the fact that the President of the United States would waive that provision of the law and we would hear about it not by his notifying Congress, but through the Turkish foreign minister.

Recently, Turkey occupied islands that have long been conceded as belonging to Greece, upping the tension between our allies, Greece and Turkey, for reasons beyond comprehension, and most egregiously.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Kurdish minority in Turkey continues to be repressed by the government of that country. There were 713 applications for treatment of torture by the Human Rights Foundation in Turkey just last year. Torture continues to be a process used by the Turkish Government throughout the country, particularly in respect to the Kurdish minority. As many as 2 million people have left their homes in the southeast—these are Kurdish peoples—over the past 7 years and have been made refugees in their own country; 2,200 villages in the southeast have been destroyed by Turkish military troops. During the last year, 1,443 publications were confiscated on court order, most pro-Kurdish publications.

Mr. Speaker, Turkey most recently tried and convicted its leading author, and what was he convicted of? He was convicted of speaking out against the policy of the Turkish Government to use violence only against its huge Kurdish minority of 15 to 20 million people, instead of sitting down at the table and negotiating with them to resolve differences and to guarantee their rights.

Mr. Speaker, government agents have harassed human rights monitors as well as lawyers and doctors involved in documenting human rights violations. Some of them reported death threats. A number of monitors have been aggressively prosecuted by the Government of Turkey. The government gave an 8-year sentence to their leading author, Yasif Kamal, and they then said that they would not impose the sentence if he would cease criticizing the government for its policy against the Kurdish people, an obvious act of censorship by the government on a person speaking out against human rights abuses that are among the most egregious in the world.

There is genocide against the Kurds going on in Turkey, Mr. Speaker, there is continuing intransigence and militarism on Cyprus, aggression toward Greece, and disruption of United States aid intended for the people of Armenia. For all these reasons, the subcommittee cut half of the economic assistance provided to Turkey in this bill. As I said, it is one of the world's major human rights abusers, and yet the only one that receives assistance from the United States. We provided a cut in the bill to send a message that all of these abuses must cease.

We want Turkey to be our ally. We wish to have a close relationship with Turkey and with its people. But, Mr. Speaker, it is made very, very difficult to do so when a major ally of ours claiming to be a democracy observes very few of the tenets of democracy whatsoever, is listed among the major human rights abusers in the world and commits genocide against its own people without any willingness to sit down at the table and talk our differences.

I believe this cut is justified. I would go further if I could, but this Congress must send a message to Turkey, to its government, to its people, that we need to see Turkey move toward real democracy, observe human rights, the basic rights that all people on this planet deserve, and stop the occupation of Cyprus, the prevention of humanitarian aid to the people of Armenia, stop its actions against Greek interests and the repression of its Kurdish minority.

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

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

I would like to point out before I yield back my time that the efforts of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] with regard to dealing with the problems of the world, the most egregious problems with those who are the least able to deal with themselves, the sick, the poor, the children, and particularly in the areas of starvation, the accomplishments of the gentleman and commitment to that cause are well-known and I congratulate him for that.

Obviously there are a great many global problems out there. You cannot pick up a newspaper, you cannot look at a map, you cannot turn on the television without being reminded that if it is not East Timor, it is Korea or one of the former Russian states or it is Russia itself or the Turks or the Greeks or maybe it is the Cypriots, as we have just heard the problem there, or perhaps it is the Baltics or the Balkans, perhaps it is the Visegrads. Maybe it comes to our own hemisphere, to South America or Central America or perhaps the Caribbean where we have Cuba and Haiti and some other things that catch our attention. Sometimes we look at the other side of the issues where we have apparently enemies to American interests, and Iraq and Iran and Libya jump into focus, and I have not even mentioned perhaps three of the biggest problem areas that we have, the immediate threat always to peace from the Mideast, that continuing nagging question; the problems going on in India today, the teeming masses there and how they are going to be fed and what provisions there are going to be for them. I know we have not talked about the continent of Africa where every day, if we can keep up with the map and the changes that are going on, the problems seem to be simply overwhelming.

□ 1115

The point of this is that we could have endless debate and we could commit endless resources to try and solve all the problems of the world, but obviously we do not have endless time, we do not have endless ability and we do not have endless resources. It is the people we work for, the American people, in the end, who are going to tell us how much resource we should commit to our domestic problems and then what percentage should we commit to the folks overseas who are in true need.

That is what this debate is about, and that is why I think it is important that this debate come forward under an open rule.

I have no doubt that there will be many Members coming forward and spending a great deal of time acquainting us and the people who are interested in this debate with aspects of our foreign assistance, our foreign interests, our foreign activities and our foreign operations that are vital not only to our national interests, our national well-being and to American interests overseas, whether it be individual, corporate, or just tourists on a summer vacation, but also to the well-being and the survival, as my friend from Ohio has so eloquently spoken, of so many countries where they have so little compared to what we enjoy in this much-blessed United States.

That debate, I think, is a debate that is critical every year. I think it helps set the tone and helps set the measure and the standard of what we are about in our world leadership role. I look forward to that debate, and I am extremely pleased that we are able to come forward from the Rules Committee, both sides, in agreement that this should be an open rule so that we can have such discussion in the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3540, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 445 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3540.

□ 1118

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3540) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. HANSEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations has reported a 1997 foreign operations and export financing bill that is balanced, compassionate, and supportive of our national interest. It has bipartisan support.

The bill the House is taking up today is within the subcommittee's 602 allocation, with $256,000 in budget authority left over. The bill is $1 billion under the President's request, and it is $458 million less than last year's bill, including all of the supplementals.

Although the administration did not request it, we have restored a separate child survival and disease programs fund and have provided $600 million for the fund.

Helping children and fighting infectious diseases such as polio and tuberculosis is our highest priority in this bill.

There are no earmarks in this bill. The Democrat managers agree with me on this, and will oppose any earmark amendments. Our report language makes clear the overwhelming support for the requests for Israel, Egypt, Ukraine, and Armenia.

On a general basis, this bill favors bilateral programs, undertaken in the name of the American people, over multilateral programs. We have attempted to fund programs of the State and Defense Departments and A.I.D., either at the request level or at the current level. For the most part, the President did not seek big increases in these areas.

We simply don't have enough money in our allocation to fund the big increases requested for some of the multilateral banks and international organizations. In fact, several of them are at last year's House-passed or conference levels.

With the International Development Association—it is called IDA—we recommend $525 million. Before that money can be spent, the bill requires a report from the Treasury on the procurement restrictions placed on American companies.

If our allocation were bigger, I'd still have problems with IDA's full request for $935 million, because of the unfortunate restrictions on American procurement.

The recommendation on population is different from what the House passed last year. It is different from what is current law. This language represents a compromise that gives an incentive for foreign family planning groups to voluntarily comply with Mexico City principles. I am hopeful that this prolife language will be acceptable to the Senate. I am confident it is something the President can live with.

As I said a few minutes ago, this is a balanced and compassionate bill. We wouldn't be here today without the contributions of each and every one of the subcommittee members. I want to especially thank the chairman and former chairman of the full committee. Finally, I want to thank my friend from Texas, the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, who will be retiring sometime after we conference this bill.

In closing, I must mention that 75 amendments have been filed for this bill. Of these, 44 were filed by DAVID OBEY in an attempt to delay the Wisconsin matter. Another 18 were filed by Republican Members, and I am aware of several other possible amendments. As far as I know, only one of these was brought to the attention of the committee before we marked up the bill.

At this time, I intend to oppose all of these amendments. Our bill took a lot of work and represents a fine balance among Republicans and between the two parties. I don't feel that those who didn't bother to inform us of their concerns in a timely manner deserve more consideration than the men and women who worked with the committee. I especially oppose attempts by the authorizers to burden this bill with matters within their jurisdiction.

Last year, this appropriation bill incorporated major authorization bills in order to cooperate with the authorizers. This year some of them demand more money for Africa while objecting to our attempts to do just that by giving the President discretionary authority to forgive African debt.

I don't serve on the International Relations Committee. Don't make this an authorization bill. Direct those concerns to BEN GILMAN and LEE HAMILTON.

Mr. Chairman, last year this bill received over 300 votes from both sides of the aisle. This year I ask the indulgence of the House to reject attempts to add well-meaning, but last-minute, policy matters to the bill. They don't belong on this bill.

Including last-minute policy matters here on this bill will only delay conference action and enactment of this appropriation bill. We want to get this bill, and all of the appropriations bills, to the President as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following extraneous material:

FY 1997 FOREIGN OPERATIONS EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3540)

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE					
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES					
Limitation on Program Activity:					
Subsidy appropriations	744,551,000	736,551,000	726,000,000	-18,551,000	-10,551,000
Administrative expenses	45,614,000	47,614,000	47,614,000	+2,000,000	.....
Negative subsidy	-89,646,000	-58,000,000	-58,000,000	+31,646,000	.....
Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States	700,519,000	726,165,000	715,614,000	+15,095,000	-10,551,000
OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION					
Administrative expenses	26,000,000	32,000,000	30,000,000	+4,000,000	-2,000,000
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections	-202,500,000	-224,000,000	-224,000,000	-21,500,000	.....
Direct loans:					
Loan subsidy	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	.....	.....
(Loan authorization)	(79,523,000)	(80,000,000)	(80,000,000)	(+477,000)	.....
Guaranteed loans:					
Loan subsidy	68,000,000	68,000,000	68,000,000	.....	.....
(Loan authorization)	(1,351,900,000)	(1,360,000,000)	(1,360,000,000)	(+8,100,000)	.....
Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation	-104,500,000	-120,000,000	-122,000,000	-17,500,000	-2,000,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Trade and Development Agency					
Trade and development agency	40,000,000	40,000,000	38,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
(By transfer)	.....	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	.....
Total, title I, Export and investment assistance	636,019,000	646,165,000	631,614,000	-4,405,000	-14,551,000
(Loan authorizations)	(1,431,423,000)	(1,440,000,000)	(1,440,000,000)	(+8,577,000)	.....
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Agency for International Development					
Sustainable development assistance	.....	1,006,000,000	.....	.....	-1,006,000,000
Child survival and disease programs fund	.....	.....	600,000,000	+600,000,000	+600,000,000
Development assistance	1,675,000,000	.....	1,150,000,000	-525,000,000	+1,150,000,000
Development Fund for Africa	.....	704,000,000	.....	.....	-704,000,000
International disaster assistance	181,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	+9,000,000	.....
Debt restructuring	10,000,000	47,000,000	10,000,000	.....	-37,000,000
(By transfer)	(5,000,000)	.....	(12,000,000)	(+7,000,000)	(+12,000,000)
Micro and Small Enterprise Development program:					
Subsidy appropriations	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	.....	.....
Administrative expenses	500,000	500,000	500,000	.....	.....
(Direct loan authorization)	(1,435,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(-435,000)	.....
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(16,700,000)	(17,000,000)	(17,000,000)	(+300,000)	.....
Housing and other credit guaranty programs:					
Subsidy appropriations	4,000,000	5,000,000	500,000	-3,500,000	-4,500,000
Operating expenses	7,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,000,000	.....
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(33,700,000)	(42,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(-23,700,000)	(-32,000,000)
Subtotal, development assistance	1,879,000,000	1,960,000,000	1,958,500,000	+79,500,000	-1,500,000
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	43,914,000	43,826,000	43,826,000	-88,000	.....
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development	465,750,000	495,000,000	465,750,000	.....	-29,250,000
(By transfer)	(3,000,000)	.....	.....	(-3,000,000)	.....
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General	30,200,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	-200,000	.....
Subtotal, Agency for International Development	2,418,864,000	2,528,826,000	2,498,076,000	+79,212,000	-30,750,000
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance					
Economic support fund:					
Camp David countries	2,015,000,000	2,015,000,000	2,015,000,000	.....	.....
Other	325,000,000	393,000,000	321,000,000	-4,000,000	-72,000,000
Subtotal, Economic support fund	2,340,000,000	2,408,000,000	2,336,000,000	-4,000,000	-72,000,000
International fund for Ireland	19,600,000	.....	19,600,000	.....	+19,600,000
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States	522,000,000	475,000,000	475,000,000	-47,000,000	.....
Assistance for the New Independent States of the Soviet Union	641,000,000	640,000,000	590,000,000	-51,000,000	-50,000,000
Subtotal, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance	3,522,600,000	3,523,000,000	3,420,600,000	-102,000,000	-102,400,000
Total, Agency for International Development	5,941,464,000	6,051,826,000	5,918,676,000	-22,788,000	-133,150,000

FY 1997 FOREIGN OPERATIONS EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3540)—Continued

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
African Development Foundation					
Appropriations	(11,500,000)	12,500,000	11,500,000	+11,500,000	-1,000,000
Inter-American Foundation					
Appropriations	(20,000,000)	20,000,000	20,000,000	+20,000,000	.....
Total, Funds Appropriated to the President	5,941,464,000	6,084,326,000	5,950,176,000	+8,712,000	-134,150,000
Peace Corps					
Appropriations	205,000,000	220,000,000	212,000,000	+7,000,000	-8,000,000
(By transfer)	.....	(5,000,000)	(12,000,000)	(+12,000,000)	(+7,000,000)
Department of State					
International narcotics control	115,000,000	213,000,000	150,000,000	+35,000,000	-63,000,000
(By transfer)	(20,000,000)	.....	.....	(-20,000,000)	.....
Migration and refugee assistance	671,000,000	650,000,000	650,000,000	-21,000,000	.....
Refugee resettlement assistance	5,000,000	.....	5,000,000	.....	+5,000,000
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	.....	.....
Anti-terrorism assistance	16,000,000	17,000,000	.....	-16,000,000	-17,000,000
Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund	20,000,000	20,000,000	.....	-20,000,000	-20,000,000
Nonproliferation and anti-terrorism	.....	.....	135,000,000	+135,000,000	+135,000,000
Counter-terrorism assistance to Israel	50,000,000	50,000,000	.....	-50,000,000	-50,000,000
Total, Department of State	927,000,000	1,000,000,000	990,000,000	+63,000,000	-10,000,000
Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance	7,073,464,000	7,304,326,000	7,152,176,000	+78,712,000	-152,150,000
(By transfer)	(28,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(24,000,000)	(-4,000,000)	(+19,000,000)
(Loan authorizations)	(51,835,000)	(60,000,000)	(28,000,000)	(-23,835,000)	(-32,000,000)
TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Military Education and Training	39,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	+6,000,000	.....
Foreign Military Financing Program:					
Grants:					
Camp David countries	3,100,000,000	3,100,000,000	3,100,000,000	.....	.....
Other	178,390,000	128,250,000	122,250,000	-56,140,000	-6,000,000
Subtotal, grants	3,278,390,000	3,228,250,000	3,222,250,000	-56,140,000	-6,000,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(23,250,000)	(23,250,000)	(23,250,000)	.....	.....
Direct concessional loans:					
Subsidy appropriations	64,400,000	40,000,000	35,000,000	-29,400,000	-5,000,000
(Loan authorization)	(544,000,000)	(370,028,000)	(323,815,000)	(-220,185,000)	(-46,213,000)
FMF program level	(3,822,390,000)	(3,598,278,000)	(3,546,065,000)	(-276,325,000)	(-52,213,000)
Total, Foreign military assistance	3,342,790,000	3,268,250,000	3,257,250,000	-85,540,000	-11,000,000
Special Defense Acquisition Fund:					
Offsetting collections	-220,000,000	-166,000,000	-166,000,000	+54,000,000	.....
Peacekeeping operations	70,000,000	70,000,000	65,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
Total, title III, Military assistance programs	3,231,790,000	3,217,250,000	3,201,250,000	-30,540,000	-16,000,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(23,250,000)	(23,250,000)	(23,250,000)	.....	.....
(Loan authorization)	(544,000,000)	(370,028,000)	(323,815,000)	(-220,185,000)	(-46,213,000)
TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Financial Institutions					
World Bank Group					
Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Paid-in capital	28,189,963	.....	.....	-28,189,963	.....
(Limitation on callable capital)	(911,475,013)	.....	.....	(-911,475,013)	.....
Contribution to the International Finance Corporation	60,900,000	6,656,000	6,656,000	-54,244,000	.....
Contribution to the Global Environment Facility	35,000,000	100,000,000	30,000,000	-5,000,000	-70,000,000
Total, contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	(1,035,564,976)	(106,656,000)	(36,656,000)	(-998,908,976)	(-70,000,000)
Contribution to the International Development Association	700,000,000	934,503,100	525,000,000	-175,000,000	-409,503,100
Total, World Bank Group	(1,735,564,976)	(1,041,159,100)	(561,656,000)	(-1,173,908,976)	(-479,503,100)
Budget authority	824,089,963	1,041,159,100	561,656,000	-262,433,963	-479,503,100
(Limitation on callable capital)	(911,475,013)	.....	.....	(-911,475,013)	.....

FY 1997 FOREIGN OPERATIONS EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3540)—Continued

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:					
Inter-regional paid-in capital	25,952,110	25,610,667	25,610,667	-341,443	.....
(Limitation on callable capital)	(1,523,767,142)	(1,503,718,910)	(1,503,718,910)	(-20,048,232)	.....
Fund for special operations	10,000,000	31,411,000	10,000,000	.....	-21,411,000
Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund	53,750,000	27,500,000	27,500,000	-26,250,000	.....
Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank	(1,613,469,252)	(1,588,240,577)	(1,566,829,577)	(-46,639,675)	(-21,411,000)
Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	13,221,596	13,221,596	13,221,596	.....	.....
(Limitation on callable capital)	(647,858,204)	(647,858,204)	(647,858,204)	.....	.....
Development fund	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	.....	.....
Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank	(761,079,800)	(761,079,800)	(761,079,800)	.....	.....
Contribution to the African Development Fund	.....	50,000,000	.....	.....	-50,000,000
Contribution to the African Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	.....	16,000,000	.....	.....	-16,000,000
(Limitation on callable capital)	.....	(112,000,000)	.....	.....	(-112,000,000)
Total, contribution to the African Development Bank	.....	(128,000,000)	.....	.....	(-128,000,000)
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Paid-in capital	70,000,000	11,916,447	11,916,447	-58,083,553	.....
(Limitation on callable capital)	(163,333,333)	(27,805,043)	(27,805,043)	(-135,528,290)	.....
Total, contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development	(233,333,333)	(39,721,490)	(39,721,490)	(-193,611,843)	.....
North American Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	56,250,000	56,250,000	50,625,000	-5,625,000	-5,625,000
(Limitation on callable capital)	(318,750,000)	(318,750,000)	(318,750,000)	.....	.....
Contribution to the Bank for Economic Cooperation and Development in the Middle East and North Africa:					
Paid-in capital	.....	52,500,000	.....	.....	-52,500,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Limitation on callable capital)	.....	(157,500,000)	.....	.....	(-157,500,000)
International Monetary Fund					
Contribution to the enhanced structural adjustment facility	.....	7,000,000	.....	.....	-7,000,000
Total, contribution to International Financial Institutions	(4,718,447,361)	(4,200,200,967)	(3,298,661,867)	(-1,419,785,494)	(-901,539,100)
Budget authority	1,153,263,669	1,432,568,810	800,529,710	-352,733,959	-632,039,100
(Limitation on callable capital)	(3,565,183,692)	(2,767,632,157)	(2,498,132,157)	(-1,067,051,535)	(-269,500,000)
International Organizations and Programs					
International organizations and programs	285,000,000	325,000,000	136,000,000	-149,000,000	-189,000,000
(By transfer)	(30,000,000)	.....	.....	(-30,000,000)	.....
Total, title IV, contribution for Multilateral Economic Assistance.	(5,003,447,361)	(4,525,200,967)	(3,434,661,867)	(-1,568,785,494)	(-1,090,539,100)
Budget authority	1,438,263,669	1,757,568,810	936,529,710	-501,733,959	-821,039,100
(By transfer)	(30,000,000)	.....	.....	(-30,000,000)	.....
(Limitation on callable capital)	(3,565,183,692)	(2,767,632,157)	(2,498,132,157)	(-1,067,051,535)	(-269,500,000)
Grand total, all titles:					
New budget (obligational) authority	12,379,536,669	12,925,309,810	11,921,569,710	-457,966,959	-1,003,740,100
(By transfer)	(58,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(29,000,000)	(-29,000,000)	(+19,000,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(23,250,000)	(23,250,000)	(23,250,000)	.....	.....
(Limitation on callable capital)	(3,565,183,692)	(2,767,632,157)	(2,498,132,157)	(-1,067,051,535)	(-269,500,000)
(Loan authorizations)	(2,027,258,000)	(1,870,028,000)	(1,791,815,000)	(-235,443,000)	(-78,213,000)
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE					
Export Assistance Appropriations	928,165,000	928,165,000	913,614,000	-14,551,000	-14,551,000
Negative Subsidies and Offsetting Collections	-292,146,000	-282,000,000	-282,000,000	+10,146,000	.....
Total, Export Assistance	636,019,000	646,165,000	631,614,000	-4,405,000	-14,551,000
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
Bilateral Development Assistance	3,550,864,000	3,781,326,000	3,731,576,000	+180,712,000	-49,750,000
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance	3,522,600,000	3,523,000,000	3,420,600,000	-102,000,000	-102,400,000
Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance	7,073,464,000	7,304,326,000	7,152,176,000	+78,712,000	-152,150,000

FY 1997 FOREIGN OPERATIONS EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3540)—Continued

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
Foreign Military Financing Program:					
Grants	3,278,390,000	3,228,250,000	3,222,250,000	-56,140,000	-6,000,000
Direct loans, subsidy costs	64,400,000	40,000,000	35,000,000	-29,400,000	-5,000,000
(Estimated level of direct loans)	(544,000,000)	(370,028,000)	(323,815,000)	(-220,185,000)	(-46,213,000)
Subtotal, Foreign Military Financing Program:					
Budget authority	3,342,790,000	3,268,250,000	3,257,250,000	-85,540,000	-11,000,000
(Program level)	(3,822,390,000)	(3,598,278,000)	(3,546,065,000)	(-276,325,000)	(-52,213,000)
Other, Military	109,000,000	115,000,000	110,000,000	+1,000,000	-5,000,000
Special Defense Acquisition Fund	-220,000,000	-166,000,000	-166,000,000	+54,000,000	.....
Total, Military Assistance Programs	3,231,790,000	3,217,250,000	3,201,250,000	-30,540,000	-16,000,000
TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
Contributions to International Financial Institutions	1,153,263,669	1,425,568,810	800,529,710	-352,733,959	-625,039,100
International organizations and programs	285,000,000	325,000,000	136,000,000	-149,000,000	-189,000,000
Total, contribution for Multilateral Economic Assistance	1,438,263,669	1,750,568,810	936,529,710	-501,733,959	-814,039,100
Grand total, all titles	12,379,536,669	12,925,309,810	11,921,569,710	-457,966,959	-1,003,740,100

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 30, 1996.

Hon. BILL ARCHER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As part of the markup for the fiscal year 1997 appropriations for Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the Committee on Appropriations included a general provision (section 533) that was included in last year's Act regarding Presidential authority to impose import sanctions on countries that trade with Iraq and several other nations. It provides discretionary authority, but the language is legislative in nature.

While this language was included in the 1996 appropriations Act, it deals with matters under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. I am writing to ask if you have any objection to inclusion of this language in the fiscal year 1997 appropriations Act.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

SONNY CALLAHAN.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAY AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 30, 1996.

Hon. SONNY CALLAHAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in response to your request regarding floor consideration of H.R. 3540, a bill making appropriations for foreign operations programs for fiscal year 1997, which was reported by the Committee on Appropriations on May 29, 1996.

Specifically, section 553(b) of the bill would grant the President the authority to impose import sanctions on products from countries that have not conformed to the United Nations economic sanctions with respect to Iraq, Serbia, or Montenegro. The grant of authority for such an import restriction falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and constitutes a tariff measure for the purposes of rule XXI(5)(b) of the Rules of the House, which prohibits the reporting of a tax or tariff measure in a bill not reported by the committee of jurisdiction.

I note, however, that similar language has been included in each of the foreign operations annual appropriations enacted into law since 1991. Therefore, based on your advanced communication on this matter with me, I will not object to your request for a waiver of Rule XXI(5)(b) on this bill. Nonetheless, I believe that the Rule should not be waived against any amendments that may be made in order to the bill on the House floor.

This is being done with the understanding that the Committee will be treated without prejudice as to its jurisdictional prerogatives on such or similar provisions in the future, and it should not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Ways and Means in the future. This is also being done with the understanding that this provision will not be broadened during conference consideration, and that no additional revenue matters will be included in the final conference report.

Finally, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be placed in the Record during consideration of the bill on the Floor. Thank you for your cooperation regarding this matter. I look forward to reviewing this issue with you again in advance of next year's appropriations cycle. With best personal regards.

Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. I want to express my gratitude and appreciation to the subcommittee chairman and his staff for working within a tight budget to produce a constructive foreign assistance bill. I generally support a higher level of funding for all foreign assistance programs, but in these times of fiscal restraint, I certainly understand the need to comply with a strict budget ceiling.

Unfortunately, now, after the fall of the Soviet Union, having established ourselves as the dominant world leader, Mr. Chairman, I fear that we are abandoning our post.

By reducing our foreign assistance as much as we have, we are limiting the impact we can have in international development, especially in rapidly emerging markets of the developing world. Just as the world is becoming more interconnected, the United States seems to be retreating into greater and greater isolation. To preserve the United States as a dominant world leader, I believe this trend must be reversed.

I commend the chairman for not reducing funding for development assistance. After a drastic reduction last year, funding for fiscal year 1997 will allow bilateral assistance agencies to maintain many of their important programs. I also support the chairman's appropriations for the Peace Corps, the Inter-American Foundation, and the overall appropriations for the multilateral lending institutions.

Although I am generally supportive of this bill, I do have some specific concerns, Mr. Chairman. I am deeply disappointed by the subcommittee's endorsement of the trend set in fiscal year 1996 for drastically reduced levels of funding for international family planning assistance. By limiting this funding, numerous women and children will suffer because they will not have access to adequate health and family planning services.

Assistance for family planning has been misrepresented as assistance for abortions. In reality, the exact opposite is the truth. It is inaccurate to portray funding for family planning, for women's and children's health services and for reproductive education, in any way as funding for abortion.

I know that this is an extremely heated debate. However, it is time for pro-life and pro-choice sides to remember who is directly affected by these philosophical wars: women and children in the poorest countries. I urge this committee and this Congress to reassess its strategy for international family assistance and prevent the deaths and suffering of countless women and children in the developing world.

I also want to stress my support, Mr. Chairman, for the international organizations and programs account. This account includes, among others, the United Nations Fund for Victims of Torture, the United Nations Environmental Program, the United Nations Development Program, and numerous multilateral conservation programs.

Too often, these U.N. programs get lumped together and their important individual responsibilities are overlooked. Each of them provides a unique service as part of a worldwide network that coordinates efforts to produce the most effective results.

Specifically, I think it is important to highlight the importance of the U.N. Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture, UNDP, and the World Conservation Union or IUCN. UNFVT brings relief to victims who have been tortured while trying to promote democracy within their respective countries.

The UNDP, whose budget was significantly reduced in fiscal year 1996, is the fundamental source for technical assistance working in the local communities of developing countries. IUCN, whose membership consists of 70 states, 100 governmental agencies, and 800 NGO's, provides the technical assistance and policy input for numerous international conventions the United States was instrumental in designing.

I am also seriously concerned with the 8-percent reduction in funding assistance for the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union. Now is not the time to make this excessive cut, as these young countries struggle to embrace democratic and economic reforms.

With our strong support, these countries will move toward stable democracies and economies. For example, just last year, with our support, Armenia made great progress with a positive GDP growth of 7 percent. If we expect this progress to continue, we must continue to support Armenia and its neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, let me finish by saying I am also deeply troubled by the behavior of the Government of Turkey which I addressed in my remarks on the rule. Yes, Turkey is a valued ally and a cherished NATO partner. But Turkey continues, despite repeated international pleas, to commit atrocious human rights violations against both its own citizens and against those of its struggling neighbors.

Continuing to give U.S. economic assistance is the equivalent of turning our heads the other way to these outrageous human rights violations. As a world leader, we must send a strong message to Turkey to immediately reform their human rights practices, and sending this message begins by reducing their economic assistance, as we have done in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, despite my differences with parts of the bill, I believe it deserves the support of the House, and I commend it to the Members for their support.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to express my thanks to Chairman CALLAHAN for working closely with me and the staff in putting together this bill. The foreign operations bill is always painful to put together, but with Mr. CALLAHAN'S leadership and understanding that people have different views on issues, we have come out with a reasonably good bill.

I know he didn't have as much money as he, or I might have wanted for the bill. Thus the distribution of funds in the bill leaves some people short, particularly in the international banks, and the NIS accounts. But for the most part I support the distribution of funds in the bill and the approach of including no earmarks. This is the approach used for the last several years, and one which I support.

The bill provides for essentially last year's level of funding for export promotion programs vital to U.S. business. The Export-Import Bank has been funded at a level which will allow them to meet the demand from U.S. business for loan guarantees. The amounts now on deposit in the war chest are sufficient in my opinion to ensure that foreign countries take seriously our intention to prohibit unfair trade practices.

As a perennial strong supporter of Ex-Im bank and export programs, I do not support attempts to add funding for this account. The bill is carefully balanced, and any increases to Ex-Im programs will come at the expense of other programs in the bill which have already been cut.

The bill fully funds the administration's request for military assistance, and continues aid to Turkey and Greece in the traditional ratios. The bill contains a limitation of $25 million on ESF to Turkey. This represents a compromise reached at the subcommittee level among various factions on this issue, and should not be altered on the floor. I will strongly oppose any efforts to amend the bill to alter this compromise.

The bill provides for the traditional levels of assistance for the Middle East, for Israel and Egypt, as well as the West Bank and Gaza and Jordan. The bill provides for $50 million for the second increment of security-related funds for Israel. The bill does not provide for debt relief for Jordan, which is regrettable and I hope to work on this as we go through the process.

Assistance to Eastern Europe is at the request level and in particular the second increment of the Bosnia reconstruction is fully funded.

Authorities to allow for the delivery of humanitarian assistance in the Republic of Azerbaijan and the region of Nagorno-Karabagh have been provided in the bill. The report language specifically states that the committee takes no view whatsoever on the political status of the region of Nagorno-Karabagh. This compromise was reached in subcommittee to allow for the delivery of humanitarian assistance through the Government of Azerbaijan under certain specific circumstances. It solves problems encountered this year due to restrictions placed in previous years bills and reports. It should not be altered.

Again, I would emphasize that the committee has taken no position on the political status of the region of Nagorno-Karabagh, and there is nothing in this bill or report that is meant to change, qualify, comment on, or alter the sovereignty of any nation in this region. The official position of the United States supports the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Azerbaijan, and views the region of Nagorno-Karabagh as part of Azerbaijan. Efforts by certain groups to portray the actions of the committee in a certain light may have ignored the facts of what actually took place.

I also expect there will be amendments on the population funding and family planning during the deliberations today. While I am aware that the language in the bill was worked out on the Republican side, there are many people who disagree strongly with it, and I therefore expect that amendments will be offered.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me again thank Mr. CALLAHAN for his cooperation on this bill. This will probably be the last bill I will manage on the House floor, and I want to express my gratitude for his approach, his understanding, and his good humor throughout the process. I hope we can work together to get through it.

□ 1130

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply observe that this bill is probably the least popular bill to emerge from the Committee on Appropriations every year, and I think it is without question the most misunderstood bill. If we take a poll of America, we will see that most Americans think that we spend about 15 to 17 percent of our budget on foreign aid. The fact is that this bill, which is the foreign aid appropriation bill before us today, spends roughly 1 percent of our budget. That is all it spends. I would like to explain why I think that is by and large justifiable.

We have seen the overall spending for foreign aid go down by over 30 percent in the last decade under the subcommittee chairmanship of myself and now the gentleman from Alabama. It is going to be very difficult to point to any other part of the budget which has declined as fast. I would simply say that there is a price for participation in the world. There is a price for defending your own national interest in the world, and this bill is part of that price.

There are many ways which a great nation such as the United States defends its interests around the world. We do that through our defense budget. We do it by trying to build up a set of political relationships with other societies who also populate this globe and with other economic and military powers. We do it through economic relationships and through trade relationships, and we also do it through this bill.

This bill is meant to help attack some of the problems around the world, some economic, some political and some military, which, if allowed to get out of hand, could grow like cancer and create severe problems for our national interest down the line. Just a couple examples: We had a long divisive fight in this country over the military support that we were giving the Contras. The Contras were a military operation to overthrow the new Marxist government in Nicaragua a number of years ago. That whole problem came about because for years conditions slowly developed in the country of Nicaragua which led to an explosion, a revolution, and the taking of power by a group of people who certainly did not have the best interest of the United States in mind. We wound up spending a lot of resources and having a huge fight that divided this society and this Congress because the conditions that occurred in Nicaragua were not improved while we had time to do it without winding up in a military confrontation.

The Soviet Union: We have spent literally trillions of dollars since the end of World War II trying to see to it that the Soviet Union changed in nature internally or at least externally did not any longer provide a threat to their neighbors or to us. Now with the Wall down, we are trying to work with that country in economic and political ways to try to eliminate the physical presence of missiles that in the past had been aimed at us, to try to build institutions in the former Soviet Union that will help democratic forces change that society against a thousand years of history that run in the other direction. I think it is worth it for us to have that kind of engagement.

The Middle East: Certainly if the Middle East is not stabilized, it will eventually cause great problems for this country economically, and it could also cause great problems militarily. It already has from time to time. All we have to do is to witness what happened with the Iraqi war.

The Balkans: That has been a tumultuous part of the world for decades, and it is in the United States' interest to try to see to it that the controversies in that part of the globe do not spill over in ways which damage the national interest of the United States.

We are trying to deal with all of those problems within this very tiny bill. We also have moral obligations to some of the fellow creatures who populate this planet. In fact, American taxpayers can be intensely proud of the fact that their money has been used for low-cost immunization programs which have literally hugely expanded the

level of immunization against devastating childhood diseases for many of the children around the world. We have literally saved millions of lives through those programs, programs such as UNICEF, and this bill also funds that.

So I think, while we will have many disagreements on the floor today about the edges of this bill, this bill is essential in order to meet our responsibilities both to the world and, most of all, to our own values and to our own interest.

Having said that, let me simply congratulate the subcommittee chairman for the manner in which he has conducted himself in bringing this bill to the floor. I know that from time to time it is frustrating to get caught up in arguments that he was not a part of. But as Archie the Cockroach, my favorite philosopher, said once, ''Now and then somebody is born who is so unlucky he runs into accidents that started out to happen to somebody else.'' I am sure that is the way the gentleman feels today.

I would also like to say a special word, if I could get the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON]. I would like to say a few words about CHARLIE WILSON. I have served with CHARLIE for more than 15 years now. How long have you been here, CHARLIE?

Mr. WILSON. Twenty-four.

Mr. OBEY. Twenty-four. How time flies. I served with CHARLIE for all of the time that he has served here. I want to say as one Member to another that I will miss him greatly. He has brought wit, he has brought compassion, he has brought tough-mindedness, he has brought fair-mindedness, and he has brought a passion for excellence to this Congress which we are never in an oversupply of.

I simply want to say that I think whether the issue has been the Middle East or whether the issue has been taking care of the needs of children, or meeting our complicated responsibilities on the economic front, CHARLIE WILSON has always had the courage to defend what he regarded as American interest. I appreciate that fact and also appreciate the way he has gone about doing his job for as long as he has been a part of this body.

I also want to say very clearly that, if it had not been for CHARLIE WILSON, America would not have experienced a foreign policy success in Afghanistan. I cannot recall another occasion which has been so dramatic. Virtually single-mindedly, CHARLIE WILSON persisted and persevered and demanded after the Russian invasion of Afghanistan that we help the forces in that country who were trying to continue the resistance.

I remember children who were blown apart by that war being brought to this country by CHARLIE. I remember seeing several of them in my office. He expended virtually every ounce of energy that it was possible for a human being to expend for a cause which he thought was just and in the end almost single-handedly helped to shape American policy on that.

□ 1145

I just want to take my hat off to him and say that he has been, in so many ways, a strong addition to this institution and we will miss him greatly.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I too want to join in commending the distinguished ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], for his long years of service to this body and his concern for foreign operations, foreign policy, going throughout the world to try to pursue the best interests of our Nation. This body will sorely miss him and we wish him well in his early retirement.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 3540, the foreign operations appropriations bill, and I want to salute the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN]. Working with this able ranking Democratic member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and other members of his subcommittee, he crafted legislation that strikes a balance between the national security, humanitarian, and development goals of this Nation and the need to conserve the taxpayers' money.

The chairman's job is not an easy one, and I know it is not one he sought. He has done yeoman's work in explaining to the American public the ways that foreign assistance serves our national interest. These programs help provide leverage to American diplomacy and they provide security and the stability that accompanies development in many parts of the world. If that security and stability was absent, our Nation would likely be called on to step in or to face the consequences of the instability. It is that simple. Foreign aid and diplomacy prevents the need for U.S. troops to go in and solve problems later, in bloody and more expensive ways.

With two minor exceptions, the appropriation amounts in chairman's bill are within the authorization levels contemplated in the conference report on H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, that was passed by the House but vetoed by the President. To the extent programs were not included in the conference report, the relevant appropriations are within the amounts provided in the House-passed version of that bill. I should add, if I may, that the passage of this bill, which I fully expect will occur on an overwhelming, bipartisan basis, continues to vindicate the choices on resource allocations that the House made on H.R. 1561 but which were attacked, I believe unfairly, on the House floor when we had that bill under consideration.

I may have a few minor differences with provisions in this bill, Mr. Chairman, but I do believe that this is an excellent bill on the whole. Mr. Chairman, this bill would also not be possible without the work of the subcommittee's able staff. I especially want to thank Bill Inglee, John Shank, Charlie Flickner, Nancy Tippins, and Lori Maes for their work and cooperation on this important piece of legislation.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and his language with relation to Turkey. Turkey must understand that it must solve the problem of Cyprus and improve human rights with the Kurds to improve its relations with the United States.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to fully support this bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a member of our subcommittee, and invaluable with respect to his input.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and want to salute the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman CALLAHAN, for the flare in which he works with Members on both sides. I want to also extend a thank you to the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], who I believe has done yeomen's work, and we will miss him as this summer moves along but wish him good luck in his next voyage.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for this bill which reflects the Foreign Operations Subcommittee's careful crafting and compromise in a time of continued reductions in the funding available for foreign assistance. It deserves our support. H.R. 3540 recognizes the fiscal situation we face and reduces the amount of money we spend overseas. But H.R. 3540 maintains our role as a leader throughout the world.

This bill makes serious cuts that reflect careful consideration and the review of every foreign assistance program. We have eliminated and reduced funding to those programs that have failed to justify our support.

I strongly believe that foreign aid is a crucial component of our foreign policy. The United States has a direct interest in promoting the expansion of capitalism and democracy throughout the world. Accordingly, I feel it is beneficial to American interests to aid countries which have shown a commitment to the ideals of free enterprise and individual freedom.

When we consider the fast paced changes taking place in countries across the globe from Israel to India to Russia it is clear that America must not insulate itself from the international community.

Yet, we will destroy our ability to assist other countries and provide for our national security if we have to continually spend greater and greater portions of our budget on interest on the national debt. We must balance the budget. That means we must reduce spending. I am very committed to reducing the deficit, lowering taxes, and empowering individuals and business by reducing the size and scope of our Federal Government. We must work toward these goals as the world's only superpower and the sole proprietor of democracy.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I only have a certain amount of time, but I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he agrees with me that if all the other subcommittees had made the same contribution to balancing the budget that this subcommittee has made, we would have a balanced budget?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Amen.

And I concur very strongly with the ranking member, but we have not eliminated, and I think this is very important, we have not eliminated, by any means, our ability to participate in the world.

Foreign aid, which makes up less than 1 percent of our Federal budget, as the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out, is a good investment and has benefited our interests around the globe by furthering the development of economic and political stability in the international community.

H.R. 3540 allows us to continue to remain active in world events while keeping us on a path to a balanced budget. I support this bill and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] who is also a member of our subcommittee and a very valuable member of our subcommittee.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the foreign operations, export financing, and related programs appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. I want to commend Chairman CALLAHAN and ranking member CHARLIE WILSON for crafting a fair and bipartisan bill that, again, contains no earmarks.

I particularly want to recognize the gentleman from Texas, CHARLIE WILSON, who will be leaving Congress this year. CHARLIE, it has been a pleasure working with you and you will be missed.

This bill continues Congress on its glidepath toward a balanced budget by cutting approximately $1 billion from the President's request and almost $500 million from last year's enacted levels. These funding reductions are a continuation of the reorganization of our foreign aid priorities. It is a tribute to Chairman CALLAHAN and his very capable staff that two very important provisions of this bill remain virtually untouched. I am speaking of our contributions to the Camp David accords and the child survival and disease programs account.

In addition, this bill supports American jobs by providing funding to vital U.S. export assistance programs such as the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Development Corp., and the Trade and Development Agency. These agencies assist U.S. businesses both large and small to advance U.S. interests and expand our export markets.

Finally, this bill strikes a balance on family planning funding that is fair to both sides. It allows half of the funds designated for these activities to be released to any organization who applies. The language then allows the rest of the funds to be released to those organizations who agree to the Mexico City language. This is as evenhanded as it gets.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me, once again, pay tribute to Chairman CALLAHAN and his staff for their hard work on this well-balanced bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of any other speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, in just a moment I will yield back the balance of my time, but let me just comment that this bill reduces the President's request by $1 billion. I know there are some in this House and in the administration who would like to have more money, but we are having to sacrifice in every area of government and I do not think requesting another $1 billion cut from the President's request is unreasonable at all.

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman WILSON, is right; if every subcommittee on appropriations was reducing in real dollars the amount of money and the percentage of moneys we are reducing in this bill and the bill last year, then we would be much more advanced toward a balanced budget. This is the lowest foreign operation bill in more than 15 years.

Mr. Chairman, I know there will be some who come and try to amend this bill upward, trying to give the administration more dollars, and I am going to strenuously object to any effort to increase the amount of this appropriation bill, which, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, is now less than 1 percent of our overall budget. A lot of people in this country are of the impression that we are appropriating a higher percentage of our dollars to foreign operations, but his year, if this bill becomes law, it will be less than 1 percent of our overall budget, and that 1 percent concentrates on things that the American people support.

The American people do not like us to give money, government to government, Mr. Chairman, but when they see starving children they want those children fed. When they see children dying of polio, when they see children dying of diseases, they want to participate in that type of program. We concentrate on that type of activity in this bill. We are not going to turn out back on starving children or sick children. We are going to educate these children where we possibly can, with the limited amount of moneys that we have. We are a compassionate nation, but we are also a nation in a fiscal crisis, and the only money we have available is this $11.9 billion, which, as we understand, is $1 billion under the President's request.

Mr. Chairman, before I close this part of the program, I too want to join my colleagues in praising the gentleman from Texas, CHARLIE WILSON, who has served as the ranking Democrat on this subcommittee since I assumed the chairmanship. He will be receiving a lot of accolades during the next few weeks as he retires from Congress, and I want to tell him it has been a true pleasure to work with him.

Handling the foreign operations bill is not something that many Members cherish. It is a difficult, complicated measure when we think of the hundreds of countries in this world that are seeking the support of the United States of America and the complexity of the governments and the working relationship between our Government and their government. It is a complicated process and certainly CHARLIE WILSON knows more than anyone else in the House about this complex world of ours and its needs. His contributions to me, both personally and professionally, have been something that I will always cherish.

So Mr. Chairman, as he moves on to this next stage of his life, I want the gentleman to know that someday we will meet on the shuffle board court in Phoenix, AZ, or some retirement city, and we will be out there talking about the great things that we did. But the people of the United States will never forget the contributions that he as an individual Member of this Congress has made toward making this world a better place and making our position in this world well understood by foreign countries.

□ 1200

It is not the end of our close relationship, I am sure. It is just the end of a distinguished tenure in this Congress, and I appreciate, on behalf of the American people, the contributions you have made.

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my good friend from Illinois, Mr. MANZULLO, that reduces the fiscal year 1997 foreign operations appropriation for the Export-Import Bank administrative expenses by $3.1 million. I support this

amendment because it mirrors the Appropriations' National Security Subcommittee's recommendation of reducing the Eximbank's subsidy appropriation by 2.5 percent. It makes no sense to me to increase funds for staffing at the same time that we are reducing the workload of the bank.

The purpose of the Eximbank is to expand U.S. exports by assisting American firms. And yet, I question the success of the bank in fulfilling this mandate under the current administration. Most recently, the Clinton administration pressured the Eximbank to refuse assistance to U.S. exporters, while at the same time supporting most-favored-nation trade status for Chinese business. I'm at a loss to see how this helps American businesses.

One case in particular is the Eximbank's announcement of May 30 to deny trade credits to American companies attempting to participate in China's Three Gorges Dam project. This decision stands in the way of job opportunities and income for American workers, and potentially, it damages our relationship with China.

The Clinton administration has portrayed the Three Gorges Dam project as disastrous to the environment, and detrimental to human rights. However, there are no facts to backup this charge. In fact, the main purpose of the project is to control the disastrous consequences to China's environment and prevent the massive loss of life and property caused by flooding along the Yangtze River. In 1994 alone, flooding along the Yangtze killed nearly 1,200 people and wiped out 2.7 million acres of farmland. Building the dam will end the need of moving millions of people each time there is a major flood on the Yangtze River.

The Three Gorges Dam is also desperately needed to enable China to keep up with it's exponentially growing energy requirements. It will produce 18,200 megawatts of clean hydropower, displacing the need for 50,000 tons of low sulphur coal or ten nuclear, power plants. The project will help clean up the air in China, decrease the global greenhouse effect and lower nuclear waste disposal problems. Moreover, the dam will not submerge the scenic Three Gorges—water levels will rise 318 feet but the mountains in the area rise between 2,600 and 3,600 feet high.

It makes no sense to prevent the creation of thousands of jobs for taxpaying American citizens by denying a loan that, in the end, would be paid back with interest by a foreign country.

Without a doubt, this project will spread prosperity and development into a new interior region of China, providing new opportunities for American firms. Establishing business relationships now through the Three Gorges Dam project would further position American firms to win new business in China for years to come. As Congressman MANZULLO has cited, $1 billion in U.S. exports and 19,000 Americans jobs are at stake.

I have often heard the argument that there is nothing stopping these companies from competing for contracts without this assistance. That's technically true, but what then is the purpose of the Eximbank if not to help U.S. companies secure the winning bids? This recent decision puts American companies at a disadvantage with their foreign competitors who will most likely receive favorable financing from their government finance agencies. Germany, Japan, Russia, and Canada are already contracting for the project through their consortiums.

The administration has supported renewing most-favored-nation trade status for China at the same time it attacks this project. This project, without a doubt, means jobs for Illinois and other states across this country. The shortsighted decision is flawed and detrimental not only to the long-range environmental and human rights concerns of China, but also the competitive, responsible companies that America is offering to the world. Our companies practice high labor and environmental standards. Only the United States has the capacity to bring the kind of technical knowledge to the project that may mitigate many of the concerns raised by its critics.

Until I see signs that the Eximbank is fulfilling its mandate, I can not support increasing funding for its administrative expenses.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I chair the Domestic and International Monetary Policy Subcommittee of the House Banking and Financial Services Committee, which is the authorizing committee for U.S. participation in the multilateral development banks. In this era of limited budgets, it is absolutely imperative that every taxpayer dollar be spent in the most cost-effective manner possible. I submit that with multilateral development we multiply each contributed dollar fivefold or sixfold for optimal leverage of our resources. Therefore, I would like to share with my colleagues the action the authorizing subcommittee took on the multilateral funding levels requested by the administration.

As we noted when the administration presented its request to my subcommittee, we should acknowledge the substantial progress already made in reforming the International Financial Institutions [IFI's]. The best way to do this and encourage the process is by paying the United States arrears on commitments to the 10th capital replenishment of the International Development Association [IDA] made by previous administrations.

It is most difficult to continue to assert a position of leadership in the various IFI's and yet owe a total of $1.56 billion in overdue obligations to them. This undermines our moral and practical influence over these institutions, and even though we still spend a very large sum of money each year, the expenditure produces little domestic or international good will.

National self-interest argues that we continue to stay engaged in the multilateral development process. Our success in leveraging funds for developing countries, encouraging free market economies, private sector development and creating new high-growth markets for U.S. companies would be undermined if opted out. For these reasons, the subcommittee included the entire $550 million requested to finish authorizing payment of the accumulated arrears of $935 million for our commitments to the IDA.

This bill appropriates $525 million to fund IDA, leaving a balance of $410 million still owed on previous commitments. I hope that we can retire these arrears as quickly as possible, although I fully accept that resources are limited for this year's foreign operations account. Failure to retire these previous commitments inevitably delays the program for the 11th capital replenishment of IDA. This, in turn, may result in another year of interim special funding that excludes U.S. companies from bidding on a portion of the projects funded under such interim arrangement.

We authorized no appropriations for any U.S. contribution to the interest subsidy account of the successor [ESAF II] to the enhanced structural adjustment facility of the international monetary fund because this account is fully funded through fiscal year 1997.

The administration requested both consent to and appropriations for the fifth replenishment of the resources of the African Development Bank [AfDB], at an undetermined level due to continuing, unfinished negotiations. We authorized a 2-year capital increase of $32 million for the AfDB that was conditioned on a successful conclusion to current negotiations to reorganize effective control of this bank away from the borrowers to the lending countries. If these negotiations are successful and sound reforms are in place, we would hope to authorize U.S. participation in the fifth replenishment next year.

In response to the administration's request, full U.S. participation in the new Middle East Development Bank was authorized for 2 years, with $105 million to be appropriated over that period. Even though there are no funds for this project in this year's appropriations bill, the concept of former enemies coming together to plan and finance joint development of their region remains a good idea.

The House Subcommittee reduced the administration's fiscal year 1997 request by $335 million.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, having stated my reservations and the rationale for them, I support the bill as passed by the Appropriations Committee, and urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concern over H.R. 3540, the foreign operations appropriations bill, because it fails to include language directing the U.S. Government to monitor human rights progress in Ethiopia as it obligates appropriations for Ethiopia in fiscal year 1997.

During the debate last year on the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996, I offered an amendment that included language to monitor human rights progress in Ethiopia. My amendment was adopted by the House. Unfortunately, my amendment was not included in the conference report on such bill but my colleagues assured me of their deep concern about human rights violations in Ethiopia.

While Ethiopia has made some progress in human rights since the new government assumed power, there are still too many instances of human rights violations throughout the country. Individuals opposed to the current government, particularly journalists, academicians, and opposition party officials have faced ordeals that raise questions about academic freedom, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and the independence of the judiciary. Many Ethiopians are facing trials for alleged offenses against the government and we must work to ensure that they receive a fair and impartial hearing. Other citizens are being harassed as they attempt to express their views on the critical issues facing the country.

Ethiopia has a distinguished history and has always been a shining example for the rest of Africa. The country has a bright future. As a superpower, the United States has an obligation to foster democracy and human rights around the world. We must engage Ethiopia's

ruling government to improve their human rights record. The United States State Department and organizations such as Amnesty International have chronicled the problems confronting Ethiopia in this regard. Over the past year, I have periodically communicated with State department officials to carefully assess the situation in the country and strongly encouraged the department to expand its efforts to improve human rights in Ethiopia.

The Congress of the United States should be on record supporting human rights progress in Ethiopia and I encourage my colleagues to continue to support the inclusion of human rights as an integral element of our foreign policy. I will continue to voice my strong support for human rights in Ethiopia and work with our Government in advancing this important cause.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which limits the amount of economic support funding for Turkey to $22 million until the Turkish Government acknowledges the Armenian genocide.

As my colleagues know, this April marked the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. The great Armenian massacre, which took place between 1915 to 1916, shocked public opinion in the United States and Western Europe.

As Henry Morgenthau, Sr., the former U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, stated ''I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.''

Last year, Members of Congress from both Houses in a bipartisan initiative called upon the President to reaffirm the Armenian genocide as a crime against humanity. While I appreciated the fact that a statement was issued by the White House, many of my colleagues and I were disappointed that the President did not use the word ''genocide'' to describe the systematic annihilation of one and one-half million Armenians.

In fact, earlier this year, I joined many of my colleagues in sending a letter to President Clinton expressing disappointment in the fact that he used the word ''massacres'' rather than the word ''genocide'' to describe this terrible tragedy.

We must also send the same message to Turkey. Turkey must take steps to acknowledge and honor the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide.

I am proud to have cosponsored H. Con. Res. 47, which enjoys the bipartisan support of 178 Members and honors the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. The survivors of the genocide and their descendants have made great contributions to every country in which they have settled—including the United States, where Armenians have made their mark in business, the professions, and our cultural life.

The time has come for Turkey to acknowledge the injustice that took place. For it is only through acknowledging it that we hold out hope for the future that no such event will occur again.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Obey-Frank amendment to prohibit the use of International Military Education and Training Funds for Indonesia. It appears to be that this amendment is designed only to insult Indonesia and would have only negative effects on U.S.-Indonesian relations. Furthermore, if enacted, I believe this amendment would actually hinder the kind of changes and increased respect for human rights its proponents claim to seek.

First, let's be clear on what IMET is. IMET is not guns and ammunition. It's not even combat training. The IMET program sponsors up and coming Indonesian military officers to come to the U.S. to receive either technical training—like accounting—or professional education including military justice and human rights awareness. Thus, IMET participants are exposed to the very issues about which the sponsors of the Obey-Frank amendment are most concerned. How better to ensure that the Indonesian military enhances its professionalism and sensitivity to the human rights concerns we've identified than to include this in their training? Especially when the Indonesian military wants this training? They are seeking our help. If the sponsors of this amendment listen to their own words, then they would see that we ought to continue to provide this training.

Second, IMET also plays an important role in improving U.S.-Indonesian security ties. Indonesia occupies a very central and strategic position in Southeast Asia. Indonesia is a key member of ASEAN and a moderate leader of the non-aligned movement. It is the world's largest Moslem country. Indonesia is very supportive of the United States presence in Southeast Asia and provides us with places in lieu of bases. The modest support the Indonesian military receives from IMET goes a long way in solidifying this relationship. It also provides our own military with exposure to senior and mid-level Indonesian military officers with all of the associated benefits such relations provide.

Third, with 190 million people, Indonesia is a growing market for American goods and services. Last year alone, the U.S. exported $3.3 billion, an increase of over 20 percent from last year. Indonesia is the host to over $6 billion in United States investments. Whether we like it or not, IMET has, in part, come to represent a bellwether of United States engagement with Indonesia. It has become a symbol of United States attitude toward Indonesia. Therefore, to prohibit IMET will be seen by Indonesians—all Indonesian, not just the Suharto Government—as a slap. Unlike most of my colleagues, as a first generation Asian-American, I have a pretty good understanding of how East Asians think. And, I can assure every one of you, this will be interpreted as a direct insult against the Indonesian nation as a whole.

Such an insult will have a direct and negative affect on all aspects of our relationship, including economic ties. At risk are jobs and incomes of Americans right here at home. The only ones really cheering for the misguided symbolism of the Obey-Frank amendment are our Asian and European competitors.

