deserved share of credit for the treaties, but it will have to accept responsibility for this blow to U.S. security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time if Senator KERRY could yield back his.

This back and forth like two sore-tailed cats in a room full of rocking chairs is not serving the Senate well, and I do not intend to participate in it any further. And I am a little bit sorry that I did at all.

But I accept the Senator's criticism. I know how he feels, and he knows how I feel, too.

So, tentatively, I yield the remainder of my time pending whether Senator KERRY yields his back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Senator HELMS yielded back his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has indicated that he is prepared to yield back the remainder of his time pending the decision on the part of the Senator from Massachusetts to do so as well.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I believe the business before the Senate is the amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HELMS. I believe it is understood between us that this will be approved on a voice vote. Is that correct?

Mr. KERRY. Yes.

Mr. HELMS. I ask the Chair to put the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment (No. 3100) was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. HELMS. I thought I had yielded mine back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is now yielded back.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Foreign Relations Committee is discharged from the consideration of the House companion bill, H.R. 1561.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce authorization for appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all after the enacting clause is stricken, the text of S. 908, as amended, is inserted in lieu thereof, and the bill is considered read a third time.

The question now occurs on passage of H.R. 1561, as amended.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 605 Leg.]

YEAS—82

Abraham	Exon	Lugar
Akaka	Faircloth	Mack
Ashcroft	Feingold	McCain
Baucus	Feinstein	McConnell
Bennett	Ford	Mikulski
Bingaman	Frist	Murkowski
Bond	Glenn	Nickles
Boxer	Gorton	Nunn
Bradley	Graham	Pell
Breaux	Grams	Pressler
Brown	Grassley	Pryor
Bryan	Gregg	Robb
Burns	Hatch	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hatfield	Roth
Campbell	Heflin	Santorum
Chafee	Helms	Shelby
Coats	Hollings	Simpson
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Cohen	Inhofe	Snowe
Conrad	Inouye	Specter
Coverdell	Jeffords	Stevens
Craig	Kassebaum	Thomas
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thompson
Daschle	Kerrey	Thurmond
DeWine	Kerry	Warner
Dole	Kohl	Wellstone
Domenici	Kyl	
Dorgan	Lott	

NAYS—16

Biden	Lautenberg	Murray
Bumpers	Leahy	Reid
Dodd	Levin	Sarbanes
Harkin	Lieberman	Simon
Johnston	Moseley-Braun	
Kennedy	Moynihan	

NOT VOTING—1

Gramm

So the bill (H.R. 1561), as amended, was agreed to.

(The text of the bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, S. 908 is indefinitely postponed.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I do not see the distinguished Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] in the Chamber, but I wish to thank her for her unwavering commitment to seeing this reorganization bill through to this point.

In fact, all of the Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee have stood in unison throughout, from the very beginning, in support of this bill.

I wish to pay my respects to Admiral Nance, the chief of staff of the Foreign Relations Committee; Steve Berry and Elizabeth Lambird, Chris Walker, and Kristin Peck and, as always, the able floor staff for their help, Elizabeth Greene and the rest.

I thank Senator KERRY for his cooperation in these difficult times the past few weeks, and I especially thank his staff person, Nancy Stetson, for her continued work on this bill.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the other day when we completed the unanimous-consent agreements, I took the time to thank each of the staff. I would simply thank the distinguished chairman for his comments right now and for his expression of gratitude to my staff, and he knows I have reciprocated, joined with him in thanking all of them for a job well done.

I thank the Chair.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to executive session to consider en bloc the nominations listed in the order of December 7, 1995; that the nominations be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate return to legislative session.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A. Peter Burleigh, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Maldives.

Sandra J. Kristoff, of Virginia, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as U.S. Coordinator for Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC).

John Raymond Malott, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malaysia.

Kenneth Michael Quinn, of Iowa, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

William H. Itoh, of New Mexico, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand.

Frances D. Cook, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Sultanate of Oman.

J. Stapleton Roy, of Pennsylvania, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia.

Thomas W. Simons, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Richard Henry Jones, of Nebraska, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

James Franklin Collins, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador at Large and Special Advisor to the Secretary of State for the New Independent States.

Charles H. Twining, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cameroon.

Charles H. Twining, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Equatorial Guinea.

James A. Joseph, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

Don Lee Gevirtz, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Nauru, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Tonga, and Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Tuvalu.

Joan M. Plaisted, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kiribati.

Jim Sasser, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China.

David P. Rawson, of Michigan, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali.

Gerald Wesley Scott, of Oklahoma, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of The Gambia.

Robert E. Gribbin III, of Alabama, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic Rwanda.

Foreign Service nominations beginning Robert S. Gelbard, and ending Sandra L. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 5, 1995.

Foreign Service nominations beginning Paula O. Goddard, and ending Michael Ranneberger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSINAL RECORD of September 5, 1995.

Foreign Service nominations beginning Carol A. Peasely, and ending Sarah S. Olds, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 22, 1995.