Finally, I am sensitive to the situation in East Timor. Unfortunately, the history as well as the future of East Timor is not as simple and black and white as proponents of this amendment claim. Progress is being made with regard to East Timor, though I agree that more is needed. However, cutting IMET will have no positive effect on East Timor. The Obey-Frank amendment is merely pandering to one special interest in East Timor at great expense overall U.S. interests in the region. In fact, as I pointed out, prohibiting of IMET could actually setback the process of improving human rights.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for America's best interests and reject this misguided amendment.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3540, the fiscal year 1997 foreign operations appropriations bill as reported out of the full Appropriations Committee. I want to commend Chairman CALLAHAN and the distinguished ranking member, Mr. WILSON, for their diligent work in crafting this year's foreign assistance package. However, I must note that the bill falls short in meeting certain critical funding needs, particularly in providing adequate assistance to the Latin and Central American region.

United States assistance for emerging democracies of Latin and Central America is severely threatened by continuing reductions in development assistance. The relatively modest sums directed towards sustainable development in Latin America are a worthwhile long-term investment in the economic and political stability of our closest neighbors. Such an investment can pay off in avoiding natural disasters, economic crises, and military conflicts, which bring with them a much higher cost in economic and human terms. Additionally, the United States has made certain commitments to the region, such as contributions to consolidating peace in Central American nations, which should be honored.

Furthermore, funds for granting relief for countries that hold U.S debt is a way to help them become more self-sufficient as aid flows diminish or end. As this bill continues through the legislative process, I would hope we could do more or increase the amount allocated for debt restricting for the poorest countries and debt buybacks.

The Fund for Special Operations [FSO], the concessional lending arm of the Inter-American Development bank, extends loans—not grants—to the poorest countries in Latin America and their Caribbean for programs designed to alleviate poverty. FSO programs benefit those most in need, especially women and children and microentrepreneurs who have little access to credit through regular financial sources. As bilateral aid to Central American and Caribbean countries is being dramatically reduced, the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations is an effective investment in the development of our poorest neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. While this bill has reduced the administration request for the FSO from $31 million to $10 million, I believe this small U.S. contribution is critical in leveraging significant funds fund other donor nations around the world and hope that we can find a means to increase this amount.

I also want to note that the bill includes a 10-percent cut in funding for the U.S. contribution to the North American Development Bank. The House Report attributes this cut to the slow start-up of the Bank's Community Adjustment and Investment Program, also known as the ''Domestic Window''. Ten percent of the NADBank's capital is allocated for the Domestic Window, which is designed to address trade dislocation issues by assisting communities and businesses throughout the United States. This assistance will be administered through other Federal lending programs and

through the direct lending program of the NADBank's Community Adjustment and Investment Program. However, I would point out that the money is not segregated, therefore, a 10-percent cut directed at the domestic window of the NADBank, is a cut to the overall NADBank funds for border-area projects. While the Bank's Domestic Window may not have been established as quickly as we had hoped, it is now open and lending criteria are in place. The fiscal year 1997 tranche of NADBank capital is critical for the Bank to realize its potential to clean up the border region and address the domestic needs of displaced workers and businesses.

Additionally, I would like to state for the record that even though we are approving counternarcotics assistance in principle to the Governments of Colombia and of Peru, the administration should not interpret this as an unconditional approval of military assistance to those countries and should carefully consult with us before requesting the release of any such assistance.

We all know that in Colombia political killings and disappearances continue at crisis levels while in Peru, thousands languish in that country's jails after blatantly unfair trials. In both countries, due process is flagrantly violated. An amnesty law in Peru has made impunity state policy, while in Colombia impunity is also the norm. We all know that human rights in both countries is under attack. But we approve counternarcotics assistance as a gesture of good faith to the administration with the caveat that serious human rights problems remain.

It is important to highlight that neither the Governments of Peru nor of Colombia will receive any assistance through the foreign military financing account, but both will receive assistance through the counternarcotics account. I want to inform the public as well as my colleagues that this counternarcotics item could lead to an administration request of military transfers to those countries' military units.

I must state for the record that I will use my office to ensure that neither the Colombian Army nor the Peruvian Army as well as Navy will receive any United States assistance. For this, I would like to thank the Chair for his consideration in ensuring that a notification requirement is kept for both countries. Furthermore, when we are duly notified, I will also ensure that if other branches of those countries' militaries are involved in violations, they do not receive a single tax dollar in assistance. This is a responsibility we have to the people in those countries and to our taxpayers as well.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1997.

What is at stake in this bill is nothing less than the future of America's leadership in the world. We all ought to be extremely concerned about the disastrous effects the low level of spending in this bill will have on U.S. influence abroad, on our ability to protect our national interests, and on the lives of hundreds of millions of people in the developing world.

In fact, when we consider the role of American leadership in the world today, and the need to protect our own interests and security in the international arena this bill is frankly an embarrassment.

One of the great myths among Americans is that the Federal Government spends a significant portion of its budget on foreign aid. Indeed, in a University of Maryland study conducted not too long ago, three of four Americans said they believe the United States spends too much on foreign aid. But when asked how much they thought the Nation spends, the median response was 15 percent of the federal budget; and when respondents were asked how much the United States should spend on foreign aid, the median response was 5 percent, with most agreeing that 3 percent would be too little.

As we all know, U.S. foreign aid actually accounts for about three-fourths of 1 percent of the Federal budget. As a percentage of our gross national product [GNP], the United States is now the lowest aid contributor of the world's top 21 industrialized nations.

For a tiny fraction of what we spend on defense, the prudent use of foreign aid helps us meet escalating threats to our national and global security, including chronic poverty, rapid population growth, environmental degradation and forced migration. The long-term effect of the cuts in this bill will be a substantial reduction in the President's ability to conduct foreign policy, leaving only the military option in some circumstances. And for this extreme cost, these cuts in foreign aid will reduce overall federal spending by only a token amount.

Many people do not realize how much our modest investment in foreign assistance programs benefit U.S. businesses and citizens. When the Marshall plan was announced in 1947, only 18 percent of Americans supported that effort to rebuilt Europe. But U.S. assistance helped to establish social and political stability, and created some of our best trading partners.

In the 1960's and 1970's, many criticized United States assistance to countries such as South Korea, Taiwan, Mexico, and India. But once again, U.S. assistance ushered in a period of unprecedented growth. With United States help, India has seen dramatic increases in agricultural production and, as a consequence of our foreign aid, a politically stable India offers a promising market of 900 million people for United States goods.

The fastest growing segment of the U.S. export market is in trade with developing countries. Today, developing countries import almost 40 percent of U.S. exports, accounting for 2 million American jobs. In the past decade alone, exports to developing countries have more than doubled from $71 to $180 billion. The United States is today exporting products and services to many of the nations the United States assisted in the 1960's and 1970's. More than 24 countries since that time have moved from foreign-aid recipient to trading partner. Africa now comprises a faster growing share of the U.S. market than Europe.

Foreign aid has also dramatically improved the lives of hundreds of millions of people and reduced the risk of, and the occurrence of, humanitarian crises.

Since 1960, development assistance has helped reduce infant mortality rates in developing countries by 50 percent, increase life expectancy from 46 to 63 years, and increase primary school enrollment from 48 to 78 percent.

Foreign aid has resulted in important breakthroughs in agriculture; investments made by the United States in better seeds and agriculture techniques has helped make it possible to feed an extra billion people in the developing world.

More than 50 million couples in the developing world use family planning as a direct result of U.S. assistance for overseas family planning services; over the past 35 years, the average number of children per family in the world has been reduced by one third—from six children to four.

U.S. aid is largely credited with fully immunizing 80 percent of all children in developing countries, eradicating smallpox worldwide and virtually eliminating polio in the Western hemisphere.

And, since 1980—in just the past 15 years—U.S. foreign assistance has helped three dozen nations make the transition to democratic government.

The spending reductions that this bill continues from last year threaten to reverse these positive trends, especially as the number of poor around the world, an estimated 1.3 billion people, continues to soar.

One of the most drastic program cuts in this bill, which many of us are deeply concerned about, is the continued 35 percent cut in funding for family planning assistance, along with restrictions that will affect some of the most effective family planning organizations. The United States has historically been the principal supporter of international family planning assistance. Our continuing contribution is vital to the effort to slow the world's rapid population growth, which underlies virtually every developmental, environmental, and national security problems facing the world today.

Global population is now 5.7 billion people, and it is growing by almost 100 million every year—by 260,000 every 24 hours. Future prospects, moreover, are even more staggering. If effective action is not taken in the next few years—as today's 1.6 billion children in the developing world under the age of fifteen reach their childbearing years—the Earth's population could nearly quadruple to 20 billion people by the end of the next century.

In much of the developing world, high birth rates, caused largely by the lack of access of women to basic reproductive health services and information, are contributing to intractable poverty, malnutrition, widespread unemployment, urban overcrowding, and the rapid spread of disease. Population growth is outstripping the capacity of many nations to make even modest gains in economic development, leading to political instability and negating other U.S. development efforts.

The impact of exponential population growth, combined with unsustainable patterns of consumption, is also evident in mounting signs of stress on the world's environment. Under conditions of rapid population growth, renewable resources are being used faster than they can be replaced. Other environmental consequences of the world's burgeoning population are tropical deforestation, erosion of arable land and watersheds, extinction of plant and animal species, and pollution of air, water, and land.

For almost 30 years, population assistance has been a central component of U.S. development assistance. While much more remains to be done, population assistance has had a significant positive impact on the health of women and their children and on society as a whole in most countries. In many parts of Asia, Latin America, and Africa, fertility rates have decreased, often dramatically. Couples are succeeding in having the smaller families they want because of the greater availability of

contraceptives that our assistance has made possible.

Today, approximately 55 percent of couples worldwide use modern methods of contraception, compared with 10 percent in the 1960's Despite this impressive increase in contraceptive use, however, an estimated 125 million couples lack access to family planning services. And, the demand for these services is increasing, largely because populations are growing. Indeed, over the next 20 years, the number of women and men who wish to use contraception will almost double.

Similarly, population assistance has contributed to the significant progress that has been made in reducing infant and child mortality rates. Child survival is integrally linked to women's reproductive health, and specifically to a mother's timing, spacing and number of births. Despite substantial progress, a large proportion of children in the developing world—particularly in sub-Saharan Africa and some Asian countries—still die in infancy.

And, while many countries in the developing world have succeeded in reducing maternal mortality rates, the incidence of maternal death and disability remains unacceptably high, constituting a serious public health problem facing most developing countries. According to the World Health Organization, an estimated 500,000 women die every year as a result of pregnancy and childbirth.

U.S. population assistance is preventive medicine on an international scale. Congress has long recognized this to be the case and over the years has reaffirmed the importance of population assistance in securing U.S. interests abroad. By addressing the basic health and educational needs of women and their families, population assistance provides building blocks for strong democratic government and sets the stage for economic growth. Furthermore, it helps prevent social and political crises, thereby averting the need for costly relief efforts.

At the International Conference on Population and Development [ICPD], held in Cairo in 1994, the Untied States was instrumental in building a broad consensus behind a comprehensive Program of Action, which was signed by almost all of the 180 countries that participated in the conference, and which is intended to help guide the population and development programs of the United Nations and national governments into the next century. Central to this plan is the recognition that with adequate funding this decade for family planning and reproductive health services, as well as educational, economic, and social opportunities necessary to enhance the status of women, we can stabilize world population in the first half of the next century.

This bill, however, effectively abandons the goals of the ICPD and the international community, as well as our Nation's own historical position—supported by many Republican and Democratic administrations and congresses—that population assistance is one of the most cost effective and important uses of our foreign aid dollars.

The Appropriations Committee has, unfortunately, followed the unwise course it began last year when funding for family planning assistance was cut drastically. This year's bill, which would allow no more than $356 million to be spent for this purpose, would have devastating consequences for developing countries. The Agency for International Development estimates that the limit on family planning assistance in this bill could result in 7 million couples in developing nations who would have used modern contraceptive methods left without access to those methods. That would cause 4 million more women to experience unintended pregnancies and, as a result, there would be: 1.9 more unplanned births; 8,000 more women dying in pregnancy and childbirth; 134,000 more infant deaths; and 1.6 million more abortions.

That last statistic—1.6 million more abortons—is particularly important to note, since Members may be under the impression that this bill would reduce the incidence of abortion by providing funding on favorable terms to family planning organizations that abide by the so-called Mexico City policy. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact is, U.S. funds do not pay for abortions. For over 20 years, under the Helms amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, Federal law has prohibited any U.S. funds from being used for abortions, or to promote abortion. There is no reason whatsoever to differentiate between organizations that do or do not abide by the Mexico City policy.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to urge strong support for the amendment that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] will be offering to strike the provision in the bill that caps family planning assistance at 65 percent of the 1995 level, $365 million, so that the Agency for International Development could apply more of its appropriated funds for the very vital and urgent purpose of providing family planning assistance.

But I urge Members to vote against final passage as a way of expressing opposition to the unwise, counterproductive, and destructive cuts in foreign assistance contained in this bill. These programs work, and providing adequate funding for them will reduce human suffering, promote global peace and security, and save many times the expense in future U.S. foreign assistance.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the foreign operations appropriations bill. The committee is like the tireless work horse who moves forward despite the weight of its load. yet, unlike the work horse, the members of this committee do not wear blinders. This bill is fiscally responsible, and it preserves and protects the long term interests of this country. It marks the beginning of the important task of the restructuring of foreign aid.

Our world has changed significantly in the last decade, and it will continue to change. The fall of communism in Eastern Europe and Russia, the rising powers in Asia, the torrent of terrorist activities. The list of challenges for America is significant. The answers may be different, but the goal remains the same. We are working toward preserving our independence, and promoting our national security.

At the same time, we have to try to spend less in our foreign efforts. This does not mean that we are ignoring our duties. It does mean that we should cut back on wasteful spending that does not achieve our goals. This bill accomplishes the long awaited consolidation of similar, repetitive programs. It reduces foreign aid spending by $458 million from fiscal year 1996.

Reductions in spending have been made possible by the consolidation of funding that was doled out in the past to many different programs which seek to achieve similar goals. Appropriations are thus targeted to specific areas of concern more effectively and efficiently. It is an attempt to cut down the proverbial forest of redtape and bureaucracy that have become all too familiar. After all, even the workhorse has trouble plodding through an endless maze of dead ends.

The aim is to achieve our goals in a direct manner, with less reliance on international organizations where we can't control the way our own money is used; the way the tax dollars of the American people are used. It is clear that this bill allows the United States to maintain a steady course as the eminent global leader. The empathy of the American people is as clear in our humanitarian efforts, as their practicality and common-sense is in our appropriations. This bill is one that protects our sovereignty, and works toward our goal of American security. I support this bill wholeheartedly, and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule by titles, and each title shall be considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote of any amendment and may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

After the reading of the final lines of the bill, a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted shall, if offered by the majority leader or a designee, have precedence over a motion to amend.

The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

The Export-Import Bank of the United States is authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such corporation, and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as may be necessary in carrying out the program for the current fiscal

year for such corporation: *Provided,* That none of the funds available during the current fiscal year may be used to make expenditures, contracts, or commitments for the export of nuclear equipment, fuel, or technology to any country other than a nuclear-weapon State as defined in Article IX of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons eligible to receive economic or military assistance under this Act that has detonated a nuclear explosive after the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBSIDY APPROPRIATION

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance, and tied-aid grants as authorized by section 10 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, $726,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further,* That such sums shall remain available until 2012 for the disbursement of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance and tied-aid grants obligated in fiscal years 1997 and 1998: *Provided further,* That up to $50,000,000 of funds appropriated by this paragraph shall remain available until expended and may be used for tied-aid grant purposes: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated by this paragraph may be used for tied-aid credits or grants except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated by this paragraph are made available notwithstanding section 2(b)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, in connection with the purchase or lease of any product by any East European country, any Baltic State, or any agency or national thereof.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan and insurance programs (to be computed on an accrual basis), including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $20,000 for official reception and representation expenses for members of the Board of Directors, $47,614,000: *Provided,* That necessary expenses (including special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the collection of moneys owed the Export-Import Bank, repossession or sale of pledged collateral or other assets acquired by the Export-Import Bank in satisfaction of moneys owed the Export-Import Bank, or the investigation or appraisal of any property, or the evaluation of the legal or technical aspects of any transaction for which an application for a loan, guarantee or insurance commitment has been made, shall be considered nonadministrative expenses for the purposes of this heading: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding subsection (b) of section 117 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1992, subsection (a) thereof shall remain in effect until October 1, 1997.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION NONCREDIT ACCOUNT

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation is authorized to make, without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by 31 U.S.C. 9104, such expenditures and commitments within the limits of funds available to it and in accordance with law as may be necessary: *Provided,* That the amount available for administrative expenses to carry out the credit and insurance programs (including an amount for official reception and representation expenses which shall not exceed $35,000) shall not exceed $30,000,000: *Provided further,* That project-specific transaction costs, including direct and indirect costs incurred in claims settlements, and other direct costs associated with services provided to specific investors or potential investors pursuant to section 234 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall not be considered administrative expenses for the purposes of this heading.

PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, $72,000,000, as authorized by section 234 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further,* That such sums shall be available for direct loan obligations and loan guaranty commitments incurred or made during fiscal years 1997 and 1998: *Provided further,* That such sums shall remain available through fiscal year 2005 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal year 1997, and through fiscal year 2006 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal year 1998. In addition, such sums as may be necessary for administrative expenses to carry out the credit program may be derived from amounts available for administrative expenses to carry out the credit and insurance programs in the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Noncredit Account and merged with said account.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 661 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $38,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1998: *Provided,* That the Trade and Development Agency may receive reimbursements from corporations and other entities for the costs of grants for feasibility studies and other project planning services, to be deposited as an offsetting collection to this account and to be available for obligation until September 30, 1998, for necessary expenses under this paragraph: *Provided further,* That such reimbursements shall not cover, or be allocated against, direct or indirect administrative costs of the agency.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIGHTFOOT

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LIGHTFOOT: Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $64,000,000)''.

Page 7, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $60,000,000)''.

Page 13, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by first commending the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] for presenting the House with, on balance, another fine bill. The bill continues the downward trend in foreign aid by reducing this bill some $450 million below last year's appropriated level. Others talk deficit reduction, these gentleman, like their predecessors, Mr. OBEY and Mr. LIVINGSTON, deliver real spending reductions. We owe them a lot for that.

Before I explain my amendment, let me also join my colleagues in expressing appreciation to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] for his years of service in this House. Whether CHARLIE is riding a camel with bandoleers of ammo over him in some country that 95 percent of us cannot pronounce or whether he is up in the full committee working through, he has made an excellent, positive contribution to this House and to this country. CHARLIE, we are going to miss you.

The House simply will be not be the same without you.

I offer this amendment because I am very concerned about the proposed funding level for the Export-Import Bank of the United States. In less than a year we have reduced Eximbank funding from $786 million, to $744.5 million through recision, to $726 million in this bill. I think this sends a terrible signal to our exporters and a worse signal to foreign governments.

Frankly, I would not support the existence of the Eximbank if world markets were truly free and open. But the fact of the matter is that foreign governments, as a matter of national policy, subsidize their businesses entry into new markets. This foreign activity is costing us business and jobs.

Our late Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, noted in the ''National Export Strategy'' that political and economic pressure brought to bear by other governments has already cost U.S. exports almost $25 billion in lost contracts.

And the world's not waiting for us. Already, over half of our exports of capital goods go to the developing world. To assure our Nation's future economic prosperity we must be prepared to support our Nation's businesses in the face of foreign government intervention.

My amendment increases the funding level for Export-Import Bank loans by $64 million to basically the amount approved in last year's bill. This would support an additional $2 billion in export assistance over the fiscal year 1996 levels and create up to 40,000 additional U.S. jobs.

I propose as the offset a 3-percent reduction in AID development assistance and a 1-percent reduction in AID operating expenses.

The amendment has drawn the support of a number of organizations including: the Coalition of Employment through Exports; The United States-Russia Business Council; the Aerospace Industries Association; the General Aviation Manufactures Association; and the International Engineering and Construction Industries Council.

I commend these groups for stepping up in support of this amendment. Asking for a funding increase in an era of declining budgets means making tough choices and these groups have associated themselves with what is a difficult funding offset.

The amendment does ask for a 1-percent reduction in total AID spending. My amendment does not, however, makes any cuts in the child survival account. As Americans, we all want to

do our best to help the world's neediest citizens.

But other parts of AID's development assistance account should be looked at more closely. Although well intended, development assistance simply demonstrates little by way of results—beyond perhaps making us feel better.

In an era of declining budgets we must make choices. I believe a $2 billion increase in exports, leading to the creation of up to an additional 40,000 U.S. jobs, is an appropriate tradeoff against a 1-percent reduction in total AID spending.

Unfortunately, I detect too many crosscurrents within the House which lead me to think we cannot be successful today.

There are groups which support an increase for Eximbank but ironically also stand to benefit from AID development assistance grants and are not able or willing to offer another offset.

There are Members concerned about Eximbank's role in China and Members on the other side of the coin concerned about Eximbank's decision not to move forward with the Three Gorges Dam project. Finally, there are Members who still need convincing that Eximbank isn't just some corporate welfare scheme.

I will not press for a vote in the House today which some might choose to construe somehow as a lack of support for Eximbank.

It certainly is not.

I also would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and others who have spoken in support of this measure and were ready to support it here on the House floor today.

Mr. Chairman, as an old rodeo announcer, one of the first things you do is count the house. We counted the House, and we see where the votes are.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa for his efforts. Certainly, there is no greater supporter in this House than Mr. LIGHTFOOT with respect to the Eximbank, and with justifiable cause because Eximbank does create jobs in the United States. The gentleman is exactly right in his philosophy. But the committee has worked long and hard trying to reach a resolve and I respect the gentleman's mission. I also respect the fact that he recognizes we have done the best we can do. If there is anything we can do in conference to facilitate his request, we certainly would take that into consideration.

I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa for his efforts. If anyone should get credit in this bill or in last year's bill for adequately funding the Eximbank, it is the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman LIGHTFOOT. I appreciate his efforts.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: On page 3, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I stand here as a longtime supporter of the Eximbank. I remember in the early years that I served on this committee and in fact in the early years when I was chairman, my ranking Republican member was then the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Kemp. At that time he and the Reagan administration favored the elimination of all support for the Eximbank. We resisted that. We stopped the elimination. I, for years, supported appropriations for that institution above the amount asked by the administration because the Eximbank, we felt, was important in the effort to expand American exports around the globe.

I take a back seat to no one in my desire to do that. I think people need to understand that in this country one out of every seven jobs are related to our ability to export or to compete effectively against companies who are importing.

I do think that we have an anomalous situation, and that is what this amendment attempts to address itself to.

We have many, many accounts in this bill which are very deeply reduced. We have a huge cut in the IDA account. We have large reductions in development accounts. We have huge cuts for administration in AID. The 1997 bill, as reported by the committee, cuts or level funds for all administrative accounts in the bill with the exception of the Eximbank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

I support the work of those agencies. As I said, I have tried to ensure over the years that they received generous levels of funding. But at a time when virtually every other administrative account in the bill has either been cut or straight lined, I have a great deal of difficulty justifying or advocating increases to this agency.

I would also point out that the Eximbank has been cited this year as having provided an excessive number of achievement bonuses for over 200 of its employees. I frankly feel that sometimes bonuses are perfectly appropriate. But it strikes me that when we had that many in the midst of forcing reductions in many domestic agencies and at a time when we are forcing reductions in many other agencies in this bill, I just do not feel comfortable supporting that.

AID has announced a reduction in force of about 10 percent of its work force. Its operating fund has been cut by $30 million by the committee. There will be attempts made on this floor today to reduce it even further. It seems to me that with those kinds of significant reductions, it is not appropriate to be providing an increase in administrative costs for Exim. Even so, my amendment does not eliminate all of the increase in administrative expenses. It simply eliminates half of the increase provided by the committee.

It seems to me that, therefore, it is perfectly prudent and reasonable to suggest a $1 million reduction in this account for administrative expenses, and that is all that the amendment does.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not addressing the issues of this particular amendment. I am taking this time, Mr. Chairman, just to commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the chairman, for the excellent work he has done on this legislation and also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], for his leadership. We appreciate that over the years and for all he has done for this body and for his country.

With the leadership of these two individuals, this legislation takes another positive step forward in shifting our priorities away from foreign aid and helping American companies increase their exports. I think that is the key to increasing exports and creating new jobs for American workers.

This bill reduces foreign aid by nearly half a billion dollars from last year's bill. Compared with the administration's request for more foreign aid, this bill saves $1 billion for the American taxpayers.

Particularly, let me commend Mr. CALLAHAN for sharply reducing the AID Housing Guarantee Program. The reason I do that is my Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade has conducted a 3-year investigation on this program with the assistance of the General Accounting Office. We uncovered the fact that AID's mismanagement of the Housing Guarantee Program is causing a 40-percent loss rate on loans that the United States has guaranteed, 40-percent loss rate.

So far, 22 foreign countries and governments have stopped payment on these U.S.-backed loans. This means that half of the countries in the program have caused losses that the United States has to cover. All told, we have paid more than $400 million to cover these bad loans. What is worse, GAO predicts that these losses will continue to mount year after year.

Mr. Chairman, we will pay over $1 billion to cover these losses. This is very significant for us to remember. Several weeks ago, the inspector general of AID testified before our committee. He agreed with our judgment that the Housing Guarantee Program was in big trouble and has to be reviewed. This provision in this bill, which cuts off virtually all new guarantees, is the right step to take. It is

consistent with the provisions of our authorization bill and would terminate this program.

Moreover, I support the focus of this bill in assisting our exporters. In hearings before our committee, witness after witness from the exporting community has emphasized over and over again that funding for the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corp. and the Trade and Development Agency are essential to our competitive position in the world markets.

□ 1215

In sum, this legislation sets the right priorities, it reduces spending, it shifts money away from foreign aid, and it helps our exporters, and it shuts down poorly run, wasteful programs.

So all in all, Mr. Chairman, this legislation has looked at the key issues and, I think, has made the proper judgments all along the way, and so I think this is a particularly good piece of legislation.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate where the gentleman is coming from, and certainly, if anybody is in favor of cutting expenses of this huge Federal Government it is me. but we have worked in a bipartisan manner to reduce Federal aid responsibly, and I think that the subcommittee and the full committee have done it. The administration requested the amount of money we put in this bill.

Now, if we are going to have responsible administrations administering programs as well supported as the Eximbank and if the Eximbank is going to continue to move in the direction of concentrating some of their efforts toward small business, then we are going to have to give them adequate resources to provide that service.

We have conveyed to the leadership of the Eximbank and not to the administration that we think they ought to look at smaller projects. There is something else other than a dam, there is something else other than a highway, there are small business people in the United States who have a potential customer in foreign countries, and that is why we have the Eximbank, and if they tell us they need money to provide this type of service to investigate whether or not the loan is viable, we have to give them adequate resources.

So I try to give this administration as much flexibility as I can. They came to me, and said in order to have an effective Exim operation, we must provide them with adequate funds. That is incidentally the request, I think that we must give them the benefit of the doubt, encourage them to be frugal, but at the same time not tie their hands and eliminate the possibility of job creativity in the United States.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to underline what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has said. Multinational companies in the United States, are companies that create the highest paying jobs in the United States. The Eximbank has done as spectacular job in the last few years of stimulating American jobs at home as well as stimulating American investment abroad. We all know that American companies work at a great disadvantage in foreign trade, due to the Corrupt Practices Act. Other countries can deduct the bribes they pay to do business from their income taxes. The companies in the United States have to abide by a very strict Corrupt Practices Act. I hope that we can make progress in persuading our European partners and others not to pay bribes anymore, but so far we have not been able to do that.

But without the financing that is furnished by the Eximbank, there would be tremendous job loss in the United States and tremendous economic loss. A loss in our gross national product, a loss in Federal income tax revenues and a loss across the board economically.

So I would join the gentleman in opposing this amendment.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I stand to speak on behalf of the amendment No. 24 from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. I do not know if the Members of this House are aware of a February 1, 1996, article: ''The Export-Import Bank Overpaid Salaries.'' This shows that the Eximbank illegally increased the salaries of about 200 employees by an average of almost $5,000 a year after portraying them as critical workers that the agency could not afford to lose, and the bank's acting chairman, now a chairman who is appointed full-time permanently during the recess, Martin Kamarck, said in February 1996 we blew it, we were aggressive, and made a mistake and will fix it. Well, this is now June 1996, and it still has not been fixed. The Eximbank only has about 400 employees, and half of them, one-half of them, got pay increases, and those 200 employees, I believe, represent 25 percent of all the Federal employees that got pay increases.

Now, this is an agency that needs some trimming. We are not talking about cutting back the amount of subsidies that will be available for the purposes of helping American exporters compete overseas. What we are talking about is an agency which will be 2.5 percent, there will be a 2.5 percent reduction in subsidy, and yet the agency wants a 4.2-percent increase in their operations expense. That is not necessary, and simply because the agency requests the amount of money does not mean that we should give it to them.

I have an even stronger amendment which I will be offering later on in the course of this debate that will cut the administrative expenses by approximately $3 million. But as to the Obey amendment, it is correct, it should be done, there is no reason why the Eximbank cannot be forced to live within its means, and the $1 million to which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is referring I think is a fact that this is a time for the American people to get back the $1 million that was improperly paid to over 200 workers at the Eximbank.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Let me simply observe that for those who indicate that they are concerned that Exim will not be able to provide sufficient services to small business if this cut goes into effect, I would suggest that I have been involved for a long time in trying to get greater focus on small business at Exim. And perhaps, taking a note of the reduction which has occurred, they will make a greater effort to respond to the needs of small business in order to build a broader constituency. That might be a very positive result of adopting this amendment.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague from Wisconsin. I think it is disingenuous on the part of Eximbank to say that unless they get their additional appropriations, they cannot reach out to small businesses. But my question is this: Just because an agency wants to increase its outreach, does that mean it has to increase its budget?

We are talking about a reordering of priorities, and I would encourage my colleagues to vote in the affirmative on Mr. OBEY's Amendment No. 24.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MANZULLO

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANZULLO: Page 3, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,136,000)''.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment numbered 19 to reduce the bill's $47.6 million appropriation for Export-Import Bank administrative expenses by $3.1 million.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is quite simple. If the Committee on Appropriations could recommend a cut of 2.5 percent for the subsidy appropriations for the Eximbank, certainly they do not need to increase Washington bureaucracy at Exim by 4.2 percent especially if the General Accounting Office found nearly $1 million in overpaid bonuses.

This is an agency, Mr. Chairman, that said that it had to take a lot of time in coming to a decision because of the layoff and the shutdown of the Federal Government, and then they turn right around and give almost $1 million in bonuses.

This is simply a budgetary priority issue. My amendment would cut Washington bureaucracy at the same percentage level as the cut in the program account at Exim. If Exim programs drop by 2.5 percent, so should a Washington bureaucracy. A 2.5-percent cut from last year's level is not a drastic measure. Every agency is experiencing severe budget crisis. Exim should not be the exception.

Mr. Chairman, the President of Exim said last February that the bank made a mistake and they would fix the overpaid bonus problem. Out of 448 employees, 200 were awarded bonuses, but the GAO said that only 10 of the 200 were actually eligible to receive the money. Well, Exim is one of the smallest agencies in the Federal Government. Exim accounted for 25 percent of all bonuses granted governmentwide. GAO concluded that many of these awards did not appear to comply with the statutory requirement.

Well, months later the issue is still unresolved, and to add salt to an open wound, the President nominated Mr. Kamarck to head the Eximbank in a recess appointment, allowing him once again to issue bonuses.

Finally, the chairman of Exim said in a press conference last week that their services are not needed for the largest public works project in the biggest emerging market in the world. Mr. Kamarck said U.S. companies can win these contracts on their own. I am perplexed at that statement. He seems to question the need for these additional personnel and resources if Exim declines at this time to support our exporters for the Three Gorges Dam project. If Exim immediately withdraws support for both large and small U.S. exporters for this huge project, then Exim does not need the extra $2 million for outreach activities to small businesses. Exim could do more for small businesses by revisiting the Three Gorges Dam decision.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment. If my colleagues are concerned about the deficit, if my colleagues want to cut Washington waste and bureaucracy, if my colleagues want to balance the committee's recommendations for programs with resources, if my colleagues want to sent a message to Eximbank, then support the Manzullo amendment No. 19.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me just see if I can sketch out here what is really happening. There are two things in play here. No. 1, we have this administration running all over Capitol Hill trying to persuade those of us in the House and Senate to vote for MFN, most-favored-nation status. I support that. I think it is good, and I hope that it will pass.

So on the one hand they want us, as a Congress, to support MFN. On the other hand this administration sends a memo to the Eximbank and says do not fund any of the loans for the Three Gorges project in China, and the reason they give in their memo is for humanitarian and environmental reasons.

So this is the classic Clinton way of doing things. On the one hand they want to portray themselves as being for the environment and being for humanitarian efforts. On the other hand they want to come up here and ignore that on MFN. So they sent this memo to the Eximbank snubbing their nose at American business. The Three Gorges project is going to proceed, it is going to move ahead. China has decided that they want this project.

So the administration wants to say, ''Oh, we're for humanitarian environmental issues,'' on the one hand, and yet come up here and ignore them on MFN. So they have totally politicized the Eximbank on this issue. Their memo has scared the Exim people to the extent that they will not allow these loans to proceed, and American business gets snubbed, and the projects, the money for this equipment, will go to our foreign competitors.

So they want to be able to tell American business, ''Yes, we're supporting you because we're for MFN, but on the other hand we can't support this particular issue.''

□ 1230

Mr. Chairman, this agency has been politicized by this administration. This amendment will send a strong shot across the bow of the Eximbank that Congress knows what the administration and Exim is up to. Hand in glove, they are working together so the administration can have what they want, on the one hand with MFN, and they can also then go out and portray themselves as being environmentalists, and also for humanitarian concerns.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAHOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding, I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, that Exim's refusal to get involved in financing with several companies could cost this country tens of thousands of highly skilled and highly paid jobs. Is that correct?

Mr. LAHOOD. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANZULLO. This is what this is about. We are talking about the largest public works project in the world.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying this. If the Members who are in their offices watching this debate on this amendment want to be consistent on MFN, what they ought to do is vote for this amendment and continue to send a strong signal that we cannot have it both ways. This is the classic Clinton attempt to have it both ways. It is nonsense, and we should not stand by and let it happen. That will send a strong message.

I encourage Members who care about American business and care about companies doing business abroad to do this.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind the gentleman, and I am sure he probably knows it, that this subcommittee, as well as other committees, have put environmental constraints on the Eximbank, and they are mandated by Congress to make decisions based on that.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Texas, it is very clear why they made this decision, because the Clinton administration told them to make it. They told them how to direct this money and they told them not to direct it onto the Three Gorges project.

Mr. WILSON. It is quite possible. I am not sure about who directed who to do what, but it is very likely that under any circumstances, and I know how you gentlemen from Illinois feel, because it means a lot of jobs, but still, I believe that the Eximbank would have come under great, savage criticism had they approved this loan.

Mr. LAHOOD. Then how can the administration run up here on Capitol Hill, then, and try to persuade all of us to vote for MFN? Where are their environmental and humanitarian concerns when it comes to that issue?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, the issues are simply not connected. The issues are simply not connected. MFN is an across-the-board trade. It is giving China the same status as practically every other country in the world has. It has nothing to do with Three Gorges Dam or the determination by the Eximbank that it did not fit into that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I did not come here to be Bill Clinton's Congressman. I did not come here to be Tommy Thompson's Congressman. I did not come here to be anybody's Congressman except the people I was elected to represent, so I do not have to come here and support every action taken by the administration.

Mr. Chairman, I do not happen to favor MFN for China. I think China has not behaved in a way that entitles

them to that privilege. I also happen to think that the Eximbank was right in the decision they made on this project, so I do not think the gentleman from Illinois—and he has a perfect right to take the position he does—but we do not have on this side of the aisle, or at least I do not have, a responsibility to support every decision made by the Clinton adminstration. I happen to think that the Eximbank was correct in that case, in the case that the gentleman from Illinois has a profound disagreement with.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply suggest that I think my amendment is a rational effort to send a signal to Exim that they should not provide inappropriate bonuses, and that it is also rational to indicate that we ought not to be exempting any agency from the squeeze when we have a very tight fiscal situation.

But if the point of the gentleman's amendment is to express the Congress' disagreement with Exim's decision on the case in question, then I would strongly urge opposition to that, because I think that would send an even more confusing signal to the Chinese Government, and I think if we are dealing with the question of what ought to happen with respect to MFN, we ought to deal with it when the time comes.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman recognize the inconsistency that I tried to point out here, though, with trying to portray the thing in two different lights by the administration?

Mr. OBEY. In my view, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, the administration's position in support of MFN and in opposition to this is irrelevant. I have an obligation to exercise my own judgment. The gentleman is free to characterize the position of the administration any way he wants.

On this issue, I do not care what the administration thinks. I care about what I think is right, and what I think is right is not to exempt Exim from the budgetary squeeze that is befalling virtually every other agency in this bill. I also happen to think that they were right to turn down the project that the gentleman thinks they should have approved.

I am not trying to get into policy questions on Exim I am simply trying to make the simple observation we should not be expanding their administrative expenses when we are cutting everybody else's. That is what my amendment does without getting into a premature argument on this.

Mr. LAHOOD. If the gentleman would further yield, I wonder, if the gentleman's own amendment goes down, if he would be willing to support ours, then, since then he would be accomplishing what he is trying to accomplish here. He would reduce by an amount of money the ability of them to do what he wants.

Mr. OBEY. As I said, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because I recognize the importance of the Exim in extending business abroad and enabling us to provide exports. I am going after their administrative account because I do not like an administrative decision they made with respect to bonuses. But if we are going to start going after their administrative account every time we do not like a policy decision they made, we will have 100 amendments on the administrative account. I do not think that makes much sense for either them or the Congress to be doing.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I would just state that the purpose of my amendment is to reduce the administrative expenses by the same percentage as the reduction in the subsidy appropriation; that is all we are doing, because we are asked to decrease the subsidy appropriation by 2.5 percent, and we are also being asked to increase the administrative expenses by 4.2 percent. So if we are spending less money, they should in essence be spending less money to administer this.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his observation. I do not think necessarily that administrative expenses are tied directly to the level of financial support the agency gets. Some deals are a whole lot more complicated than others. The world is a lot more complicated than that.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by my two close friends, the gentleman from Illinois, is offered in understandable frustration. Simply, what happened, days ago the Eximbank killed efforts by some American companies, including some from Illinois who would be participating in a massive Three Gorges hydroelectric dam project in China. A lot of time and money went into preparing bids for that project. Eximbank first signaled its willingness to finance them, and then they switched signals. I do not think it is the end of the road. I do not think the door is truly closed on that project. I think it is closed at this point.

But it is a terrible message. While I understand the gentleman's frustration, this is not the solution. As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] mentioned, if we are going to penalize the Eximbank or any other agency of the United States because they do not do what we want them to do, then we are going to be here every day on every bill with amendments such as this.

Mr. Chairman, I share the goal of the gentleman. I hope American companies will be able to ultimately participate in the Three Gorges hydroelectric dam project, but I do know that companies in the Members' districts and in their States are going to benefit, whether this becomes a reality or not, this particular project.

I just want to tell the Members that I share their frustration. I have had projects turned down in the State of Alabama. Even though I disagreed with the Eximbank for turning my people down in the State of Alabama, I did not try to penalize them by reducing their operating expenditures.

I share the frustration. I have talked with the chairman of the Eximbank about the Members' projects. I support Members' involvement in the project and I support the project, but this is not the place to establish policy. So let me share in the frustrations, let me share in my willingness to assist the Members on this or any other project. But we have worked long and hard to come up with a responsible piece of legislation that has bipartisan support, and we cannot respond to every request that comes along by punishing someone. We are not going to punish the people who are doing the work. We are not going to punish the executives who made the decision. This is going to punish the ability of American small business people and large business people to compete with the French and the Germans and the British in foreign operations.

So I respect where Members are coming from, but I also have to respectfully speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, how many agencies is the gentleman aware of that have had an actual increase in administrative expenses besides border patrol?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, how many agencies does the gentleman know of that are creating thousands of jobs? How many agencies does he know of that created $17 billion in American exports and 340,000 American jobs? That is a part of our overall policy. I would say, why are we going to punish American exports?

Mr. MANZULLO. I am not punishing, Mr. Chairman. All I am saying to the gentleman, why should the Eximbank administrative account have an increase when all other agencies, including social service agencies, are having decreases?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Because we have advised them to do more, and No. 1, we get something in return for this. This is not going to go on forever. These people buy Caterpillar machines, they buy shrimp boats from Bayou Le Batre Alabama, they buy supplies made by the American people, they buy generators for these hydroelectric plants made by the American people. So this is an agency that we have been demanding to focus more so on small business people. We are encouraging them to spend more money focusing on the ability to create jobs in the small business sector.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman aware that the generator business is going to Canada because of the decision by Eximbank, and those generators that can be American built and shipped are now going overseas for shipment to China?

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is the policy. That is this one particular job.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. I just want to make one point, Mr. Chairman. I respect the gentleman's point of view on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. LAHOOD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CALLAHAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would just make this point. If this decision were made on the merits, we would not be standing here. This administration has politicized the Eximbank by sending them a memo saying ''Do not fund this.'' So it is not us coming over here trying to exert influence. This agency has been politicized by the Clinton administration. There is no question about it. If they had not done that, if Exim would have done what they are supposed to have done, been professional, done it on the merits, it would be different. That is why we are here, because we are irritated about the fact that it has been so politicized.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. MANZULLO's amendment to H.R. 3540, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1997, and want to personally commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Procurement Exports, and Business Opportunities for his efforts to assist U.S. businesses in their endeavor to compete in the world market.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment specifically addresses the fiscal year 1997 appropriation for the Export-Import Bank and seeks to reduce their administrative costs by 2.5 percent, in proportion to the amount of reduction in subsidies, rather than increasing administrative costs by 4.2 percent as set forth in this legislation.

My reasons for supporting this amendment are many, but I would like to take this time to discuss only one example that has prompted me to support this reduction in administrative costs. This concerns the recent announcement by Martin Kamarck, president and chairman of the Eximbank, in which he stated that the Board concluded that the Eximbank cannot issue a letter of interest for the Three Gorges Dam project in China, the largest hydroelectric project in the world, and one in which I have had considerable interest because of the effect it would have on a company in my district, and the people it employs.

Even though this particular project was found financially credit worthy and technically sound by the Board, it concluded that a letter of interest could not be provided to U.S. companies seeking to do business with China because of a lack of information from the Chinese relative to environmental concerns. Mr. Kamarck went on to further comment that this decision does not limit U.S. companies from privately participating in the Three Gorges project.

First, it seems to me that if the staff of the Eximbank were not able to provide enough information on the environmental concerns to the Board, then the Board should not have voted until this information had been obtained. On this particular point, my office staff, as well as numerous others, inquired from time-to-time throughout the review process as to whether or not additional information was needed, and we were told repeatedly that they had enough information to make a recommendation.

Second, if the Eximbank is not going to assist U.S. companies, but suggests that they participate privately, then maybe we should be thinking about whether or not we need the Eximbank at all.

I do not think we need to be rewarding an organization that does not seem to be following the process as it was intended by Congress and changes the goalposts in the process, thereby hurting U.S. businesses in their efforts to compete with other countries who are now involved in selling equipment to China for this project.

Officials at Caterpillar, a large supplier of Earth moving equipment in my district, have suggested to me that what we should be doing is to increase the administrative appropriation at Eximbank, rather than reducing it, so they can hire more environmentalists to do the obviously needed staff work on projects such as this, but I disagree. the Eximbank has been touted by the administration as one of the brightest stars in their campaign to promote U.S. exports, but I believe their reputation has suffered as a result of the delay on this matter of providing export-finance assistance for the sale of United States goods to China for use in building that country's massive project.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should vote to reduce the administrative costs for the Eximbank by the same amount that we have reduced the subsidy, and I urge my colleagues to support Mr. MANZULLO's amendment.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] be allowed to offer amendment No. 26 at a later point in the reading of the bill, even if consideration of title I has been completed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would ask the reason for the unanimous consent request.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the reason for the unanimous-consent request is because I have an amendment to cut another item in this title. I am required to be in a leadership meeting for the next 10 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Before I proceed, I would like to engage the gentleman on a colloquy on the pending amendment, a discussion on his amendment.

Does the gentleman realize that if the Obey amendment is passed and the gentleman's amendment is passed, the total dollar amount in administrative costs to Eximbank will be cut?

□ 1245

Mr. MANZULLO. The total amount would be minus $3.6 million, and his would be $1 million, that is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. I think his is $2 million. You can add them together; if you add them together. So the gentleman is right, close to $5 million. Now, is that what the gentleman really wants to do?

Mr. MANZULLO. It is $4.1 million.

Mr. VOLKMER. Is that what the gentleman really wants to do?

Mr. MANZULLO. I think it is necessary that administrative expenses be cut at a time when the subsidy appropriation is being cut, that is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I may have been able to support the gentleman's amendment is he had offered it as a substitute for Obey. But as accumulate to Obey I am going to have to oppose the amendment, and I think the House should oppose the amendment, because when you total it out, it is in excess of what you say you are cutting.

Mr. MANZULLO. That is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. I would recommend to the House that we go ahead and vote and adopt the Obey amendment, which I think is a reasonable cut in administrative costs.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, if you take the Obey amendment, that is the $1 million that the chairman of the Eximbank should have paid back a long time ago, and he never did. He said back on the last day of January of this year that he was going to make up for the improper bonuses that he paid that cost the American taxpayers $1 million. To date he had not done that. So we start with the $1 million reimbursing the taxpayers that is already owed them.

My amendment then says, let us reduce the administrative expenses by the same percentage as the overall subsidy appropriation, which is 2.5 percent.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, then, you are really in favor of both amendments and adding them together in cutting the $4.1 million.

Mr. MANZULLO. That is correct. I think we can cut bureaucrats at

Eximbank and the organization can function just as well.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would argue that the Obey amendment, which I think is a reasonable amount, sends a signal to Eximbank and that Eximbank should abide by the rules and regulations of paying their employees. I do not disagree with the gentleman on that, and I think they will. I also believe that Exim does provide a meaningful, well-rounded program to provide exports out of this country. Even though there may be those Members who are in disagreement with some specific areas, I do not believe that you really should throw the baby out with the bath water. I believe that the amount that is provided in the Obey amendment is a reasonable amount, does send a signal, which you really want to do, does bring to the attention that the Congress will consider the actions of the Eximbank, just like we will any other agency of this Government and the bureaucracy.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin does not prevail, would the gentleman then be prepared to support the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, if the Obey amendment fails, then I would support the Manzullo amendment, but I would not support both. But I would support the Obey amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words, and not to take a position on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to speak on behalf of the bill in its entirety as it has been written by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and voted on by all of the members of the subcommittee. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has done an outstanding job on this bill. He has worked out agreements where frankly no agreements have been thought possible on issues that are highly controversial and proved so last year. Such issues as family planning that really hung the bill up for 9 months.

So I just want to tip my hat to him for his magnificent performance, and as well to the performance of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], the ranking minority on the subcommittee. He has done his usual superb job. He has also served valiantly in this Congress for I do not know how many years before I even came here. But he has been a great contributing Member to the Congress, both throughout his tenure as a member of the Majority and now as a member of the minority.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] has served as an outstanding contributing member as the ranking minority member on the subcommittee. This will be the last bill that the gentleman helps to manage as he goes on to other things following his departure from the U.S. Congress. I just want to thank him for his efforts and wish him will and Godspeed in all that is ahead of him and in all that life has to offer after he departs from the U.S. Congress.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, again, I compliment the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] for their work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to this amendment and urge Members to vote against the amendment. But I also want to urge all of our Members to vote for this bill that has been so finely crafted by the two people most responsible for the bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Let me just point out that I recognize the frustration, I recognize the position of the two gentlemen from Illinois, but their reason for being here today is because of an administrative decision. Someone said that the White House called down to the Eximbank and told them not to handle this project at this time. So the solution there, I might inform the gentleman, is not to punish the Eximbank, but to get an administration down there that will not do those types of things.

If that is the case and if you get an administration who wants to work with projects such as this, then you have to make certain that the Eximbank is adequately funded. So maybe there is a possibility that in 4 months, the gentleman's problem will be resolved.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

First of all, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee for his very kind and generous words, as well as everyone else for all of the other kind and overly generous words that have been uttered today. I am deeply appreciative.

I really understand the frustration of the gentleman from Illinois, the two gentlemen from Illinois. In addition to understanding the frustration, I want my colleagues to know that I am a Caterpillar fan. I have supported every project that I know of that Caterpillar has participated in, and Caterpillar is participating in projects all over the world today that are financed by the Eximbank. I am just suggesting, as the chairman of the full committee suggested, that it could be short-sighted to try to punish the Eximbank for this single decision when there are so many other decisions that involve jobs in your districts. It is penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, let me state this again. I think it is fiscally inappropriate for the U.S. Congress to reduce the subsidy appropriation of an agency by 2.5 percent, and yet increase the salaries of bureaucrats by 4.2 percent. All my amendment says is very simply, everything is being downsized. How can we as Members of the U.S. Congress vote to increase the bureaucracies of an agency? Every agency is being downsized except the administrative staff of this one. That is all we are doing on this.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is a forthright Member of this House. However, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and that is, if the Three Gorges Dam had been approved, would the gentleman be here today with this amendment?

Mr. MANZULLO. I absolutely would. I vote every time there is an opportunity to cut.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Manzullo amendment, and I will have to admit to the question of the last speaker, had the bank approved the loan, I would not have been here. I am here to make a point about that. I think it is inappropriate that the bank was subjected to unusual, or it should be unusual, political pressure from the Clinton administration to turn down the request of American companies for support in their competition for contracts related to the construction of the China Three Gorges Dam. The bank has put American companies at a severe competitive disadvantage. Our companies will lose hundreds of jobs, maybe thousands of jobs, worth millions of dollars to our major competitors: Japan, Canada, and Europe.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman aware that the only other government in the world that is furnishing financial support for the Three Gorges Dam is Canada? It is not Germany, it is not Japan, it is not France.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is my understanding from a company in my district that France is also supporting their companies in this, and the point is that we do not know that others will not, and if Canada is, we ought to be out there and we ought to be competitive, and we should not have the dual standard. We should learn from our mistakes and this administration should. We should not try to influence banks. That is not the reason that that was set up.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EWING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I would state an inquiry to the comments of the distinguished gentleman

from Texas [Mr. WILSON], that in an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal and New York Times about 3 weeks ago, China has asked several countries, excluding the United States, to participate in the first round of over $4 billion in investment going into China. Canada at this time has agreed to it, but Japan and Germany and other countries are presently considering it, seriously considering it.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I know I do not have much time left, and I want to make the point that at this time when we are being asked to consider most-favored-nation status for China, which I support, and yet we are willing to overlook environmental deficiencies, human rights deficiencies, because we believe dealing with China is a better way to handle it, and yet when it comes to American industry wanting their share of this enormous contract, we are going to raise the environmental flag, we are going to raise the human rights flag and we are going to say we cannot deal with this contract because of the same reasons that we are willing to ignore. I do not think the administration has their program together on this. It is important for the jobs. It is important for years to come. If America supplies the equipment for this enormous project, we will be creating jobs in America for years to come.

Mr. Chairman, I question the subsidy appropriation of $726 million in this bill for the Exim bank. Just last week the bank, under unusual political pressure from the Clinton White House, turned down requests by American companies for support in their competition for contracts related to the construction of China's Three Gorges Dam. The bank has put American companies at a severe competitive disadvantage. Our companies will lose hundreds of millions of dollars worth of contracts and the jobs they support to competitors in Japan, Canada, and Europe.

The bank was established, quote, ''to foster expansion of exports of manufactured goods, agricultural products, and other goods and services, thereby contributing to the promotion and maintenance of high levels of employment and real income and to the increased development of the productive resources of the United States.'' The bank was intended to do what is in the best economic interests of this country. In its decision not to support American businesses on Three Gorges, the bank has directly violated these goals in my opinion.

The Caterpillar company which manufactures earthmoving equipment estimates that with support from the bank the company could obtain contracts worth up to $200 million in sales, which would translate into about 4,000 man-years worth of jobs here in the United States. However, without the support of the bank, Caterpillar will be at a severe disadvantage trying to compete against foreign companies, such as the Japanese, which surely will have backing from their governments. However, Caterpillar and its hundreds of suppliers and subcontractors are not the only American companies to lose from the bank's decision last week. For example, C.S. Johnson, which manufactures concrete mixing equipment, on its own has obtained one contract associated with Three Gorges which employs 20 full-time people in my district. C.S. Johnson would like to bid on 15–18 additional contracts, but because of the bank's decision will be at a major disadvantage.

Despite the fact that the bank was established as an independent agency, the bank capitulated to political pressure from President Clinton's White House, The White House took the extraordinary step of sending a written memo discouraging the bank from supporting the project based largely on environmental concerns. In fact, the White House, while trying to quietly pressure the bank not to support the project, also stated that ''the U.S. Government should refrain from publicly condemning the Three Gorges project.'' The bank took its marching orders from the White House and slammed the door on American companies based on questionable environmental concerns, instead of doing what is in the best economic interests of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the dam will be built whether American companies participate or not. Because the bank allowed overzealous environmental activists in the White House to set the bank's agenda and ignored its responsibilities to do what is in the best economic interests of the United States, these jobs will go to Japan, Canada, or Europe.

When the bank's charter expires in 1997 some in this Congress will carefully review whether the bank has operated independently as it should, or catered to the political desires of the President.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and to discuss some of the issues surrounding the amendment that is on the floor today. First a little history. The Congress of the United States for the last half a dozen years, or a little bit longer, has move to make the environmental concerns part of the criteria for decisions made by multilateral development banks including the World Bank. In 1992, Congress revised the Eximbank's charter to include a requirement that the bank establish environmental review procedures consistent with the bank's overall export promotion objectives. It authorized the board to grant to withhold financing support after taking into account the beneficial and adverse environmental effects of proposed transactions.

Following this congressional directive, Eximbank staff worked with the exporters, other U.S. and multilateral agencies, and nongovernmental agencies to define appropriate guidelines and procedures to be used for transactions requesting bank support. The Eximbank environmental procedures and guidelines have been in effect since February 1, 1995, and indeed, they are a result of congressional action.

That is in addition to other actions taken by the Congress, as I mentioned, so that these multilateral developmental banks and export financing agencies cannot contribute to the environmental degradation by supporting major projects which do just that, which are not environmentally sound.

I believe that the Eximbank and the Clinton administration are to be commended for their leadership, not their followship of what other countries might do but their leadership on this issue. Indeed, as my ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] pointed out, only one other country, Canada, is providing the financing that is referenced in this debate.

□ 1300

So it is not as if our companies are at a disadvantage.

I want to also point out to Members that there is nothing preventing business from participating. If this is such a good business deal, then businesses should go in and do business as mostly all the other companies throughout the world are doing in the Three Gorges Dam without this assistance of their governments.

Mr. Chairman, several U.S. companies have already sold 60 to 100 million dollars' worth of equipment and services to this project without Exim support. The decision of the Eximbank in no way affects their ability to continue doing business privately with this project.

I support the Eximbank but I think we have to have a balance. Somehow or other corporate America thinks that they cannot do business unless they have a subsidy from the Government. There is no law against private industry going in and competing without a helpful hand from the Government—the corporate welfare that some have referenced.

But I support the Eximbank. I am not an opponent of it. I have been a strong proponent of these international banks being environmentally sound. This is about the environment—it is not about China. The World Bank, has billions of dollars of loans into China. One of the biggest recipients of World Bank loans is China. Even the World Bank is not lending money for the Three Gorges Dam because it does not meet their environmental standards.

The Eximbank was very clear in its statement that they have established what their concerns are environmentally. And if the Three Gorges Dam should at some point in the future meet those envrionmental standards, it would then be eligible for Exim participation.

So this is not a China issue. This is an environmental issue. The Eximbank voted unanimously against issuing a letter of interest because of the environmental concerns.

Again, I reiterate, the Eximbank has supported $3.8 billion in United States exports to China during the last 4 years and currently they have $10 billion in potential financing for transactions in various industries. So as I recognize the gentlemen from Illinois protecting the view of Caterpillar, but that is a special interest. We have the public interest at stake here on the floor and that public interest is nothing short of the environment in which we live. That internationally we have responsibilities to address the protection of that

environment and that the taxpayers' dollars should not be used to finance loans that will undermine the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the statement of the Eximbank as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Martin A. Kamarck, President and Chairman for Three Gorges Press Briefing—Thursday, May 30, 1996)

The Eximbank's board of directors met this morning to consider requests from several U.S. exporters for the bank to take the preliminary step of issuing letters of interest for the Three Gorges project in China.

The board has concluded that Eximbank cannot issue a letter of interest for this project at this time. The information received, though voluminous, fails to establish the projects consistency with the bank's environmental guidelines.

If the China Yangtze Three Gorges project development corporation provides Eximbank with additional information with respect to development and mitigation of the environmental issues involved in this project, the board could reconsider support for this project.

Although the level of interest surrounding this case makes it somewhat unique for Eximbank, the process used by the bank to reach its conclusion is routine, mandated by our congressional charter and applied to all long-term transactions.

American business in general, and Eximbank in particular, have a healthy economic presence in China, and it is our hope that this mutually beneficial trading relationship will continue to grow.

In fact, China is Eximbank's largest customer in Asia. And Eximbank has an aggressive outreach effort to support U.S. exporters doing business in China.

Many Eximbank staff members have spent months analyzing information, meeting with interested parties and working on the board memorandum, which assisted the board in making its decision.

Eximbank is an independent government agency. The bank's board of directors is mandated to make independent decisions about the appropriateness of providing financial support to export transactions which are determined to be financially, technically, and environmentally sound.

The mandate to consider the environmental impacts of projects requesting bank support began in 1992 when Congress revised Eximbank's charter to include a requirement that the bank establish environmental review procedures consistent with the bank's overall export promotion objectives.

It further authorized the board to grant or withhold financing support after taking into account the beneficial and adverse environmental effects of proposed transactions.

Following this congressional directive, Eximbank staff worked with exporters, other U.S. and multilateral agencies and nongovernmental organizations to develop appropriate guidelines and procedures to be used for transactions requesting bank support.

These environmental procedures and guidelines have been in effect since February 1, 1995.

So, as the bank's charter requires, staff reviewed financial, technical and environmental issues involved in this project. And because of the size and level of interest generated by this project, our staff consulted with other government agencies, including the National Security Council.

Our staff also held a series of open meetings with exporters and nongovernmental organizations and Chinese officials; and met with numerous Members of Congress and congressional staff.

Eximbank's engineering and environmental division solicited, received and reviewed information from a wide variety of sources, including the Chinese Government, U.S. companies, other U.S. Government agencies and nongovernmental organizations, as well as academic sources.

Although any project of this size raises many questions and issues, I will summarize the major (though not only) issues of concern raised by staff which the board concluded have not, to date, been adequately addressed by the projects sponsors.

Maintaining adequate water quality in the projects reservoir.

Protection of ecological resources and preservation of endangered species potentially affected by the project.

The environmental and socioeconomic impacts associated with the proposed resettlement of 1.3 million people to be displaced by the reservoir.

Protection of cultural resources affected by the project.

For Eximbank to reconsider its decision, the board would need further evidence that these issues will be adequately addressed, resolved and/or mitigated by the projects sponsors.

More specifically, to meet the objectives of Eximbank's environmental guidelines with respect to maintenance of water quality in the reservoir, Eximbank would look for the following information.

A plan to construct upstream wastewater treatment facilities needed to reduce the pollution caused by municipal and industrial wastewater discharged into the reservoir.

A plan for adequate wastewater and waste management measures for the areas surrounding the reservoir to prevent future pollution and ensure that the water quality is maintained.

A plan for clean-up of existing waste sites which will be submerged by the reservoir.

A dredging plan to reduce accumulated toxic sediments in the reservoir.

Similarly, to meet the objectives of Eximbank's environmental guidelines with respect to ecological issues, Eximbank would look for the following information:

A more fully developed plan, including mitigation measures, to reduce the risks to (and to support the propagation of) endangered aquatic and terrestrial species affected by the project.

Further information about the ecological impacts and proposed mitigation plans for areas downstream of the reservoir, especially around the lakes and estuary.

To meet the objectives of Eximbank's environmental guidelines with regard to resettlement, the bank would look for the following information:

A resettlement plan that adequately addresses issues such as, land management, infrastructure improvements, regional planning, population distribution, public health impacts, costs and sources of funding. Such a plan should also clearly demonstrate the administrative responsibilities and accountability for all steps of this process.

Adoption of soil conservation measures to control soil erosion in the newly created resettlement and inundated areas.

A plan for acceleration of forestation in areas vulnerable to soil erosion and areas slated for deforestation due to resettlement.

In addition, given the unique cultural and historical resources at risk, to meet the objectives of Eximbank's environmental guidelines with respect to maintenance of socioeconomic and sociocultural resources, Eximbank would look for the following information:

Specific information that adequate measures have been adopted for the protection of the cultural and historical resources of the project area.

Additional information has to be forthcoming before there can be a decision on committing U.S. taxpayer money. Staff informed the board that in many circumstances the information has not yet been developed.

Before taking your questions, let me make several other important points:

First, the decision to construct the Three Gorges hydroelectric project belongs to the People's Republic of China.

Today's decision by the Exim board is a recognition that as a U.S. Government agency, Eximbank has rules and requirements that must be met before extending support to projects. And, as a government institution, Exim must apply its operating procedures to all projects—large and small, in all countries where we do business, in a fair and transparent manner.

Today's decision means only that the information we have received so far about this project does not in the judgment of the board, satisfy the objectives of Eximbank's environmental guidelines.

Second, this decision does not limit U.S. companies from privately participating in the Three Gorges project.

Already, several U.S. companies have sold $60–$100 million worth of equipment and services to this project without Eximbank support. And today's decision, in no way, affects their ability to continue doing business privately with this project.

Third, with respect to whether other government export credit agencies will be involved with this project, we currently are aware of only one official government-supported financing offer for sales to this project. It comes from EDC, the Canadian export credit agency.

In addition, we also understand that requests for financing may have been made to one other export credit agency. We are not aware of any other governments which have made financing offers to this project.

Fourth, we have supported $3.8 billion in U.S. exports to China during the last 4 years, and currently have over $10 billion in potential financing for transactions in various industry sectors including power (conventional coal-fired, hydro, nuclear and wind energy), aircraft, airports, telecommunications, chemical plants, project finance and more.

In the power sector alone, during the last two years, Eximbank has financed nearly $640 million worth of U.S. exports.

Finally, given this long history of Eximbank support for U.S. exports to China, and the fact that China's demand for goods and service will continue to grow as their economy grows, Eximbank looks forward to continuing a strong partnership with our Chinese friends.

Now I'd be happy to take your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 24 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and amendment No. 19 offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 24 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 334, noes 77, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

AYES—334

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—77

Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (LA)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bishop
Bliley
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Callahan
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coyne
de la Garza
DeLauro
DeLay
Dicks
Dooley
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Frelinghuysen
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gilman
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Houghton
Hyde
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
King
Knollenberg
LaFalce
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lofgren
Matsui
McDermott
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nethercutt
Packard
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Richardson
Roth
Tauzin
Thornton
Towns
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Watt (NC)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson

NOT VOTING—23

Allard
Bonilla
Browder
Chapman
Crapo
Engel
Fields (TX)
Gallegly
Ganske
Gibbons
Greene (UT)
Hayes
Hilliard
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lincoln
McInnis
McIntosh
Miller (FL)
Myers
Schaefer
Schiff
Tejeda
Torricelli

☐ 1327

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas for, with Mr. Miller of Florida against.

Messrs. RICHARDSON, PAYNE of New Jersey, WHITFIELD, HOUGHTON, and TOWNS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. MALONEY and Mrs. LOWEY, Messrs. JONES, HANSEN, BURTON of Indiana, HEFLEY, BONO, OLVER, SCOTT, CHRISTENSEN, HORN, RADANOVICH, and MCKEON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MANZULLO

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 236, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

AYES—176

Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Flanagan
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hastert
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McDade
McHale
McHugh
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myrick
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Riggs
Roemer

Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Walker
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wicker
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—236

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Archer
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Callahan
Cardin
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Davis
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Forbes
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hefner
Hinchey
Hobson
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Klink
Knollenberg
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCrery
McDermott
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
White
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—22

Allard
Bonilla
Browder
Chapman
Crapo
Engel
Fields (TX)
Gallegly
Greene (UT)
Hayes
Hilliard
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lincoln
McInnis
McIntosh
Miller (FL)
Myers
Schaefer
Schiff
Tejeda
Torricelli
Williams

□ 1337

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Engel for, with Mr. Miller of Florida against.

Mr. KLUG and Mr. WICKER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II—BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes, to remain available until September 30, 1997, unless otherwise specified herein, as follows:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CHILD SURVIVAL AND DISEASE PROGRAMS FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, for child survival, basic education, assistance to combat tropical and other diseases, and related activities, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, $600,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That this amount shall be made available for such activities as (1) immunization programs, (2) oral rehydration programs, (3) health and nutrition programs, and related education programs, which address the needs of mothers and children, (4) water and sanitation programs, (5) assistance for displaced and orphaned children, (6) programs for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on, tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS, polio, malaria and other diseases, (7) not to exceed $98,000,000 for basic education programs for children, and (8) a contribution on a grant basis to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) pursuant to section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106 and chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $1,150,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided,* That none of the funds made available in this Act nor any unobligated balances from prior appropriations may be made available to any organization or program which, as determined by the President of the United States, supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used to pay for the performance of abortion as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions; and that in order to reduce reliance on abortion in developing nations, funds shall be available only to voluntary family planning projects which offer, either directly or through referral to, or information about access to, a broad range of family planning methods and services: *Provided further,* That in awarding grants for natural family planning under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 no applicant shall be discriminated against because of such applicant's religious or conscientious commitment to offer only natural family planning; and, additionally, all such applicants shall comply with the requirements of the previous proviso: *Provided further,* That for purposes of this or any other Act authorizing or appropriating funds for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, the term ''motivate'', as it relates to family planning assistance, shall not be construed to prohibit the provision, consistent with local law, of information or counseling about all pregnancy options: *Provided further,* That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further,* That the total amount of funds appropriated under this heading and under the heading ''Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund'' should be made available for each of the sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America and Caribbean regions in at least the same proportion as the total amount identified in the fiscal year 1997 draft congressional presentation document for development assistance for each such region is to the total amount requested for development assistance for such fiscal year: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding section 109 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, of the funds appropriated under this heading not to exceed a total of $12,000,000 may be transferred to ''Debt restructuring'', and that any such transfer of funds shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for development assistance may be made available to any United States private and voluntary organization, except any cooperative development organization, which obtains less than 20 per centum of its total annual funding for international activities from sources other than the United States Government: *Provided,* That the requirements of the provisions of section 123(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the provisions on private and voluntary organizations in title II of the ''Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1985'' (as enacted in Public Law 98–473) shall be superseded by the provisions of this section, except that the authority contained in the last sentence of section 123(g) may be exercised by the Administrator with regard to the requirements of this paragraph.

Funds appropriated or otherwise made available under title II of this Act should be made available to private and voluntary organizations at a level which is equivalent to the level provided in fiscal year 1995. Such private and voluntary organizations shall include those which operate on a not-for-profit basis, receive contributions from private sources, receive voluntary support from the public and are deemed to be among the most cost-effective and successful providers of development assistance.

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses for international disaster relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance pursuant to section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, $190,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DEBT RESTRUCTURING

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying direct loans and loan guarantees,

as the President may determine, for which funds have been appropriated or otherwise made available for programs within the International Affairs Budget Function 150, including the cost of selling, reducing, or canceling amounts, through debt buybacks and swaps, owed to the United States as a result of concessional loans made to eligible Latin American and Caribbean countries, pursuant to part IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated or expended except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

MICRO AND SMALL ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees, $1,500,000, as authorized by section 108 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended: *Provided,* That such costs shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further,* That guarantees of loans made under this heading in support of microenterprise activities may guarantee up to 70 percent of the principal amount of any such loans notwithstanding section 108 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out programs under this heading, $500,000, all of which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development: *Provided further,* That funds made available under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 1998.

HOUSING GUARANTY PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of guaranteed loans authorized by sections 221 and 222 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided,* That these funds are available to subsidize loan principal, 100 percent of which shall be guaranteed, pursuant to the authority of such sections. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out guaranteed loan programs, $6,000,000, all of which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development: *Provided further,* That commitments to guarantee loans under this heading may be entered into notwithstanding the second and third sentences of section 222(a) and, with regard to programs for the benefit of South Africans disadvantaged by apartheid, section 223(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading for the cost of guaranteed loans may be made available for obligation only for activities in South Africa.

PAYMENT TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the ''Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund'', as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1980, $43,826,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667, $465,750,000: *Provided,* That of this amount not more than $1,475,000 may be made available to pay for printing costs: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs administered by the Agency for International Development (AID) may be used to finance printing costs of any report or study (except feasibility, design, or evaluation reports or studies) in excess of $25,000 without the approval of the Administrator of the Agency or the Administrator's designee: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for expenses necessary to relocate the Agency for International Development, or any part of that agency, to the building at the Federal Triangle in Washington, District of Columbia, only pursuant to an authorization of appropriations for such purpose or upon a written certification and report to the Committees on Appropriations by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget that such relocation will result in savings to the United States Government compared to other alternatives to such relocation.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667, $30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998, which sum shall be available for the Office of the Inspector General of the Agency for International Development.

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II, $2,336,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided,* That any funds appropriated under this heading that are made available for Israel shall be available on a grant basis as a cash transfer and shall be disbursed within thirty days of enactment of this Act or by October 31, 1996, whichever is later: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for Zaire.

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR IRELAND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $19,600,000, which shall be available for the United States contribution to the International Fund for Ireland and shall be made available in accordance with the provisions of the Anglo-Irish Agreement Support Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–415): *Provided,* That such amount shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities: *Provided further,* That funds made available under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 1998.

ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES

(a) For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989, $475,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998, which shall be available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for economic assistance and for related programs for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States.

(b) Funds appropriated under this heading or in prior appropriations Acts that are or have been made available for an Enterprise Fund may be deposited by such Fund in interest-bearing accounts prior to the Fund's disbursement of such funds for program purposes. The Fund may retain for such program purposes any interest earned on such deposits without returning such interest to the Treasury of the United States and without further appropriation by the Congress. Funds made available for Enterprise Funds shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities.

(c) Funds appropriated under this heading shall be considered to be economic assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for purposes of making available the administrative authorities contained in that Act for the use of economic assistance.

(d) None of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for new housing construction or repair or reconstruction of existing housing in Bosnia and Herzegovina unless directly related to the efforts of United States troops to promote peace in said country.

(e) With regard to funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading for the economic revitalization program in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and local currencies generated by such funds (including the conversion of funds appropriated under this heading into currency used by Bosnia and Herzegovina as local currency and local currency returned or repaid under such program)—

(1) the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall provide written approval for grants and loans prior to the obligation and expenditure of funds for such purposes, and prior to the use of funds that have been returned or repaid to any lending facility or grantee; and

(2) the provisions of section 531 of this Act shall apply.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE NEW INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

(a) For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 11 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the FREEDOM Support Act, for assistance for the new independent states of the former Soviet Union and for related programs, $590,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 498B(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall apply to funds appropriated by this paragraph.

(b) None of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to the Government of Russia—

(1) unless that Government is making progress in implementing comprehensive economic reforms based on market principles, private ownership, negotiating repayment of commercial debt, respect for commercial contracts, and equitable treatment of foreign private investment; and

(2) if that Government applies or transfers United States assistance to any entity for the purpose of expropriating or seizing ownership or control of assets, investments, or ventures.

(c) Funds may be furnished without regard to subsection (b) if the President determines that to do so is in the national interest.

(d) None of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available to any government of the new independent states of the former Soviet Union if that government directs any action in violation of the territorial integrity or national sovereignty of any other new independent state, such as those violations included in the Helsinki Final Act: *Provided,* That such funds may be made available without regard to the restriction in this subsection if the President determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that to do so is in the national security interest of the United States: *Provided further,* That the restriction of this subsection shall not apply to the use of such funds for the provision of assistance for purposes of humanitarian, disaster and refugee relief.

(e) None of the funds appropriated under this heading for the new independent states of the former Soviet Union shall be made available for any state to enhance its military capability: *Provided,* That this restriction does not apply to demilitarization or nonproliferation programs.

(f) Funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(g) Funds made available in this Act for assistance to the new independent states of the former Soviet Union shall be subject to the provisions of section 117 (relating to environment and natural resources) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(h) Funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for assistance for Mongolia.

(i) Funds made available in this Act for assistance to the new independent states of the former Soviet Union shall be provided to the maximum extent feasible through the private sector, including small- and medium-size businesses, entrepreneurs, and others with indigenous private enterprises in the region, intermediary development organizations committed to private enterprise, and private voluntary organizations: *Provided,* That grantees and contractors should, to the maximum extent possible, place in key staff positions specialists with prior on the ground expertise in the region of activity and fluency in one of the local languages.

(j) In issuing new task orders, entering into contracts, or making grants, with funds appropriated under this heading or in prior appropriations Acts, for projects or activities that have as one of their primary purposes the fostering of private sector development, the Coordinator for United States Assistance to the New Independent States and the implementing agency shall encourage the participation of and give significant weight to contractors and grantees who propose investing a significant amount of their own resources (including volunteer services and in-kind contributions) in such projects and activities.

(k)(1) None of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for Russia unless the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Russia has terminated implementation of arrangements to provide Iran with technical expertise, training, technology, or equipment necessary to develop a nuclear reactor or related nuclear research facilities or programs.

(2) Subparagraph (1) shall not apply if the President determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that making such funds available is important to the national security interest of the United States. Any such determination shall cease to be effective six months after being made unless the President determines that its continuation is important to the national security interest of the United States.

(l) Funds appropriated under this heading or in prior appropriations Acts that are or have been made available for an Enterprise Fund may be deposited by such Fund in interest-bearing accounts prior to the disbursement of such funds by the Fund for program purposes. The Fund may retain for such program purposes any interest earned on such deposits without returning such interest to the Treasury of the United States and without further appropriation by the Congress. Funds made available for Enterprise Funds shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities.

(m)(1) Notwithstanding section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act or any other provision of law, nongovernmental organizations and private voluntary organizations shall not be precluded from using facilities or vehicles of the Government of Azerbaijan to provide humanitarian assistance to refugees and internally displaced persons in Azerbaijan with funds made available under this heading, or from using such assistance to make necessary repairs to such facilities (such as health clinics and housing) or vehicles that are used to provide the assistance.

(2) Humanitarian assistance may be provided with funds made available under this heading to refugees and internally displaced persons in Azerbaijan only if humanitarian assistance is also provided to refugees and internally displaced persons in Nagorno-Karabagh with funds made available under this heading, in accordance with paragraph (3).

(3) Humanitarian assistance may be provided with funds made available under this heading to refugees and internally displaced persons in Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabagh only in the proportion that the number of refugees and internally displaced persons in Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabagh, respectively, bears to the total number of refugees and internally displaced persons in both Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabagh, but in no case more than $7 to Azerbaijan for every dollar to Nagorno-Karabagh.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of title V of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980, Public Law 96–533, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by 31 U.S.C. 9104, $11,500,000: *Provided,* That when, with the permission of the President of the Foundation, funds made available to a grantee are invested pending disbursement, the resulting interest is not required to be deposited in the United States Treasury if the grantee uses the resulting interest for the purpose for which the grant was made: *Provided further,* That this provision applies with respect to both interest earned before and interest earned after the enactment of this provision: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding section 505(a)(2) of the African Development Foundation Act, in exceptional circumstances the board of directors of the Foundation may waive the $250,000 limitation contained in that section with respect to a project: *Provided further,* That the Foundation shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations after each time such waiver authority is exercised.

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Inter-American Foundation in accordance with the provisions of section 401 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by 31 U.S.C. 9104, $20,000,000.

PEACE CORPS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), $212,000,000, including the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for administrative purposes for use outside of the United States: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to pay for abortions: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 1998.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

For necessary expenses to carry out section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $150,000,000: *Provided,* That during fiscal year 1997, the Department of State may also use the authority of section 608 of the Act, without regard to its restrictions, to receive non-lethal excess property from an agency of the United States Government for the purpose of providing it to a foreign country under chapter 8 of part I of that Act subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the Secretary of State to provide, as authorized by law, a contribution to the International Committee of the Red Cross, assistance to refugees, including contributions to the International Organization for Migration and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and other activities to meet refugee and migration needs; salaries and expenses of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1980; allowances as authorized by sections 5921 through 5925 of title 5, United States Code; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, $650,000,000: *Provided,* That not more than $12,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further,* That obligations of funds to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for support of refugees from Rwanda shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses for the targeted assistance program authorized by title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act and section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 and administered by the Office of Refugee Resettlement of the Department of Health and Human Services, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, $5,000,000.

UNITED STATES EMERGENCY REFUGEE AND MIGRATION ASSISTANCE FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 2(c) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended (22 U.S.C. 260(c)), $50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the funds made available under this heading are appropriated notwithstanding the provisions contained in section 2(c)(2) of the Act which would limit the amount of funds which could be appropriated for this purpose.

NONPROLIFERATION, ANTI-TERRORISM, DEMINING AND RELATED PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses for nonproliferation, anti-terrorism and related programs and activities, $135,000,000, to carry out the provisions of chapter 8 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for anti-terrorism assistance, section 504 of the FREEDOM Support Act for the Nonproliferation and Disarmanent Fund, section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act for demining activities, notwithstanding any other provision of law, including activities implemented through nongovernmental and international organizations, section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for a voluntary contribution to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and a voluntary contribution to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO), and for the acquisition and provision of goods and services, or for grants to Israel necessary to support the eradication of terrorism in and around Israel: *Provided,* That of this amount not to exceed $15,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be made available for the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to promote bilateral and multilateral activities relating to nonproliferation and disarmament: *Provided further,* That such funds may also be used for such countries other than the new independent states of the former Soviet Union and international organizations when it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so: *Provided further,* That such funds shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for the International Atomic Energy Agency only if the

Secretary of State determines (and so reports to the Congress) that Israel is not being denied its right to participate in the activities of that Agency: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $13,000,000 may be made available to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO) only for administrative expenses and heavy fuel oil costs associated with the Agreed Framework: *Provided further,* That such funds shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to title II?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, under House Resolution 445, I make a point of order that the language in the bill contained on page 9, line 12, beginning with '': Provided'' through ''Appropriations'' on line 18, and beginning with '': Provided'' on page 13, line 20 through ''relocation'' on page 14, line 5 fails to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama wish to speak to the point of order?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak on the point of order.

The administration proposed a total of $22 million for debt relief for the poorest countries in Latin America and in Africa for 1997, an increase of $12 million over the 1996 level.

The committee proposed discretionary transfer authority in an attempt to allow the administration the flexibility to fund the full request without adding an additional $12 million to the bill. The transfer would specifically benefit Africa.

As the gentleman may know, the Ivory Coast would be the primary recipient of funds for debt restructuring. The effect of the gentleman's point of order is to deny funds for Africa's debt restructuring. I think this is unfortunate, however, I am certainly not going to stand in his way if he does not want to respond to a creative attempt to provide debt relief for the poorest nations of Africa and Latin America, and I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mr. Chairman, by making this point of order, the gentleman will remove from the bill any language providing any guidance on AID's proposed move to the Ronald Reagan Building. The committee had included language requiring that OMB certify that AID's proposed move to the Ronald Reagan Building is the most cost effective to the Government.

Now, I find it hard to believe that my friend from New York wants, for some procedural pique, to insist on this point of order, thereby removing any requirement that Congress be assured that this move is the most cost effective option for the Government. This just makes good common sense, and I cannot understand the gentleman's objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, on these points of order, I would say that I support their general intent but insist that they be considered by the authorizing committee. I have tentatively scheduled a markup of foreign assistance language in our committee next week, June 13. If the members of the administration want the provisions struck under this point of order to move, I would encourage them to propose language in the international relations markup that has been scheduled.

Under these points of order we strike debt restructuring language and language restrictions to AID's move to its new headquarters. If Members want debt restructuring or want to restrict AID's move, then I invite them to come to our Committee on International Relations to make their case.

The CHAIRMAN. The points of order are conceded and sustained. The cited provisions are stricken from the bill.

Are there any amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAYNE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey: Page 7, line 4, after ''$600,000,000'' insert ''(decreased by $118,000,000)''.

Page 7, line 21, strike ''and chapter 10 of part I''.

Page 7, line 22, after ''$1,150,000,000'' insert ''(decreased by $586,000,000)''.

Page 9, after line 18, insert the following:

DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $704,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the development fund for Africa, DFA I will refer to it. My amendment to H.R. 3540, the 1997 Foreign Operations Bill, will aid in keeping humanitarian assistance in Africa.

As my colleagues know, the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations bill for DEA was very troubling. This made deep cuts in the development assistance and created an international development assistance account that all worldwide development programs must draw from.

□ 1345

The creation of this development account means the elimination of the Development Fund for Africa. The DFA is now in its 10th year. It is a very important factor in African development and has led the way in areas of democratization, poverty elimination, health, and economic development.

Congress recognized the uniqueness of the continent's development challenges in establishing the DFA in 1987. This bipartisan effort reflected the conviction that the United States has clear national interest in promoting broad-based sustainable development in Africa.

We must recognize that sub-Saharan African nations face unique development challenges in that there are problems in southern Sudan, Liberia, and Somalia and other countries in Sub-Saharan Africa.

DFA's programs are doing what Americans think is the right thing to do with foreign aid. It is saving children's lives. It is fighting deadly diseases. It is conquering hunger and creating jobs and teaching people basic skills so that they can take care of themselves, so they can more away from aid, so that they can build democracies and promote stability.

Africa faces the greatest development challenges of any other region in the world. Average GNP per capita in Latin America is five times greater than Africa. Africa's infant mortality and child mortality rates are two to three times greater than what it is in Latin America and in Asia. In many ways Africa is about 25 years behind Asia and Latin America. They have benefited from the decades of sustained American assistance in Asia and Latin America. Now we say it is Africa's time to benefit.

A separate DFA appropriations will help us stay the course and continue to have successful, high impact programs which prevent crises and promote sustainable development.

The $704 million requested for the DFA will be concentrated in those countries which are committed to sound economic policies and good democratic governance.

I fiscal year 1996, the DFA received approximately $675 million from the total development assistance, and in fiscal year 1995 we received $804 million. This amendment that I have before the House today will help keep DFA at funding levels sufficient to foster development. Disaproportionate or serve cuts will undermine the purpose.

It is in the U.S. national interest to assist African nations. this account suffered deep cuts in fiscal year 1996 when the DFA line item was eliminated.

Instead, Africa aid was folded into a common development assistance fund, and funding was substantially reduced by more than $125 million to a level of $675 million. It is even more vital that funding levels remain consistent with demands to advance U.S. interests in Africa.

I ask that Africa not be forgotten and, in Congress' effort to reprioritize America's AID spending, that Africa remain in the forefront.

During the cold war, the United States stayed engaged in Africa to fight off the threat of communism. The cold war is over now, and now we have a chance to help Africa eradicate the problems of health care, eradicate illiteracy, eradicate AIDS, fight disease, and continue to move to democratization.

Please support this. It is good for everyone. It is good for Africa. It is good for the world. I would urge support of my amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I further reserve my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] further reserves a point of order.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, actually, I was prepared to offer an amendment that does the same thing that the Payne amendment does, with the exception of the funding structure changes, the amendment that I have proposed to offer but am prepared to withdraw at this time. I would offer to give this body an opportunity, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] has, to show its support for development programs in Africa by restoring the development fund for the Africa line item.

I am fully supportive of Mr. PAYNE'S amendment and even more many appreciative of the extraordinary work done by the committee and specifically by the chairman in doing creative things to try to protect the Africa account.

I need not explain why much of the continent of Africa needs our expertise. Africa has special development needs. The continent has a unique combination of war-related, humanitarian requirements and traditional sustainable development needs.

Africa continues to be one of the world's greatest development challenges. The Development Fund for Africa has proven to be an effective mechanism in providing foreign assistance to Africa. Its flexibility and orientation toward establishing measurable results puts the DFA on the cutting edge of the U.S. foreign assistance mechanisms.

Actually, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] was prepared to offer this amendment with me. It does not increase in our view the spending levels in this bill. As a matter of fact, it had basically the same development structure and the same assumptions for Africa which are found in the fiscal year 1977 appropriations bill. The difference is that the amendment, had I offered it, would have reestablished the line item for the DFA which was deleted last year.

Mr. Chairman, the Payne amendment and the one that I have proposed to offer have great symbolic and real significance. They show the people of Africa that the United States supports development programs rather than respond to emergencies or provide direct financial aid. We are saying that we are determined to teach them to help themselves.

This short-term investment, as requested by Mr. PAYNE, will reap many stable prosperous trading partners for American businesses. That is all that I would say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the proposed amendment that I was going to offer. I offer support for Mr. PAYNE's amendment and thank the chairman of the committee for, as I said earlier, the extraordinary work that he and the committee have done. I hope to continue to work with him in efforts to ensure that the accounts with reference to Africa are protected to the extent that our budget will permit.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I agree that assistance to Africa is important. That is why I recommended authority to allow the administration to forgive government debt owned to the United States by the Ivory Coast. However, the authorizing committee chairman objected to this language and struck it from the bill.

Over 41 percent of the development assistance funds would go to Africa under both the President's budget request and under the committee recommendation. In contrast, only 17.5 percent would go to Latin America and to the Caribbean. I would like more money for Latin America, but we have included bill language that states that the President should provide development assistance for Africa and for Latin America in the same proportion as was requested by the President. The language is similar to that included in the 1996 appropriations act.

Again, the bill language did not absolutely mandate that funding for sub-Saharan Africa be protected, but the administration followed congressional intent and did not disproportionately reduce funding for Africa.

The committee went out of its way this year to protect development assistance; the cut from 1996 is only $25 million. The committee decided that the nearly 25 percent reduction in development assistance from 1995 to 1996 was a sufficient contribution to deficit reduction for the time being.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Payne amendment to H.R. 3540, the foreign operations appropriations bill. This amendment recognizes the critical role played by United States development assistance to Africa in the tremendous political and economic transformations sweeping across the continent. Since 1987, the Development Fund for Africa has promoted well focused, broad-based, and sustainable economic policies that have prevented poor conditions from worsening and contributed to the growth of democracy on the African continent.

Across Africa, Mr. Chairman, USAID's funding for small enterprise credit, business advisory services, and entrepreneurial training, combined with support for economic policy and financial sector reforms, are creating new jobs and expanding income for poor Africans, encouraging private investment to fuel growth, and building new markets for American exports.

Mr. Chairman, it strikes me as strange that, while many of us publicly proclaim our support for emerging democracies throughout the world and express our strong opposition to militaristic regimes engaged in humanitarian abuses, today this body is considering a bill which eliminates the separate line item account for the Development Fund for Africa. Instead, preferring to lump African development assistance with the general development assistance fund.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is a very serious mistake and sends a powerful message to struggling democracies in Africa, that despite the many unique problems facing Africa, the United States no longer considers them as distinct and different from those facing third world countries on any other continent. If we are sincere, Mr. Speaker, in our efforts to promote the growth and development of the fledgling democracies in Africa, we should not pass H.R. 3540 without the separate line item account established by the Payne amendment.

The Development Fund for Africa has been a positive force in working to transform Africa. I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of democratic movements in Africa by supporting the Payne amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. Clause 2 of rule XXI states, in pertinent part, no appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill or be in order as an amendment thereto for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, the authorization for this program has not been signed into law. The amendment, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI, and I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I think that it is very important that we have the Development Fund for Africa first of all in a line item. For 10 years we have seen the development of success in Africa. We have seen countries that were under Communist domination like Benin and Ghana under military domination come to democratization. We have seen elections in Malawi and in Zambia and South Africa and Namibia, all with development funds that went to push our goal of democratization.

We have seen child survival and education. We have seen illiteracy also on the downward trend. So I believe that to have the Development Fund for Africa, the $704 million earmarked, too. As we know, there are over 600 million people in sub-Saharan Africa. It comes to a little more than $1.10 per person. We have seen funds for countries where we have $5 billion for a population of 50 million people, 55 million people. It is a total disproportion of where the need is greatest. We believe that the need to have this 704, to have the Development

Fund for Africa as an item in the budget is something that is extremely important. I wish that the gentleman would reconsider his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

Appropriations for the Development Fund for Africa for fiscal year 1997 are not currently authorized by law. Although such appropriations may be part of a longer lump sum amount in the bill and have been permitted to remain in the bill under House Resolution 445, the amendment does not merely perfect the unauthorized amount that has been permitted to remain. Instead, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey discretely restates the appropriation as a separate account.

As such, the amendment proposes an unauthorized appropriation in violation of clause 2(a) of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 7, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $144,000,000)''.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in the area of development aid, the Clinton administration asked for $1.6 billion in developmental aid for fiscal year 1997. The committee recommendation is for $1.150 billion, or $144 million more than what the administration requested. It seems to me that that is excessive. We have a lot of areas where we believe that AID has abused or been very excessive in spending money that was not necessary. I would like to give just a few examples.

In El Salvador, AID-sponsored economists organized a socialistic land reform program in the early 1980's that nationalized land holdings, banks, and private export companies. After the United States had spent billions of dollars in El Salvador, former President Cristiani of El Salvador said that millions of dollars would be needed just to correct the damage done by United States assistance in nationalizing the economy.

In other words, he is saying, because of the socialistic policies that were put forth by AID in giving the billions of dollars and dictating where the money was going to go when a democratic administration came in under Mr. Cristiani, he said it was going to take millions just to correct the damage done by the United States assistance that was given by AID.

In Nicaragua, after the Sandinistas lost the 1990 election, more than $1 billion in direct and indirect United States aid flooded Nicaragua. Hundreds of millions of U.S. dollars, taxpayers' dollars, were lost bailing out a corrupt banking system largely controlled by the Communist Sandinista bureaucrats and loan officers. Even today this fiasco threatens Nicaragua's democracy.

□ 1400

In the 1980's AID spent $7 million to create a 1,000-acre farm in Burundi in Africa to raise improved corn seed varieties. This farm cost the American taxpayers $7,000 an acre, which is a outrageous price to pay for land in that area. The project was a disaster because AID located the farm near the President of Burundi's home village, even though this was an area of the country where the soil conditions were not conducive to growing corn.

AID was simply trying to placate the President's desire to have a fancy foreign aid project in his home village. It turned out that there were never any improved varieties of corn seed to be grown in Burundi because the ag research had never been done.

AID is on a spending orgy. It needs to be stopped, and I call on my colleagues to support this amendment.

We are not cutting AID below what the administration itself asked. President Clinton asked for $1,006,000,000. This bill appropriates $1,150,000,000, $144 million above what the President has asked for. It is excessive, it should be cut, and I hope my colleagues will support my amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment.

I respect the gentleman's knowledge of international affairs and his service on the Committee on International Relations. However, this subcommittee has gone through a very difficult task. We have gone through the hearings, we have listened to the agencies that have come to us, we have listened to the dozens of Members of Congress who have come to us and requested information on child survival, disease programs, on micro enterprise programs, agricultural research. The committee has cut development assistance funding by 25 percent over the past 2 years. This year we are $63 million below the President and $25 million below 1996 levels.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Now I do not understand what the gentleman is saying there. He is saying that he is below the President's request.

I got the President's request for developmental assistance here in front of me, and it says $1,006,000,000, and the gentleman has got $1,150,000,000 in the bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Well, we have a separate account for child survival.

Mr. BURTON of Indian. Well, I am talking about developmental assistance alone, and that is where the $144 million comes from.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Well, in any event, even though if we take out development assistance, child survival, then we are still $63 million below the President's request and $25 million below the 1996 level.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, if he can clarify something for me?

The child survival fund; is that not a separate fund from developmental assistance?

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is correct. The $600 million for child survival that we reinserted in the bill this year——

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. What I am talking, if the gentleman would yield further, what I am talking about is cutting developmental assistance alone, not talking about child survival. Leaving that account aside, I am talking about cutting the development aid down to what the administration requested, and, if the gentleman will look on page 13 of the bill itself, it shows that the fiscal year 1996 level, it shows the fiscal year 1997 request and the administration, and it shows the committee recommendation, and the committee recommendation is $144 million above what the President and the administration requested. And I am not talking about the child survival account. And what I am trying to do is cut the $144 million in excess of what the President wanted out of the bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Well, I think the gentleman is going to have to look at both accounts because the amount recommended, the gentleman from Indiana is right, is $144 million more than the amount requested by the administration, but $525 million less than the amount provided in the fiscal year 1996.

So I think we have to look at the development assistance fund, the child survival fund, and the African fund if we do not have those in there. So I think that we have to look at, if we want to compare cuts, we have to look at all three of the funds that we are talking about.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Maybe the gentleman can explain to me what it says on page 13 near the bottom of the page in the bill. Says development assistance. It gives a fiscal year 1996 level. It gives the gentleman's request or the President's request, and it gives the committee recommendation.

I would presume, if there is any additional child developmental assistance, it would be included in all of those figures.

Now, above that there is a displaced children program which is $10 million, but that does not seem to be a part of the developmental assistance.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Well, I think what we are saying, and I think if the gentleman from Indiana will go further on to the bottom of the page to the last line, it says, however, a different mix of programming was provided in 1996 and in budget requests, which partially explains the disparity in the funding levels.

I can only assure the gentleman of one fact, that if we include all of the funds, then we are $63 million below

the President's request and $25 million below the 1996 level, if we include all of the funds that we appropriated in 1996 and that were changed and merged in 1997——

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman would yield further, on page 12 it lists child survival, nonchild diseases, children's basic education and a grant to UNICEF, and that is a total of $600 million, and the child survival in Egypt ESF and disaster assistance is $55 million.

Those are separate accounts, as I understand it. That is not part of the development assistance. That is a separate account; am I not correct?

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is right, but we——

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, if that is a separate——

Mr. CALLAHAN. We do not have a separate fund though for Africa.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. But if that is a separate account, then why is it——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CALLAHAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, what I am trying to figure out here, and I believe I am correct, the development assistance account, which I am trying to cut by $144 million, is separate from the child survival, nonchild diseases, children basic education and the grant to UNICEF. Those are separate accounts, and what I am trying to cut is the development assistance to the tune of $144 million, which brings it down to the administration's request.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Well, the development fund for Africa was requested at $704 million. I know where the gentleman from Indiana is coming from, but my point to him, that if we take into consideration what we passed in 1996 for this current fiscal year and what we passed in this bill for 1997, that it is $63 million below the President's request and $25 million below the 1996 level.

Now, we have changed the structure of the account. If we just take one of them, we might be able to find a $144 million discrepancy, but if we take all of the funds and all of the appropriations and weigh them against last year, then we are at $25 million below the 1996 level.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman would yield further, let me just say this.

I do not have any problem with the money going for child survival. What I am talking about is the development assistance, and the development assistance, according to the gentleman's bill, is $144 million above what the administration asked for in that one area. It is $144 million above what the administration requested. That is what I want to cut.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Well, that might be true, but then we are $704 million below the development fund for Africa, and we have included in the development fund African money. So I think I know where the gentleman from Indiana is coming from, but I think that we are taking two parts of the bill and we must take three parts of it. If we total up all of the accounts——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CALLAHAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman would yield further, the money is in those other accounts to be spent. We have got it in the bill in these other sections. I am talking about the developmental assistance. The developmental assistance, the administration is asking for $1,006,000,000. The gentleman from Alabama has got $1,150,000,000, and I am trying to cut out that excess of $144 million for development assistance alone.

As my colleagues know, with all due respect to my colleague——

Mr. CALLAHAN. I will be happy to get with the gentleman and go through the bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. In that one category it is $144 million above what the administration requested. Tell me what is in the bill. There it is.

Mr. CALLAHAN. We are in the same category, but we have put more things in that category, and we have taken some of the categories and rearranged them.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So what the gentleman from Alabama is saying is the administration——

Mr. CALLAHAN. We have to look at the bottom line. We have readjusted the accounts. If we look at the bottom line for all of the funds for USAID, then we are $63 million below the President's request and $25 billion below the 1996 level. If we include everything in there, if we are going to take one section and try to say that this one is higher, that might be right. But then we have to take into consideration another section, which is more than $125 million lower.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, the administration for this particular area asked for $1,006,000,000. Did they not include those other things the gentleman from Alabama wanted in there? Is that what the gentleman is saying? The administration in that $1,006,000,000 did not include the other things? Because the gentleman got $144 million more than the administration wanted, and what he is saying is that he has added other things into that account. Well, did the administration not add other things into that account, child survival account?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I am just simply saying the committee moves funding for child survival activities and disease prevention funds from this account to a new account, child survival and disease program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CALLAHAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I want to really get to the bottom of this.

If the gentleman would yield further, the point I am trying to make is when the administration made its request, they obviously folded into this account all the things the gentleman is talking about. What he is saying is that they did not fold in some of these things he is talking about, and that is why he is $144 million higher. That does not make sense to me when I look at the bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Not for Africa, and that is what the gentleman is leaving out.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So the administration did not put Africa into that $1,006,000,000.

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Why did they do that?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I do not know. The gentleman will have to ask the administration. That is a separate account.

But the bottom line is, if the gentleman totals all of the columns, we are $25 million below 1996. That is the bottom line.

As to explaining the difference in the three funds and the shifting of the child survival account, which was not included in the President's request, and the African fund which was left out, then the net effect is that we are $63 million below what the President requested and $25 million below the 1996 level.

The gentleman from Indiana ought to know full well that I am not going to increase the President's request on anything. I am cutting the President's request by a billion dollars in this bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman would yield further, let me just say this.

The bill is very confusing, if the gentleman is accurate, and I think that to present this to the Congress when we are trying to go through and save the taxpayers' money, and I have great respect for my colleague; when he gets something that shows $144 million increase and he is saying——

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is going to have to take my word for it, and I will assure him that this measure he is talking about is $63 million below the President's request and $25 million under the 1996 legislation.

So, as my colleagues know, I know that the gentleman would like to discuss——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CALLAHAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, let me just say this.

I do not know how anybody in this body that is trying to follow expenditures can look at this and understand it, and I think that the staff should be very careful when they put these kinds of figures in here because if we look at it on its surface, it looks like we have increased the administration's request by $144 million.

Well, it is very clear. Look at the bottom of page 13. Now, how are we, as colleagues of the gentleman's who do not have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Appropriations, supposed to understand that he folded other things in there and the administration has not?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Let me refer the gentleman from Indiana to page 23, where it says that the fiscal year request for the development fund for Africa, the President requested $704 million. He did not request any money for child survival. We eliminated the $704 million development fund for Africa, and we instituted $600 million for child survival, $104 million less——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has again expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I would like to engage my colleague from Indiana, Mr. BURTON, in just a very brief colloquy and follow up on what has been discussed with him and the chairman.

The development assistance fund cuts that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] proposes of $144 million, can he tell me in his opinion how that would be offset?

My belief is, based on what the gentleman from Alabama is saying, is that it will come out of the Africa account.

□ 1415

Does the gentleman dispute that, or does he not care?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the whole premise of my argument is this: The administration, the President of the United States and his administration, asked for 1 billion, 6 million dollars for development assistance. This bill, according to the way I read it, has 1 billion, 150 million dollars, or $144 million more than what the President requests.

Mr. Chairman, I have confidence in this particular area that the President has evaluated where the money should go, in Africa and elsewhere, and has come to the conclusion that 1 billion, 6 million dollars is enough, and I think $144 million above that is excessive.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I think in the final analysis, with a subtle earmark as it exists here, if you take developmental assistance down, you take Africa down.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. The program AID offers across the world are vital for the domestic survival of the countries they serve. They attend to the health and nutrition of children and allow these underdeveloped areas to stabilize their economies, fostering increased trade with the United States and free market economies throughout the world.

Furthermore, the cuts to AID would force the agency to cut 200 American jobs by the end of the year and 240 more by the end of 1997. AID has already demonstrated its efforts to streamline over the past 3 years, and is currently discussing the closure and downsizing of additional overseas posts, as my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, certainly knows. Therefore, the cuts proposed by the Burton amendment are unnecessary and would only further impair the agency's ability to serve its purpose. I would ask that it be opposed.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman. Also, I would like to point out or ask the gentleman if he knows that if these cuts were to be put into effect, that 45,000 families in South Africa could not be assisted with better drinking water and it would certainly cause child mortality rates to rise; 100,000 people in India will not receive safe drinking water and will be exposed to cholera and hepatitis from untreated sewage, as well as malaria and bubonic plague. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I certainly agree with that. That is part of what I was hopeful of pointing out to the gentleman from Indiana. I thank the gentleman for pointing that out, and I stand in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I will assure the gentleman from Indiana that I am absolutely right. If he reviews the entire bill and the entire context of that bill, I think that he will agree with me that we do, indeed, cut $65 million from the President's request. We must keep in mind, too, that we are talking about things like the child survival account, $27 million for disease prevention to wipe out polio, malaria, and other diseases.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the gentleman's disdain for the USAID, I recognize his true concerns about some of the activities of USAID, but we have acted, I think responsibly, in cutting the request of the President, in cutting last year's; and if we are going to have a USAID, then we are going to instruct them, as we do, on how they are going to spend the money, we are going to key in and aim it toward our child survival, and I think the committee has acted responsibly. Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I would request that the gentleman from Indiana withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the bill, at the very least, is confusing.

For anyone who is not a member of the Committee on Appropriations to read this, they would think that there is $144 million in excessive spending here. Let me just say this. I will take my colleague at his word and I will withdraw the amendment. But I hope next year when we come up with a bill that it will be drafted in such a way, especially the explanation, that any Member, aside from a member of the Committee on Appropriations, can look and see if you folded in child survival and childhood diseases and other things in there, because it is not apparent.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 13, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $46,554,000)''.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in 1996 in the foreign aid authorization bill for fiscal year 1996 and 1997, the House Committee on International Relations authorized only $419,000,000, $5,000,000 in operating expenses for AID for fiscal year 1997. The cut in this amendment would bring the total operating expenses level down to what was authorized but never enacted into law by our committee. This amount was later increased to $465 million. What we are trying to do here is to reduce by $46,554,000 the operating expenses for

AID. This is what was authorized by the Committee on International Relations and we think it should not be exceeded.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the operating cuts recommended by my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], would have a devastating effect on delivery of U.S. assistance in Africa. Such cuts would force USAID to close additional missions in the poorest continent in the world, thereby working greater hardships on the poorest of the poor. These assistance programs would be terminated abruptly, and prior U.S. investments would be jeopardized. It is simply my view, Mr. Chairman, that AID could not effectively carry out its mission, and therefore, I would recommend a no vote on the amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the committee of jurisdiction on authorizing is the Committee on International Relations, on which I serve and have served for 12 years now. What I cannot understand is why the subcommittee on the Committee on Appropriations is exceeding what the House authorizing committee requested, by $46,554,000. It is our responsibility to study this issue and to make a decision on what we should authorize to be spent. After we did that, the gentleman came back and raised it by $46 million. Why?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman, there was not an authorization bill signed into law, was there?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No, there was not.

Mr. WILSON. How long has it been since there has been one? How long has it been since we had an authorization bill signed into law?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The House authorization committee, the Committee on International Relations, made a recommendation.

Mr. WILSON. That is not the question. The question is, how long has it been since there has been an authorization bill signed into law?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It has been a while.

Mr. WILSON. I do not remember one. I have been here 24 years.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield further, he is in the House appropriations subcommittee that deals with this. Why would he not take into consideration what the authorizing committee came up with?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the gentleman is erroneous, that the House passed $419 million, as the gentleman suggested. However, when we got to conference and after it went through the Senate, then it came back to the House and it was at $465 million. So, I think that it is incorrect to say that the committee did not agree to it. When the conference report came back, the House did agree to the $465 million, so the committee originally did say, the gentleman's committee, $419 million. But as it went through the process, that committee agreed to $465 million. So the $465 million did pass the House, because we ratified and you voted for the conference report.

Also, the chairman of the authorizing committee did not raise any objection to this when he came to discuss the bill with us, so the $465 is the level that passed the House after they had their conference.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I just cited in my opening remarks that it was raised in conference to $465 million. I did not agree with that. I think that is excessive. I think the committee of jurisdiction and authorizing made the right decision. That is why I support the cut.

Mr. CALLAHAN. It is misleading when the gentleman says that this is more than the House passed. As we go through the committee process, as we go through the conference process, the final bill that the House voted on gave $465 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That was the conference committee report.

Mr. CALLAHAN. In the subcommittee it was only $419 and in full committee it was only $419, and when it first passed the House it was $419. Then the conferees went over to the Senate and compromised at $465, not the House, and then brought the authorization bill back to us and requested that we accept the $465.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, let me just say because some of my colleagues caved in to a higher figure on the other side does not make it right. That is why I want to cut it now.

Mr. CALLAHAN. It does make it right when I say that the House level of $465 million was the amount of money that we appropriated through the House, and naturally the chairman of the committee agrees with us because he did not object to raising it to the $465.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks of the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee, and I am in opposition to the Burton amendment. As indicated, it would cut USAID's operating expenses, as the gentleman from Indiana has said, by $46-plus million to a level of $419 million in fiscal year 1997.

The conference report on the fiscal year 1996–97 authorization bill passed by the House and the Senate, as has been pointed out by the subcommittee chair, proposed $465 million in fiscal year 1997, the same as recommended by H.R. 3540, the fiscal year 1997 foreign operations appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, much about this bill I do not like, but a lot that I like about it is that the chairman and the ranking member and other members of the Committee on Appropriations have gone about in a forthright manner, trying to be as creative as possible in protecting some accounts that we did not protect on the authorizing side.

In order to operate at even the $495 million request level in fiscal year 1997, USAID has announced it will have to lay off 200 U.S. direct-hire employees before the end of fiscal year 1996. In addition, 240 direct-hire employees will leave, or through attrition, for a total of 440, a reduction of 17 percent in 2 years.

Sometimes when we are on the floor we do not put human faces on these things. My view is cuts of the magnitude proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, my good friend, would require much deeper staff cuts in the field, seriously damaging USAID's ability to carry out its staff-intensive development programs, particularly child survival and microenterprise, as well as critical programs in the NIS and Eastern Europe. In fact, with such a reduction, it is likely that the agency would have to shut down its operations at some point during fiscal year 1997 for lack of funds.

I have pointed out and it has been pointed out previously that the Africa account will suffer substantially. Already, 23 overseas posts in Africa, Asia, the Near East, and Latin America have been cut, producing annual savings in excess of $40 million. I am sure my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, is mindful of that. I see him rising.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would just indulge me a moment, I want to read something. Sally Shelton, you have heard me say this before but I think it needs to be said again, she is a senior staffer at AID. Here is what she said. We have the documentation of this, which I brought before the committee: ''Larry Byrne (Assistant Administrator for Management at AID) said that AID was 62 percent through this fiscal year and we have 38 percent of the dollar volume of procurement actions completed; we need to do,'' or spend, ''$1.9 billion in the next 5 months.'' ''There are large pockets of money in the field * * * so let's get moving.''

Then if you look at a list, and I had a whole litany which I read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few minutes ago of wasteful projects, spending projects around the world in Burundi, in Africa, in Central America, Nicaragua, El Salvador and elsewhere, where we have waived millions and billions of dollars. Here we see that the head of the administration, one of the

leaders over there, is saying that we have to spend another $1.9 billion in the next 3 to 4 months, otherwise we probably will not get more money next year.

□ 1430

The problem is, until we come down hard on the administration of this agency, we are never going to cut that spending, and the American taxpayer does not like foreign aid anyhow, and when there is waste, fraud and abuse, they want something done about it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, when the gentleman makes a broad-based statement about that, about what the American taxpayer does not like, I am an American taxpayer and I recognize the critical aspect, as does the gentleman, of what we do abroad. The fact of the matter is we do not do enough. We are for free markets, he and I, and we know that international aid assists American investment and import and export undertakings, not only in the underdeveloped countries, but throughout the world.

With that in mind, what U.S. AID does can be construed as a failure, and the gentleman knows, and he and I were in the hearing; all of that was put into the record. But much has been done since that time by U.S. AID and other agencies in consultation with State to make some changes that I think the gentleman and I would agree upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do want to say that certainly we do not want to be put in the position of not wanting to eliminate cholera and having children immunized and having safe water for as many places as possible, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, I certainly agree. We are not cutting AID to the bone. We are cutting out the fat in my amendments, and what we are doing is sending a signal. Seventy-four percent, the gentleman is a taxpayer and so am I, 74 percent of the American people in a recent poll did not want any foreign aid. So the American people and the taxpayers are against it. So we have to spend their money very judiciously and in my opinion AID wastes a heck of a lot of it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana is right. The American people do not approve of foreign aid by a great majority. I think he mentioned that 74 percent of the people do not agree with it. I would agree with 74 percent of the American people, there are certain aspects of foreign aid that I loathe.

However, the American people do not object to Child Survival activities. The American people do not object to us feeding starving children in Africa or any other of the poor countries. The American people do not object to the International Rotary Club program to eradicate polio worldwide. They support this, and this is the agency that administers those funds.

I agree with you that there is great room for improvement in U.S. AID, and I have banged on their heads, and so has our ranking Democrat, insisting that they tighten their belts over there. We earmarked the money for Child Survival and said you must spend this money on this program.

So I will agree with the gentleman that there is great room for improvement, but further, I will tell the gentleman that it is $25 million less than we actually appropriated last year because we eliminated the transfer authority that we provided in the 1996 bill. So we have cut their operation expenses by a net of another $25 million.

In addition to that, it is almost $30 million below the President's budget. It is consistent with the level assumed in the authorization bill that was vetoed, the same bill that was approved last year and the President vetoed. It is consistent with that same level.

I agree that they should downsize. That is why I have supported the closure of 21 U.S. AID posts overseas, which will generate ultimately an annual saving of some $40 million. I support the efforts of AID to reduce personnel, which this year will include a reduction in force of 200 U.S. direct-hire employees. However, there is a limited beyond which any account that funds personnel can be cut before you totally disrupt agency operation.

What are we going to do with that $600 million that we put in Child Survival? Just send a check to somebody? We have to have a program that administers this aid. It costs money when you have any branch of the administration distributing money. But let us not say that 74 percent of the American people disagree with this section of this bill, because I would assure the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] that 90 percent of the American people agree that when we have starving children, when we have sick children, when we have uneducated children, when we have children who possibly might contract polio, that we ought to utilize some of our vast resources to help these unfortunate people. That is what we have tried to do, and I respectfully request that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, they have over 8,000 employees, and you are cutting 200. They have 8,000 employees, and you are talking about these children survival programs. I am not cutting the children survival programs. I am cutting the administrative overhead of the agency. They have 8,000 employees, and that does not include the contractors that they have outside that they have hired.

Now, I am very happy that the gentleman, and he is my good friend, was able to cut 200 jobs, but that is not nearly enough. The bureaucracy over there is out of control. I just read what one of the leaders said about having to blow more money so that they could get more money. The fact of the matter is, we ought to be cutting AID's administrative costs dramatically, not just to do away with a lot of unnecessary bureaucrats over there, which the taxpayers do not want to support, but secondly, to send a signal to them that we do not want this kind of attitude that they have had in the past.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will assure the gentleman that I have sent such a signal to USAID, I will assure him that this report language sends that same message to USAID, and I think that 200 employees, while it might not be as many as he would like, is a step in the right direction, that we have common destinations, that we are trying to get to this area of the room.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is saying we ought to run over there, and I am saying we ought to move judiciously to make certain that the child survival programs, that the good programs, the good that USAID does is not impacted by this.

I am with the gentleman all the way, and I will continue as long as I am chairman of this subcommittee to bang on their heads, to request and demand that the administrative expenses be kept at a minimum, but at the same time we just cannot cut. Why not cut it all out? Why not just give the money to Rotary International and say, you distribute it, you are doing such a wonderful job with polio?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CALLAHAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, when we cut 200 jobs out of 8,000, that is one-quarter of 1 percent, and you keep saying you are going to hand the checks to the Rotary Club to give that money away, that is a ludicrous thing to say. The fact of the matter is that 200 people out of 8,000 is nothing. That bureaucracy is top-heavy over there. We need to cut it to the bone.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the bureaucracy was growing until such time as I became chairman of this subcommittee, and since that time, the bureaucracy is downsizing. I know we are not doing it as rapidly as the gentleman would like, but we are not hemorrhaging like we were before; we are coming downhill, and that is the right direction, but we must do it responsibly.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, all I wish to point out is that there are 200 that have been cut, 200 through attrition. That is 400, a 17-percent decrease, and since 1995 there has been a freeze on hiring and, in addition to that, there has been a freeze on salary increases. They are making progress, I would say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, to what time in the day are we postponing the vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is really not fully aware of the answer to that question.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I might make a further parliamentary inquiry, as I understood it, we were going to be able to call votes after 2:30; is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. Not to the knowledge of the Chair.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, there is no time specific?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not heard it at this point.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So they are just being postponed indefinitely subject to the call of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair doubts if the postponement will be very long, but they are postponed as of this time.

Are there further amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 541 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $45,000,000: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for Zaire and Guatemala: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading for grant financed military education and training for Indonesia may only be available for expanded international military education and training.

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

For expenses necessary for grants to enable the President to carry out the provisions of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, $3,222,250,000: *Provided,* That funds appropriated by this paragraph that are made available for Israel and Egypt shall be made available only as grants: *Provided further,* That the funds appropriated by this paragraph that are made available for Israel shall be disbursed within thirty days of enactment of this Act or by October 31, 1996, whichever is later: *Provided further,* That to the extent that the Government of Israel requests that funds be used for such purposes, grants made available for Israel by this paragraph shall, as agreed by Israel and the United States, be available for advanced weapons systems, of which no less than $475,000,000 shall be available for the procurement in Israel of defense articles and defense services, including research and development: *Provided further,* That funds made available under this paragraph shall be nonrepayable notwithstanding any requirement in section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available for any non-NATO country participating in the Partnership for Peace Program except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans authorized by section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act as follows: cost of direct loans, $35,000,000: *Provided,* That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans of not to exceed $323,815,000: *Provided further,* That the rate of interest charged on such loans shall be not less than the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for Greece and Turkey only on a loan basis, and the principal amount of direct loans for each country shall not exceed the following: $103,471,000 only for Greece and $147,816,000 only for Turkey.

None of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to finance the procurement of defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services that are not sold by the United States Government under the Arms Export Control Act unless the foreign country proposing to make such procurements has first signed an agreement with the United States Government specifying the conditions under which such procurements may be financed with such funds: *Provided,* That all country and funding level increases in allocations shall be submitted through the regular notification procedures of section 515 of this Act: *Provided further,* That funds made available under this heading shall be obligated upon apportionment in accordance with paragraph (5)(C) of title 31, United States Code, section 1501(a): *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for Zaire, Sudan, Liberia, and Guatemala: *Provided further,* That only those countries for which assistance was justified for the ''Foreign Military Sales Financing Program'' in the fiscal year 1989 congressional presentation for security assistance programs may utilize funds made available under this heading for procurement of defense articles, defense services or design and construction services that are not sold by the United States Government under the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further,* That, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, funds made available under this heading for the cost of direct loans may also be used to supplement the funds available under this heading for grants, and funds made available under this heading for grants may also be used to supplement the funds available under this heading for the cost of direct loans: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for defense articles and services: *Provided further,* That not more than $23,250,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated for necessary expenses, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only for use outside of the United States, for the general costs of administering military assistance and sales: *Provided further,* That not more than $355,000,000 of funds realized pursuant to section 21(e)(1)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act may be obligated for expenses incurred by the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1997 pursuant to section 43(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, except that this limitation may be exceeded only through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $65,000,000: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we pass over consideration of title III, and that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] be allowed to offer the amendments he has on title III at a later point in consideration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman have any idea how many amendments there are pending?

Mr. WILSON. If the gentleman will yield, he has filed 18.

Mr. SOUDER. And does the gentleman know if the gentleman from Wisconsin intends to offer most of those amendments?

Mr. WILSON. The honest answer is I do not know.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I object. Maybe we can have this come up when we know how many there are going to be, but at this time I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Are there amendments to title III?

The Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the United States contribution to the Global Environment Facility (GEF), $30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

For payment to the International Development Association by the Secretary of the

Treasury, $525,000,000, for the United States contribution to the tenth replenishment, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That none of the funds made available for the International Development Association may be obligated until the Secretary of the Treasury submits a report to the Committees on Appropriations detailing the efforts made by United States officials, during discussions leading to an agreement to undertake the eleventh replenishment of the Association, to oppose the formation of an Interim Trust Fund, and fully describing the adverse impacts to the United States resulting from the Interim Trust Fund and other potential alternative funding structures for the Association during 1996 and 1997.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

For payment to the International Finance Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, $6,656,000, for the United States share of the increase in subscriptions to capital stock, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the Inter-American Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the United States share of the paid-in share portion of the increase in capital stock, $25,610,667, and for the United States share of the increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION OF CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of such capital stock in an amount not to exceed $1,503,718,910.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT FUND

For payment to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the United States contribution to the Fund to be administered by the Inter-American Development Bank, $27,500,000 to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the Asian Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury for the United States share of the paid-in portion of the increase in capital stock, $13,221,596, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the Asian Development Bank may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of such capital stock in an amount not to exceed $647,858,204.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the United States contribution by the Secretary of the Treasury to the increases in resources of the Asian Development Fund, as authorized by the Asian Development Bank Act, as amended (Public Law 89–369), $100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development by the Secretary of the Treasury, $11,916,447, for the United States share of the paid-in share portion of the initial capital subscription, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of such capital stock in an amount not to exceed $27,805,043.

NORTH AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the North American Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the United States share of the paid-in portion of the capital stock, $50,625,000, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the North American Development Bank may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of the capital stock of the North American Development Bank in an amount not to exceed $318,750,000.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and of section 2 of the United Nations Environment Program Participation Act of 1973, $136,000,000: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for the United Nations Fund for Science and Technology: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading that are made available to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) shall be made available for activities in the People's Republic of China: *Provided further,* That not more than $25,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available to the UNFPA *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available to the UNFPA unless the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Congress that UNFPA programs in the People's Republic of China have ended and the United States has received assurances that the UNFPA will not resume such programs during fiscal year 1997: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO).

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title IV?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we pass over consideration of title IV and that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] be allowed to offer the amendments he has filed on title IV at a later point in consideration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

OBLIGATIONS DURING LAST MONTH OF AVAILABILITY

SEC. 501. Except for the appropriations entitled ''International Disaster Assistance'', and ''United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund'', not more than 15 per centum of any appropriation item made available by this Act shall be obligated during the last month of availability.

PROHIBITION OF BILATERAL FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 502. None of the funds contained in title II of this Act may be used to carry out the provisions of section 209(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

LIMITATION ON RESIDENCE EXPENSES

SEC. 503. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, not to exceed $126,500 shall be for official residence expenses of the Agency for International Development during the current fiscal year: *Provided,* That appropriate steps shall be taken to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, United States-owned foreign currencies are utilized in lieu of dollars.

LIMITATION ON EXPENSES

SEC. 504. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, not to exceed $5,000 shall be for entertainment expenses of the Agency for International Development during the current fiscal year.

LIMITATION ON REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

SEC. 505. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, not to exceed $95,000 shall be available for representation allowances for the Agency for International Development during the current fiscal year: *Provided,* That appropriate steps shall be taken to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, United States-owned foreign currencies are utilized in lieu of dollars: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available by this Act for general costs of administering military assistance and sales under the heading ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', not to exceed $2,000 shall be available for entertainment expenses and not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for representation allowances: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''International Military Education and Training'', not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for entertainment allowances: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available by this Act for the Inter-American Foundation, not to exceed $2,000 shall be available for entertainment and representation allowances: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available by this Act for the Peace Corps, not to exceed a total of $4,000 shall be available for entertainment expenses: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''Trade and Development Agency'', not to exceed $2,000 shall be available for representation and entertainment allowances.

PROHIBITION ON FINANCING NUCLEAR GOODS

SEC. 506. None of the funds appropriated or made available (other than funds for ''Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'') pursuant to this Act, for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used, except for purposes of nuclear safety, to finance the export of nuclear equipment, fuel, or technology.

PROHIBITION AGAINST DIRECT FUNDING FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES

SEC. 507. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance or reparations to Cuba, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Iran, Sudan, or Syria: *Provided,* That for purposes of this section, the prohibition on obligations or expenditures shall include direct loans, credits, insurance and guarantees of the Export-Import Bank or its agents.

MILITARY COUPS

SEC. 508. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance to any country whose duly elected Head of Government is deposed by military coup or decree: *Provided,* That assistance may be resumed to such country if the President determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that subsequent to the termination of assistance a democratically elected government has taken office.

TRANSFERS BETWEEN ACCOUNTS

SEC. 509. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated under an appropriation account to which they were not appropriated, except for transfers specifically provided for in this Act, unless the President, prior to the exercise of any authority contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to transfer funds, consults with and provides a written policy justification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

DEOBLIGATION/REOBLIGATION AUTHORITY

SEC. 510. (a) Amounts certified pursuant to section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1955, as having been obligated against appropriations heretofore made under the authority of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the same general purpose as any of the headings under title II of this Act are, if deobligated, hereby continued available for the same period as the respective appropriations under such headings or until September 30, 1997, whichever is later, and for the same general purpose, and for countries within the same region as originally obligated: *Provided,* That the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of the Congress are notified fifteen days in advance of the reobligation of such funds in accordance with regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(b) Obligated balances of funds appropriated to carry out section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act as of the end of the fiscal year immediately preceding the current fiscal year are, if deobligated, hereby continued available during the current fiscal year for the same purpose under any authority applicable to such appropriations under this Act: *Provided,* That the authority of this subsection may not be used in fiscal year 1997.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

SEC. 511. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation after the expiration of the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided in this Act: *Provided,* That funds appropriated for the purposes of chapters 1, 8, and 11 of part I, section 667, and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and funds provided under the heading ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'', shall remain available until expended if such funds are initially obligated before the expiration of their respective periods of availability contained in this Act: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any funds made available for the purposes of chapter 1 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which are allocated for cash disbursements in order to address balance of payments or economic policy reform objectives, shall remain available until expended: *Provided further,* That the report required by section 653(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall designate for each country, to the extent known at the time of submission of such report, those funds allocated for cash disbursement for balance of payment and economic policy reform purposes.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES IN DEFAULT

SEC. 512. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which is in default during a period in excess of one calendar year in payment to the United States of principal or interest on any loan made to such country by the United States pursuant to a program for which funds are appropriated under this Act: *Provided,* That this section and section 620(q) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply to funds made available in this Act or during the current fiscal year for Nicaragua, and for any narcotics-related assistance for Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or the Arms Export Control Act.

COMMERCE AND TRADE

SEC. 513. (a) None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for direct assistance and none of the funds otherwise made available pursuant to this Act to the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall be obligated or expended to finance any loan, any assistance or any other financial commitments for establishing or expanding production of any commodity for export by any country other than the United States, if the commodity is likely to be in surplus on world markets at the time the resulting productive capacity is expected to become operative and if the assistance will cause substantial injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity: *Provided,* That such prohibition shall not apply to the Export-Import Bank if in the judgment of its Board of Directors the benefits to industry and employment in the United States are likely to outweigh the injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity, and the Chairman of the Board so notifies the Committees on Appropriations.

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act to carry out chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be available for any testing or breeding feasibility study, variety improvement or introduction, consultancy, publication, conference, or training in connection with the growth or production in a foreign country of an agricultural commodity for export which would compete with a similar commodity grown or produced in the United States: *Provided,* That this subsection shall not prohibit—

(1) activities designed to increase food security in developing countries where such activities will not have a significant impact in the export of agricultural commodities of the United States; or

(2) research activities intended primarily to benefit American producers.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

SEC. 514. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Investment Corporation, the North American Development Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the African Development Bank, and the African Development Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose any assistance by these institutions, using funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, for the production or extraction of any commodity or mineral for export, if it is in surplus on world markets and if the assistance will cause substantial injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity.

NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 515. For the purposes of providing the Executive Branch with the necessary administrative flexibility, none of the funds made available under this Act for ''Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund'', ''Development Assistance'', ''Debt restructuring'', ''International organizations and programs'', ''Trade and Development Agency'', ''International narcotics control'', ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'', ''Assistance for the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union'', ''Economic Support Fund'', ''Peacekeeping operations'', ''Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development'', ''Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General'', ''Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs'', ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', ''International military education and training'', ''Inter-American Foundation'', ''African Development Foundation'', ''Peace Corps'', ''Migration and refugee assistance'', shall be available for obligation for activities, programs, projects, type of materiel assistance, countries, or other operations not justified or in excess of the amount justified to the Appropriations Committees for obligation under any of these specific headings unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are previously notified fifteen days in advance: *Provided,* That the President shall not enter into any commitment of funds appropriated for the purposes of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act for the provision of major defense equipment, other than conventional ammunition, or other major defense items defined to be aircraft, ships, missiles, or combat vehicles, not previously justified to Congress or 20 per centum in excess of the quantities justified to Congress unless the Committees on Appropriations are notified fifteen days in advance of such commitment: *Provided further,* That this section shall not apply to any reprogramming for an activity, program, or project under chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 of less than 10 per centum of the amount previously justified to the Congress for obligation for such activity, program, or project for the current fiscal year: *Provided further,* That the requirements of this section or any similar provision of this Act or any other Act, including any prior Act requiring notification in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, may be waived if failure to do so would pose a substantial risk to human health or welfare: *Provided further,* That in case of any such waiver, notification to the Congress, or the appropriate congressional committees, shall be provided as early as practicable, but in no event later than three days after taking the action to which such notification requirement was applicable, in the context of the circumstances necessitating such waiver: *Provided further,* That any notification provided pursuant to such a waiver shall contain an explanation of the emergency circumstances.

Drawdowns made pursuant to section 506(a) (2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 516. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds provided for ''International Organizations and Programs'' shall be available for the United States proportionate share, in accordance with section 307(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, for any programs identified in section 307, or for Libya, Iran, or, at the discretion of the President, Communist countries listed in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended: *Provided,* That, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, funds appropriated under this Act or any previously enacted Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, which are returned or not made available for organizations and programs because

of the implementation of this section or any similar provision of law, shall remain available for obligation through September 30, 1998.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL

SEC. 517. The Congress finds that progress on the peace process in the Middle East is vitally important to United States security interests in the region. The Congress recognizes that, in fulfilling its obligations under the Treaty of Peace Between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel, done at Washington on March 26, 1979, Israel incurred severe economic burdens. Furthermore, the Congress recognizes that an economically and militarily secure Israel serves the security interests of the United States, for a secure Israel is an Israel which has the incentive and confidence to continue pursuing the peace process. Therefore, the Congress declares that, subject to the availability of appropriations, it is the policy and the intention of the United States that the funds provided in annual appropriations for the Economic Support Fund which are allocated to Israel shall not be less than the annual debt repayment (interest and principal) from Israel to the United States Government in recognition that such a principle serves United States interests in the region.

PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR ABORTIONS AND INVOLUNTARY STERILIZATION

SEC. 518. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for the performance of involuntary sterilization as a method of family planning or to coerce or provide any financial incentive to any person to undergo sterilizations. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for any biomedical research which relates in whole or in part, to methods of, or the performance of, abortions or involuntary sterilization as a means of family planning. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be obligated or expended for any country or organization if the President certifies that the use of these funds by any such country or organization would violate any of the above provisions related to abortions and involuntary sterilizations: *Provided,* That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.

POPULATION ASSISTANCE FUNDING LIMITATIONS

SEC. 518A. (a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities may be made available for a foreign private or nongovernmental organization only if the organization certifies that it will not during the period for which the funds are made available, perform abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

(2) Paragraph (1) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

(b) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—

(1) None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion, and, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities may be made available for any foreign private or nongovernmental organization until the organization certifies that it will not during the period for which the funds are made available, violate the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited, or engage in any activity or effort in a foreign country to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

(c) Notwithstanding subsections (a)(1) and (b)(1), a foreign private or nongovernmental organization may receive funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities in the absence of the certifications required in said subsections, but funds made available for each such organization by this Act shall not exceed 50 percent of the funds made available to the organization during fiscal year 1995. Funds for population assistance activities may not be made available for any foreign private or nongovernmental organization that did not receive such funds during fiscal year 1995 unless the organization meets the certification requirements of subsections (a)(1) and (b)(1).

(d) Funds made available pursuant to subsection (c) shall be apportioned on a monthly basis for the first four months of fiscal year 1997 only, and monthly disbursements during such period to each organization covered by said subsection may not exceed 8.34 percent of the total each such organization could receive pursuant to said subsection.

(e) Subsections (a), (b) and (c) apply to funds made available for a foreign organization either directly or as a subcontractor or sub-grantee, and the required certifications apply to activities in which the organization engages either directly or through a subcontractor or sub-grantee.

(f) Funds appropriated or otherwise made available in title II of this Act for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available for obligation and expenditure in an amount not to exceed 65 percent of the total amount appropriated or otherwise made available by Public Law 103–306 and Public Law 104–19 for such activities for fiscal year 1995.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT

SEC. 519. The President shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations the reports required by section 25(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act.

SPECIAL NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 520. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be obligated or expended for Colombia, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Liberia, Pakistan, Peru, Russia, Serbia, South Africa, Sudan, or Zaire except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

DEFINITION OF PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

SEC. 521. For the purpose of this Act, ''program, project, and activity'' shall be defined at the Appropriations Act account level and shall include all Appropriations and Authorizations Acts earmarks, ceilings, and limitations with the exception that for the following accounts: Economic Support Fund and Foreign Military Financing Program, ''program, project, and activity'' shall also be considered to include country, regional, and central program level funding within each such account; for the development assistance accounts of the Agency for International Development ''program, project, and activity'' shall also be considered to include central program level funding, either as (1) justified to the Congress, or (2) allocated by the executive branch in accordance with a report, to be provided to the Committees on Appropriations within thirty days of enactment of this Act, as required by section 653(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

CHILD SURVIVAL AND AIDS ACTIVITIES

SEC. 522. Up to $8,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act for assistance for family planning, health, child survival, and AIDS, may be used to reimburse United States Government agencies, agencies of State governments, institutions of higher learning, and private and voluntary organizations for the full cost of individuals (including for the personal services of such individuals) detailed or assigned to, or contracted by, as the case may be, the Agency for International Development for the purpose of carrying out family planning activities, child survival activities and activities relating to research on, and the treatment and control of acquired immune deficiency syndrome in developing countries: *Provided,* That funds appropriated by this Act that are made available for child survival activities or activities relating to research on, and the treatment and control of, acquired immune deficiency syndrome may be made available notwithstanding any provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated by this Act that are made available for family planning activities may be made available notwithstanding section 512 of this Act and section 620(q) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

PROHIBITION AGAINST INDIRECT FUNDING TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES

SEC. 523. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated to finance indirectly any assistance or reparations to Cuba, Iraq, Libya, Iran, Syria, North Korea, or the People's Republic of China, unless the President of the United States certifies that the withholding of these funds is contrary to the national interest of the United States.

RECIPROCAL LEASING

SEC. 524. Section 61(a) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by striking out ''1996'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''1997''.

NOTIFICATION ON EXCESS DEFENSE EQUIPMENT

SEC. 525. Prior to providing excess Department of Defense articles in accordance with section 516(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations to the same extent and under the same conditions as are other committees pursuant to subsection (c) of that section: *Provided,* That before issuing a letter of offer to sell excess defense articles under the Arms Export Control Act, the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the regular notification procedures of such Committees: *Provided further,* That such Committees shall also be informed of the original acquisition cost of such defense articles.

AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENT

SEC. 526. Funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956.

PROHIBITION ON BILATERAL ASSISTANCE TO TERRORIST COUNTRIES

SEC. 527. (a) Funds appropriated for bilateral assistance under any heading of this Act

and funds appropriated under any such heading in a provision of law enacted prior to enactment of this Act, shall not be made available to any country which the President determines—

(1) grants sanctuary from prosecution to any individual or group which has committed an act of international terrorism, or

(2) otherwise supports international terrorism.

(b) The President may waive the application of subsection (a) to a country if the President determines that national security or humanitarian reasons justify such waiver. The President shall publish each waiver in the Federal Register and, at least fifteen days before the waiver takes effect, shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the waiver (including the justification for the waiver) in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

COMMERCIAL LEASING OF DEFENSE ARTICLES

SEC. 528. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, the authority of section 23(a) of the Arms Export Control Act may be used to provide financing to Israel, Egypt and NATO and major non-NATO allies for the procurement by leasing (including leasing with an option to purchase) of defense articles from United States commercial suppliers, not including Major Defense Equipment (other than helicopters and other types of aircraft having possible civilian application), if the President determines that there are compelling foreign policy or national security reasons for those defense articles being provided by commercial lease rather than by government-to-government sale under such Act.

COMPETITIVE INSURANCE

SEC. 528A. All Agency for International Development contracts and solicitations, and subcontracts entered into under such contracts, shall include a clause requiring that United States insurance companies have a fair opportunity to bid for insurance when such insurance is necessary or appropriate.

STINGERS IN THE PERSIAN GULF REGION

SEC. 529. Except as provided in section 581 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1990, the United States may not sell or otherwise make available any Stingers to any country bordering the Persian Gulf under the Arms Export Control Act or chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

DEBT-FOR-DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 530. In order to enhance the continued participation of nongovernmental organizations in economic assistance activities under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including endowments, debt-for-development and debt-for-nature exchanges, a nongovernmental organization which is a grantee or contractor of the Agency for International Development may place in interest bearing accounts funds made available under this Act or prior Acts or local currencies which accrue to that organization as a result of economic assistance provided under title II of this Act and any interest earned on such investment shall be used for the purpose for which the assistance was provided to that organization.

SEPARATE ACCOUNTS

SEC. 531. (a) SEPARATE ACCOUNTS FOR LOCAL CURRENCIES.—(1) If assistance is furnished to the government of a foreign country under chapters 1 and 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 under agreements which result in the generation of local currencies of that country, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall—

(A) require that local currencies be deposited in a separate account established by that government;

(B) enter into an agreement with that government which sets forth—

(i) the amount of the local currencies to be generated, and

(ii) the terms and conditions under which the currencies so deposited may be utilized, consistent with this section; and

(C) establish by agreement with that government the responsibilities of the Agency for International Development and that government to monitor and account for deposits into and disbursements from the separate account.

(2) USES OF LOCAL CURRENCIES.—As may be agreed upon with the foreign government, local currencies deposited in a separate account pursuant to subsection (a), or an equivalent amount of local currencies, shall be used only—

(A) to carry out chapters 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II (as the case may be), for such purposes as—

(i) project and sector assistance activities, or

(ii) debt and deficit financing; or

(B) for the administrative requirements of the United States Government.

(3) PROGRAMMING ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Agency for International Development shall take all necessary steps to ensure that the equivalent of the local currencies disbursed pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(A) from the separate account established pursuant to subsection (a)(1) are used for the purposes agreed upon pursuant to subsection (a)(2).

(4) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Upon termination of assistance to a country under chapters 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II (as the case may be), any unencumbered balances of funds which remain in a separate account established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be disposed of for such purposes as may be agreed to by the government of that country and the United States Government.

(5) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The provisions of this subsection shall supersede the tenth and eleventh provisos contained under the heading ''Sub-Saharan Africa, Development Assistance'' as included in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1989 and sections 531(d) and 609 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(6) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall report on an annual basis as part of the justification documents submitted to the Committees on Appropriations on the use of local currencies for the administrative requirements of the United States Government as authorized in subsection (a)(2)(B), and such report shall include the amount of local currency (and United States dollar equivalent) used and/or to be used for such purpose in each applicable country.

(b) SEPARATE ACCOUNTS FOR CASH TRANSFERS.—(1) If assistance is made available to the government of a foreign country, under chapters 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as cash transfer assistance or as nonproject sector assistance, that country shall be required to maintain such funds in a separate account and not commingle them with any other funds.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—Such funds may be obligated and expended notwithstanding provisions of law which are inconsistent with the nature of this assistance including provisions which are referenced in the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference accompanying House Joint Resolution 648 (H. Report No. 98–1159).

(3) NOTIFICATION.—At least fifteen days prior to obligating any such cash transfer or nonproject sector assistance, the President shall submit a notification through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, which shall include a detailed description of how the funds proposed to be made available will be used, with a discussion of the United States interests that will be served by the assistance (including, as appropriate, a description of the economic policy reforms that will be promoted by such assistance).

(4) EXEMPTION.—Nonproject sector assistance funds may be exempt from the requirements of subsection (b) (1) only through the notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

COMPENSATION FOR UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCING INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 532. (a) No funds appropriated by this Act may be made as payment to any international financial institution while the United States Executive Director to such institution is compensated by the institution at a rate which, together with whatever compensation such Director receives from the United States, is in excess of the rate provided for an individual occupying a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, or while any alternate United States Director to such institution is compensated by the institution at a rate in excess of the rate provided for an individual occupying a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) For purposes of this section, ''international financial institutions'' are: the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Asian Development Fund, the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, the International Monetary Fund, the North American Development Bank, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

COMPLIANCE WITH UNITED NATIONS SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAQ

SEC. 533. (a) DENIAL OF ASSISTANCE.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act to carry out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including title IV of chapter 2 of part I, relating to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation) or the Arms Export Control Act may be used to provide assistance to any country that is not in compliance with the United Nations Security Council sanctions against Iraq, Serbia or Montenegro unless the President determines and so certifies to the Congress that—

(1) such assistance is in the national interest of the United States;

(2) such assistance will directly benefit the needy people in that country; or

(3) the assistance to be provided will be humanitarian assistance for foreign nationals who have fled Iraq and Kuwait.

(b) IMPORT SANCTIONS.—If the President considers that the taking of such action would promote the effectiveness of the economic sanctions of the United Nations and the United States imposed with respect to Iraq, Serbia, or Montenegro, as the case may be, and is consistent with the national interest, the President may prohibit, for such a period of time as he considers appropriate, the importation into the United States of any or all products of any foreign country that has not prohibited—

(1) the importation of products of Iraq, Serbia, or Montenegro into its customs territory, and

(2) the export of its products to Iraq, Serbia, or Montenegro, as the case may be.

POW/MIA MILITARY DRAWDOWN

SEC. 534. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may direct the drawdown, without reimbursement by the recipient, of defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense, defense services of the Department of Defense, and military education and training, of an aggregate value not to exceed $15,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, as may be necessary to carry out subsection (b).

(b) Such defense articles, services and training may be provided to Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, under subsection (a) as the President determines are necessary to support efforts to locate and repatriate members of the United States Armed Forces and civilians employed directly or indirectly by the United States Government who remain unaccounted for from the Vietnam War, and to ensure the safety of United States Government personnel engaged in such cooperative efforts and to support United States Department of Defense-sponsored humanitarian projects associated with the POW/MIA efforts. Any aircraft shall be provided under this section only to Laos and only on a lease or loan basis, but may be provided at no cost notwithstanding section 61 of the Arms Export Control Act and may be maintained with defense articles, services and training provided under this section.

(c) The President shall, within sixty days of the end of any fiscal year in which the authority of subsection (a) is exercised, submit a report to the Congress which identifies the articles, services, and training drawn down under this section.

MEDITERRANEAN EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES

SEC. 535. For the four-year period beginning on October 1, 1996, the President shall ensure that excess defense articles will be made available under section 516 and 519 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 consistent with the manner in which the President made available excess defense articles under those sections during the four-year period that began on October 1, 1992, pursuant to section 573(e) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1990.

CASH FLOW FINANCING

SEC. 536. For each country that has been approved for cash flow financing (as defined in section 25(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as added by section 112(b) of Public Law 99–83) under the Foreign Military Financing Program, any Letter of Offer and Acceptance or other purchase agreement, or any amendment thereto, for a procurement in excess of $100,000,000 that is to be financed in whole or in part with funds made available under this Act shall be submitted through the regular notification procedures to the Committees on Appropriations.

AUTHORITIES FOR THE PEACE CORPS, THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION AND THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

SEC. 537. Unless expressly provided to the contrary, provisions of this or any other Act, including provisions contained in prior Acts authorizing or making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, shall not be construed to prohibit activities authorized by or conducted under the Peace Corps Act, the Inter-American Foundation Act, or the African Development Foundation Act. The appropriate agency shall promptly report to the Committees on Appropriations whenever it is conducting activities or is proposing to conduct activities in a country for which assistance is prohibited.

IMPACT ON JOBS IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 538. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended to provide—

(a) any financial incentive to a business enterprise currently located in the United States for the purpose of inducing such an enterprise to relocate outside the United States if such incentive or inducement is likely to reduce the number of employees of such business enterprise in the United States because United States production is being replaced by such enterprise outside the United States;

(b) assistance for the purpose of establishing or developing in a foreign country any export processing zone or designated area in which the tax, tariff, labor, environment, and safety laws of that country do not apply, in part or in whole, to activities carried out within that zone or area, unless the President determines and certifies that such assistance is not likely to cause a loss of jobs within the United States; or

(c) assistance for any project or activity that contributes to the violation of internationally recognized workers rights, as defined in section 502(a)(4) of the Trade Act of 1974, of workers in the recipient country, including any designated zone or area in that country: *Provided*, That in recognition that the application of this subsection should be commensurate with the level of development of the recipient country and sector, the provisions of this subsection shall not preclude assistance for the informal sector in such country, micro and small-scale enterprise, and smallholder agriculture.

AUTHORITY TO ASSIST BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

SEC. 539. (a) The President is authorized to direct the transfer, subject to notification of the Committees on Appropriations, to the government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, without reimbursement, of defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense and defense services of the Department of Defense, of an aggregate value that equals the difference between $100,000,000 and the aggregate value of any such articles and services that were transferred under the authority of Section 540 of Public Law 104–107, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1996: *Provided*, That the President certifies in a timely fashion to the Congress that the transfer of such defense articles would assist that nation in self-defense and thereby promote the security and stability of the region.

(b) Within 60 days of any transfer under the authority provided in subsection (b), and every 60 days thereafter, the President shall report in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate concerning the articles transferred and the disposition thereof.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the applicable appropriation, fund, or account for defense articles provided under this section.

RESTRICTIONS ON THE TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS AGAINST SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO

SEC. 540. (a) RESTRICTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no sanction, prohibition, or requirement described in section 1511 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160), with respect to Serbia or Montenegro, may cease to be effective, unless—

(1) the President first submits to the Congress a certification described in subsection (b); and

(2) the requirements of section 1511 of that Act are met.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this subsection is a certification that—

(1) there is substantial progress toward—

(A) the realization of a separate identity for Kosova and the right of the people of Kosova to govern themselves; or

(B) the creation of an international protectorate for Kosova;

(2) there is substantial improvement in the human rights situation in Kosova;

(3) international human rights observers are allowed to return to Kosova; and

(4) the elected government of Kosova is permitted to meet and carry out its legitimate mandate as elected representatives of the people of Kosova.

(c) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The President may waive the application in whole or in part, of subsection (a) if the President certifies to the Congress that the President has determined that the waiver is necessary to meet emergency humanitarian needs or to achieve a negotiated settlement of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina that is acceptable to the parties.

SPECIAL AUTHORITIES

SEC. 541. (a) Funds appropriated in title II of this Act that are made available for Afghanistan, Lebanon, and Cambodia, and for victims of war, displaced children, displaced Burmese, humanitarian assistance for Romania, and humanitarian assistance for the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Kosova, may be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided*, That any such funds that are made available for Cambodia shall be subject to the provisions of section 531(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and section 906 of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the President shall terminate assistance to any country or organization that he determines is cooperating, tactically or strategically, with the Khmer Rouge in their military operations, or to the military of any country which the President determines is not taking steps to prevent a pattern or practice of commercial relations between its members and the Khmer Rouge.

(b) Funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of supporting tropical forestry and energy programs aimed at reducing emissions of greenhouse gases, and for the purpose of supporting biodiversity conservation activities: *Provided*, That such assistance shall be subject to sections 116, 502B, and 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(c) During fiscal year 1997, the President may use up to $50,000,000 under the authority of section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, notwithstanding the funding ceiling contained in subsection (a) of that section.

(d) The Agency for International Development may employ personal services contractors, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of administering programs for the West Bank and Gaza.

POLICY ON TERMINATING THE ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL

SEC. 542. It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Arab League countries should immediately and publicly renounce the primary boycott of Israel and the secondary and tertiary boycott of American firms that have commercial ties with Israel; and

(2) the President should—

(A) take more concrete steps to encourage vigorously Arab League countries to renounce publicly the primary boycotts of Israel and the secondary and tertiary boycotts of American firms that have commercial relations with Israel as a confidence-building measure;

(B) take into consideration the participation of any recipient country in the primary

boycott of Israel and the secondary and tertiary boycotts of American firms that have commercial relations with Israel when determining whether to sell weapons to said country;

(C) report to Congress on the specific steps being taken by the President to bring about a public renunciation of the Arab primary boycott of Israel and the secondary and tertiary boycotts of American firms that have commercial relations with Israel; and

(D) encourage the allies and trading partners of the United States to enact laws prohibiting businesses from complying with the boycott and penalizing businesses that do comply.

ANTI-NARCOTICS ACTIVITIES

SEC. 543. (a) Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for ''Economic Support Fund'', assistance may be provided to strengthen the administration of justice in countries in Latin America and the Caribbean and in other regions consistent with the provisions of section 534(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, except that programs to enhance protection of participants in judicial cases may be conducted notwithstanding section 660 of that Act.

(b) Funds made available pursuant to this section may be made available notwithstanding section 534(c) and the second and third sentences of section 534(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Funds made available pursuant to subsection (a) for Bolivia, Colombia and Peru may be made available notwithstanding section 534(c) and the second sentence of section 534(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

SEC. 544. (a) ASSISTANCE THROUGH NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Restrictions contained in this or any other Act with respect to assistance for a country shall not be construed to restrict assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapters 1 and 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided*, That the President shall take into consideration, in any case in which a restriction on assistance would be applicable but for this subsection, whether assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations is in the national interest of the United States: *Provided further*, That before using the authority of this subsection to furnish assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations, the President shall notify the Committees on Appropriations under the regular notification procedures of those committees, including a description of the program to be assisted, the assistance to be provided, and the reasons for furnishing such assistance: *Provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion or involuntary sterilizations contained in this or any other Act.

(b) PUBLIC LAW 480.—During fiscal year 1997, restrictions contained in this or any other Act with respect to assistance for a country shall not be construed to restrict assistance under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to carry out title I of such Act and made available pursuant to this subsection may be obligated or expended except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply—

(1) with respect to section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act or any comparable provision of law prohibiting assistance to countries that support international terrorism; or

(2) with respect to section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any comparable provision of law prohibiting assistance to countries that violate internationally recognized human rights.

EARMARKS

SEC. 544A. (a) Funds appropriated by this Act which are earmarked may be reprogrammed for other programs within the same account notwithstanding the earmark if compliance with the earmark is made impossible by operation of any provision of this or any other Act or, with respect to a country with which the United States has an agreement providing the United States with base rights or base access in that country, if the President determines that the recipient for which funds are earmarked has significantly reduced its military or economic cooperation with the United States since enactment of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1991; however, before exercising the authority of this subsection with regard to a base rights or base access country which has significantly reduced its military or economic cooperation with the United States, the President shall consult with, and shall provide a written policy justification to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That any such reprogramming shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That assistance that is reprogrammed pursuant to this subsection shall be made available under the same terms and conditions as originally provided.

(b) In addition to the authority contained in subsection (a), the original period of availability of funds appropriated by this Act and administered by the Agency for International Development that are earmarked for particular programs or activities by this or any other Act shall be extended for an additional fiscal year if the Administrator of such agency determines and reports promptly to the Committees on Appropriations that the termination of assistance to a country or a significant change in circumstances makes it unlikely that such earmarked funds can be obligated during the original period of availability: *Provided*, That such earmarked funds that are continued available for an additional fiscal year shall be obligated only for the purpose of such earmark.

CEILINGS AND EARMARKS

SEC. 545. Ceilings and earmarks contained in this Act shall not be applicable to funds or authorities appropriated or otherwise made available by any subsequent Act unless such Act specifically so directs.

PROHIBITION ON PUBLICITY OR PROPAGANDA

SEC. 546. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not authorized before the date of enactment of this Act by the Congress: *Provided*, That not to exceed $750,000 may be made available to carry out the provisions of section 316 of Public Law 96–533.

USE OF AMERICAN RESOURCES

SEC. 547. To the maximum extent possible, assistance provided under this Act should make full use of American resources, including commodities, products, and services.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENTS TO UNITED NATIONS MEMBERS

SEC. 548. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used to pay in whole or in part any assessments, arrearages, or dues of any member of the United Nations.

CONSULTING SERVICES

SEC. 549. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order pursuant to existing law.

PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS—DOCUMENTATION

SEC. 550. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be available to a private voluntary organization which fails to provide upon timely request any document, file, or record necessary to the auditing requirements of the Agency for International Development.

PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS THAT EXPORT LETHAL MILITARY EQUIPMENT TO COUNTRIES SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

SEC. 551. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be available to any foreign government which provides lethal military equipment to a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined is a terrorist government for purposes of section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act. The prohibition under this section with respect to a foreign government shall terminate 12 months after that government ceases to provide such military equipment. This section applies with respect to lethal military equipment provided under a contract entered into after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Assistance restricted by subsection (a) or any other similar provision of law, may be furnished if the President determines that furnishing such assistance is important to the national interests of the United States.

(c) Whenever the waiver of subsection (b) is exercised, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report with respect to the furnishing of such assistance. Any such report shall include a detailed explanation of the assistance to be provided, including the estimated dollar amount of such assistance, and an explanation of how the assistance furthers United States national interests.

WITHHOLDING OF ASSISTANCE FOR PARKING FINES OWED BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

SEC. 552. (a) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available for a foreign country under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, an amount equivalent to 110 percent of the total unpaid fully adjudicated parking fines and penalties owed to the District of Columbia by such country as of the date of enactment of this Act shall be withheld from obligation for such country until the Secretary of State certifies and reports in writing to the appropriate congressional committees that such fines and penalties are fully paid to the government of the District of Columbia.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR THE PLO FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA

SEC. 553. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated for assistance for the Palestine Liberation Organization for the West Bank and Gaza unless the President has exercised the authority under section 604(a) of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1995 (title VI of Public Law 104–107) or any other legislation to suspend or make inapplicable section 307 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and that suspension is still

in effect: *Provided*, That if the President fails to make the certification under section 604(b)(2) of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1995 or to suspend the prohibition under other legislation, funds appropriated by this Act may not be obligated for assistance for the Palestine Liberation Organization for the West Bank and Gaza.

EXPORT FINANCING TRANSFER AUTHORITIES

SEC. 554. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation other than for administrative expenses made available for fiscal year 1997 for programs under title I of this Act may be transferred between such appropriations for use for any of the purposes, programs and activities for which the funds in such receiving account may be used, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 25 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That the exercise of such authority shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

WAR CRIMES TRIBUNALS

SEC. 555. If the President determines that doing so will contribute to a just resolution of charges regarding genocide or other violations of international humanitarian law, the President may direct a drawdown pursuant to section 552(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, of up to $25,000,000 of commodities and services for the United Nations War Crimes Tribunal established with regard to the former Yugoslavia by the United Nations Security Council or such other tribunals or commissions as the Council may establish to deal with such violations, without regard to the ceiling limitation contained in paragraph (2) thereof: *Provided*, That the determination required under this section shall be in lieu of any determinations otherwise required under section 552(c): *Provided further*, That 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations describing the steps the United States Government is taking to collect information regarding allegations of genocide or other violations of international law in the former Yugoslavia and to furnish that information to the United Nations War Crimes Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

LANDMINES

SEC. 556. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, demining equipment available to any department or agency and used in support of the clearing of landmines for humanitarian purposes may be disposed of on a grant basis in foreign countries, subject to such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe.

RESTRICTIONS CONCERNING THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 557. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended to create in any part of Jerusalem a new office of any department or agency of the United States Government for the purpose of conducting official United States Government business with the Palestinian Authority over Gaza and Jericho or any successor Palestinian governing entity provided for in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply to the acquisition of additional space for the existing Consulate General in Jerusalem: *Provided further*, That meetings between officers and employees of the United States and officials of the Palestinian Authority, or any successor Palestinian governing entity provided for in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles, for the purpose of conducting official United States Government business with such authority should continue to take place in locations other than Jerusalem. As has been true in the past, officers and employees of the United States Government may continue to meet in Jerusalem on other subjects with Palestinians (including those who now occupy positions in the Palestinian Authority), have social contacts, and have incidental discussions.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES

SEC. 558. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading ''INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING'' or ''FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM'' for Informational Program activities may be obligated or expended to pay for—

(1) alcoholic beverages;

(2) food (other than food provided at a military installation) not provided in conjunction with Informational Program trips where students do not stay at a military installation; or

(3) entertainment expenses for activities that are substantially of a recreational character, including entrance fees at sporting events and amusement parks.

HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

SEC. 559. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for assistance in support of any country when it is made known to the President that the government of such country prohibits or otherwise restricts, directly or indirectly, the transport or delivery of United States humanitarian assistance.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Funds may be made available without regard to the restriction in subsection (a) if the President determines that to do so is in the national security interest of the United States.

WITHHOLDING OF ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES SUPPORTING NUCLEAR PLANT IN CUBA

SEC. 560. (a) WITHHOLDING.—The President shall withhold from assistance made available with funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act an amount equal to the sum of assistance and credits, if any, provided on or after the date of the enactment of this Act by that country, or any entity in that country, in support of the completion of the Cuban nuclear facility at Juragua, near Cienfuegos, Cuba.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The requirement of subsection (a) to withhold assistance shall not apply with respect to—

(1) assistance to meet urgent humanitarian needs including disaster and refugee relief;

(2) democratic political reform and rule of law activities;

(3) support for private sector and nongovernmental organizations that are independent of government control;

(4) the development of a free market economic system; and

(5) assistance for the purposes described in the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (title XII of Public Law 103–160).

EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 561. Not more than 20 percent of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106 and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, that are made available for Latin America and the Caribbean region may be made available, through bilateral and Latin America and the Caribbean regional programs, to provide assistance for any country in such region.

PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS

SEC. 562. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

LIMITATION OF FUNDS FOR NORTH AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

SEC. 563. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''North American Development Bank'' and made available for the Community Adjustment and Investment Program shall be used for purposes other than those set out in the binational agreement establishing the Bank.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

SEC. 564. In order to pay for the United States contribution to the tenth replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association authorized in section 526 of Public Law 103–87, there is authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, $525,000,000 for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury.

SPECIAL DEBT RELIEF FOR THE POOREST

SEC. 565. (a) AUTHORITY TO REDUCE DEBT.—The President may reduce amounts owed to the United States (or any agency of the United States) by an eligible country as a result of—

(1) guarantees issued under sections 221 and 222 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; or

(2) credits extended or guarantees issued under the Arms Export Control Act.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only to implement multilateral official debt relief and referendum agreements, commonly referred to as ''Paris Club Agreed Minutes''.

(2) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only in such amounts or to such extent as is provided in advance by appropriations Acts.

(3) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only with respect to countries with heavy debt burdens that are eligible to borrow from the International Development Association, but not from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, commonly referred to as ''IDA-only'' countries.

(c) CONDITIONS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only with respect to a country whose government—

(1) does not have an excessive level of military expenditures;

(2) has not repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism;

(3) is not failing to cooperate on international narcotics control matters;

(4) (including its military or other security forces) does not engage in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights; and

(5) is not ineligible for assistance because of the application of section 527 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994 and 1995.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be used only with regard to funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Debt restructuring''.

(e) CERTAIN PROHIBITIONS INAPPLICABLE.—A reduction of debt pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be considered assistance for purposes of any provision of law limiting assistance to a country. The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised notwithstanding section 620(r) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

AUTHORITY TO ENGAGE IN DEBT BUYBACKS OR SALES

SEC. 566. (a) LOANS ELIGIBLE FOR SALE, REDUCTION, OR CANCELLATION.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO SELL, REDUCE, OR CANCEL CERTAIN LOANS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may, in accordance with this section, sell to any eligible purchaser any concessional loan or portion thereof made before January 1, 1995, pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to the government of any eligible country as defined in section 702(6) of that Act or on receipt of payment from an eligible purchaser, reduce or cancel such loan or portion thereof, only for the purpose of facilitating—

(A) debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps; or

(B) a debt buyback by an eligible country of its own qualified debt, only if the eligible country uses an additional amount of the local currency of the eligible country, equal to not less than 40 percent of the price paid for such debt by such eligible country, or the difference between the price paid for such debt and the face value of such debt, to support activities that link conservation and sustainable use of natural resources with local community development, and child survival and other child development, in a manner consistent with sections 707 through 710 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, if the sale, reduction, or cancellation would not contravene any term or condition of any prior agreement relating to such loan.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall, in accordance with this section, establish the terms and conditions under which loans may be sold, reduced, or canceled pursuant to this section.

(3) ADMINISTRATION.—The Facility, as defined in section 702(8) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall notify the administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 of purchasers that the President has determined to be eligible, and shall direct such agency to carry out the sale, reduction, or cancellation of a loan pursuant to this section. Such agency shall make an adjustment in its accounts to reflect the sale, reduction, or cancellation.

(4) LIMITATION.—The authorities of this subsection shall be available only to the extent that appropriations for the cost of the modification, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, are made in advance.

(b) DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.—The proceeds from the sale, reduction, or cancellation of any loan sold, reduced, or canceled pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the United States Government account or accounts established for the repayment of such loan.

(c) ELIGIBLE PURCHASERS.—A loan may be sold pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A) only to a purchaser who presents plans satisfactory to the President for using the loan for the purpose of engaging in debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps.

(d) DEBTOR CONSULTATIONS.—Before the sale to any eligible purchaser, or any reduction or cancellation pursuant to this section, of any loan made to an eligible country, the President should consult with the country concerning the amount of loans to be sold, reduced, or canceled and their uses for debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be used only with regard to funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Debt restructuring''.

LIBERIA

SEC. 567. Funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for Liberia notwithstanding section 620(q) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and section 512 of this Act.

GUATEMALA

SEC. 568. (a) Funds provided in this Act may be made available for the Guatemalan military forces, and the restrictions on Guatemala under the headings ''International Military Education and Training'' and ''Foreign Military Financing Program'' shall not apply, only if the President determines and certifies to the Congress that the Guatemalan military is cooperating with efforts to resolve human rights abuses which elements of the Guatemalan military forces are alleged to have committed, ordered or attempted to thwart the investigation of.

(b) The prohibition contained in subsection (a) shall not apply to funds made available to implement a ceasefire or peace agreement.

(c) Any funds made available pursuant to subsections (a) or (b) shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(d) Any funds made available pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) for international military education and training may only be for expanded international military education and training.

SANCTIONS AGAINST COUNTRIES HARBORING WAR CRIMINALS

SEC. 569. (a) BILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—The President is authorized to withhold funds appropriated by this Act under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or the Arms Export Control Act for any country described in subsection (c).

(b) MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States executive directors of the international financial institutions to work in opposition to, and vote against, any extension by such institutions of financing or financial or technical assistance to any country described in subsection (c).

(c) SANCTIONED COUNTRIES.—A country described in this subsection is a country the government of which knowingly grants sanctuary to persons in its territory for the purpose of evading prosecution, where such persons—

(1) have been indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, or any other international tribunal with similar standing under international law, or

(2) have been indicted for war crimes or crimes against humanity committed during the period beginning March 23, 1933 and ending on May 8, 1945 under the direction of, or in association with—

(A) the Nazi government of Germany;

(B) any government in any area occupied by the military forces of the Nazi government of Germany;

(C) any government which was established with the assistance or cooperation of the Nazi government; or

(D) any government which was an ally of the Nazi government of Germany.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR HAITI

SEC. 570. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, may be provided to the Government of Haiti until the President reports to Congress that—

(1) the Government is conducting thorough investigations of extrajudicial and political killings; and

(2) the Government is cooperating with United States authorities in the investigations of political and extrajudicial killings.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to restrict the provision of humanitarian or electoral assistance.

(c) The President may waive the requirements of this section on a quarterly basis if he determines and certifies to the appropriate committees of Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States.

(d) The authority contained in the previous subsection to make such a determination may be exercised by the President only and may not be delegated.

LIMITATION OF ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 571. Not more than $25,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' may be made available to the Government of Turkey.

REPORTS REGARDING HONG KONG

SEC. 572. (a) Section 301 of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5731) is amended in the text above paragraph (1) by inserting ''March 31, 1997,'' after ''March 31, 1996,''.

(b) In light of the deficiencies in reports submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 301 of the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act (22 U.S.C. 5731), the Congress directs that the additional report required to be submitted under such section by subsection (a) of this section include detailed information on the status of, and other developments affecting, implementation of the Sino-British Joint Declaration on the Question of Hong Kong, including—

(1) the Basic Law and its consistency with the Joint Declaration;

(2) Beijing's plans to replace the elected legislature with an appointed body;

(3) the openness and fairness of the election of the chief executive and the executive's accountability to the legislature;

(4) the treatment of political parties;

(5) the independence of the Judiciary and its ability to exercise the power of final judgment over Hong Kong law; and

(6) the Bill of Rights.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 233, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

AYES—184

Andrews	Burr	Cooley
Archer	Burton	Costello
Armey	Buyer	Cox
Baker (CA)	Calvert	Crane
Ballenger	Camp	Cremeans
Barcia	Canady	Cubin
Barr	Castle	Cunningham
Barrett (NE)	Chabot	Danner
Bartlett	Chambliss	Deal
Barton	Chapman	DeLay
Bass	Chenoweth	Dickey
Bilbray	Christensen	Doolittle
Bilirakis	Chrysler	Dornan
Bliley	Coble	Doyle
Boehner	Coburn	Dreier
Brownback	Collins (GA)	Duncan
Bryant (TN)	Combest	Dunn
Bunning	Condit	Edwards

Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Ewing
Fields (LA)
Flanagan
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Hancock
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
Kingston
Klink
Klug
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
McCollum
McHale
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—233

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Callahan
Campbell
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Taylor (NC)
Thompson
Thornton
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Allard
Bonilla
Browder
Brown (CA)
Crapo
Gephardt
Hayes
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lincoln
McInnis
Myers
Payne (VA)
Schiff
Stenholm
Tejeda
Torricelli
Wise

□ 1503

Messrs. HOLDEN, KLINK, and CHRYSLER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title V?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: On page 82, line 12, strike ''$25,000,000'' and insert, ''$50,000,000''.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very straightforward amendment. It would simply raise to $50 million the limitation now in the bill of $25 million on the amount of noncash support that we can provide for the International War Crimes Tribunal in The Hague.

For those who are not familiar with it, the International War Crimes Tribunal is the first international tribunal for war crimes established since World War II. It has the responsibility for investigating and prosecuting individuals responsible for war crimes in the former Yugoslavia.

The biggest obstacle, frankly, to the functioning of that tribunal has been a simple lack of funds. We seem to want to spend millions for all sorts of special investigations here at home and abroad, but the U.S. has only made modest contributions to the International War Crimes Tribunal.

The victims of atrocities committed in the former Yugoslavia, it seems to me, deserve justice, and the war crimes tribunal is the best way to make war criminals answer for their crimes. Moreover, the best deterrent for those kinds of atrocities in the future is for the war crimes tribunal to try and convict these perpetrators now.

It seems to me we ought not have a limitation on the amount of noncash support that we can provide for this worthwhile item, and if we do have one, as this amendment would still allow, it seems to me it ought to be high enough so that the war crimes tribunal is in fact a real deterrent to some of the kinds of abhorrent actions that we have seen in that part of the world.

So I would simply urge that the amendment be supported in the interest of justice.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of this amendment. What this amendment seeks to do is make additional funds available, not additional appropriated funds but from existing appropriated funds, to make a greater sum available for the prosecution of war crimes and for the pursuit of war criminals.

Mr. Chairman, as many Members in this House know, I chaired for many years the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. During the latter part of the 1980's and throughout the 1990's, our Commission held extensive hearings on the tragedy that has occurred in the former Yugoslavia and most particularly in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The fact of the matter is that since the 1930's and 1940's there has not been on the European continent the commission of atrocities against human beings based upon their ethnicity, nationality or religion, the kind of genocide, and that word properly applies, that we saw and heard testified to in Bosnia.

In fact, as many Members of this House know, more refugees were created in Bosnia-Herzegovina during the prosecution of the Serbian aggression than at any time since the Second World War. That is to say that in the last half a century we did not have the kinds of crimes that were committed in Bosnia.

During the course of testimony before the Helsinki Commission, and I know before the Foreign Affairs Committee as well, we heard of not only the murder of women, children, as well as combatant males and noncombatant males, civilian makes, we also heard of the creation of incarceration camps.

We heard of the creation of camps specifically designed for the purposes of raping Moslem women, for the purposes of degrading those women, for the purposes of intimidating those who were not in custody or under arrest or imprisonment by the Serb aggressors. We heard of the fact that this was a policy, not an aberration.

The Dayton Agreement recognizes the fact that the leader of the Bosnian Serbs, Mr. Karadzic, whom previous Secretaries of State under the Bush administration and the Clinton administration have branded as a war criminal, that Karadzic continued to be the driving force behind the commission of these crimes.

In addition, of course, the military leaders of the Bosnian Serb effort, led by their general, he, too, was as a policy planning and implementing the criminal activity, the murders, the so-called ethnic cleansing that occurred on a daily, weekly, and monthly basis for a very long period of time. This policy created over 2 million refugees, some in-country and some forced to leave their country, but all forced to leave their homes and their neighborhoods.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment so that the American people, through the Congress of the United States, will say in as strong terms as possible that we will hold culpable those who as a means of war employ genocide and the commission of atrocities to intimidate and defeat an enemy.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not do this, we will continue to see the cycle of violence that is perpetrated in retaliation for wrongs done against a people years before, decades before, indeed, in some cases centuries before.

Those of us who have traveled to Europe know full well that, particularly in Yugoslavia, we hear about the offenses that were perpetrated against a family and their antecedents, long before they may have been born. They believe that those wrongs must be redressed, and because there has been no mechanism short of warfare, short of the kind of atrocities that we have seen perpetrated in Bosnia, we have in effect set up an environment in which such atrocities were perhaps almost inevitable.

□ 1515

After the Second World War, the civilized society said we are going to hold people culpable. We can argue about whether war is a legitimate exercise of international politics but, that aside, civilized society has said there are certain things even in war that we will not tolerate as a civilized international community.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, in a civilized society we will not tolerate some crimes, and we will adjudge the commission of such act as war crimes. And we will, at the appropriate time or as soon as possible, hold accountable those who committed such crimes, whether they be at the lowest levels or whether they be at the highest levels.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is a critical one as we look to a more civilized international community, where we do not redress our differences through armed conflict but redress those grievances through negotiation and through the application of international law.

As we do in this country, ultimately, the application of international law must be done through a tribunal which adjudicates the commission of wrong and then imposes the sanction for the commission of that wrong. One of the restraints on doing that is the financial ability of the War Crimes Tribunal to gather evidence; to go after and arrest international lawbreakers, and to bring those lawbreakers before the court of justice.

Mr. Chairman, it is for that reason that I believe the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is not only one that is worthy of support, but is one that will ultimately lead to a more peaceful, less violent, more accountable international community. And because of that, I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 97, after line 5, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PURCHASE OF PRODUCTS NOT MADE IN AMERICA

SEC. 573. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be made available to the government of any foreign country when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) the funds are to be used to purchase any equipment or product made in a country other than such foreign country or the United States; and

(2) substantially similar equipment or products are made in the United States and available for purchase at a price that is not more than 10 percent higher.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment basically states that in the foreign aid accounts, those countries that are recipients of our foreign aid, when they make procurements, regardless of what the cost is within their own country, it has no bearing on the amendment.

For example, if they are buying tables, and a table costs $300 in America but the table costs $700 in their own country, they just go right ahead; that is the purpose of our aid. But when that country does not make a table and they go outside their country for procurement, the Traficant amendment says if we are within 10 percent, we can be as high as 10 percent costlier, but that purchase shall be made from the American company.

I believe this is a good amendment. We provide a lot of foreign aid. I realize there will be some concerns about this, but I am willing to work them out in conference as long as the legislative intent is reflected in the final bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the distinguished ranking member. I too want to join in on the many accolades given him here today.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and for yielding to me.

I think the gentleman from Ohio has a good amendment. I think it would be constructive. I think if we furnish foreign aid to countries, they should certainly give American companies, give the American economy the benefit of their purchases.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I too support the mission of the gentleman. I think it is so important that in the passage of this we should send such a message to the administration and that we have a recorded vote, and I would respectfully request that the gentleman so request that at the appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 415, noes 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

AYES—415

Abercrombie	Brown (OH)	Crane
Ackerman	Brownback	Cremeans
Andrews	Bryant (TN)	Cubin
Archer	Bunn	Cummings
Armey	Bunning	Cunningham
Bachus	Burr	Danner
Baesler	Burton	Davis
Baker (CA)	Buyer	de la Garza
Baker (LA)	Callahan	Deal
Baldacci	Calvert	DeFazio
Ballenger	Camp	DeLauro
Barcia	Campbell	DeLay
Barr	Canady	Dellums
Barrett (NE)	Cardin	Deutsch
Barrett (WI)	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Bartlett	Chabot	Dickey
Barton	Chambliss	Dicks
Bass	Chapman	Dingell
Bateman	Chenoweth	Dixon
Becerra	Christensen	Doggett
Beilenson	Chrysler	Dooley
Bentsen	Clay	Doolittle
Bereuter	Clayton	Dornan
Berman	Clement	Doyle
Bevill	Clinger	Dreier
Bilbray	Clyburn	Duncan
Bilirakis	Coble	Dunn
Bishop	Coburn	Durbin
Bliley	Coleman	Edwards
Blumenauer	Collins (GA)	Ehlers
Blute	Collins (IL)	Ehrlich
Boehlert	Collins (MI)	Emerson
Boehner	Combest	Engel
Bonior	Condit	English
Bono	Conyers	Ensign
Borski	Cooley	Eshoo
Boucher	Costello	Evans
Brewster	Cox	Everett
Brown (CA)	Coyne	Ewing
Brown (FL)	Cramer	Farr

Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—1

Kolbe

NOT VOTING—18

Allard
Bonilla
Browder
Bryant (TX)
Crapo
Gephardt
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lincoln
McInnis
Meyers
Myers
Peterson (FL)
Rose
Roth
Schiff
Thornton
Wise

□ 1542

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. CLINGER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN].

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me and would enter into a short colloquy with him to ascertain the committee's legislative intent on the amendment to assist refugees and displaced persons in Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabagh.

I ask the gentleman if it is the legislative intent that there be no comment on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republics of Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabagh.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, referring to the bill language, pages 21 and 22 of the bill, section (m) (1) through (3), the purpose of this subsection, as stated in the report accompanying the bill, is to provide for the improved delivery of humanitarian assistance in Azerbaijan and for the delivery of humanitarian assistance in Nagorno-Karabagh. Also as stated in the report accompanying the bill, the committee expresses no view whatsoever on the political status of Nagorno-Karabagh.

□ 1545

Mr. LAUGHLIN. In other words, the amendment is neutral on the territorial rights of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

Mr. PORTER. The committee expresses no view whatsoever on political status.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

As everyone knows, I have submitted an amendment, amendment 9, which was in title II, which I will not submit, involving the situation of the majority of Albanians in Kosovo, and I am wondering if I can ask the distinguished gentleman to engage in a colloquy with me.

Mr. Chairman, after years of repression, the humanitarian situation in Kosovo is very grim. Recent reports by respected international relief groups spell out the seriousness of the situation. According to O. Terry Heselius, Country Director of Kosovo for Mercy Corps International, ''because there has not been 'all out war' in Kosovo, many people have difficulty in understanding the severity of the situation and the need for continued emergency humanitarian aid relief.''

Given the difficult circumstances and the importance of maintaining stability in Kosovo, I firmly believe that it is in the interest of the United States to continue our humanitarian assistance program for Kosovo at last year's level of $6 million. I ask my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations [Mr. CALLAHAN], does he agree that the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance should again provide $6 million to Kosovo in fiscal year 1997?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] for his inquiry. I am aware of the difficult humanitarian situation facing the people of Kosovo and agree that OFDA should provide $6 million for humanitarian relief in Kosovo again in fiscal year 1997.

Mr. ENGEL. OK.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for his support.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title V?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts: Page 97, line 5, insert the following new section:

PROHIBITION OF FUNDS FOR SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS

SEC. 573. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the School of the Americas.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a couple of days ago a good friend of mine, Sister Clara O'Meara, a 74-year-old Ursuline nun, entered Danbury Prison in Connecticut. In the next few days Father Roy Bourgeois will enter prison in the Federal system. He is a Maryknoll priest. They and several others recently protested this country's involvement in the funding of the School of the Americas. They did so because they believe that this school that has as its graduates 16 out of the 28 officers involved in the murder of six priests and nuns in El Salvador; Roberto D'Aubuisson, the death squad leader of Central America, Manuel Noriega himself, and a current convicted criminal in our own prison system; Leopoldo Galtieri, one of the great human rights abusers of all time, from Argentina; Hector Gramahoe, recently convicted by courts in this country of rapes and killings in Guatemala, responsible for the overthrow of that government and responsible for the rape of Sister Diana Ortiz as well as the killing of Jennifer Harbury's husband.

The list goes on, and on, and on.

This institution is a relic of the cold war. It associates the people of this country far too closely with the terrible regimes, militaristic in their nature, that were so much a part of the culture of Latin America over the course of the last several decades.

I believe that it is important that the United States work in a cooperative fashion with the military regimes throughout Latin America. What I do not think is right is for the United States of America to be involved in teaching those armies how to kill, how to rape, how to torture.

This school, make no mistake about it, has been involved in teaching people that come from these foreign countries in the United States how to torture people in those countries. It is morally reprehensible, it is wrong, and I urge this Congress to withdraw the funding that we currently provide to the School of the Americas.

I know that this has been a controversial issue. We have voted on it times in the past. We have come close to winning, 2 years ago. I am concerned that the votes that we would get on the House floor today would not equal the votes that we have gotten in the past, and I am going to withdraw this amendment before we come to a vote because we want to preserve our capability of winning on this issue in the future.

We have before us a new proposal, a proposal to not defund the School of the Americas completely, but rather to do away with it as we know it today and to reopen a new school that could teach democracy, that could teach people the rule of law, that could teach people that come from these foreign countries respect for civilian authority, that could teach them the understanding of human rights that is so much a part of our military service.

I am very proud of the U.S. military, but I do not believe the U.S. military does this country proud when it is itself tainted by these reprehensible regimes that are so much a part of Latin America over the course of the last couple of decades.

So let us break that tie, let us go forward with a new kind of school of democracy that in fact will teach those individuals that come from these Latin American regimes what the basis of our fundamental democracy and rule of law and our respect for human rights that has been so much a critical component of our own military in the United States.

And I appreciate the understanding of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] of my intent, and I do want to just pay a particular tribute to someone whom I have a tremendous amount of respect for who is one of my closest personal friends in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this country loses a tremendous servant, public servant, who has dedicated his life, has risked his life time and time again for the principles of democracy, has stood tall for our military, and I am proud to stand tall as his friend, and I appreciate so much all the contributions that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] has made to our country, and I wish him the best as he goes on to another career.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 95, line 12, insert before the semicolon the following: ‘‘, including the murders of Mireille Bertin, Michel Gonzalez, and Jean Hubert Feuille’’.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, last fall we had a hearing on Haiti, and during that hearing we had the administration’s point man, Ambassador James Dobbins, appear before the committee, and we asked him about the progress that was being made about the FBI investigation into the murders, the political murders that were taking place in Haiti, particularly the murder of Ms. Bertin, which took place in broad daylight in downtown Port-au-Prince. We subsequently found out during that hearing that Mr. Dobbins misled the committee. In fact, he lied to the committee. He said that the people in the Embassy down there, particularly himself, was not aware of FBI information that indicated that the Aristide government might have been involved in the murder of Ms. Bertin. The FBI agent that was in charge was sitting at the table with him and indicated that everybody at the Embassy had been notified about the investigation and that there was no cooperation from the Aristide government.

The fact of the matter is there have been a lot of political assassinations that have taken place in Haiti, and none of these people connected with the government has ever been brought to justice. As a matter of fact, there were 13 people that allegedly had something to do with Ms. Bertin’s death in the Haitian Government down there, and the government itself defended those people with government-sponsored lawyers.

Now, in addition to that, our general in charge knew about the potential assassination of Ms. Bertin prior to her being killed, and instead of telling her and her family that she was a target for assassination, they went to Mr. Aristide’s government, and that is like going to somebody who has a gun pointed at them telling them they might get shot.

The fact of the matter is the Aristide government is believed to have been behind the assassination of Ms. Bertin and our general down there was talking directly to them instead of Ms. Bertin herself.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to express my support for the gentleman’s amendment and say that this side has no objection to it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Texas, ‘‘Thank you very much.’’

Let me just conclude then, if the amendment is going to be accepted. What my amendment does is it says on page 95, line 12, that the administration must give a report before any additional money goes to Haiti on the murders of Ms. Bertin, Mr. Gonzalez, and Mr. Feuille in addition to other political assassinations that may have taken place.

I want to thank my colleague for agreeing to accept the amendment. I presume that my colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, will accept it as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The questions is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title V?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VISCLOSKY: Page 85, line 8, insert after ‘‘Funds’’ the following: ‘‘(other than funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ‘Economic Support Fund’)’’.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a bipartisan amendment in conjunction with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Our amendment would narrow the authority of the President to provide U.S. economic assistance to countries found to be in violation of the U.S. Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. The Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act was signed into law in 1995, prohibits foreign aid to any country that blockades the delivery of U.S. disaster relief supplies to a third country as that currently applies to the country of Turkey which, since April 1993, has blocked all U.S. disaster relief assistance and International Red Cross medical supplies bound for the landlocked country of Armenia.

In addition to Turkey’s ongoing blockade of humanitarian assistance to Romania, Turkey is continuing its illegal occupation of northern Cyprus, its internationally condemned war against the Kurds living in southeast Turkey,

its persecution of Christians and its aggressive policy in the Aegean Sea which very nearly resulted in an armed confrontation with Greece earlier this year.

The Clinton administration has failed to address these issues. In fact, last month President Clinton rejected clear congressional intent by waiving the application of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act to Turkey. As I stated before, U.S. law today prohibits U.S. economic or military assistance to any country that directly blockades the transport of U.S. disaster assistance or emergency relief supplies to a third country.

Authored in the House by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, and in the Senate by Senators DOLE and SIMON, this law applies to Turkey because of its ongoing blockade of all U.S. and international humanitarian relief supplies bound for Armenia.

In order to maintain U.S. pressure on Turkey, we are offering this amendment in a bipartisan fashion to ensure that Turkey complies with the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act before it receives any additional U.S. economic support funds.

Specifically, our amendment will narrow the Presidential waiver authority contained within the act, ending the ability of the President to invoke a national security waiver in order to provide up to $25 million in fiscal year 1997 in economic assistance funds to Turkey.

□ 1600

Mr. Chairman, while our amendment would cut $25 million in economic aid to Turkey if they do not lift the blockade of Armenia, it would have absolutely no effect on U.S. military assistance to Turkey. I repeat that. It would have absolutely no effect on U.S. military assistance to Turkey, which, in fiscal year 1997, is scheduled to exceed $140 million.

Turkey's hostile and aggressive actions in the last 11 months demand a response from this country. The Clinton administration has failed to adequately do so, and it is up to the Congress to make a clear, decisive statement to Turkey that its hostile and aggressive policies against other countries will not be tolerated or rewarded by the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support a policy of positive engagement with Turkey. However, we cannot condone blindly giving foreign aid and economic assistance dollars to a country which so routinely violates the rights of its neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan measure.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment, but also I want to take this opportunity to salute a colleague of mine from the other side. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has put so much effort into the issues of human rights and, in particular, Turkey, that I would like to take this opportunity to salute him.

Mr. Chairman, I myself have worked hard on the case of Leyla Zana, a Kurdish parliamentarian who has been imprisoned by the Turkish authorities for speaking out on behalf of the people she represents. The gentleman from Illinois has been helpful to me in that effort, and he is always there to speak out for the downtrodden. It is so important, Mr. Chairman, that people like him are willing to take stands that are not popular, but are issues of life and death to the voiceless of the world. There is no more important work we do.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] is a light for those who live in the darkness of oppression and injustice. I so much appreciate his courage that I would like to speak out on this floor to tell him how much his work means to those of us who work on human rights and for those who are imprisoned around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana which will send, I think, a clear message to Ankara that Turkey needs to end its blockade of Armenia and needs to do it soon.

I might remind our colleagues that in addition to our concerns over the blockade on U.S. humanitarian assistance, Turkey continues to occupy northern Cyprus with some 35,000 troops. It has done that for some 22 years. Turkey has recently asserted a claim to the islet of Imir, which was ceded to Greece by a valid treaty more than half a century ago. Finally, Turkey has yet to fully recognize the cultural and political rights of the Kurdish people and is waging a brutal military campaign to suppress the legitimate aspirations of the Kurdish people.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, while preserving the necessary discretion of the President to safeguard important United States interests in regard to our relations with Turkey, also signals that economic assistance provided by U.S. taxpayers should not, under any circumstance, go to any government which frustrates our humanitarian objectives by blocking U.S.-provided aid to another country.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I express my pride in joining with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY] in this amendment. This amendment, which has already been said, will narrow the President's waiver authority under the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act which prohibits U.S. funds available under the foreign operations appropriations bill from going to countries that block U.S. humanitarian assistance. While this amendment is not country specific, the only country in violation of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act is Turkey. Therefore, our amendment will ensure that Turkey does not receive economic support funds until it ends its blockade of U.S. humanitarian assistance to Armenia.

Turkey has signed numerous international agreements guaranteeing human rights and freedom of religion. Despite this, Turkey continues its illegal blockade of U.S. assistance to Armenia. Turkey began its blockade of Armenia in April 1993, when it refused to allow land or air passage to the International Red Cross relief workers bound for Armenia with medical supplies to be used for disaster relief.

Turkey also continues its suppression of religious expression within its borders. The Turkish government has systematically repressed the religious freedom of the Greek community and other ethnic minorities in Turkey.

Particularly disturbing to me is Turkey's failure to take strong action in the wake of several recent terrorist attacks against ecumenical patriarch Bartholomew I. The patriarch is the spiritual leader of the eastern Orthodox Christian church, representing over 250 million Orthodox Christians worldwide, including over 5 million residing in the United States.

In addition, Turkey continues its illegal occupation of northern Cyprus—one recognized by no other government. Turkey continues to station more than 30,000 troops on the island of Cyprus and also maintains 65,000 settlers there. In fact, the amount of U.S. aid we send to Turkey each year is roughly equal to the amount needed to maintain the 30,000 plus troops illegally occupying Cyprus.

Altogether, this illegal occupation represents over two decades of division, over two decades of human rights violations, and over two decades of cultural destruction.

On May 16, President Clinton waived the Corridor Act with regard to Turkey, clearing the way for continued U.S. economic assistance. Opponents of our amendment argue that it ''would effectively curtail U.S.-Turkish cooperation and counter U.S. foreign policy interests.'' By defending the presidential waiver of the Corridor Act, our opponents are acknowledging that Turkey is in violation of the Act.

Mr. Chairman, last year, Congressman PORTER of Illinois offered a similar amendment that cut economic aid to Turkey to hold Turkey accountable

for its egregious human rights violations and suppression of religious freedom. His amendment passed the House with the bipartisan support of 247 members.

I urge my colleagues to again hold Turkey accountable for its continued violations of human rights by supporting this much needed amendment. Neither the American people nor the U.S. Congress should tolerate, much less subsidize, Turkey's illegal and immoral blockade of Armenia.

Is it right, we have to ask ourselves, is it right that they receive U.S. taxpayers' economic support while at the same time they prevent assistance, they prevent the same type of assistance to Armenia, and also are very guilty of other human rights violations? I think not. If my colleagues agree then they must vote for this amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Visclosky amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is essentially to put enforcement teeth in a provision that is already part of the foreign operations bill: The Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act.

Speaking in my capacity as the co-chairman of the Congressional Caucus on Armeniase oren Issues, I applaud the chairman and members of the subcommittee for once again, as they did last year, including this important provision which restricts U.S. aid to those countries blocking delivery of humanitarian aid to third countries. While this provision is not country-specific, it clearly applies to Turkey, which for more than 3 years has maintained a blockade of neighboring Armenia. While the people of Armenia are struggling to build democracy and reform their economy according to market principles, the blockade imposed along their border with Turkey disrupts the delivery of vitally needed humanitarian supplies.

The Corridor Act provision was in last year's Foreign Ops bill, which finally became law earlier this year. Unfortunately, the current provision allows for a Presidential waiver and last month President Clinton exercised that waiver. I deeply regret that decision, and I joined with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and 27 other Members in sending a letter to the President protesting this decision.

The amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY] would remove this waiver and I urge support to help enforce the intent of Congress.

Not only do I disagree with the President's waiver on substantive and moral grounds. I am particularly dismayed with the procedural way in which the waiver was handled by the administration. We learned about the waiver almost by accident, through a statement made by Turkish Foreign Minister Emre Gonensay, who, speaking at a press conference on May 21, 1996, indicated that the national security waiver had been invoked. Subsequently, it was confirmed by officials at the State Department and the National Security Council that the waiver was invoked on May 16, 1996.

I cannot understand why the Turkish Foreign Ministry was aware of this information before the Congress. Given the strong statement of congressional intent, we believe it would have been appropriate for the administration to have advised Members of Congress of its plans with regard to the waiver, and hope the administration will consult with Congress in the future.

Furthermore, I am concerned that the language in the Presidential Determination contains no reference to the Turkish blockade of Armenia. Failure to at least mention the blockade in the context of the determination to waive the Corridor Act sends the disturbing signal that the United States is not concerned about the ongoing, illegal blockade of a small country striving to establish democracy and a market economy. I hope the administration will make a top priority of imploring the Turkish Government, the recipient of so much U.S. aid, to lift its blockade of Armenia and accept Armenia's offer to normalize relations without preconditions.

This amendment will help make that happen.

Mr. Chairman, supporters of this amendment bear no ill will to the Turkish people and we recognize the strategic importance of relations with Turkey. We are simply saying that maintaining good relations should not entail turning a blind eye to the outrageous actions committed by Turkey. Given the generosity the United States has shown toward Turkey, it is appropriate to attach conditions—particularly such a basic condition as allowing the delivery of aid to a neighbor in need. Such a condition should be a basic requirement for any recipient of U.S. aid. I think most of the American people would be shocked to know that such a provision is not already a requirement on the recipients of U.S. assistance.

Armenia is a small, land-locked nation dependent on land corridors through neighboring countries for many basic goods. Armenia has been one of the most exemplary of the former Soviet republics in terms of moving toward a Western style political and economic system. The Armenian people respect and admire the United States. There are more than 1 million Americans of Armenian ancestry. The bonds between our countries are strong and enduring. But the people of Armenia face a humanitarian crisis which is not the result of any natural disaster but the deliberate policy of its neighbor to choke off access to needed goods from the outside world. We believe the exertion of U.S. leadership can play a major role in easing tensions and promoting greater cooperation among the nations of the Caucasus region. Enforcement of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act must be an important component of those efforts. I urge support for the Visclosky amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Visclosky-Smith-Bilirakis-Kennedy amendment to the fiscal year 1997 foreign operations appropriations bill.

Last year's foreign operations appropriations bill included the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, which bans U.S. Government assistance to any country that prohibits or restricts the transport or delivery of U.S. humanitarian aid to other countries. The act, which I had the honor of introducing in the House, permits a Presidential waiver of the ban, if he determines that U.S. national security interest demands one. The justification for our amendment today is simple enough. This amendment would not allow the President to use the waiver under the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act to provide economic support funds to countries that impede the delivery of U.S. humanitarian aid.

The Corridor Act mentioned no country by name, but everyone knew it was aimed at Turkey, which has been blockading Armenia for years. Ankara has stubbornly refused to allow transshipment across Turkish territory to Armenia of United States humanitarian aid, specifically, clothing, food, and medicine for hundreds of thousands of refugees.

In refusing to open a land corridor, Ankara points to the occupation by Armenian forces of Azerbaijani territory. But Turkey's close relationship with Azerbaijan or its approach to the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict does not justify or excuse blocking the delivery of United States humanitarian aid to Armenia. Turkey's behavior in this respect is simply scandalous.

Unfortunately, the Clinton administration has shown its unwillingness to press Ankara to rethink its policy. A couple of weeks ago, the President determined it was in the national security interest of the United States to waive the application of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act to Turkey. In essence, President Clinton continues to reward Ankara even though they have blocked U.S. humanitarian aid from people in need. Also galling is the manner in which the White House exercised its option. The White House did not have the courage or the courtesy of informing Congress of the President's decision to exercise the waiver until the news was broken, post facto, by Turkish Foreign Minister Gonensay, who announced it at a May 21 press conference in Washington. The waiver, it turns out, had been exercised 5 days earlier, on May 16.

Why didn't the administration have the courage to inform Congress before

May 16, or at the very latest, on May 16. Why did we have to hear about this from Foreign Minister Gonensay. Was the White House hoping nobody would notice.

If so, that hope was in vain. Not only did we notice, we are now determined to act, so that the will of Congress, as inscribed in the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, which has strong bipartisan support, will be done. The Visclosky-Smith-Bilirakis-Kennedy amendment, while allowing the President to waive the laws application for genuine national security interests, would remove economic support funds from the waiver. If the President exercised the waiver, the United States could continue to provide military assistance to the country in question. But economic aid would be barred, so long as the country was in violation of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act.

This amendment is a measured and fair response to the President's waiver of last month. It puts the White House on notice that Congress is serious about its commitment to provide humanitarian assistance to those in need. The amendment also provides further incentive to Ankara to allow United States humanitarian assistance across its territory to refugees in Armenia. Turkey has suffered no consequences for its blockade of Armenia, and evidently has no reason to reconsider its foolish, mean-spirited policy. This amendment aims to supply one, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize the strategic importance of Turkey and maintain the waiver for assistance other than economic support funds. I would contend that human rights violations, whether committed by enemies or allies, should never be ignored. As my colleagues have noted during debate on the rule, and in conjunction with this amendment, the ongoing human rights violations in Turkey are disturbing. For example, free expression restrictions, widespread torture, and repression in southeastern Turkey continue to pose serious concerns about the health of Turkish democracy and the status of reforms. Although the Turkish Parliament recently amended article 8 of the 1991 anti-terror law that criminalized separatist propaganda and then released more than 100 political prisoners, the amended article 8 has been used to prosecute at least 35 individuals—including Turkey's best known author. According to yesterday's Financial Times, 154 statutes impose restrictions on free speech, and many are to punish peaceful, free expression, including article 7 of the anti-terror law and article 312 of the penal code.

Persistent, widespread torture continues to mar Turkey's democratic credentials, although officials have made public statements condemning torture. Human rights observers reported at least 69 torture-related deaths in detention since 1993. Forty-eight police officials involved in the beating death of a journalist last January were arrested (one subsequently alleged torture), yet the 1995 State Department Human Rights Report states, ''The climate of impunity that the relatively small number of convictions creates remains the single largest obstacle to reducing unlawful killing, torture, and other human rights abuses.'' Currently, the Foreign Ministry is orchestrating a campaign to halt the Human Rights Foundation of Turkey's torture rehabilitation efforts.

The Turkish military's 12-year-old, $7 billion-a-year campaign against Kurdish militants poses another threat to stability and Turkish democracy. Under the mantle of combating terrorism, the military conducts a violent campaign responsible which has claimed almost 20,000 lives and takes an increasing toll on civil liberties. Turkish forces have destroyed or evacuated more than 2,500 Kurdish villages in southeastern Turkey and have created almost 3,000,000 internal refugees. Death squads connected with security forces and armed Islamic extremists have been responsible for hundreds of unsolved killings and disappearances.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say how proud I am that this bipartisan group of Members offering this particular amendment is united in our concern about suffering refugees. We are all concerned about human rights, and we speak out on human rights abuses whenever and wherever they exist; but in this case we have an opportunity to help people with our medicines, our food, our clothing, and all we are asking for is a way, a land route to transship them. Unfortunately, that has been blockaded. This is a very good amendment and deserves the support of my colleagues.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and myself. This amendment is about a matter of fundamental principle that any nation that asks for aid from the American people must not, in turn, deny aid to its neighbors.

This fundamental principle was enacted into law last year when Congress included the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act in the fiscal year 1996 appropriation bill. This amendment would simply narrow the waiver authority of the President in last year's bill.

□ 1615

It would prohibit economic support funds to any nation that violates the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, even if the President grants a waiver. The amendment is carefully crafted, only applying to the economic support funds. It does not apply to other forms of assistance, such as humanitarian assistance.

The people of Armenia have suffered for decades, some say for centuries. They are suffering now from a brutal blockade. This blockade has prevented the delivery of assistance to 300,000 Armenian refugees and obstructed the rebuilding of earthquake damage which left 5000,000 people in Armenia homeless. The blockade has cut off the transport of food, fuel, medicine, and other humanitarian assistance to the people of Armenia.

In this time of crisis, the people of Armenia need our strong support. As long as Armenia is blockaded by its neighbors, the United States should stand resolute and firm in the position that we will not provide assistance to the governments that are imposing this blockade and I rise in strong support of this amendment which I am cosponsoring.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of the bill, it shall be in order to consider the following amendments as though offered during consideration of the title of the bill to which drafted:

The amendment numbered 42 by Mr. OBEY;

The amendment numbered 44 by Mr. OBEY;

The amendment numbered 29 by Mr. OBEY;

The amendment numbered 30 by Mr. OBEY; and

The amendment numbered 74 by Ms. WATERS.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Visclosky amendment to strengthen the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act.

This amendment would make it more difficult for countries to block U.S. humanitarian assistance from reaching its destination.

Mr. Chairman, Turkey continues to impose a cruel and illegal blockade against Armenia. Critical humanitarian assistance is not making it to the needy people of Armenia because of this blockade. This is unconscionable, and this amendment will help to lift this terrible blockade.

The Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, which was included in last year's foreign aid bill, prohibits United States assistance to countries like Turkey that impose cruel blockades of humanitarian assistance. This amendment strengthens this important provision to ensure that it actually accomplishes its goal: to end blockades of humanitarian assistance.

Mr. Chairman, in 1993 Turkey began its blockade of Armenia by refusing to allow passage of International Red Cross workers bound for Armenia. Since then, Turkey has continually refused to allow these relief workers into

Armenia. Very simply, this is a fundamental violation of human rights.

We continue to give Turkey economic assistance each year, and Turkey continues to disregard our calls for improvements in its human rights. Turkey has been illegally occupying Cyprus for over two decades, it has used United States assistance to threaten our ally Greece, and it has engaged in atrocious human rights violations against the Kurds. We cannot tolerate this any longer.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will not solve all of the concerns we have about Turkey's human rights record. But it will send a clear signal that we will not tolerate any blockade of humanitarian assistance. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I may be a voice in the wilderness, but I do not agree with all of my colleagues who have preceded me.

Mr. Chairman, Turkey has been an ally of the United States through thick and thin. In the Persian Gulf war we had our bases in Turkey. During the Persian Gulf war they cut the Iraqi pipeline and hurt their economy dramatically. During the war in Somalia, Turkey sent their troops there to help us. In fact, Turkey has been with us as a NATO ally from day No. 1, day No. 2, day No. 3, day No. 4, but we seem to have a penchant in this Congress of kicking our friends in the teeth and embracing those who are not our friends.

Now, let me give my colleagues some facts about Turkey and about the Armenian problem that have not been discussed today. First of all, Turkey recognized Armenia immediately after its independence from the Soviet Union and publicly stated its willingness to establish good neighborly relations with Armenia. Top level Armenian and Turkish officials continue right now discussing bilateral relations. Turkey closed its land border with Armenia only after Armenia escalated the cargo conflict by invading Azerbaijan proper. That is when they closed the border, after they invaded Azerbaijan proper. Currently 20 percent of Azerbaijan is occupied by Armenian forces. One-fifth of Azerbaijan is occupied by Armenian forces.

Turkey's position is consistent with its opposition to territorial gain through the use of force. Turkey was one of the first countries to condemn Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and to participate in the Iraqi embargo, and it cost Turkey, get this, them working with us, cost Turkey over $20 billion.

Turkey's participation was crucial in the allied success of the gulf crisis. It is inaccurate to say that Armenia does not receive humanitarian assistance because of Turkey. Container transit shipments occur via Izmir and the Turkish Straits to Batum, Georgia, only a few kilometers away from the nearest Turkish port.

Transit passage between the two countries continues. Armenian Airlines conduct weekly flights from Yerevan to Istanbul. Armenians can travel to Turkey freely, conducting suitcase trade. Those who purport a different reality should provide concrete figures to support their arguments.

Turkey has made efforts to normalize relations with Armenia. As a goodwill gesture in April 1995, Turkey opened air corridor H–50 connecting Erzurum to Yerevan. Soon after taking office, Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz announced Turkey will open its border with Armenia provided, there is a bilateral agreement on the declaration of principles. Turkey is an active member of the Minsk group and plays a key role in achieving this goal.

As the only remaining superpower in a world threatened by ethnic strife, the United States must maintain impartiality in order to be a constructive influence in containing and resolving these conflicts. Perceived United States partiality in the Caucasus would undermine progress in ongoing Armenian-Azerbaijan talks. Further, the power of the President to execute foreign policy consistent with national security interests should not be curtailed by Congress. Foreign assistance to Turkey has been drastically reduced in the last 5 years.

Now, let me say, the Turkish Parliament will consider the extension of Operation Provide Comfort in June. Adoption of an anti-Turkish amendment like this one will adversely affect the vote on its mandate. Such amendments also insult the Turkish people and raise questions in Turkish public opinion about the strength of the United States-Turkish partnership, thereby endangering the pursuit of common goals in such volatile regions of the world.

Let me just end up by saying, Turkey, I want to state one more time, may be like the United States, imperfect in some regard, but Turkey has been there every single time we needed them.

I see some of my colleagues nodding their heads saying yes, but, but, but. But they were there when we needed them in the Persian Gulf. They were there in Somalia, they were there in Korea. They were there every time, in NATO, base rights, cutting off oil, $20 billion in losses to their own economy to help us and to help the free world.

Now, my colleagues need to think long and hard and make absolutely sure the are doing the right thing before they kick them in the teeth.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I do not think anybody is talking about kicking the Turks in the teeth. What we are talking about is the fact that right now, if the Turks were so interested in providing humanitarian aid to the Armenians, all they have to do is flip a switch. They flip a switch and the lights go on throughout Armenia. They flip a switch and the wheat flows into Armenia. They flip a switch and trade is normalized.

I agree that the Turks have done great things for the United States. But the truth of the matter is that this is a democracy that has an opportunity to do great things for the whole caucasus region, including the Kurds. I know my friend from Indiana is concerned about the Kurds. But time and time again, this regime in Ankara has suppressed the rights of individuals and has suppressed the rights of the Armenian people to get basic humanitarian aid.

I would just ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], as we are complimenting the Turks on some of the great things that they have done in conjunction with this country, to please urge those Turks to open up the pipleine, open up the fuel line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(On request of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, let me just say, as I said in my statement here, that Azerbaijan, 20 percent of Azerbaijan is occupied by the Armenians. Let me just say, they are in talks right now, and the Turkish Government and the Armenians are in consultation with one another, and if they can work out these differences, I think they will resolve that problem. But for us, the United States of America, to kick a friend in the teeth when this kind of a situation is going on does not make any sense to me.

Now, there are humanitarian planes going in there, there is humanitarian aid going in, maybe not to the extent that we want, but it is moving in the right direction, and the pressure, according to the Turkish Government, needs to be consistent in order to bring about a withdrawal from Azerbaijan by Armenian forces.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(On request of Mr. WILSON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman on his statement, and I would like to say one thing that has not been pointed out that I think should weigh very, very heavily on our consideration here is the extremely fragile political situation that exists in Turkey today. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] knows, the largest party in Turkey today is the radical Islamic party. A very fragile coalition of the two nonradical Islamic parties has just fallen

apart. This is the worst time that we could pick to punish Turkey who, as the gentleman has pointed out, has been a staunch ally.

Turkey recognized Israel in 1949 and for three decades remained the only Muslim country to have full diplomatic representation in Tel Aviv and all of the other things, down through Korea, down through the gulf war. I would just like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. Let me just follow up on what he has said.

Everybody is concerned about Iran and the terrorism that has been exported from Iran throughout the Middle East. As the gentleman has just stated, Iran has a great deal of influence in countries like Turkey, and it is a very fragile situation right now. If we do not make the right decisions, we could very well be a party to pushing Turkey and their government in the wrong direction.

Do we want another Iran in the Middle East? Do we want the Turkish Government to start adopting their policies? It does not make any sense, particularly when you view the fact that Turkey has been there from day one with us.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that Iran also has a border with Armenia. This is a democracy that has an ability to have a great deal of influence in that region, and a real democracy that has the ability to have influence, and not one that has suppressed the Kurds, not one that is occupying Cyprus, not one that has so often been involved in human rights abuses in terms of Armenia. And Armenia is occupying part of Azerbaijan, and we have to ask ourselves, why is that true? Is it not true that Stalin in fact took away Nagorno-Karabagh from Armenia, broke that country up as a result of his concerns about the strength of the Armenian people. And is it not true that all they are trying to do right now is get back part of the land that really is part of their country?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I do not know how far the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] wants to go back. We can go back 50, 70 years. I do not know how far back the gentleman wants to go back.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I would be happy to go back to 1918.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, one of the problems that we have is we keep going back decades and decades and decades and reopening old wounds again and again and again, and it makes no sense. What we need to do is look at the world the way it is today and try to make it a better place. One of the things that I submit to my colleagues today is we should not be kicking Turkey in the teeth, and that is what you are doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

□ 1630

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Kicking Turkey in the teeth, our friend right now, is not a constructive thing to do. If my colleagues want to write a letter to the Turkish leadership, and I would be happy to participate, expressing our concern about some things that we agree to, that is one thing. But for this Congress to take this kind of a hard line position to kick a good, steadfast ally that has been there forever in the teeth makes absolutely no sense.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman is aware that the government of the United States of America recognizes Nagorno-Karabagh as a part of Azerbaijan, as well as the United Nations. Is the gentleman aware of that?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is that anyone who has looked at that situation, and the United States will change its view as soon as the negotiation with the gentleman from Indiana concludes. Nagorno-Karabagh by any standard is not a part of Azerbaijan. I cannot believe that the gentleman from Texas would suggest such a thing. Nagorno-Karabagh, if anything, is an independent region, and if anybody looks at the historical roots of Nagorno-Karabagh they will recognize that it is occupied by Armenians. Armenians live in Nagorno-Karabagh and it ought to be a part of Armenia.

Mr. WILSON. Has the gentleman consulted the State Department of the United States on this?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. All too often.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment. With the passage of this amendment, the House of Representatives will stand up for a fundamental tenet of our foreign policy, that countries who block United States humanitarian aid cannot expect to receive our assistance themselves.

With this amendment, the House will send an unmistakable signal to Turkey that we will not tolerate its appalling human rights record and recent hostile behavior in the region. And, yes, with this amendment we are respectfully telling President Clinton, with whom I usually agree on foreign policy, that his waiver of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act was ill-advised.

Mr. Chairman, I am a proud Representative of a large Armenian-American, Cypriot-American and Greek-American community in New York City. At meeting after meeting in my district, I have heard stories firsthand about the tragic personal losses of life, of torture, murder and missing relatives that have been inflicted by Turkish authorities.

I have spoken with constituents who as young children survived the Armenian genocide, only to face the indignity of consistent Turkish denial of this catastrophe. My Armenian-American constituents can only watch in horror as Turkey continues its unlawful, cruel and immoral embargo of their homeland, causing the human suffering in Armenia to worsen day by day.

Mr. Chairman, as the cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, I have stood on this floor many times in recent months to highlight Turkey's flagrant disregard for human rights and international law. With this record, Turkey is not a suitable recipient of United States economic aid. We cannot give aid to one country and then allow them to cut off humanitarian aid to another.

With this amendment and its likely cutoff of economic aid to Turkey, our message will be strong and forceful. The illegal occupation of northern Cyprus must end. Turkish illegal actions and lack of support for the proposed demilitarization of this beautiful island of Cyprus must end. The foot dragging over the final fate of the missing Greek Cypriots and Americans must end.

For my colleagues who are not aware of the depth of suffering brought on by the 1974 invasion, I invite them to Astoria, Queens, in my district, where they will meet dozens of people who have not heard a word about their loved ones in over 22 years.

With this amendment, we are also telling Turkey that its brutal war on the Kurdish minority is an outrageous affront to human decency. With this amendment, we register our profound dismay at Turkey's recent aggressive actions in the Aegean which challenge the internationally recognized sovereignty of our friend and ally, Greece.

Mr. Chairman, it is not easy for me to support an amendment which overturns a foreign policy decision of President Clinton, but in this case we simply have no choice. Turkey's record on human rights and international law deserves our strongest condemnation.

The last thing Turkey deserves is over $20 million in United States taxpayer dollars. As a matter of fundamental respect to the most profound and sincere policy objectives of this Nation, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The gentleman from Indiana is not a minority of one or two with the gentleman from Texas but we are in a distinct minority and I just would start by pointing out the colleague letter that the gentlewoman from New York signed along with another colleague who talks about and I think in her comments she said she represented a large Armenian-American community. That is the thrust of this amendment.

Because when you look around, ask yourselves how many Turkish Americans you have known. When was the last time the Turkish American Association called on you in your office?

That is not true of this amendment, and we are here for ethnic reasons and ethnic reasons alone. Large groups of Armenian-Americans live in this country, large groups of Greek-Americans live in this country, and I respect them and I count friends from that group. But what about the Turkish Americans? They do not have a large organization. I doubt one ever served in this body.

But let us consider the Turkish citizen today that has a son or daughter in the military and look around their neighborhood. When I listened to the gentlewoman from New York talk about all the murders and the crime and the torture, I thought she was reading from the New York Times because I have been there, I have read that paper and I have seen the same thing in our big cities. But it is true that Turkey as Iraq, Iran, and Syria, are not first-class human rights countries, not first-class democracies. In fact, other than Greece and Israel, there is no other democracy in the area.

And when you talk about human rights, what about Soviet Jewry? AIPAC and people in the Jewish community that followed Soviet Jewry closely will tell you Turkey was a pipeline much like the underground railroad a century ago in this country was. And the Turks have a strong record in that area. But when you look at where Turkey has been, and I agree with the gentleman from Indiana, we are kicking a friend in the teeth. We are saying to a country that asked their sons to go to Korea, who asked their citizens to have economic deprivation when they shut off the pipeline the first day Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, and we have said, ''That is too bad. You are blockading the country.''

Let us look at the geography for just a minute. As I have listened to the speakers from the Armenian-American community, they want you to believe, as I hear them, that Turkey surrounds Armenia. All you have got to do is look at a map and you find that the republic of Georgia has a long common border with Armenia. Why are we not blockading or cutting off aid to Georgia in the Freedom to Support Act? What about the Federation called Russia who even has troops, soldiers, military stationed in Armenia today? Why are we not blockading and cutting off Russia? The answer is simple. We have a commitment to a friend and if we do not stand up for this country that has stood with us every time since the end of World War II, not one time have they failed to stand up in the fight to preserve freedom and democracy around the world, and we are going to stick a knife in their back simply because there is not an equal number of Turkish Americans in this country.

I realize we would lose this vote if we have one but I would ask the Members of this body, why not put our country first? I find it a little strange to be standing here before this body to tell Members this, but the Secretary of Defense is opposed to this amendment, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of our military is opposed to this amendment.

So I ask why not? Why not stand up for a friend who has a democracy? And we talk about the abuse of Armenians. Just last year my own daughter went to an Armenian church wedding in Istanbul, the largest city in Turkey. Was she suppressed? Was she terrorized? The answer is no.

So, I say to all my colleagues, let us stand up for a friend, let us recognize that they do not have the only border as others would suggest. They do not have the only border and there are air flights and there is the Black Sea that connects with both Russia and Georgia that gives access.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LAUGHLIN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LAUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would just like to point out to the gentleman from Texas that the truth of the matter is that the only country that is actively going out and preventing aid from going into Armenia, it is not Russia, it is not Georgia. The country that is standing in the way is Turkey. And the only other country that is standing in the way is Azerbaijan, for crying out loud.

So, all we are asking them to do is, this great friend of the United States, this great supporter of human rights that the gentleman has so glowingly called them, why do they not just simply turn the rights on in Armenia? That is the question. The Turkish Government, as it sits today, represents a great deal of Azerbaijanis in that country and they are the ones that are systematically denying the Armenian people the right to have basic human aid that is so vitally needed by the people of that country.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. As the gentleman well knows, I have been to all the countries in the caucus more than once.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I do know that. I have seen the gentleman.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. We have met in Moscow switching planes as we both came from that region. But the truth of the matter is I am absolutely convinced in my heart from being in Armenia and visiting with Armenians, being in Armenia visiting with President Ter-Petrossian, there would be peace in that region today if not for the Americans, anyway we want to put a hyphen in front of their names, me included, there would be peace in that region if we were not involved.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAUGHLIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY. First of all, there is no torture in New York and the crime rate has gone down dramatically with the anticrime bill that President Clinton initiated and that we passed.

Second, I would just merely like to ask the gentleman how he justifies cutting off humanitarian aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] has again expired.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we are told this is about a blockade. This is not about a blockade. We are hearing about Cyprus, Kurds, Greece, Armenians. We are not hearing much about the PKK and what Turkey has to do to fight the terrorism. We are not hearing much about Greece's unilateral expansion of their territory which has created the situation. It is not a one-sided situation. We are hearing criticism of what the Ottoman empire is accused of doing in 1918. But we are not hearing a whole lot about a blockade.

I think it is unfortunate that this really has boiled down to another session of Turkey bashing. We need to pay attention to the fact that they were a crucial ally during the cold war but not only during the cold war. When that was over they were a key ally during the gulf war, and they are still a key ally in dealing with Bosnia. But the gulf war is a good example. We have heard earlier that we should not be providing assistance to somebody who is doing these nasty things that they are doing. We need to remember, Turkey is losing more through assisting us in the way we deal with Iraq than we ever give them. They have lost literally billions of dollars by closing off the pipeline because they have been willing to support the U.S. policies.

They have been a good friend, they have paid a high cost, they have been a friend to Israel, they are a key democratic Islamic nation that is in a very precarious situation. I think that what is at stake here is our relationship

with Turkey. The Armenians will not win if this passes. We will not change the situation. What we will do is damage the relationship that the United States has with a key ally. I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1645

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out, I know there is a lot of conversation going back and forth with Turkey and its rule over the years with the United States and our military. But I think the bottom line is here talking about humanitarian aid. That is all we are saying.

I rarely criticize the President, but I have to in this case. When President Clinton certified and said that he was going to waive the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, which is essentially what this amendment was all about, he was essentially admitting that there is a blockade, that the blockade is taking place and that, for whatever national security interests, which I guess is what you were citing, we should allow that blockade to continue and not have the humanitarian aid come to Armenia. I think that is wrong. Regardless of the fact of whatever the national security interests are, however you view United States-Turkey relations, the bottom line is that there is absolutely no reason why Turkey should be allowed to continue this blockade of Armenia for humanitarian assistance.

We are only talking about humanitarian assistance, whether they are going to get energy assistance, whether they are going to get food supplies. I think this principle applies in general. We are talking here about Armenia but it applies in general. Why should any country, a friend of the United States or whatever, continue to get assistance from our country if they do not allow humanitarian aid to go to another country? I think that is what this is all about.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I do appreciate the fact that the gentleman brought the debate back to the blockade. I was trying to point out when someone said earlier there is not Turkey bashing, there are other neighbors that could provide the corridor, Turkey is not the only one. It is not a one-way relationship in dealing. Turkey does provide a great cost to themselves to support us.

I also wanted to bring out that, when we hear discussions about 1918, that has nothing to do with today's discussion of the corridor. That is talking about something that happened dealing with the Ottoman empire. When we hear talk about the Aegean and what Turkey has done, we could get into a debate all day about those issues.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. The way the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY] is phrased, we are not just talking about Turkey. We are talking about the general issue of whether or not a country should continue to receive United States aid if it forbids or blockades humanitarian assistance from going to another country that is a friend of ours.

So I agree, if there was any other country that was doing this, then they should be stopped as well. So focusing on Turkey versus Armenia makes sense in the context of today, but this is a basic principle that I think should apply to all U.S. foreign policy. It does not matter whether it is Armenia or not.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. The other portion of the policy is that apparently the gentleman is deciding that the President cannot make the correct foreign policy decision in this area.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the Visclosky amendment and thank the gentleman for his leadership in bringing it to the floor today. But frankly, I am very disappointed that this amendment is even necessary. As we know, Mr. Chairman, last year Congress passed a Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act in order to discourage nations which receive U.S. aid from blockading other nations which also receive United States aid such as, in this case, Armenia.

Unfortunately, the Clinton administration chose to waive the act as it applied to Turkey, a nation which continues to illegally blockade Armenia. That is what brings us here today. Many of our colleagues have talked about the relationship that the United States has with Turkey, going back to the end of World War II in terms of strategic importance, vis-a-vis the Soviet Union at that time and the oil embargo during the Persian Gulf war.

And, now they are talking about the rise of Islamic fundamentalism. Being an ally of the United States or being next to the Soviet Union or having Islamic fundamentalists in one's country is not a license to block humanitarian assistance. The fact is that you can list all kinds of pros and cons in our relationship, but it does not take away from the fact that there is an immoral action going on in the blockade of Armenia.

Congress spoke very clearly last year to this point. It is unfortunate that the Clinton administration did not understand Congress' intent. Turkey is continuing to illegally blockade Armenia by preventing trade, transport and transshipment of United States and international humanitarian assistance to Armenia. This blockade is not sanctioned by the United Nations or any other international organization.

Mr. Chairman, Turkey began its blockade of Armenia in April 1993, when it refused to allow land or air passage of international Red Cross relief workers bound for Armenia with medical supplies to be used for disaster relief assistance. Since that time, Turkey has refused to allow the passage of any international Red Cross relief workers into Turkey. Turkey has not been promoting peace in the region. It has recently declared that its border with Armenia is a militarized zone.

That brings us back to why we need the Visclosky amendment. It would strengthen the Humanitarian Corridor Act and increase pressure on Turkey to lift the 3-year blockade of United States relief supplies to Armenia. The Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, which was signed into law earlier this year, prohibits U.S. foreign assistance to states which obstruct our efforts for humanitarian relief to needy populations.

The pressing need for the Visclosky amendment was made clear when, as I say again, the President, disregarding the will of Congress, and I might state the bipartisan expression of support in this body, Democrats and Republicans alike, coming together to support the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. The President chose to disregard the intent of Congress and cleared the way for continued military and economic aid to Turkey.

Neither the American people nor the United States Congress should tolerate, much less subsidize, the Turkish Government's illegal and immoral blockade of Armenia.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I would like to commend once again the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY] for his leadership on this subject, proclaim once again the bipartisan nature of the support for his amendment. I again reiterate that the bill, the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, was passed in a bipartisan fashion and signed into law. The intent of Congress should be respected. Since it has not been, it is important for Members to support the Visclosky amendment.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment. The amendment will ensure that Turkey complies with the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act before it receives any more economic support funds.

Whether we are talking about Cyprus, the Kurds, persecution of Christians or Armenia, the evidence is overwhelming against Turkey. Questions of democracy, human rights, fairness, family reunification and decency principles we stand for, we have to shoot straight with our Turkish allies.

For over 20 years, Turkish troops have illegally occupied the northern one-third of Cyprus. Today over 35,000 armed troops occupy northern Cyprus. Recent reports indicate Turkey has increased its occupation forces. Turkey continues its military and colonial policy towards Cyprus.

With regard to the Kurds, Turkey's militaristic policy toward the Kurdish

minority living in the southeastern Turkish desert region goes beyond the pale of civilized behavior; 20,000 lives have been lost, 3,000,000 civilians displaced. It is time for the United States to take a principled stand and express its opposition to Turkey's ongoing plan and campaign to destroy the Kurdish culture.

With regard to the persecution of Christians, Turkey continues to place prohibitive restrictions on Christian churches. There have been numerous terrorist attempts to desecrate the ecumenical patriarch's premises in Istanbul. The Turkish Government has launched a concerted effort to convert the Church of Saint Sophia, one of the most sacred monuments of Orthodox Christianity and, I should add, one of the greatest architectural wonders of the world, their plan to convert this into an Islamic mosque.

With regard to Armenia, Turkey is continuing its illegal blockade of Armenia by preventing trade, transport and the transshipment of United States and international humanitarian assistance to Armenia. We must make a strong stand. We must send a strong message to the world, and the President should send a strong message to the world that Turkey's aggressive behavior is not acceptable.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Visclosky amendment and want to reiterate the point made by the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. PALLONE]. This amendment does not reference Turkey. Let me at the outset state that I believe that Turkey is a friend. Turkey is an important ally. Turkey has strategically been of great assistance to the United States of America.

As I pointed out, when I spoke on the additional funds for the war crimes tribunal in The Hague, we need to hold accountable in the international community those who did not meet international norms, friend or not a friend.

I am one who has been substantially critical of Turkey, notwithstanding my premise that they are a friend and important ally. Whether it relates to the Kurds, whether it relates to their treatment of prisoners or the press, whether it deals with any other matter, all of us need to hold one another accountable for transgressions and for a failure to meet international norms.

Now, in the Humanitarian Corridor Act we said one of the norms was allowing assistance to go to those in trouble. Not combatants, not adversaries, but people in trouble. People in trouble because of conflict, perhaps beyond their control, children in trouble. We have provided, and other Western nations have provided, humanitarian assistance. Not to aid combatants, not to aid one side or the other, not to make an ideological point, but to say that, when there are people in trouble, it is the objective of the international civilized community to give aid and comfort and help.

We ought to ask all of our allies and our friends to assist to the greatest extent possible in the delivering of that humanitarian assistance. That is all this amendment says.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Maryland is right, this is purely a humanitarian issue. The Armenians have suffered in the early part of this century, in the early part of this century at the hands of the Turks. The Armenians have suffered through a Soviet regime for decades. This is simply the transition that the Armenians are trying to make from being part of the Soviet union as a State in the Soviet Union to a free market, independent, free society. The American tradition is to extend a helping hand to countries like that.

That is all that the Visclosky-Bilirakis amendment is about, to extend that helping hand, to help Armenia in a humanitarian way. That is all we are asking for.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution and his support of this amendment.

In closing, I would hope and I believe that this amendment will receive broad bipartisan support. I do not know whether there will be a rollcall vote, but if there is, I hope that there is an overwhelming show of support, not against Turkey, not against any other country, but for the critically important principle that we will expect our allies and our friends, as well as those who may not count themselves in that category, to facilitate the relieving of human misery and suffering.

I trust that this amendment will receive the strongest support possible.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mr. VISCLOSKY's amendment. As a cosponsor of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, I was very pleased with the passage of this legislation last year. However, I was extremely troubled with the President's waiver of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act on May 16. I joined many of my colleagues in expressing our disappointment with his decision to waive the statutory restrictions on assistance to the Republic of Turkey, and I am urging my colleagues to support this amendment to strengthen the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act.

The Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act prohibits U.S. assistance to any country that prohibits or restricts the transport or delivery of U.S. humanitarian aid to other countries. We should not allow humanitarian assistance to be used as a political weapon while innocent victims are deprived of food, fuel, and medical supplies, whether it be in the wake of a natural disaster or armed aggression.

Unfortunately, countries are still hampering the delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance to those in need. Turkey continues its illegal blockade of American humanitarian relief to needy population in Armenia and it continues to deny the existence of the Armenian Genocide of 1915.

This amendment would limit the scope of the executive waiver under the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. This amendment would limit the President's waiver authority to only U.S. military aid—economic assistance would be withheld from any country that impedes the delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance to other countries.

This amendment continues to protect U.S. national security interests, but it will send a strong message to nations that blocking humanitarian assistance to those in need is unacceptable. I commend the members of the committee who have worked on behalf of this legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to support this important amendment.

□ 1700

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words to speak against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear all Members speaking on both sides of this issue are recognizing the fact that Turkey is a valuable ally of the United States. I think that everyone recognizes that.

I would like to say on the issue of blockades, that container transit shipments to Armenia through Izmir and the Turkish straits to Batum, Georgia, only a few kilometers away from the Turkish border, are taking place now. Transit passage between the two countries continues. Armenian Airlines conduct weekly flights from Yerevan to Istanbul. Armenians can travel to Turkey, frequently conducting suitcase trade.

I would also like to say that Turkey has made efforts to normalize relations with Armenia. Obviously, this is a long-standing dispute, and as a good will gesture in April of 1995, Turkey opened air corridor H–50, connecting Erzurum to Yerevan. And soon after taking office, Prime Minister Yilmaz announced Turkey will open its border with Armenia, providing there is a bilaterial agreement on the declaration of principles.

So I think Turkey is making great strides in the area of humanitarian aid and treating people in its country with respect.

As we know, Turkey is located in a very unsettled part of the world, surrounded by Syria, Iraq, and Iran. It is a strong secular democracy. And although I imagine this amendment will pass, I think it is important that we recognize the contribution that Turkey makes in our foreign policy as a valuable ally, and I, for one, intend to vote against this amendment.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in strong support of the Visclosky amendment. Few of us would

disagree with the fact that Turkey is an important ally of the United States. Many of us have said it on both sides of the question. But as a member of the Committee on International Relations, I ask let us look at that in context. Should that fact entitle Turkey to deny the transits of United States aid to the Armenian people? Does it permit Turkey to deny basic human rights to Christians and Kurds within Turkey? And should our relationship allow Turkey to threaten the stability of the region and to delay the long overdue unification of Cyprus, which it invaded and now occupies?

I was there this past summer, Mr. Chairman, in Cyprus, and I say this by way of context, that when we say that Turkey is an ally, we have to look at how our allies act in the rest of the world and what are our interests in its totality. And in that respect, here is a country that was invaded and occupied, that is divided. When I crossed the green line which divides the northern part, controlled by the Turkish Government, with the southern part of the rest of the island, it was a very difficult process. And, in fact, we found that Turkish Cypriots, original Turkish Cypriots, do get along with Greek Cypriots, but the Turkish officials who are there and the troops that are there interfere with that reunification.

So when we look at all these things, and when we say that Turkey is an ally, we have to look at it in context.

Now, opponents of this amendment will emphasize what a great friend Turkey has been to the United States and suggest that any action that we might take might jeopardize that relationship, but I think we have to keep in mind as well, in addition to the total context that United States-Turkish relationship is a mutually beneficial one, and that means that it is strategically important for both countries. And a relationship which rises to the term of ally has to be open to honest and open debate as to what we, in fact, are willing to support when we support an ally.

Now, foreign assistance is one of the few tools of peaceful diplomacy that we have. It is not unreasonable for us to demand that Turkey allow the transit of United States aids to Armenia if it wants to continue to receive United States economic support funds. That is the purpose in part of aid; it is, in fact, to produce an inducement as part of your overall foreign policy.

Now, we should note that the longer Turkey blockades the passage of aid to Armenia, the longer the people of Armenia will need to depend on United States assistance. And in this era of budget cutting and increasing pressure to limit the foreign assistance budget, we cannot afford not to enact this amendment.

The Visclosky amendment carefully curbs aid to Turkey by removing economic support funds from the President's waiver authority for the Humanitarian Corridor Act, but military support funds remain intact. And when we look at the question of where Turkey is moving, we have to look at recently the question of Aliza Marcus, a New Jersey resident who works for Reuters, who was almost jailed simple because she wrote an article they did not care for.

Are we willing to support an ally under any conditions? We did that in the past in our history and we paid dearly for it.

Day after day and year after year Turkey has continued to actively block the transit of assistance to the people of Armenia at a time when they are struggling to rebuild their economy and establish a democracy. And by forcing Turkey to make a decision about how important that $25 million in economic support funds is to the people of its country, we can send the message that the United States will not stand by and allow Turkey to bully its neighbors, Armenian, Greek, Cypriot, Kurdish or Christian, and continue to receive the blessings of the United States assistance.

I urge all of my colleagues, because it is the right policy for the United States, to support the Visclosky amendment.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, the Visclosky-Bilirakis amendment. I want to review how we got to the point that we are at today with respect to this because I think it is instructive and important.

We passed a provision in the 1996 foreign ops appropriations bill that has become known as the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. That was put into the bill by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. The purpose of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act was to prohibit U.S. assistance of any kind from going to a country that impedes the delivery of humanitarian aid to a third country.

It also allowed for a waiver that could be implemented by the President, allowing him to waive those restrictions for any specific country that he deems necessary in order to uphold U.S. national security interests and then reinstate military and economic aid to that country.

Now, in fact, we found out 5 days, 5 days fully after, that the President has apparently invoked this. And did we find out from the administration? Did we find out from the President that he invoked the waiver directly? Did the President come to the Congress and let us know? No, he did not. We found out through the foreign ministry of the nation of Turkey that our own President, or own administration had waived this specific provision in the 1996 foreign ops appropriation bill.

I mean we have to ask ourselves why on earth, why on earth was the President not coming to us and telling us, the U.S. Congress, that he was going to make this waiver? Why are we finding this out from Turkey as opposed to the United States?

So we find out, and we find this out on May 21. May 21, what, 11, 12 days ago? This is when we found out. That is when we found out this national security waiver had been invoked. That brings us to today.

What does this provision, the Visclosky-Bilirakis amendment actually do? It says that we will continue to have the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act in place, but that with respect only to economic support funds, the waiver provision will no longer exist. In other words, the President of the United States will no longer be able to waive the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. He will not be able to waive that provision specifically with respect to the economic support fund.

How much money are we talking about for the nation of Turkey, potential? Not more than $25 million. Turkey is going to continue to get $146 million in military aid. I do not know how Members feel about that. I am not crazy about it. But Turkey will continue to get that. Turkey will continue to get humanitarian aid if it needs it.

This does not affect humanitarian aid. It does not affect military aid. It merely affects the economic support fund, which is used for what? Things like economic development, the retirement of debt. Sometimes we do not know exactly what it is for. The State Department does not always tell us, but it is up to $25 million.

It is a very incremental, moderate, frankly, step to be taken at this time. It is anything but radical or extreme. It is, as opposed to a smack in the face, it is more like a little tap on the wrist, and it is absolutely necessary that we do it. This ought to have the broadest bipartisan support from every Member of this Congress, because we should not, we should not be giving economic support funds to Turkey or any other nation under the pretext of a national security interest.

Mr. Chairman, I urge every Member of this Congress to vote in favor of this.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. Even though Turkey is one of our biggest beneficiaries of American good will, that nation continues to block distribution of American aid to the Republic of Armenia. In other words, Turkey is acting like a big bully against its small neighbors and American aid is being held hostage. Not only is this clearly unfair, but it is illegal, according to the U.S. law.

The time has come that we stop making execuses for Turkey. The time has come to quit playing politics with humanitarian aid, aid destined for Armenia. I know that Turkey is a member of NATO, and I acknowledge Turkey's strategic importance, but fair is fair. Human rights must be protected, and no one, not even our military allies, have the right to flaunt the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, period.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Visclosky amendment. This is a vote for the people of Armenia and this is a vote for strengthening and upholding the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding, and I also rise in very strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY]. I do so for reasons of strategic balance, constitutional propriety and moral imperative.

On issues of strategic balance, I do not think anyone on our side of the question would disagree that the importance of Turkey's military role to the defense of this country is very important and very desirable. But one of the many benefits of the Visclosky amendment is it does not in any way impair that relationship. In fact, it simply only speaks to the economic assistance and conditions that assistance, not the military assistance, upon the behavior of Turkey.

With respect to the issue of constitutional propriety, with all due respect to the administration, many of us believe that its decision to waive the provision of the Humanitarian Corridor Act was incorrect and wrong. This, we believe, restores a sense of constitutional balance, where we say with respect to economic assistance funds there will be none, period, unless there is compliance with the act. And with respect to other provisions, we respect the prerogative of the Commander-in-Chief and the executive branch.

Finally, there is a matter of the moral imperative here. A country that continues to illegally and harshly occupy the island of Cyprus, that continues to persecute people within its own borders for the practice of their religion, a country that has the dubious distinction of leading the world in 1995 in the number of journalists imprisoned for simply speaking their minds, such a country has no place receiving the hard-earned tax dollars of the people of our country.

□ 1715

Cyprus is the most egregious example. What has happened to the people of Armenia fits a similar standard. And for us to adopt Mr. VISCLOSKY's amendment, I think, would make us unwitting and undesirable components or accessories to such a policy. I believe we should not do that. I commend Mr. VISCLOSKY and his colleagues for introducing this. I thank my friend from California for yielding to me.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I realize how passionate and sincere many Members of Congress are with respect to Turkey and to some of the events that have taken place there, not by all people of Turkey but by a small group of people in Turkey. It has been my position that the Constitution gives the affairs of foreign policy to the administrative branch of government and sometimes we constrict the administration too harshly.

Last year during this debate I had a conversation with many members of the Greek community who were concerned about some of the same problems that you all are concerned about. I agreed then that we were not going to earmark any money for Turkey, that we were not going to afford Turkey the same monetary help that we were giving them with respect to the F–16's they were trying to purchase. And in my bill there is not one penny earmarked to Turkey. We have a pot of money that we give to the administrative branch of government. It is called the Economic Support Fund.

The administration can choose to take part of that money and give it to Egypt. They can take part of that money and give it to Israel. We do not tell them how to spend every nickel. We do not tell them to spend money in Turkey. Neither do we deny them the opportunity to spend money in Turkey.

To further facilitate those who have concerns about the problems in Turkey, the committee, through amendment, elected to restrict the ability of the administration that if they decide to give money to Turkey, under no circumstances could they go above $25 million. So there is no economic support money earmarked. The administration has a limited amount of availability of money for Turkey, and there is no new money in here for Turkey for new military equipment.

There is money in there for sustainment needs to allow them to buy parts, and Turkey is an ally of the United States. No one here disputes that.

So I am trying to tell the House that we are trying not to write foreign policy for the administration. We elected President Bill Clinton to lead this Nation. He appointed the Secretary of State. While I disagree with them more often that not, nevertheless we must recognize that the Constitution gives this charge to the administrative branch of government.

I hope that we will not have to even vote on it, but if we were to vote on it, I would vote ''no.'' I would like to encourage a ''no'' vote but to emphasize that in this bill, we are not creating foreign policy. We are making an appropriation. At the behest of some, we have limited the amount of the administration's ability to give Turkey money. I think that we have come a long way, and I would urge a rejection of this amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago the Congress, both the House and the Senate, with the agreement of the President adopted a principle, and that principle was that no country receiving foreign assistance from the United States, should continue to receive that assistance if they were to block transit of humanitarian assistance to another country which the United States wished to help.

We are talking, Mr. Chairman, about humanitarian assistance. We are talking about food and clothing and medical supplies and energy, the kinds of things that keep people alive, something that we could send to those in great need.

Mr. Chairman, that principle was not stated in terms of Turkey and Armenia. It was applicable to any country that might be receiving humanitarian assistance from the United States and any country that might prevent its transit. But let us be truthful, there was only one country cutting off humanitarian assistance a year ago, and there is only one country cutting off United States humanitarian assistance today, and that is Turkey cutting off assistance to Armenia.

Is Armenia presently receiving United States humanitarian assistance? Yes. How is it getting there? It is that other countries are not preventing transit. It is going mostly through Georgia. And what does that mean?

It means that it costs the United States millions of additional dollars to get the aid to where we want it to go to, Armenia, because Turkey refuses to allow it to cross their borders. Why should the U.S. taxpayers pay that additional cost and still provide economic assistance to the country that is preventing the aid from proceeding in the normal way?

As we do with all these provisions, we said that the President could waive this part of the law for national security reasons, and isn't it interesting that the President of the United States waived the provision of the law on May 16, thwarted the entire purposes for which Congress adopted it, and never had the courtesy or the courage to tell Congress or the American people that he had done it? We had to find it out through the Turkish Foreign Minister 5 days after the fact.

Now all we are saying in this amendment is, yes, the President of the United States still can waive the provisions of the law in regard to national security, but the waiver will only relate to national security assistance, military assistance to the country involved, and that if he issues such a waiver the economic assistance, nevertheless, will not be allowed to go through.

Are we concerned about Turkey and its instability, as the gentleman from Texas suggested earlier? Of course, we are. Is Turkey a valuable ally to the United States? Of course, it is. Has it stood with us? Yes. But it is in the hands of Turkey not to have assistance cut off simply by allowing humanitarian assistance to pass across its borders. Is that too much to ask of any country in the world? I think not.

I think this amendment is very, very properly crafted. It preserves national security assistance and does not touch

it. It simply says, if you are going to cost the American taxpayers extra money, millions of extra dollars to transship across areas to get the humanitarian assistance where we want it to go, you certainly should help to pay for it.

I think that is perfectly reasonable. I think the Members understand it. I commend the gentleman from Indiana for offering this amendment. I believe it is going to receive the overwhelming support of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It is appropriate, and it is necessary to implement the will of this House and this Congress enacted into law last year in the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. It is wrong for the President to have waived the provisions not only with respect to military aid but also with respect to economic aid.

There can be no national security justification for restoring economic aid, at a time when Turkey continues to maintain a choke hold on the important corridors through its country to Armenia, which is suffering considerably as a result. This general statutory sanction applies to Turkey because Turkey, since 1993, has maintained this blockade and has prevented aid from reaching Armenia. It has callously ignored the tragic humanitarian toll that its blockade has caused, and it has defiantly resisted calls from the international community to stop this illegal blockade.

Turkey has a dismal humanitarian record. It continues its military campaign against its own people of Kurdish descent. More than 2,000 Kurdish villages have been destroyed and millions of people have been displaced. But despite the blockade, despite Turkey's record with respect to its own people, despite its provocations with respect to Greece and to continued occupations of Cypress, President Clinton chose to exercise the waiver clause across the board. That is the wrong thing to do, and that is why this amendment is so absolutely necessary.

We should not be rewarding a country with American dollars for callously disregarding human rights and human lives. We have heard a great deal today about how Turkey is our ally, how Turkey has stood with us through thick and thin. Let me just remind my colleagues what President Eisenhower said some 40 years ago when he established the Eisenhower doctrine. President Eisenhower said, ''There can be no peace without law, and there can be no law if we were to invoke one code of international conduct for those who oppose us and another for our friends.''

The Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act applies to every country in the world. Its impact is on Turkey because Turkey is acting in contravention of the rules of decency, humanity and international law. That is why Turkey, because of its own actions, should suffer these penalties. Through its own actions, it can relieve itself of these penalties. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this will be the close of the debate. We just wanted to respond to a couple of the points that were made today. There was a debate here earlier today on the House floor about how far back in time we should go to resolve the issue before us. I would suggest last year, 1995, represents the year in which we adopted the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act which does have an impact on Turkey. There is an existing blockade. We have to go back but one year.

There was a suggestion that there is in fact no blockade, that there is suitcase trading going on here. I have people coming into my office today talking about triple trailers doing trade with the country of Mexico and Canada. Here we are talking about suitcase trade.

There is also an assertion that there is an airline corridor once a week. My recollection is there was an air corridor to the city of Berlin when the Russians blockaded the city. It would be my assertion that the blockade continues to exist.

The comment was made here too that this is simply ethnic politics. I would agree with that assertion. I am very concerned about the ethnic Armenians who have 1 hour of electricity every day because of the Turkish blockade. I am very concerned about the ethnics in north Cyprus because of the continuing Turkish occupation.

There was a suggestion here that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense are opposed to this amendment. I will accept their objection. But my question is, why? We do not limit or prevent the waiver of this act by the President for military assistance. It only goes to the example of economic assistance, to the tune of $25 million. There be in excess of $140 million in military assistance.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that my colleagues support the amendment, the bipartisan amendment that is before the House.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my colleague's amendment to prohibit funding for the Army's School of America's in my home State of Georgia. Although I am proud to represent the people of Georgia, I must speak about this institution's shameful legacy of which I am not proud.

Proponents of the school assert that it is simply a training facility for military leaders of Latin America. The truth of the matter is that many of the school's graduates are among the region's most ruthless human rights abusers. Allow me to provide some examples of the atrocities committed by graduates of the school.

In 1980, four women in El Salvador, Jean Donovan, Laura Clark, Edith Ford, and Dorothy Hazell were raped and murdered by graduates of the school. That same year, after calling on the army for peace in el Salvador, Archbishop Romero was executed by other graduates. In 1981, the entire village of El Mozote, 900 people including 131 children under the age of 12, were lined up and executed. Ten of the 12 officers responsible, were graduates of the Army's School of the Americas. In 1989, School of America graduates were found responsible for the murder of six Jesuit priests. The 1991 commencement speaker at the school was General Hector Gramaho. General Gramaho alone is responsible for the death of 200,000 men, women, and children in Guatemala.

In 1993, the United Nations issued a report regarding atrocities in Central America, and found that 49 of the 60 officers responsible were graduates of the U.S. Army's School of the America's. Additional graduates of the school include Manuel Noriega and Bolivian dictator Hugo Bonza.

Not only are these assassins training on our own soil, but they are being funded by U.S. tax dollars.

Mr. Chairman, clearly this taxpayer-funded institution has become nothing less than a prep school for the Hitlers and Stalins of Latin America. The American taxpayer should no longer have to pay for the training of rapists and child killers. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for the Kennedy amendment and close this school of the assassins.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, the School of the Americas is a strong and effective advocate of human rights and representative government in Latin America.

This is the finding of an independent study retained by the Army last year. It is my own finding, as well.

Fort Benning is in my district. I have visited the school many times, studied the curriculum, talked often to the students and faculty, examined all the evidence.

Critics make a lot of charges but they offer not one shred of real evidence to substantiate their false and malicious accusations. And they ignore all evidence to the contrary, including the fact that an overwhelming majority of the graduates have worked for democracy when they returned home.

Anyone who studies the facts objectively will reach the same conclusion as I have and the study has—that the School of the Americas is effectively promoting human rights and should continue to fulfill its mission to help representative government take hold in Latin America. I oppose the Kennedy amendment.

I urge my colleagues in this House to reject this amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Visclosky amendment eliminating the President's authority to waive the bill's prohibition on Economic Support Funding to countries that restrict the delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance. Last year, at this time, I stood on this floor with my colleagues to cut $25 million in U.S. economic assistance to Turkey during consideration of the FY 1996 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill until the blockade of U.S. humanitarian assistance was lifted.

Since that time, the Turkish government has not adequately addressed its behavior against its neighbors, in particular, its internationally-condemned

blockade of U.S. humanitarian assistance to Armenia. On May 16, 1996, President Bill Clinton disregarded this Congress' intent by waiving the application of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act to Turkey. This act prohibits U.S. economic or military assistance to any country that blockades the transport of U.S. disaster and relief assistance.

I am here today in support of the Armenian people and in support of this amendment. By narrowing the Presidential waiver contained in the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, we will limit the President's ability to provide up to $25 million in FY 1997 economic assistance funds to Turkey. Since the president has failed to address this issue, it is now up to Congress to make a clear decisive statement. In addition, it is also important to continue a positive and active relationship with the government of Turkey to resolve this and other mutual matters.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to this amendment, I would also like to express my support for the Radanovich amendment which will be offered to this bill. This amendment would limit the amount of Economic Support Funding for Turkey to $22 million until Turkey acknowledges the Armenian genocide and takes steps to honor the memory of its victims.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment of my friend and colleague from Indiana.

This amendment would cut another $47 million from the Agency for International Development's operating expenses. I would just like to make three quick points.

First, further cuts in operating expenses would destroy many benefits of the streamlining efforts that have been ongoing for much of the past two years. The fact is that USAID has already been achieving savings. Many posts have closed and 3,000 staff positions have been cut since 1993. Indeed, this year AID is in the process of closing another 24 more missions. This is a very fiscally responsible agency.

Second, these cuts would cause major disruptions in policy and program management. Morale would suffer, and many capable employees of the agency would seek jobs outside government rather than work in an atmosphere of reduced effectiveness, not to mention the increased number of RIFs, already at 200 for FY 96.

Third, cuts in operating expenses undermines AID's ability to effectively promote U.S. interests. We will be less effective in helping to promote democracy and market reforms in the third world. We will be less effective in facilitating economic growth in developing countries, encouraging new markets for U.S. companies, and addressing serious global problems such as rapid population growth, environmental degradation, and the spread of disease and crime.

Mr. Chairman, AID's goals are our foreign policy goals and cannot be achieved without adequate resources for their operating expenses. This amendment is short sighted. It ignores significant savings already achieved and most importantly it is utterly misguided nationally policy.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Visclosky Amendment which prohibits economic aid to countries which interfere in the transport or delivery of U.S. humanitarian aid. This important amendment will strengthen the Humanitarian Corridor Act included in this legislation.

I believe that our Nation's traditions and values demand that we support the delivery of humanitarian aid to suffering people. In addition, those nations that prohibit the delivery of such lifesaving aid should not be rewarded with U.S. foreign assistance.

I had hoped that inclusion of this provision in last year's appropriations bill would have sent a clear message to countries like Turkey that blocking humanitarian assistance to Armenia would not be tolerated. Unfortunately, that was not the case, and this amendment has become necessary.

This amendment will prohibit $25 million in economic assistance to Turkey. It sends a clear message that Turkey must end its blockade of Armenia. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. The Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act was created to ensure that U.S. aid reaches refugees in the quickest way possible regardless of geopolitical concerns.

This amendment notifies countries such as Turkey, which refuses to allow humanitarian aid destined for Armenia to cross its borders, that they will lose United States economic assistance unless the aid blockade is lifted.

Breaking aid blockades is provided for by existing law, but unfortunately, a Presidential waiver is allowed under certain circumstances. This amendment will put teeth into the law by requiring a cutoff of economic support funds to offending countries regardless of a Presidential waiver. The amendment will not affect military aid nor other forms of noneconomic aid, such as humanitarian assistance, to offending countries. With this amendment, we will be able to protect national security interests while sending a clear message to countries to act in accord with internationally accepted human rights standards.

I urge passage of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana cutting USAID's operating expenses by $47 billion. Adoption of an additional cut to the operating expenses level, which already represents a 26-percent cut from last year's appropriations, would not only undermine the United States ability to carry out staff intensive development programs, such as child survival and microenterprise, but would also have a devastating effect on the delivery of U.S. assistance in programs integrating economic growth, fostering health and family planning, protecting the environment, and promoting democracy.

USAID has undertaken ambitious programs of streamlining and downsizing for the past 3 years and is in the process of closing additional overseas posts. By September 1996, USAID will have closed 23 overseas posts in Africa, Asia, the Near East, and Latin America, producing annual savings in excess of $40 million. In this era of reinventing government, the USAID has done its part. What we must secure in this age of global instability and change is the United States' role in promoting economic and political development in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

With respect to Africa, the impact of $47 million would be devastating. USAID would be forced to close additional missions in the poorest continent in the world. Assistance programs would be abruptly terminated and prior U.S. investments jeopardized. For instance, the new regional initiative in the greater horn of Africa, which promotes food security and crisis prevention, would be undermined, as will trade and investment opportunities for United States companies in southern Africa.

USAID has been the leader in the global child survival efforts that are now saving an estimated 4 million children each year. The impact of further proposed cuts in USAID operating expenses will inevitably lead to:

An increase in child mortality; 45,000 families in South Africa who will not be assisted with better water and sanitation services; 100,000 people in India who will not receive safe drinking water and will be exposed to cholera, hepatitis, malaria, dengue, and bubonic plague from untreated sewage and waste;

Delay or termination of support for the consolidation of the transition from military rule in Guatemala;

Withdrawal of United States support for military demobilization in Mozambique;

Sharp reduction in support for poverty programs in South Asia; and

The curtailment of economic transition programs in southern Africa, Ethiopia, and Tanzania.

The impact of additional double-digit cuts is real and contrary to the interests of the United States in promoting strong and sustainable economic and political development in the world. This is our role.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I thank Representatives VISCLOSKY, BILIRAKIS, and DURBIN and my other colleagues helping to improve and strengthen the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act.

On May 16, to the surprise and disappointment of the international human rights communities, as well as Members of this body, President Clinton exercised his option to waive the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. Passed with strong bipartisan support as part of last year's Foreign Operations appropriations bill, the Corridor Act is essential because it exerts the appropriate pressure on countries, such as Turkey, that block United States foreign assistance to the region.

As the only Member of Congress of Armenian descent, I have a deep understanding of how the Ottoman Empire decimated Armenians and thus wrote one of the darkest chapters in human history. Mr. Chairman, as we remember the tragic history of the Armenian people, it's essential for us to frame the role the United States can play in establishing peace in the caucuses. I'm committed to the safety and independence of Armenia. We must ensure that its people are protected. Therefore, I support efforts to strengthen the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act and to curtail aid to Turkey should that country refuse to abide by the Act.

Strengthening the Corridor Act by narrowing the waiver authority recently involved by the President will send a clear, decisive statement: that nations which continue hostile and aggressive policies against other countries will not be tolerated or rewarded with economic aid. We must do all we can to help advance a proactive foreign policy which can help bring lasting peace to the region. I urge the House to support the Visclosky Amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote and, pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY] will be postponed.

The point of order of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKAGGS

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SKAGGS: Page 52, strike lines 14 through 20.

□ 1730

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment removes the provision in the bill that caps spending for population planning activities at a maximum of 65 percent of the fiscal 1995 level.

Humane and respectful assistance to other nations seeking voluntarily to limit their population growth is in the profound national interest of the United States.

Ultimately, there's no greater threat to our national security than standing by while the world's population explodes. If we don't constrain population growth, our work to improve living standards, control pollution, and battle disease is hopeless. If we let up on the effort to limit population, all of the other good works that we are seeking to accomplish with our development assistance will be overwhelmed.

The cap proposed in the bill would severely disrupt international family planning efforts. If the cap stays put and the cuts take place, 7 million couples seeking access to birth control will not get it. That means that 4 million more women will experience unintended pregnancies. This will lead to 1.9 million unplanned births, 1.6 million more abortions, 8,000 more women dying in pregnancy and childbirth, including those from unsafe abortions, and 134,000 more infant deaths.

Is that what we want? Nearly 2 million more unplanned births, and over a million and a half more abortions? All things we know we can prevent?

International population assistance is not used to pay for abortions. The 1973 Helms amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act requires that no U.S. funds may be used to pay for abortions. There have been no reports of violations of this ban, and my amendment would not affect it.

To the contrary, international family planning efforts stop abortion. They protect the health of women and infant children. And they have had a dramatic influence on our ability to do something about uncontrolled population growth in many parts of the world.

American leadership has been crucial to making family planning assistance available to couples in the developing world. Partly because of our leadership, other countries have joined the effort. And a growing number of developing countries now provide family planning services of their own. In fact, these countries now provide more than two-thirds of the funds spent on international population efforts.

International family planning is not a unilateral handout. It has grown into a partnership, and one that's in our interest to preserve and expand.

Without our leadership, the progress we've made in building a global partnership to attack the population problem will be lost. Without U.S. leadership, the efforts of others could not soon—if ever—make up for reductions in resources and experience that the United States brings to the population effort.

If we retreat, accelerated population growth will pose a direct threat to our national interest. The world's natural resources are severely overtaxed. Sustaining the health and welfare of Americans and people everywhere depends on careful management of these resources. This is a most fundamental obligation of good stewardship. That obligation can't be met if population growth is unchecked.

My amendment won't mean additional spending for foreign operations, and it doesn't require offsets. There is no longer a separate account for population development assistance; family planning is funded out of various accounts, including the development assistance fund and the new child survival account. My amendment would simply eliminate the bill's 35 percent cut in population assistance and allow the Agency for International Development to determine how to manage its own accounts.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Just briefly, I appreciate the gentleman's views. I think that the House is fully aware of the issue of this language in the bill. I think the House is fully aware of the compromise that this body must occasionally undertake where neither side gets everything it wants. There is no doubt that if this amendment were to pass, it would cause great controversy, probably requiring us to pass stronger language, probably including the Mexico City language, and I think that the debate on this issue truly should take place in the Committee on International Relations as authorizing legislation. It was made in order by the rule.

But under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, in a body such as this we must let reasonable heads get together and move on with our function, and that is to fund the foreign affairs operations for the next 2 years, and while I appreciate the gentleman's concern about the issue, I do not necessarily agree with him, I especially appreciate his decision, hopefully, to let us move forward by withdrawing his amendment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Skaggs amendment, and to express my continued concern about the relentless attacks the new majority continues to make on women. And this time their attack spreads to women and families across the globe.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill which will inhibit international organizations from providing needed family planning services. Not only does this bill potentially cut off funding for those organizations which provide these needed health services, but it limits population assistance funds to 65 percent of the total amount appropriated in fiscal year 1995.

We must realize the unintended consequence of such action.

Some Members of the majority who oppose a woman's constitutional right to choose are expanding the scope of their opposition to cover all family planning activities. In so doing, these harmful provisions only serve to increase the risk of unintended pregnancies, unplanned births, and unnecessary abortions. It simply doesn't make sense to inhibit the activities which are intended to prevent abortions. And this bill, by limiting population assistance and those who provide it, does just that.

Mr. Chairman, I am gravely concerned about the language in this bill which will endanger the health of women around the world. I urge my colleagues to closely examine these provisions, consider the unintended consequences, and support the Skaggs amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, just let me say, so that the record is very clear on this, the language in this bill is a compromise. It was very carefully worked out. The Gentleman from Alabama, distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, has worked with Members to try to find some way out of the difficulty and the impasse that we find ourself with the White House as well as with the Senate.

None of us is totally happy with this. I think, as my colleagues know, when people talk about the huge so-called cuts in family planning, let me remind Members that in 1992 the United States spent $325 million on family planning. In the last fiscal year we spent $356 million. That is a 16-percent increase, and this bill straight-lines that amount into fiscal year 1997. Many of us believe very strongly that abortion—lobbying for abortion and performance of abortions—is not family planning, and that is what the issue comes down to.

The Mexico City policy was in effect for about 10 years under the Reagan and Bush administrations. The United

States was the primary donor of international population control funds around the world during those years. And it was the NGO'S that refused to divest themselves of the killing and the maiming of unborn children by way of chemical poisoning or by way of dismemberment of the child by suction machines and other methods, they were the ones who were taking themselves out of contention for those Federal funds. They were the ones so obsessed with killing babies that they forfeited U.S. donations.

That is what this is all about, and I just want to say that I understand the gentleman from Colorado is going to withdraw this amendment, but had he not, we would have—and I would welcome it—a full-fledged debate on the Mexico City policy again. Because I think that is the preferable way. But I am also a realist, and I understand what likely would happen over the Senate side, and we would be there right into December, probably, debating this issue. But, you know, that too would be OK with me. This is a compromise. Nobody is happy with it I'm not—but I think it is a step in the right direction, and again there is much money in here, a 16-percent increase over 1992.

Let me also say that it really is disingenuous for Members to suggest that the language in this bill ''cuts'' population control. Let's remember that the Clinton Administration hyperinflated pap funds in fiscal year 1995. And isn't it amazing how quickly the new higher level became the baseline. When did the international adoption industry get a ''entitlement''? As I pointed out, if we look at the historic levels that AID has provided for family planning, the fiscal year 1997 spending plan is above those levels. Thus—rightly or wrongly—the United States remains one of the major providers of those kinds of funds.

Let me just say the distinguished gentleman from Alabama has done yeoman's work on trying to craft this compromise. This compromise has to hang together or else it all falls apart and we are right back to Mexico City. Frankly, that would be just fine with me, but as of now I think this is the way we ought to proceed.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. He is a true statesman and true believer in human life.

And let me just take one exception to what the gentlewoman said from New York. This bill is very pro-women I have worked with the gentleman from Alabama on child survival and maternal health care. This legislation directs $600 million by way of earmarks for the child survival and disease account. As my colleagues know, if we look in Africa and elsewhere—and I chair the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, and we have looked at this every carefully, we have worked with WHO and UNICEF and others—kids and women are dying in exceedingly high numbers in those countries from preventable diseases. Hundreds of millions of dollars in this bill are responsive to those needs. And I am grateful to Mr. CALLAHAN for his responsiveness to these pressing needs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Skaggs amendment that will restore necessary funding to international family planning. For our colleagues on the far right to call the restrictions on international family planning in this bill a compromise is ludicrous.

Not only do the provisions in the bill slash funding for the programs, but they also force programs to abide by the Mexico City restrictions in order to get adequate funding. My colleagues, this is not a compromise, this is the worst of both worlds.

Our chairman, Mr. CALLAHAN, has crafted an excellent foreign aid bill and I will support it. However, I will fight to have this extreme language removed from the bill in conference. It is simply unacceptable.

Last year, this bill was held up by the antichoice caucus' insistence that the bill contain some restrictions on international family planning. Well, here we go again. They have included a provision in this bill that they know both the Senate and the administration will reject.

And as for their suggestion that this is a compromise, let us not forget who was involved in this so-called ''compromise.'' This is not a deal between the pro-choice caucus and the antichoice caucus, this is a deal between CHRIS SMITH and DICK ARMEY, two antichoice leaders.

The bottom line is that this provision will slash by over one-third one of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries: family planning assistance.

No one can deny that the need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent and the aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile.

Let me illustrate for you the impact of these cuts. It has been estimated that the slashing of these funds will result in: 7 million people in developing countries that would have used contraceptives now will not have access to them; 4 million women will have unintended pregnancies; as a result of those pregnancies, there will be 1.9 million unintended births; 1.6 million more abortions; 8,000 more women dying in pregnancy and childbirth; and 134,000 more infant deaths.

These tragedies will be the direct result of this provision.

And as we have said repeatedly on this floor, the Mexico city restrictions, including the international gag rule, are simply unnecessary. Not a single U.S. dollar pays for abortions overseas. The members of the antichoice caucus are so obsessed about this issue that they see problems where they simply do not exist. International family planning programs decrease the number of abortions by making them unnecessary. Certainly that is a goal that we can all support.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. We cannot let them cut international family planning. There is just too much at stake.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. The family planning provisions in this foreign operations appropriations bill are an absolute disgrace. Anybody who says that they are a compromise is either fooling themselves or trying to fool someone else. This bill contains a double-barrelled shotgun pointed at the heart of responsible population policy. It combines disproportionate funding cuts with onerous policy restrictions.

Last year there was the flimsy excuse that the funding restriction was there because there was no agreement on the policy. Now, the Mexico City policy is imposed, and there are still the unfair funding restrictions.

If money for NGO's that do not follow these diktats on abortion is going to be restricted, what is the point in then also unduly restricting the total amount of money that can be spent on family planning? I do not know why it so difficult for some of my colleagues to understand that if couples do not have access to contraceptives, they are more likely to then get an abortion. And that if we cut money for family planning, it leads to more abortions, not less. That is why I say this debate is not about abortion, but about family planning.

The world's population is growing at an alarming rate. In just 4 years, the population of Africa is going to reach 1 billion. By 2010, India's population will reach 1 billion, by 2020, it will pass China as the world's most populous country.

Population pressure threatens to ignite conflicts and war all around the world. And just like any other problem in the world, nothing is going to be done about it unless the United States shows some leadership. Unfortunately, this bill is negative leadership. Please pass this amendment.

□ 1745

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], an amendment which would lift the cap on family planning services requiring that no more than 65 percent of fiscal 1996 funding should be available in fiscal 1997.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself at this point, without the whole repetition, with the reasons which have been enumerated by the gentleman from Colorado, the gentlewoman from New York, and the gentlewoman from Kansas in her comments just completed.

Mr. Chairman, I want to extend a little here and say that I commend this bill's commitment to the Middle East peace process, the whole of the legislation; but its approach to the rest of the world is, it seems to me, simply bad policy. The legislation provides strong support for Israel and the peace partners in the process of Arab-Israeli reconciliation as it moves forward, and I support the financing levels for Israel, the West Bank, Gaza, and Egypt, and the President supports those amounts as well.

Mr. Chairman, after nearly 2 decades of progress, where American leadership has been so critical following the Camp David Accords, we must continue our commitment as Israel faces a period of transition under new leadership. But while our commitment to the Middle East must endure, so should our leadership and support in other regions of the world.

This legislation cuts aid to the new democracies in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union in an area where we were willing to spend $40 billion per year to conduct the Cold War, but we are now cutting deeply into the only $600 million or so that helps those new nations build their economies and democracies. Six hundred million is only a little bit more than 1 percent of what we were willing to spend year in and year out, 1 percent year in and year out, of the $40 billion that we were spending to keep the conduct of the Cold War going.

The bill, in its total, slashes support for global environmental maintenance, weakening the fight against degradation of our common oceans and our common atmosphere. This bill totally eliminates financing for the African Development Bank, and it severely cuts financing for international family planning, cutting 35 percent from last year's level, which is, of course, the subject of the amendment that we are considering at the moment; and among which provisions, in constraining international family planning, among those provisions are those which, in the words of the gentlewoman from Kansas who just completed speaking, are completely outrageous. This is short-sighted and I think flat out wrong. We really cannot afford to turn a blind eye on global problems of population growth and poverty and environmental degradation.

Mr. Chairman, I very much support and hope that we will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Skaggs].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Skaggs amendment to the foreign operations appropriations bill. If Members believe that women, rich and poor alike, should have the right to choose safe motherhood, they must support the Skaggs amendment. If Members believe that women should have the right to choose how many children they have, they must support the Skaggs amendment. If Members believe that the United States has an obligation to support efforts to slow down the earth's rapid population growth and the misery that comes with it, they must support the Skaggs amendment.

Mr. Chairman, family planning programs are key to international self-sufficiency. Let me remind us that today, right now, we are debating a bill which reduces financing for overseas development. We cannot, in good conscience, reduce aid to poor countries and tell them to be more self-reliant, without giving them the tools to do so. I urge my colleagues, support the Skaggs amendment and remove the spending cap on international family planning.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in my opening remarks on this amendment, it is my intention to request unanimous consent to withdraw it. I regret having to make that request, given, obviously, my belief and the views of many of my colleagues who have spoken on the merits of this amendment. But the realistic circumstances that we face, as indicated by the comments made by the gentleman from New Jersey, I think make it advisable that we withhold on this.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Skaggs motion to strike the cap on funding for international population assistance.

This bill singles out population assistance activities for a disproportionate 35 percent cut, more than other development and humanitarian assistance programs. This cut will have a direct and severe impact on the lives of women and their families in developing countries. It would be expected to result in 7 million couples in developing countries left without access to modern, safe contraceptive methods, 4 million women experiencing unintended pregnancies, 1.6 million more abortions, 8,000 more women dying in pregnancy and childbirth, including those from unsafe abortions, and 134,000 infant deaths. These are not theoretical arguments. These are numbers of real people—numbers of deaths that we have the power to prevent. Can your conscience allow these poor people to pay the price for reducing costs with their lives and the lives of their children?

I respect that there are competing priorities at odds in this bill. But how can there be a greater priority in this bill than preventing deaths and suffering of impoverished women and families in developing countries? We cannot address foreign aid without being serious about our responsibility to promote health and survival in countries of need. Without a proper commitment to these programs, we have the health and lives of poor women and children hanging over our heads.

I urge my colleagues to support the Skaggs amendment and retain proper funding for these life-saving family planning programs.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the Skaggs amendment. Simply put, this amendment would have ensured that the family planning program is treated the same as the rest of the development assistance portfolio, and not singled out for severe, disproportionate funding cuts.

We know that family planning saves lives. U.S. family planning assistance is critical to millions of couples who only ask for help in spacing their children and avoiding unplanned pregnancies. This bill, by subjecting our international family planning efforts to a 35-percent cut for yet another year, will result in more unwanted pregnancies, more abortions, and more maternal and infant deaths. Moreover, a cut of this magnitude undermines other humanitarian assistance programs, particularly U.S. efforts to improve child survival.

Again, the Skaggs amendment would only have deleted the provision of the bill that imposes a deeper spending cut on family planning than on the rest of our humanitarian assistance. It would not increase funding for foreign operations overall, nor would it have necessitated offsets.

Although the gentleman has chosen to withdraw his amendment, we in this House need to take a serious and unjaundiced look at the implications of the disproportionate cuts, as well as short-sighted restrictions, which have been imposed upon our family planning programs.

I look forward to working with the gentleman and other Members to reverse these provisions in conference.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Skaggs amendment to remove the cap on population planning activities. Adopting this amendment would speak clearly to our concern for women, children, and families—wherever they may live.

The bill before us caps family planning activities at no more than 65 percent—less than two-thirds—of last year's level. This restriction would have a devastating impact on family planning activities worldwide.

Literally millions of people would be denied access to information. Unplanned—even unwanted—pregnancies would increase. Efforts to promote healthy pregnancies and healthy births would be undercut. None of this is necessary—and none is in our country's best interest.

If we believe that strong and healthy families are the building blocks of strong and healthy societies, we should make assistance of this kind more—not less available. The arbitrary cap contained in this measure would deprive families worldwide of the humane and respectful assistance they so often want.

I urge my colleagues to support families and the Skaggs amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments to title V?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that is to be considered under the unanimous-consent request, amendment No. 74.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 74 offered by Ms. WATERS: Page 34, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $8,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 34, after line 24, insert the following:

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the African Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury for the United States share of the paid-in portion of the increase in capital stock, $8,000,000 to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the United States contribution by the Secretary of the Treasury to the increase in resources of the African Development Fund, as authorized by Public Law 103–306, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to restore a modest financing level for the African development fund. This amendment is fundamentally about fairness. Our regional development lending institutions are strapped. The United States is in arrears on more than one of them. However, our obligations remain. However, this appropriations bill only zeros out one program, the African development fund. It appropriates $25 million for the Inter-American Development Bank, $100 million for the Asian development fund, and $13 billion for the Asian Development Bank.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, comparable institutions like the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development receives $12 million, and the North American Development Bank gets $50 million. I cannot accept singling out the African Development Bank and the African development fund, both of which are zero funded in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would appropriate half the administration's request for the African development fund. This modest replenishment will allow the fund to do priority poverty alleviation work in Africa's poorest countries. The fund has depleted its resources and has not been able to make new loans.

These loans that assist the indigenous private sector development of these countries, as well as create export and investment opportunities for U.S. businesses, investing in primary education, preventive health care, and physical infrastructure, are crucial components of a growth and development program for Africa.

Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that the African Development Bank group has had organizational difficulties. However, since those problems came to a head 2 years ago, enormous progress has been made. For example, they have a new president who is committed to remaking the institution. Term limits have been adopted for all senior bank officials. Twenty percent of the staff has been dismissed and 70 percent of the managers have been replaced. A comprehensive audit of the bank group is underway. New lending policies have tightened access to lending for noncreditworthy borrowers and new inspector general type offices have been created and staffed. These changes represent one of the most, if not the most, expansive form of an institution of this kind ever.

Given this progress, it would be irresponsible for the United States, a leader, a prime pursuer of reform, to shirk its responsibility at this crucial time. The United States has a foreign policy and national security interest in the program of economic development in Africa. The African Development Bank group serves as a prime facilitator of this progress, especially the fund, which provides highly concessionary loans to poor borrowers and technical assistance grants to support lending operations.

This country must lead, not walk away from its responsibility. Hopefully, at a later time in the budget cycle this year, we will not be forced to make the difficult choices faced in this amendment. However, it is crucial that this House make a modest contribution to our international obligation for the African development fund. Again, Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of fairness. It is just inconceivable and unconscionable that every institution, every other bank, multilateral bank, has been funded and the African Development Bank and the fund both were zeroed.

There are those who will make the argument that funds were put in other places, but the cuts are continuing to grow as it relates to Africa. It is unfair, I take this opportunity to challenge us to do the right thing.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program, and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

Clause 2 of rule XXI states, in pertinent part:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill or be in order as an amendment thereto for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, the authorization for the African Development Bank has not been signed into law. The amendment therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI, and I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] like to be recognized to respond to the point of order?

Ms. WATERS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that it is not authorized in this legislation. However, the other banks are not authorized either, but they got a waiver in the rule. So what we have here is a construction that recognized that the other banks were not authorized, they waived the rule so they could fund them, but they excluded the African-American Bank, and the chairman of the committee knows that took place. So it is not a matter of simply not having an authorization. The others do not have one either.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

While there is authorization law for the African development fund, appropriations for the African Development Bank for fiscal year 1997 are not currently authorized by law. The amendment, therefore, violates clause 2(a) of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained.

Are there other amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 44.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: On page 31, line 4, after the colon insert the following:

''*Provided further.* That the Department of Defense shall conduct during the current fiscal year nonreimbursable audits of private firms whose contracts are made directly with foreign governments and are financed with funds made available under this heading (as well as subcontractors thereunder) as requested by the Defense Security Assistance Agency:''

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against amendment No. 44.

□ 1800

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores the requirement that foreign countries agree to an outside audit as a condition of receiving FMF grants. It has been included in the foreign operations bill for a number of years as a result of a number of notable bribery cases involving U.S. funds and foreign officials. It was not included in the bill by the committee apparently because the language is contained in another bill which passed the House and is pending in the Senate. But the problem is, we have absolutely no idea what the fate of that bill in the Senate will be, and this provision is too important to leave to the whim of the other body.

It is a very simple proposition. It restores the proposition that if you get an FMF grant from the United States Treasury that you have to agree to accept an audit. It boggles my mind that we would risk losing that language. I would think we would want to nail this language into every single bill moving through this House that affects foreign aid. I can think of absolutely no constructive purpose that is served by the elimination of language which simply provides for an audit any time a country gets an FMF grant from the United States, and I would urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] wish to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not differ with my colleague on the merits of this amendment. The committee has carried this provision for several years. However, the committee did not carry the provision this year at the specific request of Chairman GILMAN of the authorization committee. This is an authorization provision, and it is contained in the House passed bill, H.R. 3121, which has the support of both the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] of the authorizing committee. They expect this measure to be enacted into law, and therefore, Chairman GILMAN does not believe that the inclusion of these authorization measures in our bill are necessary.

I have done my best to work with the authorizing committee on this issue, and therefore, I must reluctantly oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], but only on those grounds.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that it is very nice to hear that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] expects some other legislation to pass which will restore protections for the American taxpayer. However, I do not care if this FMF loan goes to our best friend or our worst enemy, it ought to be audited, and if it is not audited, the loan should not be approved in the first place.

But in God's name do we expect to maintain any shred of public support for foreign assistance when we are eliminating in the appropriation bill for foreign assistance the requirement that anyone who receives FMF funds should be willing to accept an audit. For the life of me, I do not see why we ought to roll the dice and risk losing this provision which has been in the law for years.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, we certainly agree with the objectives of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and his goals, and that will be built into our measure which we hope to take up shortly. We want to commend the gentleman for his approach to this very important problem.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me simply say, I would rather you withhold the commendation of me personally and instead let the language stand, because I remember how tough it was to get these provisions in the appropriation bill in the first place. I remember shouting at people from several embassies one very late night when we were in our conference on the bill, because they took offense to the fact that we wanted an audit if we were going to provide FMF funding for them.

So for the life of me, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but I would rather that the gentleman denounce and leave my amendment stand.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will further yield, the gentleman will not have to shout at our committee. We understand his objective and we will try our best to meet his objective.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the pending amendment is legislative in nature, does violate clause 2(c) of rule XXI, which provides that no amendment to a general appropriation bill shall be in order if changing existing law.

I want to commend the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee on appropriations who has adhered to his rule of making certain that there be no authorization language in this measure, and that that authorization would have to go through out committee.

Mr. Chairman, amendment No. 44 reinserts the provision which the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], agreed to pull out of this year's bill. Again, I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] for working with us on these authorization provisions.

As is well-known, there has not been a foreign authorization bill entered into law since 1985. In an effort to make some headway, our Committee on International Relations separated from the foreign aid legislation some noncontroversial defense and security assistance authorities. The purpose of the committee was to revise and clarify these authorities and codify into permanent law authorizing language which has been too long carried on annual appropriation measures.

Now the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], wants to reinsert these provisions back into the foreign operations bill, and we certainly will try to do that in an authorization measure.

These provisions are provisions which are contained in legislation that were twice passed by the House this year in our authorization legislation, first as a freestanding measure in H.R. 3121, and secondly as an amendment to fiscal year 1997 DOD authorizations.

The Committee on International Relations is trying to fulfill its responsibility as an authorizing committee. We passed this provision twice. Please let us do our business in the appropriate manner, and we assure the gentleman we will carry forth on his goals and expectations.

I might add that our measure is currently pending in the Senate, and the majority and the minority have reported that it should be proceeding soon without controversy.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

Let me simply say that what bothers me is that this reminds me of what my old friend Dick Bolling, who used to represent the State of Missouri in such a distinguished fashion, it reminds me of what he used to call dung hill politics. He used to say that the problem around here is that so often committees are so concerned with jurisdiction that they put that before the substantive needs of the country. It seems to me that I would very much like to see the gentleman's committee be able to pass a bill, any bill. But it is more important to me to protect the taxpayers' interests in seeing to it that these loans are accompanied by an audit to protect the taxpayers' money.

If the gentleman insists on his point of order, which will simply remove from this bill an antifraud requirement, I cannot do much about it, but I think it is a sad day.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order and ask for a ruling by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment constitutes legislation by directing the Secretary of Defense to conduct an audit and is in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY; on page 30 line 5, after ''Act.'', insert

Provided further, That not more than $100,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be available for use in financing the procurement of defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services that are not sold by the United States Government under the Arms Export Control Act to countries other than Israel and Egypt.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to the previous amendment. This amendment restores language that has been carried in the foreign operations bill for a good many years. It limits to $100 million the amount that can be spent on non-Israel and Egypt FMF grants for direct commercial contracts. Its effect is to limit the extent to which countries can contract on their own for goods and services and thereby escape the oversight requirements of the Arms Export Control Act. It is again an antifraud safeguard because it assures that the Pentagon will review these contracts. It was stricken again by the Committee because again, it is contained in an authorization bill which has passed the House and is pending in the Senate.

Again, I have no idea what is going to happen to that authorization bill, or what mischief might occur along the way. All I know again is that this provision is too important to leave to chance. We fought a good long time to see to it that we had the added protection of Pentagon review of these contracts so that we do not have bribery

or fraud that occurs because the Pentagon is not able to oversee what happens in this account.

So again, this is a jurisdictional matter, but it would seem to me that the requirement to protect taxpayers' money ought to override any jurisdictional concerns that someone might have. I would urge acceptance of the amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, on my point of order, I want to assure the gentleman again that his measure is included in our H.R. 3121 that is presently before the Senate, passed twice by the House, and we are optimistic that that measure will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the last three lines of the bill have not been read and the limitation amendment is not in order, and for the same reasons as I previously outlined, I ask for a ruling on our point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. GILMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairman, again, I think the issue here is whether or not a committee's jurisdiction is more important than the necessity to protect taxpayers' money. This provision has been carried for years without the objection of the authorizing committee. It seems to me that it is peculiar at a time when both parties are bragging like crazy to the American paople that we are going to balance the budget and fight waste, fraud and abuse, that we take the two main items in this bill that prevent fraud and abuse and strip them from the bill. That is indeed a quaint way to build support for public aid, and I again cannot do anything about it if the gentleman insists on his point of order, but I do not think the taxpayers' interests are being served by the elimination of the language that protects their hard-earned tax dollars.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, again, I reiterate that it has been passed twice by the House and it is presently before the Senate, and the proposal of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is within that measure that is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that the fact that that legislation has been passed twice by the House and has not been passed by the Senate is not encouraging to me. That does not sound to me like a very good track record. It seems to me that since this is a must-pass bill, we need to keep this language in this bill because it is the only sure way we have of protecting the taxpayers.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure he will be pleased when this measure is permanently made into law once the Senate acts.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment is in the form of a limitation which must await the reading of the last lines of the bill where that question is raised under rule XXI, clause 2. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN]. The colloquy is with respect to the Jewish Agency in Russia. On April 30, 1996, the Jewish Agency, which is a quasi-governmental body that has brought more than 630,000 Jewish immigrants to Israel from the former Soviet Union since 1989, had its accreditation revoked by Russian Government authorities, which effectively terminated its right to operate is Russia. If the chairman recalls, during our subcommittee markup, I reserved the right to revisit the situation of the Jewish Agency and the Russian authorities were unable to come to an amiable settlement of the matter.

At this time, it is my understanding that the Russian Government has promised to renew by mid-June the Jewish Agency's accreditation. It is my hope that this misunderstanding can be cleared up, and we can continue the great strides made over the past 6 years.

Mr. Chairman, I would hate to see this as a sign of the return of the bad old days when Moscow placed sharp restrictions on immigration and ill-treated Jewish refuseniks. I will reserve on this matter so that I may bring this issue back at a conference should the conditions not change.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the interest of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. Let me assure the gentleman we will review this situation when we reach conference with the Senate.

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

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

□ 1815

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois and want to note to the gentleman that we have already brought this to the attention of President Yeltsin and have voiced our objections on behalf of our committee, on behalf of the Congress and we will try to keep the gentleman apprised of any response.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, would associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and had earlier planned to file an amendment without understanding that he had been way ahead of me on that subject. So I thank the gentleman and the chairman in that regard and do not intend to offer the amendment that I had prepared.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 301, noes 118, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

AYES—301

Abercrombie	Dellums	Heineman
Ackerman	Deutsch	Hilleary
Andrews	Diaz-Balart	Hinchey
Bachus	Dickey	Hobson
Baesler	Dicks	Hoekstra
Baker (CA)	Dingell	Hoke
Baldacci	Dixon	Holden
Barcia	Doggett	Horn
Bartlett	Dooley	Hoyer
Bass	Doolittle	Hunter
Becerra	Dornan	Hutchinson
Beilenson	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Bevill	Dreier	Jacobs
Bilbray	Duncan	Jefferson
Bilirakis	Durbin	Johnson (CT)
Bishop	Edwards	Johnson (SD)
Bliley	Ehlers	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Ehrlich	Jones
Blute	Engel	Kanjorski
Boehlert	English	Kaptur
Boehner	Ensign	Kelly
Bonior	Eshoo	Kennedy (MA)
Bono	Evans	Kennedy (RI)
Borski	Ewing	Kennelly
Boucher	Farr	Kildee
Brown (CA)	Fattah	Kleczka
Brown (FL)	Fawell	Klink
Brown (OH)	Fazio	Klug
Brownback	Fields (LA)	Knollenberg
Buyer	Filner	LaHood
Calvert	Flake	Lantos
Camp	Flanagan	Largent
Campbell	Foley	LaTourette
Canady	Forbes	Lazio
Cardin	Ford	Leach
Castle	Fox	Levin
Chabot	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Chapman	Franks (CT)	Linder
Chenoweth	Franks (NJ)	Lipinski
Christensen	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Chrysler	Frisa	Lofgren
Clay	Frost	Longley
Clayton	Funderburk	Lowey
Coburn	Furse	Lucas
Collins (GA)	Gallegly	Luther
Collins (IL)	Gejdenson	Maloney
Collins (MI)	Gekas	Manton
Condit	Gephardt	Manzullo
Conyers	Gilchrest	Markey
Cooley	Gilman	Martinez
Costello	Goodlatte	Martini
Cox	Goodling	Mascara
Coyne	Greene (UT)	Matsui
Cramer	Greenwood	McCarthy
Crapo	Gunderson	McCollum
Cremeans	Gutierrez	McCrery
Cubin	Gutknecht	McDade
Cummings	Hall (OH)	McDermott
Cunningham	Hastings (WA)	McHale
Danner	Hayworth	McHugh
DeFazio	Hefley	McInnis
DeLauro	Hefner	McKeon

McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sanders
Saxton
Scarborough
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Thomas
Thompson
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wicker
Williams
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—118

Archer
Armey
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bonilla
Brewster
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Chambliss
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Combest
Crane
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Fields (TX)
Foglietta
Fowler
Ganske
Geren
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Herger
Hilliard
Hostettler
Houghton
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Kolbe
LaFalce
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Livingston
McIntosh
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Montgomery
Murtha
Myers
Nethercutt
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Quillen
Rogers
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Schaefer
Schroeder
Shuster
Skelton
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stockman
Stump
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thornberry
Thornton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Ward
White
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Slaughter

NOT VOTING—14

Allard
Browder
Gibbons
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lincoln
Pelosi
Roth
Sawyer
Schiff
Torres
Young (FL)

□ 1836

Messrs. BENTSEN, HILLIARD, GOSS, DAVIS, STOCKMAN, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and GONZALEZ changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BALDACCI, REGULA, RICHARDSON and FROST, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. GEKAS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, on the previous rollcall No. 214, I did not make it to the Chamber in time. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall No. 214.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 29 offered by Mr. OBEY: On page 27, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes to the military training account. Last year the military training account was funded at $39 million. This year, despite the fact that the bill is being cut by around $1 billion, this account is going to receive a $6 million increase to $45 million.

That is an increase of 15 percent, out of only 3 accounts that have received an increase in the bill, and it seems to me that that is not proportional under the circumstances. With the end of the cold war, it seems to me that we ought to have a greater recognition than we have, that we simply cannot afford to be raising some of these military accounts while virtually everything else in the budget is being cut.

I support and continue to support an IMET program in Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, places like that. I also think it is useful in developing countries to try to have a military relationship of some kind.

But I would ask why on Earth the United States should spend $25,000 or $50,000 for countries like Austria, Finland, Spain, Portugal, countries which are relatively high-income countries? I understand that the basis of these programs is reciprocal training arrangements, and I am all for that. But I see no reason why, if these are so valuable, that the countries who are on the receiving end of the training should not be paying for the cost.

We are being asked, under the budget that passed the House some time ago, to cut Medicare, and we are being asked to consider means testing Medicare to require higher income seniors to pay higher amounts. Why on Earth should we be doing that if we are not asking higher income countries to pay for the military training which we are providing under IMET? It seems to me only a rational thing to do.

So, I would simply urge, in the interest of some balance and the interest of some fiscal prudence, that the committee approve the amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the unique position of having to defend the administration for one of the programs they essentially deem as one of the most important military functions that they do. I received a letter today from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Shalikashvili, and from Secretary William Perry, the Secretary of Defense, telling us that this program was crucial.

The gentleman from Wisconsin talks about the fact that we increase IMET, but what he does not talk about is in 1995, when he was chairman of this committee, he cut IMET training by 50 percent. But now comes a Democratic administration, the President, the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, all telling us that this is very crucial to their effectiveness in running an effective military.

The IMET training program is a program that trains military people. It trains them in areas such as human rights. It trains them in areas such as military engagement. It gives us the ability of having people that are trained in such a manner whereby if we ever are in some situation with them, they will understand something about military strategy.

□ 1845

It is a crucial program to the administration. I find myself, as I said, uniquely trying to defend an administration that normally the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is defending and I am on the opposite side.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is a vital program. It is a well-thought-out program. It is well received by many of our allies throughout the world, and without it the United States would lose great military advantages. So I would urge the Members on both sides of the aisle to go along with the President, to go along with the Secretary of Defense, with the Secretary of State, with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to leave this appropriation as the subcommittee agreed, where incidentally, no discussion of this ever came up in subcommittee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge all my colleagues to continue to allow us to adequately fund the IMET training program and to reject the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in opposition to this amendment and the following amendment which cuts the IMET program. The IMET program is an extremely important program which should be fully funded. The proposed fiscal year 1997 program will enable us to reach more than 5,000 personnel in over 120 different countries.

In recognition of the importance of this program, the Committee on International Relations and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the

Committee on Appropriations recommended full funding in fiscal year 1997 for the IMET program in the 150 budget function.

Mr. Chairman, let me note that both the authorizing and appropriations committees met the administration's request in fiscal year 1996 and in fiscal year 1997. Forty-five million dollars in fiscal year 1997 is not an unreasonable funding level. And while it is an increase from last year, this level of funding merely returns IMET to levels of funding for the program from fiscal year 1990 to fiscal year 1993.

Further, $45 million in IMET funding in fiscal year 1997 will enable our Nation to advance its foreign policy interests in over 30 new country programs that have been instituted since 1991, primarily in Central Europe and in the former Soviet Union.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to make the point that I understand the fiscal 1997 DOD authorization bill, as reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee, contains language which once again makes it clear that it is the intent of that committee to move responsibility for funding and implementation of the IMET program to the Department of Defense.

We need to fully fund the IMET program so that the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Department of Defense hears our message loud and clear. We are committed to supporting full funding for this program in the 150 account.

I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin should want to retain control of this program in the 150 account, and should it be moved to the 050 account, we can be certain funding would go even higher, perhaps as much as $60 million more.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote for full funding for IMET. Vote against the Obey amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Obey amendment. I do that reluctantly, because the gentleman and I agree on many issues. Here is one where we disagree. I think my chairman, the gentleman from New York, BEN GILMAN, has given some very important reasons why we should have full funding for IMET and, indeed, it was this gentleman's amendment in the authorizing committee, debated and which raised the authorization level to the full amount requested by the administration.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to my colleagues that when Secretary Perry came to address a meeting of House Republicans some time ago, within the past year, and out of all the issues he might have spoken he focused his remarks primarily on the IMET program. He asked us to continue to give it full funding. He stated on another occasion, I believe, as the chairman mentioned, if in fact this IMET program was funded by the authorization of the Committee on National Security, it would be authorized at a higher level. But because IMET is found within the 150 account, it gets very tough and special scrutiny.

I would also say to my colleagues that the IMET program is one of those programs that pays very big dividends in reinforcing the human rights concerns that this country and other countries.

The officers and noncommissioned officers that take advantage of these IMET programs come to our programs, and they receive a very heavy dose of human rights and civil action training as a part of their IMET training programs. I think for that reason, too, the IMET program is a very good investment that we make in our foreign policy and in our military-to-military relationship.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues, in this case, to reject the Obey amendment and go for the full amount requested by the appropriations subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: On page 27, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,525,000)''.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment cuts $1,525,000 from the IMET account. The amount of the cut corresponds exactly to the amount requested for the high-income countries of Austria, Finland, Malta, Portugal, Spain, Singapore, India, and Bahrain. The per capita gross domestic product for Finland is $16,140; for Austria the per capita income is $17,500; for Spain, $13,000; for Malta, $10,700; for Portugal, $10,000; for India, $1,300; for Singapore, $19,900; for Bahrain, $12,100; yet, this committee is insisting that we pay for the training costs for these countries.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out there are countries in this bill who receive aid where the per capita income is less than $400 a year. It just seems to me strange indeed that countries like Austria and Singapore cannot afford to pay for the training which we provide. I am not saying we should not provide training to these countries, I am saying we ought to do it on a cash paid-for basis. I do not see why we ought to fund it.

I would point out that a number of these countries spend a much smaller share of their gross domestic product on military expenditures than we do. I would point out a number of these countries are knocking our socks off on trade in a wide variety of sectors in the trading economy.

I can see no reason whatsoever why I ought to ask somebody in my State or in my district, making $8,000 or $9,000 a year, to support a program which provides military assistance, military training to countries that make $20,000 a year on average.

So, Mr. Chairman, enough said. I will not belabor the point, but I urge the acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from Wisconsin had raised this issue earlier, during the markup, or at least highlighted it in his discussions with me on our bill. The high income figure he offered does not cut IMET to high income countries, it just cuts IMET by $1.5 million. The high income countries will still be able to get IMET funds.

Furthermore, $1.2 million of the $1.5 million is to cut IMET to the gentleman's high income countries: India, $400,000 and Portugal $800,000. The remaining $300,000 is for the true high income countries, like Singapore or South Korea. The only reason they get this is so they can have access to U.S. military training.

I think it is wrong to penalize India and Portugal, as this does, and especially since it does not, in my opinion, achieve the gentleman's goal. I think if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] were to choose to retire in the not too distant future, and if he had a friendly administration to him, that he would make an excellent Secretary of State, if indeed Warren Christopher did not want to serve any longer. And once he achieves that position, I think the gentleman should then be entitled to make decisions such as he is forcing upon the administrative branch of government.

The gentleman is a Member of Congress. It is up to us to direct and to suggest to the administration. We are not even the authorizing committee. But here we are playing pseudosecretaries of state, telling them because of the fact that we feel this way, that we ought to restrict the administration's ability to have an effective foreign policy as well as military policy.

So, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows the respect I have for him, and I want to assure him if I am still a Member of Congress and still chairman of this committee, and this gentleman does indeed, as Secretary of State, come to me saying, ''For goodness sake, will you please fund IMET training to the substantial amount so we

can have an effective foreign policy?'', I will respond to his wish. But I will not tonight respond to his wish because it is wrong, I tell the gentleman, and I am going to respectfully ask, No. one, that he withdraw the amendment, and in the absence of that, I would ask all my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Obey amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Yes, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman asked me to consider withdrawing it, I simply want to point out that the only reason that this amendment is not drawn to specifically forbid aid to those countries and simply subtracts the amount that is provided in aid to those countries is that, as the gentleman well knows, were I to draw it the other way, it would be subject to a point of order, and I have already had two points of order lodged against amendments I have offered today.

So the gentleman is kind of offering me a deal that I have no choice but to refuse.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RADANOVICH

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RADANOVICH: Page 97, after line 5, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 573. Not more than $22,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' may be made available to the Government of Turkey, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the Government of Turkey has (1) joined the United States in acknowledging the atrocity committed against the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1923; and (2) taken all appropriate steps to honor the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, in this turbulent century we have witnessed humanity's great potential for good and bad, but the world has triumphed more often in the last 96 years and it has been disappointed. And yet while focusing on humanity's successes is always more attractive——

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RADANOVICH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me make an inquiry as to whether or not this is a limitation amendment.

Mr. RADANOVICH. This is, yes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. And if so are there other nonlimitation amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Alabama insisting on his point of order at this time?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to know if there are other nonlimitation amendments before we get to limitation amendments.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment and will introduce it at the appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

□ 1900

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, I reserved the right to object not to interfere with the gentleman from California but to ask the Chairman's intentions. What happens if there are no further nonlimitation amendments?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Then we will go to limitation amendments. We wanted to dispose of all of the nonlimitation amendments before we got to the limitations.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thought maybe I would get a cabinet nomination out of my colleague.

In lieu of that, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am not sure, was it clear, are there any other nonlimitation amendments? I did not think there were.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to inform the subcommittee chairman that there was one additional amendment which I was going to offer to title I, which I got permission earlier to offer. But at this point I do not intend to offer that amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. So there are no other nonlimitation amendments? That is what we were seeking.

Absent that, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments not precluded by clause 2(a) or clause 2(c) of rule XXI?

If not, the Clerk will read the last three lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the next amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. PALLONE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that on this next amendment, the Radanovich amendment, if it were possible to have that unanimous consent request withdrawn. We just wanted to see how many speakers would be here. We will try to limit it to the 30 minutes, if possible, but since a lot of the Members who wanted to speak on the amendment were not necessarily aware that the time was limited and thought they would have 5 minutes, I would like to not limit it formally at this time, if the Chair won allow us that.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of compromise which I have done all the way through this bill, with both sides of the aisle, with every Member present here tonight, I would be happy to.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RADANOVICH

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RADANOVICH: Page 97, after line 5, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 573. Not more than $22,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' may be made available to the Government of Turkey, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the Government of Turkey has (1) joined the United States in acknowledging the atrocity committed against the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1923; and (2) taken all appropriate steps to honor the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of compromise, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not personally have a problem with that, but I have been told that there are a number of Members on this side of the aisle who do. So I would urge that the gentleman withdraw that request, and I would urge that the gentleman consider offering a time limit of 1 hour.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if we do allow debate for the 40 minutes, as I have suggested, would the gentleman at that time be willing to agree to some limited amount of time to debate this after that point, maybe limiting debate time for each Member to 2 minutes or 1 minute or to designate the time?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to support cutting off amendments that other Members offer. I have just been asked by a Member of our leadership not to.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous consent request, and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 60 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I would say to the chairman that I think this amendment, from what I hear on this side, I think this amendment is the one that Members want more time on. I do not think you need to give an hour for all subsequent amendments.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the unanimous consent request was just this one amendment.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I did not understand that.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I will not object, but just for scheduling purposes, would it then be the intention, I wonder if it is proper to ask that the clustered votes would then take place so Members might know? I know we have been talking about a vote at 8. If we have a 60-minute limit, to which I do not object, would it then be the Chair's intention to go to the three votes that would then be pending? Members have been talking about an 8 o'clock time from the standpoint of scheduling here.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the intention of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, in this turbulent century, we have witnessed humanity's great potential for good and bad—but the world has triumphed more often in the last 96 years than it has disappointed. And yet, while focusing on humanity's successes is always more attractive than remembering any stumbles, we as civilized peoples, countries, and nations must not deny the immorality of such stains on history as the Holocaust and the Armenian genocide.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, today I offer an amendment which provides a practical incentive to Turkey to join the community of nations in recognition of a tragic chapter in its history. Let me explain the amendment.

This amendment links Turkey's denial of the genocide to United States foreign aid levels. In other words, the amendment states that if Turkey joins the United States in acknowledging the atrocity committed against the Armenian population, and takes all appropriate steps to honor the memory of those innocent victims, it will then receive the full portion of aid appropriated to it in H.R. 3540.

This amendment is reasonable. The levels of economic aid we propose to withhold from Turkey is approximately 2 percent or $3 million. The figure of $3 million is equal to the amount the Turkish Government spends on swaying opinion in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying that such distinguished individuals as Ronald Reagan, Winston Churchill, and Woodrow Wilson, have recognized the terrible tragedy suffered by Armenians from 1915–1923. Today this body has the opportunity of encouraging Turkey to respect the memory of those Armenian victims. I ask that you vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud to be a cosponsor of the Radanovich amendment. Again, as Mr. RADANOVICH mentioned, capping economic support fund aid to Turkey at $22 million, as this does, represents a cut of about 2 percent of the total U.S. military and economic assistance, approximately $3 million. We know that the government of Turkey has spent at least that amount annually in its Washington lobbying and public relations effort.

I was on the floor just the other day talking about some aspect of that. One of the things they have been doing rather successfully, is basically donating money to major universities to establish chairs of Turkish studies. Then they use that oftentimes to influence what goes on at those universities.

I was very concerned about that issue, particularly in my home State of New Jersey, because they established one of these chairs at Princeton University, one of the leading institutions of higher learning in the Nation. And yet, we have documented that some of the promotional efforts that have come out of that donation, have basically resulted in an effort to try to deny that the genocide ever took place.

Rather than confront the historical record of the Armenian genocide, the Turkish Government has chosen to instead to ignore the documented evidence. This pattern of denial offends the memory of those who perished, contradicts the historical record in our own national archives, and helps lay the groundwork for those who would commit similar atrocities in the future.

Our amendment provides a practical incentive for Turkey to join the international community in coming to terms with this tragic chapter in history. By acknowledging the Armenian genocide, Turkey will open the door to full diplomatic relations with Armenia.

I do not want to go through the historical account of the genocide because I think that we should try to limit our time here. But I just wanted to say that to this day the government of Turkey maintains this policy of denying that the genocide against the Armenians ever took place.

I, just to give you an example from my own experience, myself and Congressman PORTER have on various occasions written to the Turkish embassy and talked about the genocide. And we get very curt responses suggesting that the genocide never took place, And yet the historical record is clear. There were no Nuremberg trials, and there has been no official atonement by the Turkish nation. And I think the only way that we can make this point and to try to persuade Turkey, which receives millions of dollars of U.S. aid, is to basically try to pass a resolution like this that makes them acknowledge that the genocide took place.

I just want, again, for the sake of time, I just want to point out that there have been many Americans and world leaders who have continued to point to the genocide and the example of the Armenian genocide.

Just to quote two of them here today, if I could, I wanted to mention a statement by President Reagan that was made on April 22, 1981. He said, Like the genocide of the Armenians before it and the genocide of the Cambodians which followed it and like too many other such persecutions of too many other people, the lessons of the Holocaust must never be forgotten.

President Clinton said this year on the anniversary of the genocide, April 21, that he joins with Armenians around the world on this solemn day in commemorating the senseless deportations and massacres of 1.5 million Armenians that took place from 1915 to 1923 in the Ottoman Empire.

The bottom line is that if we do not recognize that genocide takes place, it

will happen again. We know that it happens over and over again historically. One of the most disgraceful things I think is when Adolf Hitler said, before he started the preparations for the Jewish Holocaust, he mentioned that no one remembered the Armenian genocide. Therefore, there was no reason why he could not proceed.

We do not want this genocide to continue. The Turkish Government must recognize it. Once they do, I think relations between our countries will certainly be a lot better. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. Chairman, Germany has acknowledged the Holocaust. Japan has apologized for its atrocities in World War II, but regrettably Turkey remains adamant in opposing measures which simply recognize the genocide of Armenians under the government that preceded the Turkish Republic. All this amendment seeks is that the Turks take a step similar to Germany's and Japan's in acknowledging genocide crimes and honor its victims. The Armenians deserve at least that much.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking my colleagues who are joining me in offering this amendment today. The gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] have all put in a great deal of work in bringing this issue to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Armenian genocide is one of the great tragedies of our century.

Beginning on the night of April 24 in 1915, the religious and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community of Constantinople were taken from their beds, imprisoned, tortured, and killed.

In the days that followed, the remaining males over 15 years of age were gathered in cities, towns and villages throughout Ottoman Turkey, roped together, marched to nearby uninhabited areas, and killed.

Innocent women and children were forced to march through barren wastelands—urged on by whips and clubs—denied food and water.

And when they dared to step out of line, they were repeatedly attacked, robbed, raped—and ultimately killed.

When all was said and done, one and one-half million Armenians lay dead, and a homeland which has stood for 3,000 years was nearly completely depopulated.

Mr. Chairman, we bring this amendment to the floor with the knowledge that all of us have a responsibility to remember the victims, to speak out and to make sure that tragedies like this are never allowed to happen again.

We must pause today and say ''Never again.''

We can never forget that in 1939, another leader used the Armenian genocide as justification for his own genocide.

This leader said, and I quote: ''I have given orders to my Death Units to exterminate without mercy or pity men, women, and children belonging to the Polish-speaking race. After all,'' Adolf Hitler asked, ''who today remembers the extermination of the Armenians?''

Mr. Chairman, it is up to all of us to remember.

For centuries, the Armenian people have shown courage and great strength.

The least we can do is match their courage with our commitment.

Because today, we must be their voices.

If we don't remember, nobody else will.

Mr. Chairman, some may say this amendment will alter our relationship with Turkey, and I agree—it will.

It will give the Turkish government an opportunity to join with us in acknowledging the Armenian genocide.

Such an acknowledgement will help to open the door to improved relations in the region.

We know from ethnic conflicts around the world that differences are hard to set aside until history, no matter how tragic, is acknowledged. Only then can the healing process begin.

Today, let us follow the example of Elie Wiesel, the noted Nobel Peace Prize Laureate and Holocaust survivor, who said this about the Armenian genocide:

''. . . The Turks should have understood the pain and the anger of the Armenians who are denied the right to remember . . . The Turks today are not responsible for the bloody events that took place 50 years earlier, but they are responsible for their present attitudes regarding these events.''

Mr. Chairman, this is our opportunity to confirm the historical record. This is about human rights. It's about historical fact. As this century draws to a close, we cannot allow these tragic events to be erased from our memory.

Support this amendment and stand for those who count on us to be their voices.

□ 1915

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. We have already had the Visclosky amendment, and we have treated a NATO ally, a very strong NATO ally, in such a manner that, frankly, we would not dare treat other allies or other members of the world community.

But this amendment takes an act, certainly an atrocity, that was committed by an entirely different government almost 100 years ago and takes a much newer country and rubs their noses in the acts that happened so very long ago. It is just incredible, it is wrong-headed, it is bad policy. I urge that Members vote against this. It is a destructive measure which will do nothing but offend a great ally of the United States and jeopardize our Nation's security.

The measure withholds ESF moneys to Turkey unless the Turkish Government acknowledges the Armenian genocide and takes steps to honor the memory of its victims. Do we require any other nation to admit to blatant political statements? Of course not. This language does not belong in this or any other measure.

The bill already caps ESP at $25 million. It is less than half of the administration's request. The intent of this language is simple: embarrass a valuable ally for whatever political purposes or otherwise, depending on who our constituents may be.

If adopted, the language will eliminate all ESF funding for Turkey. While some in this Chamber are in favor of this, it will have a devastating impact on Turkey.

ESF funding for Turkey is extremely important. The funds will simply be used to help them address long-term structural reforms necessary to sustain growth and ease their entry into the European Customs Union. The funds will also be used to help offset the economic cost associated with the enforcement of U.S. sanctions against Iraq, and I should remind Members that the bill already significantly reduces the amount available for Turkey.

Turkey is, again, one of our most strong and most steadfast NATO allies. The strategic importance to the United States is immense. General Shalikashvili said it best: ''Turkey occupies the new front line in the post-Cold War era. The strategic value to the United States of having a staunch and steadfast ally situated in a critical and strategic location in the flanks of the Middle East cannot be overstated.''

Turkey has stood with the U.S. during a number of troubling times for our Nation. During the Gulf war she was extremely important. They were one of the first countries to participate in the U.N.-sanctioned embargo of Iraq. This cost them over $20 billion. To this day the negative effects and financial loss are still being felt. Turkey allowed the use of NATO air bases, where over 2,700 strike missions against Iraq were launched. Without the use of these air bases we would not have been able to achieve the victory over Iraq without accruing greater expenses or suffering more casualties.

Since the Gulf war, Turkey's importance in assistance has grown highlighted by their hosting ''Operation Provide Comfort'' to protect Iraqi Kurds since its inception after the Gulf war; participating in the mission to Bosnia by training the Bosnian army, thereby furthering the critical goal of achieving military parity in the region; signing a military agreement with Israel which provides for joint military cooperation and securing Caspian oil reserves for Western consumption. These reserves provide a viable alternative to OPEC dependency.

Turkey is making serious progress in the area of human rights. It is important to point out that they are one of the only Muslim countries—if not the only Muslim country—with a free press, independent judiciary and all elements of a secular parliamentary democracy. They have established a human rights commission and a human rights ministry designed to monitor human rights. They are a signatory of the United Nations and European Conventions against torture.

Turkey has also instituted many legal reforms that reduce pretrial detention, enforce a detainee's rights to counsel at all stages of detention and ban unethical methods of interrogation such as torture. One point that is often forgotten in the debate is in the presence of a terrorist organization, the PKK, in Turkey.

The State Department's report on human rights situation in Turkey, while it raised many concerns about the situation there, did raise some important points. Continued U.S. support for Turkey is essential, and the PKK represents a major threat to Turkey's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

It would be wrong for us, Mr. Chairman, to include in this bill such inflammatory language as this amendment poses on Turkey.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LIVINGSTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Whether one supports aid to Turkey or not, one should agree that this is not the forum for such rhetoric. The substance of this amendment has been defeated time and time again in years past, and it should be defeated again.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this year marks the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide, an act of mass murder that took 1.5 million Armenian lives and led to the exile of the Armenian Nation from its historic homeland.

It is of vital importance that we never forget what happened to the Armenian people. Indeed the only thing we can do for the victims is to remember, and we forget at our own peril.

The Armenian genocide, which began 15 years after the start of the twentieth century, was the first act of genocide of this century, but it was far from the last. The Armenian genocide was followed by the Holocaust, Stalin's purges, and other acts of mass murder around the world.

Adolf Hitler himself said that the world's indifference to the slaughter in Armenia indicated that there would be no global outcry if he undertook the mass murder of Jews and others he considered less than human. And he was right. It was only after the Holocaust that the cry ''Never again'' arose throughout the world. But it was too late for millions of victims. Too late for the 6 million Jews. Too late for the 1.5 million Armenians.

Unfortunately, there are still some who refuse to admit that this genocide occurred. The Turkish Government has actively denied that the Armenian genocide happened. This amendment will encourage the Turkish Government to end this campaign of denial and recognize the suffering of the Armenian people.

Mr. Speaker, after the genocide, the Armenian people cried out, ''Let us never forget. Let us always remember the atrocities that have taken the lives of our parents and our children and our neighbors.'' I rise today to make sure that those cries were not uttered in vain.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I know that the gentlewoman is concerned about the genocide, as we all should be, by an event that happened almost a hundred years ago. But does the gentlewoman feel that the country of Israel, whose constituents suffered greatly at the hand of the Holocaust, as the gentlewoman well knows, is any less interested in such genocide. Is she aware that Israel has just engaged in some very close negotiations for a warm relationship with Turkey?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to know that, and I am pleased that there has been some negotiations and discussions and important arrangements made for security between Israel and Turkey, and I would hope that this amendment would encourage the Turks to certainly acknowledge the Armenian genocide and would take a stronger role in freeing Cyprus and in speaking out and acting against some of the human rights abuses.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, the importance of Turkey, in fact, in our regional needs. I understand the importance of Turkey as an important ally. And what we hope to do with this amendment, as with other actions that we hope to take, is send a very strong signal to Turkey although they are an important ally, they must certainly stand up and speak out against all kinds of human rights abuses.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would yield further, perhaps the gentlewoman read the article appearing in the local press about 4 or 5 days ago in which it was indicated that actually Turkey is strengthening its ties with Israel because the United States, for whatever reason, is proving to be a much less reliable ally?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. Certainly I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, the only point I wanted to make very briefly is, as my colleagues know, in the same way that the German Government, which today of course, as my colleagues know, could hardly be seen as the successor to the Nazi regime, constantly makes reference and apologizes for what the Nazis did to the Jews and other people in Eastern Europe, and as a result we have a very cleansing effect, if my colleagues will, on the German people and on the German nation. We would like to see the Turkish Government do the same thing. They are the successor to the Ottoman government. Rather than every time we write to them or bring up the genocide, they are coming back to us and saying, and I will do it from my own experience, that it never occurred; that they would acknowledge that this happened in their history and go through this same cleansing process.

So I think the example of the Nazi Holocaust means that they should acknowledge it, not that they should reject that it ever occurred. And I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

☐ 1930

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. BUNN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether we are here to set foreign policy or we are here to have a history lesson, but we are getting quite a history lesson today. Others will talk about the negatives of the Ottoman Empire, without question, but there are some other things that are left out in the discussion.

For example, when we are told about the Nazi regime and the current German Government, if we looked at a map of Germany before and after the war, it would look fairly similar. If we looked at the Ottoman Empire before and after, we would not see anything that was even close. The Ottoman Empire included Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, and many other territories.

The Ottomans chose the wrong allies in World War I. Their enemies, who were our allies, were not just in the war to defeat the Ottomans, they were also in the war to possess the Ottoman lands. Italy, Greece, France, England,

Russia, and others eyed the territory of the Ottoman Empire. Russia wanted Constantinople, which was the key to controlling access to the Black Sea. France wanted, and got, Syria and Lebanon. England wanted Iraq and the Persian coast to protect their interests in India.

With the defeat in World War I, Mr. Chairman, the Ottoman Empire ceased to exist. It was not just one government following another. The empire ceased to exist, just as the Byzantine Empire before them no longer existed. The Sultan had been forced to surrender to the European powers, and the European powers were in the process of dividing the spoils. A group of Turks, led by Ataturk, were unwilling to have their land occupied by conquering armies, so they raised their own force and fought the authority of the Sultan and of the European powers. Turkey was born from this effort.

Mr. Chairman, today's democracy in Turkey is no more responsible for the actions of the Ottoman Empire than the Soviet Union was responsible for the actions of the czars or the United States was responsible for the actions of England before the birth of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, history is important and it should not be ignored, but neither should we dig up something from 80 years ago and ask a nation that did not exist to apologize for what it did not do.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I would like to tell Members why. I think it is very important for us to note, and every opportunity we have we should take advantage of, to reject genocide wherever it occurs.

Sadly, more than 80 years after the commencement of the Armenian genocide by the Ottoman Turkish Government, the present-day Turkish Government, and indeed, it is a separate government, not only denies the occurrence of the genocide, but also has initiated a well-financed campaign to distort and tarnish the American historical record on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, passage of this amendment will serve to deter the Turkish government from pursuing their unconscionable coverup of this internationally recognized crime against humanity. But do not take my word for it. Let us reference some American Presidents and how they referred to the Armenian genocide.

President Reagan, at the remembrance of victims of the Holocaust on April 22, 1981, said:

> Like the genocide of the Armenians before it, and the genocide of the Cambodians which followed it, and like too many other persecutions of too many other people, the lessons of the Holocaust must never be forgotten.

In 1990, April 20, President Bush said:

> Their history, though marked by a number of tragedies, nonetheless reflects their faith and strength and the resilience of their tradition. Those tragedies include,

and we are talking about the Armenians now,

> their tragedies include most prominently the terrible massacre suffered in 1915 to 1923 at the hands of the rulers of the Ottoman Empire. I call upon all peoples to work to prevent future acts of inhumanity against mankind, and my comments of June, 1988, reflect the depth of my feeling for the Armenian people and the suffering they have endured.

President Clinton said on April 24, 1996:

> I join with Armenians around the world on this solemn day in commemorating the senseless deportation and massacres of 1.5 million Armenians that took place from 1915 to 1923 under the Ottoman Empire. Tragically, our century has repeatedly born witness to man's senseless inhumanity to man. Together we mourn the terrible loss of so many innocent lives.

There are two issues here, Mr. Chairman. One is the issue of the Armenian genocide. And yes, we should not hold this Government responsible for something that happened 80 years ago. But we can ask this Government not to try to revise history. We can ask this government to stop its campaign to distort the historical record on the Armenian genocide. That is why this amendment is so important. I have heard it characterized a variety of different ways, that it would stop assistance to Turkey, et cetera. That is why I would like to read the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

It says:

> Not more than $22 million of the funds appropriated in this act under the heading ''economic support fund'' may be made available to the government of Turkey, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the Government of Turkey has (1) joined the United States in acknowledging the atrocity committed against the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1923; and (2) has taken all appropriate steps to honor the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide.

So this is not about eliminating assistance to Turkey. This is about cutting back from $25 million to $22 million. Once gain, I think it is most appropriate for this Congress to follow the lead of a bipartisan list of American Presidents and the bipartisan support that we have had on this issue for a long period of time in making our message clear to the Turkish Government, that while we need them as an ally and we respect the progress they are making in human rights, the fact is that their strategic location or the fact of the Islamic fundamentalism in their country is no license for them to try to revise the history of the Armenian genocide, not to disregard the rights of the people in Armenia for humanitarian assistance by their blockade of Armenia.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, tonight I rise to offer my strong support for this important amendment that is before us here today. The amendment we will vote on recognizes the Armenian genocide by simply reducing the amount of economic aid available to Turkey until they acknowledge the horrible events that occurred during the Armenian genocide.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who are offering this amendment know full well that Turkey is a strong ally and a strategic ally of the United States, but the $3 million reduced represents a minimal amount of aid. Turkey will still be eligible to receive $22 million overall. It certainly does not in any way restrict the President in the conduct of our foreign policy, and it does not place Turkey at an economic disadvantage. Furthermore, it does not touch one penny of military aid.

What it does do, Mr. Chairman, is link economic aid to Turkey's willingness to confront its history and acknowledge the Armenian genocide as a terrible event in the history of the Ottoman Empire that should not be brushed aside cavalierly. Consistently and unfortunately, our ally, Turkey, has neglected to acknowledge the Armenian genocide. I recognize that this is a difficult issue, political issue, in Turkey. However, the genocide of 1.5 million innocent people deserves recognition by this House of Representatives. No one today denies the Holocaust of Eastern Europe; at least no one worthy of our attention or respect.

Similarly, no one should deny the Armenian genocide. We are not trying to assign blame, but merely trying to bring attention to a consistent pattern of ignoring the truth and denying historical fact. History is important, and as we have been told, those who forget history are condemned to repeat it. Genocide is a word that we should take very seriously, that makes the soul recoil, and in some ways language refuses to describe it.

Mr. Chairman, tonight I am proud to join with my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] in supporting this amendment and honoring the memories of those who perished in this genocide, and encouraging and urging our friend and ally, Turkey, to acknowledge this fact of history.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment, and I commend my colleagues for bringing it to the floor.

Earlier today, we debated and overwhelmingly passed a bipartisan amendment that will cut United States economic assistance to Turkey unless that nation allows humanitarian aid to flow to Armenia. Turkey, an ally to the United States, can and must take a humane step and end its blockade of Armenia. In the same vein, Turkey can and must end its blockade of history. The Armenian genocide was a fact.

The genocide was substantiated by detailed press accounts of the day, as well as by thousands of pages of documents from historical archives all over the world. I have personally sat down with constituents who survived the genocide and listened to their tragic stories.

We all read recently about a Princeton University professor who is the leading academic spokesman for those who deny the Armenian genocide. It was troubling to learn, of course, that his research is bought and paid for by the Turkish Government.

Turkey must stop its historical revisionism. By once and for all acknowledging the crimes against humanity committed by the Ottoman Empire, Turkey will take a great stride forward in its international relations. And Turkey would take a great stride forward for the simple cause of truth and human decency.

Let us make sure that this great House speaks out tonight for truth and justice.

Support the Radanovich-Bonior amendment.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have never heard of such a modest request, more simple in form or in substance. The Armenian people simply want recorded in history what every schoolchild learns at the earliest stages of their education. They seek no revenge and they come forward with no rancor. They recognize that the dead die twice when the crimes against them are not recorded.

In this case, not a few individuals, not just simply a few forgotten souls, but hundreds of thousands, indeed in excess of 1 million, a whole people helplessly locked inside churches, surrounded in villages, hunted down in the streets, the Armenian people suffered the first great genocide of the 20th century.

To some it is a distant part of history, but to those who still live with the memories, to those who lost mothers and fathers and other relatives, it is a haunting nightmare. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, for those who care about history, and here in the final days of the 20th century are committed to the concept that the worst of our time will not be repeated, it is more than relevant. The Armenian genocide is compelling.

Indeed, the story has been told every year in which I have served in this Congress, and it will be told every year until justice is done. In contemplating the genocide against the Jews, Hitler's first question was, ''Who remembers the Armenians?''

Today I come to my colleagues and I ask again, who is to remember the Jews, the Cambodians, the Bosnians, all the lost souls of history, if every despot and dictator in our time and in the ages to come can believe that their crimes will ever be forgotten, because if they are forgotten, then in the eyes of history, they are forgiven.

Mr. Chairman, there are some things that must never be forgotten. Crimes against humanity are one of them. I know every Member of this House wants only friendship with the Turkish people. They have been our ally. They have stood with America. But earlier tonight, in arguing on the corridor act, we asked justice in that it is a despicable crime to deny humanitarian assistance to those who are suffering. At other times we cite the occupation of Cyprus, aggression in the Aegean, crimes against the Kurds. There is a compelling argument that a pattern is developing with the Turkish people against her neighbors.

□ 1945

It began with the Armenians. It continues against the Cypriots and the Kurds, and in this Congress we do no favor to our friends in Turkey to deny this simple truth.

So tonight, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment vowing that every Member of this House, every year until it is done. We will rise until justice is done for the Armenian people and history is written as history occurred.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have debated the so-called Armenian genocide issue for the past 13 years. I can remember when I stood at this table with a stack of books this high from historical experts who had studied the so-called Armenian genocide and took issue with the findings of the majority of the speakers here tonight. They do not believe the conclusions that have been reached by the legislation that has been proposed. The fact is, there was a lot of killing on both sides, and there is enough blame to go around. There is no question that a lot of Armenians were killed, but there were also a lot of Turkish people that were killed as well.

Now, the fact of the matter is, there is a divergence of opinion on this issue. Historians from the Middle East come to different conclusions about the issue. And for us to start penalizing an ally like Turkey when there is this huge division of opinion among historical experts, historians, just does not make any sense to me. I could see us kicking somebody in the teeth who is an enemy of the United States, but to go back 70 years, 80 years and start dredging up old wounds and old issues that is going to divide the people in that part of the world makes no sense to me. It just makes no sense whatsoever.

If there was conclusive evidence that the Armenian genocide did take place the way it is depicted here tonight, then I would say let us go ahead with it. But there is a huge divergence of opinion. We had a hearing before the international operations committee just a few weeks ago and we had historians from Turkey, historians from other parts of the Middle East who made it their life's goal to get to the bottom of all of this, and they had very strong differing opinions. It was split right down the middle. So for the U.S. Congress to take one position on this, the position that is being proposed here tonight and penalizing one of the best allies we have, Turkey, makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Indiana is schooled on foreign affairs and I know that perhaps he has the answers to these questions, but the thought has occurred to me, we have just, at the behest of the President of the United States, opened up diplomatic relationships with Vietnam. Was there any precondition that the Vietnamese own up to the massive numbers of people that they killed in the revolutions of the last 40 years?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. There was absolutely none. As a matter of fact, 2,300 POW–MIA's were not accounted for, as every President before demanded.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And perhaps the gentleman could tell me, has there every been any condition on Boris Yeltsin to own up to the terrible genocide imposed by the Stalin regime against 30 million Russian people and perhaps no telling how many Polish people and other people throughout the CIS today?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No, there was none.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Was there any precondition on foreign aid going to Russia?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. There was no precondition whatsoever.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. As a matter of fact, was there any precondition on any assistance that we might have sent to our allies of today penalizing the French for what Napoleon might have done or for the British or for what the British Empire might have done throughout the world when they controlled the world, or any despot that might have lived in the last 150 years? Is the gentleman aware of any other country that we have penalized for something that happened 100 years ago or more and said that we are simply not going to honor our commitments to them as a modern day ally?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. My colleague makes a very, very valid point. What we are doing is dredging up an issue that happened 70 years ago, if it happened at all, and there is a divergence of opinion, and we are penalizing a friend based upon that erroneous information. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. These is a big distinction between what the gentleman was

citing and what we are talking about here today. We are talking about a crime against humanity, genocide. We are talking about a country that made a concerted effort to wipe out a people and a country that has refused to recognize that that occurred.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I have studied this issue and debated this issue for 13 years, and I am telling you that we have brought history book after history book after history book and stuck them up on this table, and there is a strong divergence of opinion about what happened, and that is the problem. Therein lies the problem, because there is no conclusive evidence on one side or the other, and for us to penalize our friends because of inconclusive evidence makes no sense.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this debate tonight is not over really whether or not Turkey or some people in Turkey some 80 years ago performed an atrocity on some people. There is no doubt. History documents that. They tell us that that is the fact. We agree that it was an atrocity, all of us here tonight. So the debate is not whether or not the atrocity took place, but whether or not this is 1996 or 1923. Yes, the atrocities took place, but at the same time it is not what took place then, it is what is taking place today.

If we are going to demand that Turkey apologize for something that took place that many decades ago, why do we not at the same time we praise them for some of the good things that they have done? Why do we not look at the fact that history has reflected that Turkey has been a loyal NATO ally for decades? Why are we not praising Turkey for its essential support during the gulf war when it saved thousands of Americans lives? Why are we not standing by Turkey because they stood by us. When the Soviet Union was shattering their borders, they stood by us.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] made an excellent point. Today's Turks did not commit these atrocities. Today's Turks are hosting Provide Comfort to provide Iraqi Kurds comfort from Saddam Hussein. Today's Turks signed a military agreement with Israel, a key United States ally in the Middle East. Today's Turks are sworn to fight on the side of American soldiers to protect our interests in Europe. Today's Turks saved hundreds of American lives during the gulf war.

This amendment is an unbalanced amendment, and it fails to differentiate the past from the future. Why do we not, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] suggested, talk about Vietnam? We are trying now to do some business with Vietnam to open trade relations. Why are we not demanding an apology from them? We are trying to build power plants in North Korea to stop them from nuclear proliferation of power plants. Why are we not first demanding from them before we go in there with KEDO and say you, you must issue an apology to the United States of America? Why are we not doing it to Japan? Why are we not doing it to Germany? Why are we just picking on Turkey?

Mr. Chairman, I do not stand here and defend for one minute the fact that these atrocities took place, but I do stand here and defend this bill and to tell you that this is 1996. Our military, our national government is insisting and hoping that we will let them handle foreign policy, we will let them address this issue. Sooner or later, they will apologize. But it should not be in this piece of legislation. Let us not send a message to the world that just because you did something 60, 70, 80, 100 years ago that we are not going to consider you in ally anymore, but rather we are going to condemn you.

This is a good bill as it stands. We already have one limiting amendment to Turkey already, and this one just goes a little too far. So we worked hard, we worked long, we tried to reach some reasonable agreement on both sides of the aisle with respect to all of the issues in this bill, and I would encourage this body to reject this amendment because it simply goes too far, and unnecessarily so.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment for all the reasons that have been outlined by the chair and others, but for some others as well.

If we are going to talk about history, I would urge new Members particularly not to make some of the mistakes of history, mistakes such as I made. I voted for this amendment the first time I was here, my first session, and then I started to look at it more thoroughly. Please, before you vote on this, look at a map, a map of the world, and look at Turkey and look at where Turkey is situated. Of course, it was even more clear-cut in the old days, the old days being what, 5 years ago. It was even more clear-cut that it was the Soviet Union that we were up against and Turkey was like a knife blade in the flank of the Soviet Union, listing posts for us, staging area, but someone that we counted upon as we contended with the Soviet menace. Well, of course, we do not have that anymore. But we do have a very, very real situation in the world today.

Continue to look at that map, because while you are looking at the former Soviet Union, you are also looking at a nation that borders Iran, a nation that borders Iraq, a nation in its proximity to Syria, all very bad actors on the world scene. Yet this is a nation that we are going to drag up a 70- or 80-year dispute that is intensive, that is vitriolic, that is red hot to all parties involved, and we are going to insert ourselves right in the middle of it? It is insane to me.

I also ask my colleagues to look at the present day situation in Turkey. Turkey is not a stable country. We like to think that it is, but its democracy is undergoing some rough times right now as it deals with what some of those bordering nations have not dealt with very well, as it deals with the pressure of modern day fundamentalism, the fundamentalist Muslim movement that threatened the government when it was up for election this time.

In the last election, which was fairly recently, within the last year, the Prime Minister's party lost, that party which was sympathetic to the United States. There is a coalition that has been cobbled together. That coalition incidentally may fall, based upon some things that have happened recently. That coalition was cobbled together. In many ways, that is all that stands between having a secular state and one that is a Muslim fundamentalist state, another state which, incidentally, you will not have to have this debate, because if that happens, Turkey will no longer be on the board as an ally of the United States.

I do not have to go too far back to the Persian Gulf War, if we all remember 500,000 men and women from the United States in the Persian Gulf fighting against Saddam Hussein. Who was the person we were looking to then for a lot of our assistance? It was Turkey. Where is it that we still have a lot of our materiel based right now? It is Turkey. Yet, this is a nation that we are going to bring up this historical dispute, kick around a little bit, threaten governments and say, I am sure things will be the same as normal.

I do not know about the history of it. Genocide is terrible wherever it occurs, and everyone is going to have to form his or her own opinions. I do think that the chairman, full committee chairman and others have pointed out that there are many other instances of genocide as well where similar action has not been taken. But I can tell you this. There are going to be a lot of us that deeply regret this resolution passing, if indeed it passes, if indeed it should be enacted. We will cause, simply by passing this resolution in the House, particularly based upon what occurred just a few minutes ago, by passing this resolution will be enough to cause significant mischief in the foreign relations between this country and Turkey.

Mr. Chairman, I just beg my colleagues not to pass this resolution. I would once again urge new Members, those of you who have been here less than 4 years, please, please, go look at that map before you come over to this floor for a vote and look at the significance of the vote you are casting.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will ensure that the 1.5 million victims of the Armenian genocide will not be forgotten. By telling their history and evoking their names we protect them and indeed ourselves from those who would willfully erase from history their lives and the tragic events which occurred between 1915 and 1923.

As with the Nazi Holocaust, we have a responsibility to society to recount the history of the Armenian genocide so that we do not forget its victims and so that we remember man's capacity to destroy others who differ in their opinions, race, religion or ethnicity.

Genocide is the most egregious crime. It is not a crime of passion or revenge, but rather of hate—its innocent victims are guilty only of being born to a different mother.

Since 1923 Turkey has virtually denied the Armenian genocide. There has been no justice and there were no Nuremberg trials for the victims and the families of the Armenian genocide. This amendment is not about cutting aid to Turkey, it is about justice for Turkey's Armenian victims.

Ralph Waldo Emerson tells us:

The history of persecution is a history of endeavors to cheat nature, to make water run up hill, to twist a rope of sand. The martyr cannot be dishonored. Every lash inflicted is a tongue of fame, every prison a more illustrious abode; every burned book or house enlightens the world; every suppressed or expunged word reverberates through the earth from side to side. Hours of sanity and consideration are always arriving to communities, as to individuals when truth is seen and martyrs are justified.

This amendment gives us an opportunity to make the words of Mr. Emerson true. Support the victims and the families of the Armenian genocide and support this amendment.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this very important amendment introduced by Rep. RADANOVICH. The Armenian genocide of 1915–1923 is a tragic event that should never have taken place. This amendment simply states that the country of Turkey should recognize the devastating event that took place 81 years ago as a genocide. It is of vital importance that we do not allow any country to view this event casually.

This amendment would ensure that Turkey take steps to honor the memories of the victims of Armenian genocide. Turkey must come to terms with this tragic event in history. Not only would this amendment enable Turkey to properly remember those who were brutally killed by the Ottoman Empire, it will open doors for full diplomatic relations between Turkey and Armenia.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would not only persuade the Turks to properly recognize the Armenian genocide, it would lay the groundwork for a peaceful existence for future generations in those two countries. This amendment does not change history, it simply asks the Turks to join those who still live with the nightmare and brutal memories of what happened to Armenian people over 80 years ago.

I urge my colleagues to support this honorable amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Bonior amendment. It presents a practical approach for Turkey to finally come to terms with a terrible chapter in the Armenian genocide.

Eighty-one years is far far too long to deny the deaths of 1.5 million Armenians. And yet to this day, the Government of Turkey has remained silent—a silence that is deafening.

The Bonior amendment provides a proper incentive for Turkey to finally end the silence. It also sends a message throughout the world that despots cannot and will not get away with crimes against humanity.

History shows that we cannot forget the past lest we be doomed to repeat it. Only through remembering and acknowledging the past can we stop such horrible crimes against humanity from happening again. I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

□ 2000

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 97, after line 5, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR INDIA

SEC. 573. Not more than $48,674,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available to the Government of India, or to nongovernmental organizations and private voluntary organizations operating within India.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we have talked about human rights violations that may or may not have taken place 70 years ago, but what I want to talk about tonight are human rights violations that are taking place today.

First of all, let me just say if we were not even talking about human rights violations, this amendment would make sense, because what it does is it freezes assistance to India at last year's spending level. We are not cutting the aid to India, the developmental assistance, we are just freezing it at last year's spending level.

The administration and the bill chose to raise it by $8.3 million. So what we are doing really is not cutting anything, we are just freezing spending at last year's level, but it will save $8.3 million because we are not going to allow the increase. So if for no other reason than the fiscal impact, this bill makes some sense.

But let us talk about what is going on in India today in a place called Kashmir, Punjab, Nagaland, and elsewhere. More than 150,000 Sikhs have been killed by the Indian regime since 1984. This includes more than 40,000 killed in the Delhi massacre, over 20,000 killed in the Golden Temple attack, and 25,000 killings documented by other leaders over there. India has also killed over 200,000 Christians in Nagaland since 1947 and more than 40,000 Muslims in Kashmir since 1988 and tens of thousands of Tamils and others.

According to the U.S. State Department, between 1991 and 1993 the Indian regime paid over 41,000 cash bounties to police officers for killing innocent people, Sikhs. Women in Kashmir, because of their Muslim beliefs, are taken out in the middle of the night, their husbands are held at gun point in their homes, and the women are gang-raped, and many of those women commit suicide or leave the country because of the shame that is brought upon them. This is happening today.

This picture shows a picture of a man who has been disemboweled and tortured. His arm has been burned severely, he has been disemboweled, there are burns on his side. This is what the Indian occupied troops are doing in Kashmir and Punjab. They have 550,000 troops in Kashmir, they have 550,000 troops in Punjab, and this goes on daily.

Recently, I want to read to my colleagues what happened when a fellow was stopped. One of the leaders was stopped, he was taken out of his car and he was killed. They took his driver, they tied his legs, one to one car and one to the other, and they drove off in different directions and cut him in two.

This is not baloney, folks, this is really happening, and it is happening at the hands of the Indian Government. We are our brother's keeper. We should be concerned about human rights violations wherever they take place in the world. We may have some differences of opinion on what happened 60, 70, 80 years ago, but today in India, In Kashmir and Punjab, this is taking place. This is happening right now.

They drained some canals in Punjab and Kashmir, and they found hundreds of bodies with their hands tied together and their feet bound, and they were thrown in the canal and drowned. They estimate, according to reports that we have, that almost every single person that is taken into prison in Punjab and in Kashmir is tortured. This goes on every single day.

We might say, well, if that is happening, why does the world not know about it? Well, Amnesty International is not allowed in there. Other human rights groups are not allowed in there. Television cameras are not allowed in there, and so the world does not see it.

Now, if Congressmen go over there and they seem to have a bias toward India, what they will do is they will take them out there with Indian troops and Indian guides, and they will go through to talk to people. But those people will not respond because they are afraid they will be tortured or punished later on if they say anything in front of the Indian officials that are with the traveling people that come in there.

The fact of the matter is that area should be opened up. The world should be able to see. If they could see what is going on in Punjab and Kashmir and Nagaland, the world would shudder, because it is as bad as what was going on in Bosnia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we have talked about this before, and I know I have a lot of my colleagues who have Indian constituencies who are going to stand up here tonight and say all of this is baloney and it is not really happening. Well, I want to tell my colleagues I have had CIA informational reports, I have had other documented reports that have come into my office over the last 13 years, and I am convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that these things are occurring.

All I am asking tonight is to send a signal. I am not saying cut off all developmental aid to India, I am not saying cut off every dollar, although I think we should. We should not be supporting a regime like that. But what I am saying is let us just send one little signal to the Indian Government that the United States Congress does not want to stand still for human rights violations, and the way to do that is to freeze spending at last year's spending level. We are not even asking to cut it. Just freeze it at last year's level and do not give them an $8.3 million increase.

The people over there every night go to bed in fear for their lives, not knowing if they are going to be dragged out in the middle of the night to be tortured or killed or raped. It is time to at least give them some solace by letting them know that the Congress of the United States does care about human rights and does care about what is going on in that part of the world.

I do not care if human rights violations take place in Africa, in India or anyplace else, we should be concerned and we should send a signal, and we should not be rewarding that kind of activity. So I would just like to say to my colleagues in closing, let us send a little signal tonight, a little small signal saying we do not tolerate this sort of action.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know that my colleague from Indiana is extremely serious about the matter that he brings to the attention of the body this evening. I would only urge upon him when we discuss human rights around the world that we be mindful also of human rights violations within the confines of the United States.

I listened actively to the debate a moment ago about asking the Turks to apologize for atrocities that took place some years ago against Armenians and many Members will come to vote on that rollcall vote with this country never having apologized to black folk in this country for slavery in this country, and I am not talking about the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. I am talking about the country. We need to be very cautious when these elections are taking place like in Turkey and in India and we recognize the value of these countries for a variety of reasons.

Right here in our country, for example, there is no massive outcry in this body—there is among some Members—about church burnings that are taking place in the South at black churches. So let us get a little careful before we throw stones.

I rise in opposition, Mr. Chairman, to my good friend DAN BURTON's amendment. This marks the third year that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will submit an amendment that singles out India for punitive treatment. Ironically he was on the floor a moment ago arguing about others singling out treatment for Turkey. It sounds to me like a whole lot of political pandering is going on in this body. These alleged claims of India's human rights violations, despite the fact that the State Department has praised India for its progress in this area, have always been based on outdated and mistaken information. Yet this year these attacks will be especially damaging to United States-India relations in light of India's recent economic reforms.

Present the United States is India's largest trading partner with investments reaching $5 billion this year. United States firms such as General Motors, McDonnell Douglas, GE, AT&T, Boeing, and Citicorp, major investors in India, are taking advantage of its strong intellectual property rights laws and highly skilled work force, many of whom are in the United States of America. The Enron Oil & Gas Co., which I received, as did a lot of Members, a letter from dated June 3, has three plants throughout India which together make Enron the largest non-Indian energy developer in India. Such investments are currently possible as India is taking increasing steps away from a command and control economy. Yet DAN BURTON's amendment would send the wrong signals to India, discouraging it from continuing with these reforms and improving its economic ties with these United States companies.

My good friend's amendment also ignores that India is not only the world's largest democracy but has just completed the world's largest free and popular election ever. Our foreign policy should be aimed at encouraging democracy rather than punishing it with unjust punitive measures, and I caution my friends with reference to the Turkish matter that they be mindful of elections and the results there as well.

Finally, my good friend's attacks on India's human rights record is not consistent with its ongoing improvements in this area. An independent human rights commission found the Indian Government to be cooperative and consistently complying with the proposals and reforms of its human rights commission.

India, the world's largest democracy, is currently taking tremendous strides to open its economy and improve its relations with the United States. I believe that your amendment caps development assistance but it does nothing but damage these relations by sending the wrong signals to India's Government as well as hurting our own American companies that are already working to make future projects possible in a truly promising market.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. First of all Mr. Chairman, let me thank my colleague for yielding. I would like to say that there is money to be made in India. I will not discount that fact. There is a lot of American companies who want to go over there and are over there making money and they are very concerned because they have an ax to grind. But the fact remains that human rights atrocities are taking place in Punjab, Kashmir, Nagaland, and elsewhere. When we were talking about Turkey just a few short minutes ago, we were talking about something that may or may not have occurred. There is a big divergence of opinion among historians in Turkey.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I might conclude, my concern is these human rights violations do occur. All I want to do tonight is send a signal to the Indian government that we do not approve and that there ought to be some change in policy. It is not punitive from the standpoint that we are penalizing them because we are not cutting the aid they got last year by one dime. We are only not allowing them to get an increase.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I just suggest not only as pertains to India but elsewhere around the world, and I do not accuse the gentleman from Indiana of being arrogant, but very often we start because of our parochial or personal political considerations to point fingers at others. We would almost be in a position of not being able to do any business anywhere in the world if we were to just identify human rights violations as the only link that we must have considered before we do business.

We are getting ready to do MFN China, we do business with Russia, we do business all over this world. With Nigeria we have on one decertification

link; Pakistan, we do not on another and I have not even reached South America. I could go on and on.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been involved in working with India for the past, oh, 7, 8, or 9 years now and the beginning of that relationship was because of the great work that was being done there as well as here in trying to combat the rising tide of international terrorism. But in that process, I have learned a lot about India and I have watched the development of a relationship between the United States and India which has changed and grown and become far greater in terms of the strength and importance to the United States not only as a trading partner with India but also from a strategic and national security standpoint.

□ 2015

I regret to say that the proposal of the gentleman from Indiana tonight would do a great deal to undermine this growing relationship that I believe would be detrimental to not only our trading partner interest but our national security interest. We are seeing today that we have had since 1991 joint military exercises with India. They have a 4,000-mile border with China. China is a very unknown quantity for us in the future.

As our relationship with this great emerging democracy of India has grown and is growing, we need to be secure in knowing that we will have a long-standing and firm relationship in the Near East with a democracy that will be there and be our ally for a long time into the future.

I can describe any number of atrocities that I know have occurred in lots of places in the world, and I do not deny for a minute that we have had some human rights violations in the past in India. But to the best of my knowledge, in doing the research and trying to keep up with this, the Government of India, both past and certainly the new one coming in, which has had nothing to do with that in the past, the one that was just elected recently, but the government that was in charge for quite a number of years has taken great strides to eliminate those violations.

My judgment and observations are that those strides have been very effective. Now to say that every single violation in every place has been eliminated, I could not stand here tonight and tell you that. But I can say that they made great progress. It would be insulting and improper and not a good thing for us to do to go back and slap them in the face.

This same type of proposal was offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], slightly a variation on the terms, for several Congresses, in an effort to criticize and to rebuke India for these perceived violations which are old hat by now.

Yes, we are dealing with the facts of today's world, and I can tell you, looking at the terrorism issue, for example, that there are tremendous problems that exist out in the world in this regard. We have a rising, growing movement of a messianic totalitarian world out there in the Muslim area. We are seeing in Iran and Sudan a grave movement of governments that are going to promote this, to try to take control of their way of looking at things throughout southern Europe, northern Africa, the Middle East, the Near East, all the way to the Philippines. That is a movement that is very strong right now. Most Muslims do not believe in it, but there is a radical group that wants to have those governments.

India has the second largest Muslim population in the world. The same terrorists that have come here to bomb the World Trade Center do not like the life in the United States. They see us as getting in their way. They want to move us out. They want to control all those governments, including ultimately the government of India.

We share a lot of bonds in trying to combat that terrorism, among other things. We share growing bonds of concern over China and perhaps an axis someday, depending upon the results of the elections in Russia, between China and Russia and the threats that come from the destabilization that is going on out there of nuclear controls after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the breakup of the Soviet Union.

What I am saying in short is that between the tremendously new relationship that was described by my colleague from Florida on the trading front with all of the investment of the United States in India and all the Indian trade investments here that have grown over the last 5 or 6 years from a mere $500 million to over $5 billion, we also have in addition to that concern with this Burton amendment the disruption of a growing relationship on the national security front with the country of India. It is something that I just do not think we should risk with this type of an amendment.

There are ways to protest, and we should protest human rights violations anywhere in the world. But I do not think that this is the appropriate place tonight to do it, with all due respect to the gentleman from Indiana, with this amendment. I would strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on the Burton amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me say in its report Dead Silence, the Legacy of Abuses in Punjab, Asia Watch said that over the last 5 years there were between 4,000 and 5,000 people that were tortured in one police station alone, according to a police official there. This is in one police station alone in the last 4 to 5 years in Punjab. We are not even talking about Kashmir.

Let me just say one more thing, if I might, if the gentleman will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCOLLUM was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The inadvertent depiction, I hope, that Muslims in America are out to overthrow our government, at least that is the way I interpreted it.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, I did not say that Muslims in America were out to overthrow our government. I said there is a messianic totalitarian movement in Iran and Sudan that would spread across the world, if it could, and like to capture the control of governments, that India is an important link to stopping that terrorism threat.

I would like to say to the gentleman that Asia Watch has not been accurate about a lot of this in the past. I do not believe they are accurate today about the human rights violations. I would cite that the American Conservative Union, no less, has a paper out today that I have in mind that says we should not be adopting your amendment, that things have changed with India, that we ought to look at the national and international strategic alliance that India's new vibrant democracy provides to us.

While, yes, we do not want to put our heads in the sand about violations of human rights, we have to look out about America's national security interests first. We have to look at reality, which is India is emerging from the past. It is doing a good job now.

We should defeat the Burton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCOLLUM was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I just want to say to my colleague that I have been to a lot of meetings with Christians and Muslims around this country. The Muslims are very sensitive because they feel like they are being depicted as terrorists. Probably 97, 98, 99 percent of them are very patriotic Americans and law abiding. I think it is real important that we in the Congress of the United States bear that in mind when we are debating issues of this magnitude.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would concur with the gentleman completely, and I agree. I do not make speeches anywhere where I do not say something similar to what he said. But that does not take

away from the fact that there is a messianic totalitarian movement of a minority of Muslims to control all Muslim governments in the world, and they are terrorists by nature in how they operate.

They are involved in India. They are involved in wanting to thwart the United States interest in that part of the world, and they are involved in things like bombing the World Trade Center. We have that plus the relationships that I have described with India that we need to keep and maintain. The idea of going in and slapping India's face with this amendment tonight in the face of the need for the new relationships with India is wrong. I urge a vote against the Burton amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. This amendment is not a cutting amendment, rather, it is strictly an attempt to stigmatize India and I think the gentleman from Indiana has essentially said as much. This amendment will unfairly tie the hands of those agencies, including nongovernmental organizations, religious relief efforts, and AID receive U.S. Government assistance. This is the wrong amendment at the wrong time.

Recently the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans, which I cochair with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], hosted a briefing presented by Linda Morse, the India program director from United States AID. Miss Morse also briefed staff of the Asia and Pacific Subcommittee. What we learned was that the AID program in India supports economic growth, child survival, and environmental protection.

At a time when India is 5 years into a economic reform program, the AID program in India is helping with privatization, deregulation, increased foreign investment, and development of capital markets and encouraging competition.

In the past, the gentleman from Indiana has criticized India on human rights and he does so again tonight. Let me report that India's human rights record is steadily improving. An independent National Human Rights Commission with unprecedented powers has been established. The commission has been lauded by many international agencies, including our State Department, for its aggressiveness and independence.

Again last year, the chairman of the Human Rights Commission, a former chief justice of India's Supreme Court, came to Capitol Hill, again under the auspices of the India Caucus and addressed Members and staff. I only wish the gentleman from Indiana had been there to hear about the great progress and what was said. This is the kind of development we would like to see happen in many of India's Asian neighbors.

The Indian Human Rights Commission has won praise by our State Department. Assistant Secretary of State Robin Raphel says the commission ''has surprised the skeptics and begun to establish itself as an effective advocate for human rights.''

During his visit to the United States last year, Mr. Misra, the chairman of India's National Human Rights Commission, met with representatives of Asia Watch, Amnesty International and the International Red Cross. He indicated that there will be progress on these organizations sending representatives to India. Clearly the steps taken by India to remedy human rights problems are far superior to the efforts of India's neighbors; I particularly mention Pakistan and China.

Whether it is market reforms, democracy or human rights, time and again, it is India that is taking the lead in providing a model for other developing countries in Asia and throughout the world.

What I find most disturbing about this amendment is that it set its sights on the wrong target. Under the guise of sending a message to the government of India, the amendment frustrates our ability to work with the Indian people to aid the poorest and neediest people in that country, and to make important economic reforms.

An amendment offered in the name of human rights should not go after the humanitarian programs. This is not the right way to make America's moral persuasion felt around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned that the debate over human rights in India, and specifically in Punjab and Kashmir, seems to focus entirely on one side of the issue. I do not want to get into a debate over which side did what, or who struck first or why. The important distinction is that the Indian Government is being held accountable for actions by its security forces while the separatist groups operate with no accountability at all. By cloaking themselves in the mantle of freedom fighters, these organizations reserve unto themselves the right to strike at civilian targets with impunity.

Many of the militant organizations receive support, both moral and financial as well as arms, from other nations. Most importantly, Pakistan has frequently had links to terrorist organizations in India in a direct attempt to destabilize its neighbor.

Under these conditions, imposing punishment on the Government of India will have the unmistakable effect of encouraging and emboldening those groups which seek by violent means to pursue their separatist agendas. This is the type of behavior we are going to be rewarding with this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has nothing to do with what is really going on in India today, in 1996. We should reject this amendment. If it is necessary to make spending cuts and restructure AID, so be it. But let us base it on fair criteria, not unfairly singling out India for a symbolic slap on the wrist that this emerging country clearly does not deserve.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the Burton amendment. I agree with my good friend from Indiana that India has a very serious human rights problem in Kashmir and the Punjab. Amnesty International and Asia Watch have well-documented proof of torture, rape, and executions by Indian security forces.

But we should not forget that these same human rights organizations also denounce the Muslim terrorists who receive crucial support from elements of the Pakistani Government.

There are no excuses for India's security forces' serious misbehavior. But we must not lose sight of the context of which it is taking place. For the first time in India's history it shares a border with Communist China due to Beijing's illegal and violent occupation of Tibet. For this reason China fuels the fire between India and Pakistan by transferring nuclear weapons production technology and nuclear capable missiles to Pakistan.

India and Kashmir are between a rock and a hard place. The situation is more complicated than what meets the eye. And while the security forces must be stopped from committing its outrageous and inexcusable abuses, we need to find another way to help end the suffering in Kashmir and the Punjab.

Accordingly, I reluctantly oppose my good friend's amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the way the gentleman has presented his arguments. I would just like to ask one question rhetorically and that is this: If you lived in a neighborhood and you were a Muslim in Kashmir and they held you at gunpoint in your home and a bunch of soldiers took your wives down the street, out in the streets and gang raped them, do you think you would want to rebel and fight back?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do, and that is why I criticized the Indian security forces for its abuses.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly urge a vote against any amendment that may be offered to freeze, cut, cap, or condition foreign assistance to India and particularly the amendment currently before the House.

The Burton amendment, if it passes, will do damage to the growing economic and diplomatic relationship between the United States, the world's oldest democracy and India, the world's largest democracy.

While the loss of even one precious life should always be a cause for our

concern, the human rights violations that have been alleged concerning India are greatly overstated.

A 1995 human rights report by the State Department sharply contradicts many of the claims that are being made, particularly those claims about loss of life.

That same 1995 report, moreover, also forcefully praised India for establishing an independent Human Rights Commission under the direction of a former Supreme Court Justice. To date, the Commission has prosecuted more than 200 human rights violations, convicting and imprisoning those security personnel found to be guilty of abuse.

The relationship between the United States and India is growing stronger every day. The United States is now India's largest trading partner and largest investor. United States investment in India has grown by 500 percent in the past 5 years, from $500 million in 1991 to $5 billion this year. American companies, such as GE, Boeing, AT&T, Merrill Lynch, Motorola, and Amoco, are finding the Indian marketplace as large and as vibrant as the marketplace of China.

Unlike China, however, India is a democracy, with the world's largest middle class, an active free press, enforceable property rights, and a common-law legal system.

We should not retard the progress we have made with India during the past 5 years by passing the Burton amendment. There are elements in India who welcome the Burton amendment, elements who would turn back the clock of progress that has been made between our Nation and India. We must not play into their hands.

I strongly urge you to vote no on any amendment that may be offered against India during consideration of the foreign operations bill.

Vote ''no'' on the Burton amendment.

□ 2030

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. The biggest concern I have is this amendment will ostracize India at a very critical point in time.

India is moving forward, as others have said, on important economic reform programs, making it one of the most important big emerging markets. The United States is working to build a stronger relationship with India, and we are now India's largest overseas investor and trading partner.

These steps have come about very strongly in the last 4 or 5 years. These steps help to bring India closer to the United States. This amendment, I believe, is needless and damaging to this progress that is being made to the relationship between the United States and India.

India is a developing country, and it does have problems and the gentleman has alluded to those, as have others. But India is working to solve those problems. The Indian Government has taken important steps to end any abuse of human rights within its borders. It has, as others have mentioned, established an independent national human rights commission to investigate and prevent human rights abuse cases, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] stated a moment ago.

Assistant Secretary of State Robin Raphel has said the Commission, and I will not repeat it entirely, but it has surprised the skeptics in a very, very strong way and has begun to establish itself as an effective advocate for human rights.

India is bringing greater accountability to all government forces. And the Indian Government is allowing access for international efforts to monitor its progress. The U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights has praised the advances India has made on human rights.

I firmly believe that passing this amendment will risk jeopardizing our close ties with India. Damaging our relationship with India will weaken our ability to use the persuasion and cooperation that we have to help India move toward full democracy and development, and we can best encourage the resolution of the problems that face India by remaining involved, and this is one of those ways of remaining involved.

This amendment will punish India for making significant efforts to correct its problems. This amendment will lead us to shutting ourselves out of involvement with the India Government and hinder our efforts to help create a prosperous and free country.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, briefly, the gentleman just said that U.N. Human Rights Commission said they were making real progress. I want to read to him one paragraph from the Washington Post on May 19, less than a month ago. They said Human Rights Watch Asia said State-sponsored militias are committing grave human rights abuses, including summary executions, torture, and illegal detention in the only Muslim majority state in mostly Hindu India. This is less than 1 month ago.

And if I might say one more thing briefly, and that is this. Does the gentleman really think not giving them an additional $8.3 million is going to hurt our economic ties with them?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that we have been through that already this evening a number of times. I do not stand for that. I know the gentleman does not stand for that. Nobody stands for those kinds of things.

The fact of the matter is we have something ongoing with India that can improve those situations. By slamming the door on India, we do not help that situation.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend him on his statement. I want to focus on two aspects of it.

One, the world's largest democracy just had an election. In the Punjab, the source of tremendous strife, the source of terrorism, the source of massive state reaction to that terrorism, they have an election, a free election, where the Congress Party, the government in power during much of the strife, was thrown out of power, where a Sikh Coalition Alliance won almost all the seats in that province and it will now represent the State of Punjab in the Federal Parliament.

It is the best example of the process of moving away from this kind of terror toward democratic participation. To come in now and cut the aid, not that goes to the Indian Government, but that goes to private voluntary organizations that are helping the poorest of the poor, and we are talking about 600 million poor people, malnourished, a terrible situation where they still manage to participate in a democratic process, to now take this niche out of the aid going to these people to me makes no sense, does not accomplish America's purposes, does not serve the people we try to help with foreign assistance, and I want to commend the gentleman for his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KNOLLENBERG was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, let me say this. This is an article that is less than 1 month old. The gentleman talked about the free elections. On May 24, this is a report here in the Washington Newspapers, armed troops, armed troops herded Kashmirians to the polls yesterday for the rebellious state's first elections in 7 years, forcing Kashmirians to participate in an Indian Government election they wanted no part of.

So they literally forced them to vote.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, my comments were directed to what happened in the State of Punjab, which is the area of India which the gentleman addressed his initial comments to when he spoke. There is no doubt the Indian Elections Commission has affirmed that there was coercion and intimidation in the vote in Kashmir.

We can spend the next 2 hours talking about the miserable problems in Kashmir, the terrorism, the state militias that are wreaking havoc there, but let me tell the gentleman one interesting thing about the election in Kashmir.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. BERMAN and by unanimous consent, Mr. KNOLLENBERG was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, there was a 90-percent turnout in Jammu in the Hindu areas, and a 40-percent turnout in the rural areas of Kashmir. In Srinigar, which is the center of much of the strife, there was only 10 percent voting.

As I said, the gentleman is correct, there was intimidation and force. But what was interesting is, when they went to the ballots, where there were secret ballots, no doubt about that, only 7 percent of the people who voted cast blank ballots or scribbled on them. The rest participated. Some of those people wanted to be able to go to the polls and were afraid what would happen if they went voluntarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KNOLLENBERG was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if there is a gun pointed at an individual's back taking that person to the polls, and that person goes in and votes, they are not going to turn in a blank ballot. The gentleman knows that and I know that.

When we talk about Punjab and Kashmir, we are talking about two areas that are very similar in many respects and not so similar in others, except in one respect, and that is there is torture and human rights violations going on by 1.1 million Indian troops, and that is the problem.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I used to serve in the State legislature many years ago with a man by the name of Harvey Dueholm. He was a Danish farmer. He looked like a basset hound. He had the strongest character of any human being I have ever known, and he had a lot of observations about life. And one of the things he said once is, he said, ''Did you ever notice that the poor and the rich get the same amount of ice, but the poor get theirs in the wintertime?''

I think that really will be the result of the adoption of this amendment. I think India has a serious human rights problem, and I think we need to hold them to task on it at every opportunity.

I greatly respect the legitimate concerns expressed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. I know he is sincere. But I just have to say that when we pick up a gun, it is nice, if we are hunting a rabbit, that we hit the right target. It does not help if we are trying to reform the conduct of the government that we wind up hurting the folks who are doing the most to try to change some of the nastiest aspects of any society. That is what I think this amendment would do.

I am also struck, frankly, by the fact that in this part of the world there are only two or three major players. India is a major player and China is a major player. I have to tell my colleagues that I am a whole lot more frustrated right now by the conduct of China than I am India, with all of the failings that they have demonstrated.

I wonder how many people will vote for this amendment tonight and then, when Most Favored Nation status is brought up for China, will then turn and vote to grant China most-favored-nation status, in spite of the fact that they employ slave labor, in spite of the fact that a large number of American workers have seen their jobs put at risk because of products produced by that slave labor that then wind up in this country. It just seems to me that that would be a quaint double standard.

So I would suggest that we remember that if we are going to try to change conduct, that we focus on actions which will, in fact, have that effect and not the opposite effect. I think the amendment being offered tonight will have the opposite of that which is intended, and that is why, while I do not think that in terms of a United States-India relationship $8 or $9 or $10 million one way or another is going to make that big an impact, I do think that the mindset that it demonstrates is not one which is easily explainable.

I would, therefore, urge that we oppose the amendment, and I would urge that we support the gentleman from Alabama in his resistance to the amendment.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to urge my colleagues to oppose my friend from Indiana's amendment. I am convinced that most of what should be said has already been said tonight. I am worried that the adoption of this amendment would play into the hands of elements in India who would like to turn back the clock on the economic improvements and reforms that have led to our improving relationships and also turn back the hands on an improving human rights record.

Nobody is here to defend the human rights record of the State of India forever, but we must admit, even as our State Department has, the human rights report that substantial progress has been made in the area of human rights. India has an Independent Human Rights Commission, which is headed by a former justice of the Indian Supreme Court. Last year it prosecuted more than 200 human rights violations. The State Department has applauded this commission's independence and aggressiveness.

There are human rights abuses across this globe, including on behalf of some of India's most close neighbors. None of that can be defended, but we should not be punitive. We should not single out a nation to try to make a political point here. There is no question that improvements must be made, but India, the largest democracy in the world, has done more than any other nation in that part of the globe to bring in disparate ethnic groups and include them in the electoral process, give them opportunities to be heard, such as we just heard from the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], about the Punjab, to be heard not only publicly but with the vote.

□ 2045

No nation in that part of the world has done as much as India has done to include ethnic diversity in their political processes. They should not be punished for trying to do well. They should be criticized for not doing well enough yet, but they are doing far better than some of their neighbors.

I would urge Members to defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that there are human rights problems in India, that one would deny that, but that is true of many countries around the world. In fact, anyone who travels around the world or even reads the newspapers knows that in virtually any country you can find examples of human rights violations. We ought not to overlook them. We ought to be doing everything we can to have them corrected by those countries in which they are occurring. And I think that that is precisely what is being done in the case of India.

I think that this country is trying to deal with some very difficult and very complex problems. After all, it is a young country. It has been in existence for less than 50 years. It comes out of a colonial background, but it is a country with which we have much in common. Obviously, there is the commonality of language. We have the English language in common.

We also have the commonality of governance. We are two democracies. We have much in common with this country, and we need to encourage the creation and development of democratic principles in India, where, in fact, in comparison to many other countries around the world, they are flourishing.

To cut this aid at this particular time flies in the face of all of that effort. It would make it more difficult

for India to achieve the full democratization of its institutions, and it would also, in fact, not lessen human rights violations in that country but, in fact, it would in all likelihood make them worse. So while I very much respect our friend and colleague from Indiana and respect what he is doing and respect the motivation which gives birth to this amendment, nevertheless, I find myself in strong disagreement with it, because I think from his point of view as well as from the point of view of most Americans as well as from the point of view of India and most Indians, it would be counterproductive. It would, in fact, not reduce human rights violations but it would, in fact, increase them.

This is a huge country, a country of 900 million people, almost a billion people. It will, sometime in the next century, supplant China as the most populous country in the world. They need the help of other countries, particularly democratic countries with which they share common beliefs and common principles and common traditions. That is true of our relationship with India, and we ought to continue to assist them in whatever way we possibly can, particularly with this form of aid.

While I very much appreciate the motivation of my friend and colleague from Indiana, I must reluctantly say that it would accomplish the wrong thing. Therefore, I am in opposition to it.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on his fine statement. The words that have been said by the chairman and ranking member of this committee are the advice that we should follow tonight. Let us not kick our old friend India at this very crucial point in the transition of its government. India is our friend. They have been our friend for a long time and are becoming even closer to America as time progresses.

It is important that we heed the advice of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the authorizing committee. India has stood with us and is a bulwark against even China today, as China encourages and helps Pakistan with nuclear weapons and ring magnets and other things that we know it should not be trading. India is trying to open itself up to outside investment. I know there have been human rights problems in that Punjab area. We all need to counsel our friends in India because of that, but this House basically is a friend of India. Let us not blemish that record here tonight by kicking this country in the teeth with even a symbolic diminution of the small aid that we have given.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his sensitive and sensible words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my friend from Indiana.

I rise in opposition because there are very few things we can be certain about in this world, but there are some things we can be certain about. The first is that Asia will be an incredibly important area of the world for our country for years to come, and there is no credible Asia strategy for America that does not include a strong relationship with India, potentially as a counterbalance to the People's Republic of China but for the relationship in and of itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HINCHEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, the second argument is that there is no scenario for the future of our economy that does not include increased global trade, and there is no trade strategy that does not focus upon enhanced trade with India.

Another thing we can be sure of is the fact that people all over the world are watching what we do here. They watched as 1 in 10 citizens of the world voted in a free and fair election in India. If we reward that desirable conduct with this undesirable amendment, we will be abandoning our own principles. For these reasons and others, I would strongly urge a vote in opposition to the Burton amendment.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I often agree with the gentleman from Indiana. In fact, we have worked together many times to cut waste, fraud, and abuse from Federal Government programs.

We work on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. In fact, when we work together and we slay dragons together, the dragons usually have a bad day. But I rise tonight really in opposition to the good gentleman's amendment and it is with some hesitation. I respect his opinion.

Mr. Chairman, no one supports human rights violations in India or in any other country. Unfortunately, human rights violations occur there, they occur in the United States. And they occur in numerous other nations.

In fact, I brought with me tonight, and some of my colleagues have seen it referred to, this 1996 report by Amnesty International. It details dozens of countries that have been recipients of the United States foreign assistance and their violations.

Let me read a few of these. Egypt, one of the top recipients, just a few of the violations: Detention of thousands of political opponents, systematic use of torture against political detainees, increased number of political detainees who died while in custody, deliberate and arbitrary killings by armed opposition groups.

Let me read just a couple more, if I may, here.

Saudi Arabia, another huge recipient: Arrest and detention of suspected political opponents, torture and ill treatment during pretrial detention, alarming upsurge in numbers of executions, wide use of judicial punishments by flogging and amputations.

Then we go to Bolivia, which we support assistance to and we are going to be working for: Arbitrary detentions, torture and ill treatment, rape, the same types of offenses, extrajudicial executions. The list goes on.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, why should we single out India in this fashion? This amendment will, in fact, hurt our ability to assist a close ally, to assist in the situation that we have a problem in. It will hurt us with a great trading partner.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, we can do much more, I submit, by calling attention to human rights violations whether they are in India or anywhere else in the world.

If we recognize differences, if we promote democratic institutions, if we increase trade, exchanges, communications, tonight we do not need to embarrass by singling out the world's largest democracy in this fashion. We must recognize the strides India has taken. We must help India now as it changes its government in this most historic election and this most historic fashion that we have seen the election take place the last few weeks.

Let us tonight not take a step backward in our relationship with India. I admire the gentleman's interest. I opposed his potentially damaging amendment. As India steps forward, we do not need to be a Congress stepping backward.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I have about a minute left.

I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment. I have to say tonight that there are a lot of people that have come on the floor to speak against it. So I think this is the third time the gentleman has offered it. Certainly, I think the feeling is that this amendment certainly would not be appropriate after they have had their largest election in world history in which about half a billion people have voted.

I think most people would regard the election as universally free and fair. And I think, as William Safire of the New York Times put it: ''It is the most breathtaking example of government by the people in the history of the world.''

Every year I offer a resolution, a House Resolution to recognize India's national independence. This is the 49th

year. I think now is not the time to pass a personal affront to this country when they have been so successful a democracy. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, my colleague mentioned that there were a number of countries that had human rights violations that were getting our aid. I would like to say to my colleague, I have no objection whatsoever to him or any Member of this body proposing a cut in aid to any country that violates human rights, that violates women's rights, that gang rapes women and tortures people and throws them into rivers with their hands bound, and gagged. I think that those kinds of countries should be penalized. We should hold them up to public scrutiny throughout the world.

When we talk about Egypt torturing people, I will support the gentleman's amendment if he wants to cut some of their aid.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, with this strong array of Members coming to the floor to oppose Mr. BURTON's amendment, I have been trying to figure out what this is really all about. I think it was said during the opening minutes of this discussion by Mr. BURTON himself, I think those Members who are interested in cutting aid of any kind have to listen to what Mr. BURTON said.

This is not about cutting aid, because no money is saved here. Not one dollar, not one penny, not one rupee is saved. What this does is it just limits the amount of money India can take out of an existing pot.

We are all against human rights abuses, Mr. Chairman. We are all offended by the kind of things that we see in the pictures that Mr. BURTON has brought before us. But I have to tell Members, when he says things or anybody says things over and over and over again, that does not make it so; and it does not necessarily make it true.

We were all horrified by that picture that was up on the easel. Mr. Chairman, looking at the speaker, looking at the picture and hearing the words that this is the abuse that is taking place in India today right at this minute, that is the same picture we saw last year when we heard the same story. I have seen that same picture, 3 years in a row. I have even seen pictures that Members from the other side bring me that Members, say, the other terrorist did this and this is one of our guys. Three years in a row that guy died. Unless he is triplets, I am not sure what is guy died.

I do not mean to make light about violations of human rights. But to say that this is going on and sponsored by the Government of India is not necessarily what is happening, Mr. Chairman.

□ 2100

This amendment, which is not a cutting amendment, admittedly, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], is meant solely and strictly to stigmatize a sister democracy, and that is not what we should be doing. India, according to the human rights report that Mr. BURTON cited, and I will quote it, India, quote, ''has made significant progress in resolving human rights problems,'' end of quote. The Indian Government has responded to our initiative when we objected to one of the bills that they have, their Terrorist Destructive Activities Act. They no longer have that.

Contrary to what our colleagues heard, the Indian Government has reached agreement with the International Committee of the Red Cross to permit visits to Kashmir. I visited Kashmir; I visited Kashmir again. Many Members of this body were there. My colleagues heard that we were escorted and monitored by Indian troops. I visited with the very people who oppose the Indian Government, I had dinner in their homes, I met with their council, I met with every single opposition group in Kashmir. I was stuck there during a blizzard in January. I met with more people I had not intended to meet with, and not once in the presence of Indian troops, and not once was anybody restrained in what they had to say to me.

The insurgent violence in Punjab has largely disappeared, and there is visible progress in correcting the abusive practices by the police which has occurred. The National Human Rights Commission continues to play a useful role in addressing whatever patterns of abuse and specific abuses there might be. Last year the commission, which was not even referenced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], prosecuted more than 200 cases.

Economic reforms: India has done everything that we have asked of her. Since 1991 the Indian Government has substantially reduced inflation. Their budget deficit has been reduced. They have privatized. They have cut subsidies to inefficient state owned industries. They made the rupee convertible.

In international trade they reduced tariffs and industrial licensing controls in order to attract foreign investment, and, as a result, United States investment in India, Americans investing over there as we do in all strong democracies, has gone from $500 million a year in 1991 to $5 billion this year alone. That is a thousand percent increase. That is the kind of confidence the American business people have in India and the reforms that are going on there. The United States is India's largest trading partner and largest investor.

The democracy issue is probably the most important issue of all. India is, as has been stated, the world's largest democracy. They have a free press, they have civilian control of the military, they have an independent judiciary, they have active political parties and civic associations. The election that we have just seen was really ho-hum. It did not take a lot of attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ACKERMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ACKERMAN. An election that did not gain that much attention because there were no very serious violent abuses during the entire electoral process. Over 400 million people going to the polls democratically, even turning out the controlling government 2 weeks ago. That is democracy in action. One out of every ten people on the planet going to vote; imagine that.

At a point where India is struggling to form a coalition government right now, this is a terrible message to send. There are only very, very few countries within the purview of this legislation that we look to cap in any way from the pot of money that is provided. Those countries include North Korea, the Sudan, Iran, Iraq, Libya, and Syria. Certainly not even the most ardent of India-bashers can come to the floor and seriously suggest that the world's largest democracy, and getting more democratic all the time, belongs with such a group.

This is an attempt to stigmatize and not an attempt to legislate.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the Burton amendment. I know that some members of the committee may think that the debate is going on for some time here, but I think it is important for the sponsor of the amendment, the American people, the Congress, to understand the depth of support for India, for improved American-Indian relations, for Indian democracy and for improvements in civil and human rights that are underway in India.

The Burton amendment should be opposed for many reasons. One important consideration is the fact that in April and May of 1996, as mentioned here, India conducted the largest democratic election in the history of the world. In a monumental undertaking of more than 640 million eligible voters, about 65 percent of whom took the time to vote, the Indian electorate chose a new parliament in elections that were widely judged to be free, fair, and largely peaceful.

Mr. Chairman, for the United States to respond to this remarkable accomplishment by the world's largest democracy by passing the Burton amendment will send to India and to the rest

of the world precisely the wrong signals about United States support for Indian democracy. This Burton amendment would prove to be the most expensive $8 million amendment ever approved. It is important that it be rejected overwhelmingly.

In addition, the new Indian Government is headed by Prime Minister H.D. Deve Gowda, the leader of the United Front, a coalition of center, center left, and regional parties. The leadership of this new government is at the very moment hammering out policies on a number of issues of great interest to the United States, including the fate of economic reform, India's nuclear program, its policies toward Pakistan, and other neighbors.

Although the proposed change is a small one in dollar terms, for Congress to single out India in this fashion at this time will, for symbolic reasons, have a very negative impact on United States-Indian relations that would be disproportionate to the amount of money involved. At a minimum, any cut in United States development assistance to India at this critical juncture, apart from a broad cut in the overall development assistance account, could severely damage the spirit of cooperation the United States should be establishing with the new Indian Government.

Although a number of parties which support the United Front government have a long tradition of left-leaning economic policies, Prime Minister Gowda has expressed strong support for the economic reforms begun under the government of former Prime Minister Rao. Early evidence of Prime Minister Gowda's intention have been the naming of a highly progressive U.S.-educated finance minister who is extremely supportive of the economic reforms begun in the 1990's as a commerce minister in the Rao government.

Current and ongoing United States development assistance provides important support for India's effort to open its economy to trade and investment. Included are programs that promote private sector involvement in energy production and distribution, United States-India commerce, technology joint ventures, programs to provide urban areas with badly needed infrastructure, and assistance for Indian enterprises attempting to restructure and become competitive.

Although India is beginning to push forward economically, it remains a very poor country with millions of people still well below the poverty line. In fact, half the world's poor people, very, very poor people, live in India today. The United States development assistance program focusing on family planning, preventive health care, and nutrition are very critical areas that support the Indian family.

Now, the number of political parties that comprise the United Front represent the millions of people who make up India's poorest of the poor groups, minorities, members of the lower caste, those that were once called the untouchables. A diminution, symbolic or otherwise, of U.S. development assistance that would benefit these groups would certainly send a wrong message to a part of the leadership of the new government.

There has been strong evidence that the Gowda government intends to hold talks with the leaders of the Kashmiri separatist movement to seek a peaceful and just solution to the Kashmir crisis. V.P. Singh, a major United Front leader and the former Indian Prime Minister, visited Kashmir during the election campaign. He has promised talks with the separatists as well as an offer of political, social, and economic peace package.

Prime Minister Gowda has promised to take steps to improve relations with Pakistan. On May 31, Gowda said quote: ''As far as Pakistan is concerned, I have an open mind. I will definitely take an initiative to diffuse the tension between the two countries,'' end of quote. The United States should do nothing to undercut the new Indian Government's efforts to initiate rapprochement with Pakistan by sending a negative message via cuts in development assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BEREUTER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, I called our senior career ambassador to India today, Ambassador Frank Wisner. He said the Burton amendment would quote, ''send a very negative message,'' close quote, to a newly elected government in India, and as pointed out by the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], democracy, it would seem very specifically supportive of the dissident forces in Punjab, has been vindicated, a step in the right direction.

The same is true of the direction of the vote in Kashmir. These are two very favorable signs for improving the situation there.

Finally, let me close by quoting briefly from a letter from the political director of the American Conservative Union. He says about the Burton amendment:

> It would be interpreted as a gratuitous slap, and could even contribute to undermining the fragile coalition government that just assumed power—possibly bringing to power a government dominated by the very people Mr. Burton professes to opposes.

I urge my colleagues to cast a strong, strong vote against the Burton amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Burton amendment. It is the wrong amendment at the wrong time. The issue, Mr. Chairman, is that there has been, particularly over the last 5 years, there has been great progress in India. There has been progress in the area of human rights. Time and again we hear about the national human rights commission that the Indians have established, that they have actually prosecuted human rights violations, some 200 in India, that they have had it up to human rights commission with a former justice of the Indian supreme court, that our State Department has recognized progress in Indian human rights.

In the last 5 years India's economy has liberalized greatly; market reforms, free and open markets. It is a country that has welcomed American investment to the tune of $5 billion.

I have been to India, I have been to Bombay, and Delhi and Amritsar and seen the kind of progress they have made both in human rights by talking to people at the Golden Temple in Amritsar and talking to people, as my friend from New York, Mr. ACKERMAN said, that are opponents of the Indian Government, but nonetheless will say that, yes, in fact major human rights progress has been made. The same people who again are opposed to the present government in India as of 3 months ago, the Congress party, will again talk about the progress that has been made in economic liberalization.

There has also been major progress in India in the last 5 years in building a stable democracy, as has been pointed out on the floor over and over and over again. India just conducted the largest, the greatest election, the most wide-ranging election, the most participatory election in the history of humankind. Some 500 million people voted. That says to me again in the last 5 years India has made major progress.

The other area of great improvement in India the last 5 years is what India means to the United States. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] talked abut the major players in Asia or India in China. India is a much more reliable ally. India is a country that, as has been said repeatedly, is the largest democracy in the world. India is a country that we can rely on for strategic reasons for the United States. This is just putting the thumb in the eye of the Indian people and a thumb in the eye of the Indian Government by sending this message to India that, no, the United States does not appreciate the kind of progress that India has made in the last 5 years.

Again it is the second largest democracy—it is the largest democracy in the world; it is the second largest nation in the world. As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] said, it is very, very important strategically for us as a nation in South Asia and what that means to us. And India, again, is a democracy. We do not treat a democracy this way; we work with that country, we see the kind of progress that India has made in the area of human rights and the kind of progress India has made in their economy and the

kind of progress India has made as a democracy and the kind of progress India has made as a friend of the United States.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I have been pretty silent during this debate, and reasonably neutral, but I must bring to my colleague's attention the fact that in New Delhi today they are building SU–34's, they are building MiG–29's, and they are building T–80's. They have, throughout the cold war, allied themselves in the Soviet Union. So I think it is a little bit of a stretch to call them an ally.

□ 2115

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Taking back my time, Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], brings up a good point. But that only proves my point that in the last 5 years India has made progress. The pro-Pakistani tilt at the State Department has begun to right itself. As we have seen as we have extended an arm to India and they have to us, they are becoming much more of an ally to us. They will become much more of an ally to us as we begin to treat them with respect and treat them as the kind of ally they should be.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I would say we have always treated them with respect. We should continue to treat them with respect. But they continue to be a military ally of Russia, and I would submit, although I am not sure how I am going to vote on this amendment, I would submit that if the Soviet Union should be born again, that India would again be closely allied because of their military alliances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Taking back my time, Mr. Chairman, I absolutely reject that thinking, when India has become a more and more liberalized economy, an economy much more in line with ours, an economy which has welcomed $5 million in American investment, an economy in which, if we continue to sell arms to Pakistan, a whole other debate, then perhaps we might drive them a little more away.

But the last time I checked, the cold war was over. We need to make friends with these countries like India that were not necessarily our friends before. This is a golden opportunity to reach out to India and make friends with India. If we pass the balanced budget amendment, and the Soviet Union is reborn in some form, as the gentleman suggests, he can be sure India will turn back to them. Do not let this opportunity pass to be friends with them in a bigger way.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr.Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Burton amendment to freeze the foreign aid levels we give to India to last year's levels, which is basically an $8 billion cut.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, let us make it really clear; India is not, N-O-T, not an old friend of the United States. The gentleman from Texas, CHARLIE WILSON, was absolutely correct, and I guess everybody else in this House has amnesia, but throughout the entire cold war India kicked us in the teeth every time they got a chance to do so. When we were down, they kicked us in the gut. When we turned around to protect ourselves, they kicked us in the back, and they accepted our money the whole time; and especially they wanted the money to come from the United Nations, from us to the United Nations, so they would not even have to show any gratitude to the United States for accepting all of our hundreds of millions of dollars of aid while they were kicking us in the teeth and supporting the Soviet Union's aggression in Afghanistan and elsewhere in the world.

Mr. Chairman, India receives more aid right now, $156 million, and votes against us more than any other country in the United Nations. That is 83 percent of the votes in the United Nations are against our position. That is their level of support against us, while getting $156 million in aid from us.

Indian should not even be getting any aid, much less just a simple little cut of $8 million. They take our aid, our hundreds of millions of dollars; and do Members know what they do with their own money? They are building nuclear weapons. That is what it is all about. We give them humanitarian aid so they do not have to spend their own money on their people, and then they spend it on nuclear weapons. Good deal, is it not?

Mr. Chairman, we are being Uncle Saps here if we are giving that type of country money from us so they can build nuclear weapons, and to intimidate their neighbors or whatever. But that is not the question tonight. We are not going to end all aid to India. We just want to send a little message, $8 million worth of message, cutting off aid by $8 million, to say ''Please clean up your human rights abuse in the Kashmir.''

Come on, folks, we can call these people terrorists in the Kashmir, but the real problem we all know is, and no one wants to say it, is that India has refused to hold an honest plebescite, as they were required to do by the United Nations, for the last 40 years. If the people of Kashmir had a right to vote on their own destiny, they would probably vote not to be part of India and there would be no conflict. There would be no excuse for 1 million Indian soldiers to be stationed up in northern India to repress those people who want nothing more than a right to vote as to whether to be a part of India or not, which is what the United Nations required them to do.

India has been condemned by Amnesty International, by Asia Watch, by people, honest people who are looking and trying to support human rights around the world. They have been condemned over and over and over again. The examples given by the gentleman form Indiana are only a few examples. These people are trying to fight for their rights in the Kashmir, and as a reaction, the Indians are saying ''we are not going to let them get away with it,'' so they are condoning monstrous human rights abuse against the people of Kashmir.

It can be stopped very easily. Let those people in the Kashmir determine their own destiny through the ballot box, rather than through bullets. That is the bottom line. If we do that, if we insist on that, if we send that message tonight with this little tiny cut of $8 million, I will tell the Members this much: The tensions on the subcontinent will subside. We will have done what is right, and in the long run it will create a more peaceful world because the people of Kashmir will have their right to vote and there will be no excuse for the violence that exists there today.

Mr. Chairman, I plead with all of the Members, come on, let us get beyond all of this rhetoric. Let us not talk about India as our old friend, or create some false images of how we have to help this developing country. Let us get down to the facts. Let us get down to we must stand for human rights there and elsewhere, because it furthers the cause of peace to do so. Let us send that message to India. Please, end the repression, give those people a right to vote on their own destiny, $8 million.

Instead, what we are going to do is send them a message that they can do anything they want to and they are going to get hundreds of millions of dollars of aid from the American taxpayers. That is not the message we should send.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. WILSON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROHRABACHER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I just cannot let these things go without being spread on the record. As I say, Mr. Chairman, I do not have extremely strong feelings about this amendment, but some things must be said. I would ask the gentleman, who I know with great personal courage visited Afghanistan many times, but Afghanistan was a major, major, major, major conflict in the cold war. I would ask the gentleman if he remembers and agrees with me that in every instance, in every instance, India supported the Russian invasion of Afghanistan.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Not only did they support the Russian invasion but during the war Indian pilots, we were told, were actually flying missions in

Afghanistan for the Communist-supported government.

Mr. WILSON. Would the gentleman remember that Najibullah was received with great honors as the head of state in India?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is correct.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, again, I must repeat that as we speak tonight, SU–34s, MIG–29s, and T–80s are being built in New Delhi. Does that sound like an ally to the gentleman?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Not only are they being built in New Delhi, but we are giving them $150 million in aid, so who is actually paying for that, indirectly?

Mr. WILSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just say this. The questions the gentleman from Indiana asked are very relevant questions. They are: ''What would you do if it was your wife that was gang raped? What would you do if it was your child that was murdered and dragged through the neighborhood as a symbol to the neighborhood not to resist the Indian authorities?''

Why that is relevant is because if we Americans were denied the right to choose our own destiny through a free election, if we were denied that right, we too would resist, and perhaps those people that we were resisting would use the same type of brutality and ugly repression that the people of Kashmir have had to suffer, and we, our families, would be the ones being dragged through the streets and the women raped in such a way. We cannot let this sit. Standing for freedom, standing for human rights, insisting that this $8 million be cut out as a message to India is not only right morally, but will help create a more peaceful world.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana appears to have a noble purpose—to focus the attention of the House on human rights abuses.

But despite his intentions, the amendment will do great harm to the very people it purports to help. And the timing of the amendment could not be worse.

Yes, India has had problems with human rights in the past. Yes, there are still incidents. But this nation—this democracy—has taken exceptionally strong steps forward.

India's Human Rights Commission, headed by the former Supreme Court Justice, has been hailed by the State Department for its ''significant progress in resolving human rights problems.''

Freezing developmental assistance would hurt the poorest of the poor in India. The amendment would directly undermine the stated objectives of India's newly elected Prime Minister to improve the living conditions of the country's poorest citizens.

And finally, this amendment would be an enormous blow to United States-Indian relations at the very moment when we should be strengthening ties between our two democracies.

India just completed a historic election. Nearly a tenth of the entire population of the globe went to the polls in what the New York Times' William Safire called ''the most breathtaking example of government by people in the history of the world.''

This momentous free and fair election must be rewarded. It must be held out as a shining example of how democracy can work. We must not pass a punitive anti-India amendment on the heels of this election.

United States-India relations are strong. American businesses are flourishing in India. Let's send the world's most populous democracy the right message. Let's vote for progress in India. Let's vote for democracy.

I ask my colleagues to oppose the Burton amendment.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to much of the debate. I am amazed. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is only seeking to freeze the aid we give India at this year's level. All he is saying is what we are giving them now is what we will give them next year, which means they are going to get $48 million in this particular category.

It is good that India has had a change of government. That is very recent. We ought to take at least a wait-and-see attitude, and give them a year to perform before we increase the aid, borrowing money which we do not have to give away to foreign countries which, like this one, have not been very loyal supporters of the United States. In fact, they have been charged with and have been found to have committed serious human rights abuses, including the extensive taking of innocent human life.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just restate what my colleague has stated. That is that we are not cutting aid to India. We are going to give them the same amount of developmental aid we did last year. We are just not giving them an $8.3 million increase, and we are doing that to send them a message. A lot of my colleagues have just said this is going to be a cataclysmic experience if we do this. That does not make any sense. My colleagues know it.

The fact of the matter is that all we want to do is send a signal that the United States will not tolerate these human rights abuses. Some of my colleagues have talked about Libya and other terrorist states and the kinds of human rights abuses that are going on there. They are right, there are horrible human rights abuses. But we do not give them aid. Wherever we do give aid and there are human rights abuses, we should cut that aid to send a signal. We are our brother's keeper.

Almost every speaker who spoke here tonight has admitted there are human rights abuses in Kashmir, Punjab, Jagaland and elsewhere in India. So we know what is going on. They say there is a human rights commission in India. What would you expect them to say? They are government-sponsored. They are going to say things are getting better.

But listen to what the paper said just last week. This is the Washington Post:

> Human Rights Watch Asia said state-sponsored militias are committing grave human rights abuses, including summary executions, torture, and illegal detention in the only Muslim majority state in mostly Hindu India, and it is going on in Punjab as well.

Let me say to my colleagues one more time: Put yourself in the place of people who live in Punjab, Kashmir, Nagaland, and elsewhere in India. You have got a wife. You have got a kid. You have got a son. You have got a husband. They take your husband out in the middle of the night and you do not see him again. They find his body in a canal with his hands wrapped together and a gag in his mouth. Your wife is taken out in the middle of the night, they hold you at gunpoint and they take her out and gang rape her, because they know it is going to hurt her and you and everybody else, because of your Muslim beliefs. Those things are going on today. They take your son out and they remove a kidney because they want to use that for somebody that needs a kidney transplant, and that has happened as well.

These are not happening in the past, as many of my colleagues have said. They are going on today, right this minute. There are 550,000 troops in Kashmir and Punjab, and these things are going on as we speak.

□ 2130

So I just want to say to my colleagues tonight, if you care about your brothers around the world, if you care about human rights, I am not asking for the moon, I am just saying, do not give them any more money than you gave them last year. And the American taxpayers will applaud you for it. Because they do not want you to give that additional money anyhow. And all you are going to be doing by cutting a paltry $8.3 million is sending a signal. We do not want any more gang rapes for women. You would not want them in the United States. We do not want any torture, throwing people in canals with their hands bound and gagged. We want that to end, we want your government to stop these things and if you do that, we will applaud you and we will start working with you.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. I

know the hour is late and this has been debated, but we are talking about the largest democracy in the world and our relationship with that democracy, and a new government that is being elected there, and what in fact we do has meaning to that new government, and I think the debate is important.

Mr. Chairman, every year in the foreign operations authorization bill, Members are presented with the same amendment to punish India, a secular democracy.

It is wrong to vote for this amendment this year in particular. India has just completed its 11th general elections. Mr. Chairman, these were fair and free elections in which over 350 million Indian citizens voted and elected a new government.

Speakers for this amendment will cite examples of human rights abuses, cold war, dollars to many of previously cold war countries. Well, let me take this opportunity to cite examples of Indian voters who rejected the agenda of separatists at the ballot box in Punjab. In this state, where violence was common in the 1980s and early 1990s, 70 percent of the eligible voters chose to support moderate parties over separatist ones.

In Jammu and Kashmir, approximately 40 percent of the eligible voters defied the death threats of armed militants to cast their ballots. In many cases these militants do not even come from Jammu and Kashmir. According to the State Department's ''Global Report on Terrorism for 1995,'' Pakistan was the base for many terrorist groups operating in Kashmir, and Indian authorities have detained Mujahedin from Sudan, Afghanistan and Pakistan. These are the same types of militants who are still holding 4 Western hostages captive, including Donald Hutchings of Spokane, Washington. The same militants who beheaded a Norwegian hostage last August.

Why is this amendment to cap assistance to the world's largest democracy being offered?

The Government of India has taken positive steps to address concerns raised by the United States in regards to human rights. In October 1993, India established a National Human Rights Commission. According to the 1995 State Department Human Rights Report ''the National Human Rights Commission continues to play a useful role in addressing patterns of abuse, as well as specific abuses, and is consolidating an attitudinal shift toward acknowledgement of human rights problems.''

The Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, special security legislation under which people had been held without charges, was allowed to lapse in May 1995. This amendment tries to inflict punishment on a country that has made significant progress in resolving its human rights problems.

Let me remind Members of the violence that exists in parts of India. Separatist militant groups and terrorists caused hundreds of deaths in 1995. These were all politically motivated killings that targeted civilians and community leaders who dared to call for an end to the violence. In Kashmir, terrorist threats have disrupted the judicial system, including the assassination of judges and witnesses. Many of these armed militants support secession from India and try to scuttle any progress towards a political process and dialog.

By supporting this amendment, we would only be hurting ties between the United States and India, the world's two largest democracies. The punitive nature of this amendment would only serve to isolate India, diminish the prospects for constructive dialog and add to the misery of the poorest and most desperate people in India.

Isolation of India would eradicate the potential for even greater economic and political changes and ties between the United States and India. So let us promote democracy in India, let us continue the progress that we have said as a country it is making in human rights. Let us vote against the Burton amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply take this time to say that it is my understanding, and I think it is the understanding of the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Alabama, that if discussion ends on this amendment, we can have a series of votes on the pending amendments and go home tonight, and I would urge that we do that.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think that is correct. This will be the fourth vote that we have to take tonight, and it is my understanding that once we can end debate on this issue, have the vote on the four amendments that are pending, that we will rise for the night. So I am hoping that we can begin to limit debate.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] told me just a few minutes ago that maybe we ought to offer a bounty of $10 to anybody who says something new. I do not think we would stand to lose much money tonight, because everything has been said, but nevertheless, people want to be heard. I would encourage my colleagues to be brief. We are not going to change any votes at this late in the night. I think the amendment is going to be soundly defeated, and I know I am going to vote against the amendment, and I know many people on my side are going to vote against the amendment, but I would encourage my colleagues to be brief in their remarks. Instead of closing, I will just do something unique. I am going to submit my statement for the RECORD.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, under this open rule, we have approximately at this point 8 Members who wanted to speak. However, we have reached an agreement on our side because of the late hour, we have agreed to have two more speakers for 3 minutes apiece, if that is okay with the chairman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. With that, then I would like to also request for our side, we will limit it to one more, and after, that, I will just submit mine for the RECORD. So I will assume that on our side that the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] will be the last.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have many Sikhs in my district and, like I said, nothing has been said new except that the Bulls are going to win tonight and you can pay me my $10, SONNY.

Mr. Chairman, the atrocities have gone on long enough. India has been anti-American. I support the amendment strongly.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that that $10 offer is very tempting, but I just want to make a brief statement, I will not take all of my time.

First of all, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I think as people have said, it is ill-timed and it is the wrong amendment at the wrong time. The people who raise the cold war, the cold war is over, the Soviet Union has collapsed. We do not have a cold war anymore, it is a whole new ball game and I do not think we ought to dwell on the past.

India and the United States are developing a very good relationship. It has been said it is the two greatest democracies in the world, and I think again that India showed in the past several weeks that it is a democracy. A government was elected, that government was unpopular, it was doing some unpopular things, the government fell, and a new government was put in place, all in a democratic way. That is something that we wish the rest of the world could do. That is one of our stated policy aims. We want to increase democracy in the world. We want to promote democracy in the world.

When 400 million people participate in an election in India, I can think of nothing greater than to say that democracy works. They are making progress in human rights, there have been difficulties, no one denies that, but they are making progress. And United States investment in India being $5 billion, this would just cut $8 million to the poorest people in India, the people that really need our help.

So I think that again, the United States and India need to look to the future. The United States has worked with India; India has been working with the United States. Let us not go backwards, let us move forwards. This is a good investment in democracy; it is a good investment in United States-India relations, and we ought not to cut it.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the hour is late, but you know, it is only so often we get an open rule, so if I am going to be here at this time I might as well take this opportunity.

I just want to rise to voice my opposition to this amendment. Each year the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] finds it necessary to offer the same amendment to cut foreign assistance to India. Fortunately each year this amendment fails, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and defeat it again this year.

India is the largest democracy in the world and continually displays its commitment to democratic principles. Recently 350 million people exercised their right to direct the future of their country by voting in democratic elections. India has maintained its allegiance to freedom and democracy.

Understandably, this amendment is being offered to punish India because of the country's poor human rights record. However, India has taken steps to improve its record and continues to do so. The Indian Government has allowed the United Nations offices, the Western media and the Red Cross into many regions to document their success.

Furthermore, we will not improve the government's record on human rights by cutting aid, which will cause thousands of India's residents to suffer. As Representatives of this Congress, we must be aware of our message on this vote and what it will send to nations struggling for democracy, to invest it in the United States and abroad. Cutting development assistance or making aid conditional on unwarranted premises will stigmatize India and make it less attractive to businesses and development that that country desperately needs. It is our responsibility to help invest in and help stabilize any nation willing to let citizens live in freedom and participate in government. Let us show our support for the largest democracy of the world and vote against the Burton amendment, and I thank the majority for having an open rule. It is seldom that we get this opportunity.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, may I respond to the gentleman that it was not my idea to have an open rule, but nevertheless, I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to urge the Members to vote against the amendment and remind the Members that we have four pending amendments that will be voted on before we rise. We have the Obey amendment No. 1, Obey amendment No. 2, Radanovich and the Burton amendments, and the committee and I would urge a ''no'' vote on all four amendments.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to voice my opposition to this amendment. Each year, Mr. BURTON finds it necessary to offer the same amendment to cut foreign assistance to India. Fortunately, each year, this amendment fails. I urge my colleagues to join me again this year to defeat it.

India is the largest democracy in the world and continually displays its commitment to Democratic principles. In recent countrywide Presidential elections, preliminary results show that over 350 million people exercised their right to direct the future of their country by voting. India has maintained its allegiance to freedom and democracy despite being surrounded by autocratic regimes and unstable governments.

Villages in India need outside aid to help foster their citizens' entry into modern living; 75 percent of all the bikes and portable radios sold in India are sold in small villages. Sixty percent of all the table fans, sewing machines, bath soaps, and wristwatches are being bought by people who live in isolated areas that are years behind in technology.

Reports show that foreign aid dollars can translate into lower mortality rates, higher gross domestic product levels and higher literacy rates. Currently, health and medical conditions are so poor in parts of India that 40 percent of the women in India die in childbirth, 50 percent of all children are undernourished, and 50 percent of all polio patients die for lack of vaccinations. Food security is still a national security concern in this country—if this aid is cut thousands will go hungry, many more could die.

This amendment is being offered to punish India because of the country's poor human rights record. However, India has taken steps to improve this record and continues to do so. The Indian Government has allowed United Nations officers, western media, and the Red Cross into many regions to document their progress. Furthermore, we will not improve the Government's record on human rights by cutting aid that will cause thousands of India's citizens to suffer.

As Representatives to the United States Congress, we must be aware of the message our vote on this issue will send to nations struggling for democracy and to investors in the United States and abroad. Cutting development assistance or making aid conditional on unwarranted premises will stigmatize India and make it less attractive to the businesses and development the country desperately needs.

As our world grows smaller, it is to our responsibility to help invest in and help stabilize any nation willing to let her citizens live in freedom and participate in government.

Let's show our support for the largest democracy in the world. Vote against the Burton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote and pending that, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 29 by Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin; amendment No 30 by Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin; amendment No. 67 by Mr. RADANOVICH of California; and amendment No. 5 by Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 231, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

AYES—191

Abercrombie	Cunningham	Greenwood
Ackerman	Danner	Gunderson
Andrews	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Baldacci	DeLauro	Hall (OH)
Barcia	Dellums	Hall (TX)
Barrett (NE)	Dicks	Harman
Barrett (WI)	Dingell	Hilleary
Bass	Dixon	Hilliard
Becerra	Doggett	Hinchey
Beilenson	Dooley	Hoekstra
Berman	Duncan	Horn
Bilbray	Durbin	Hostettler
Blumenauer	Ehlers	Hoyer
Blute	Ensign	Jackson (IL)
Bonior	Eshoo	Jacobs
Boucher	Evans	Jefferson
Brown (CA)	Fattah	Johnson (SD)
Brown (OH)	Fazio	Johnston
Brownback	Filner	Jones
Bryant (TX)	Flanagan	Kaptur
Campbell	Foglietta	Kasich
Cardin	Foley	Kennelly
Chabot	Ford	Kildee
Chapman	Fox	Kleczka
Clay	Frank (MA)	Klug
Clement	Franks (NJ)	LaFalce
Collins (IL)	Funderburk	LaHood
Collins (MI)	Furse	Lantos
Condit	Gejdenson	Lewis (GA)
Conyers	Gibbons	Lipinski
Cooley	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Costello	Goodling	Lofgren
Coyne	Gordon	Lowey
Cummings	Green (TX)	Luther

Markey
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stupak
Talent
Thompson
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weller
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Zimmer

NOES—231

Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Brewster
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Gutknecht
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hobson
Hoke
Holden
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pombo
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Roberts
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Salmon
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scott
Seastrand
Shadegg
Shaw
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Torricelli
Traficant
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—12

Allard
Browder
Flake
Gephardt
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lincoln
McDade
Scarborough
Schiff
Studds
Thornton
Yates

□ 2204

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. McDade against.

Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas for, with Mr. Scarborough against.

Messrs. DEUTSCH, HEINEMAN, and DOOLITTLE and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. SKAGGS, SMITH of Michigan, and WAMP, Mrs. LOWEY and Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. SERRANO and Mr. GREENWOOD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 30 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 181, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 216]

AYES—240

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TX)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chapman
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Ehlers
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Harman
Hefner
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Stupak
Talent
Thomas
Thompson
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Zimmer

NOES—181

Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Canady
Chambliss
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fields (TX)
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frisa
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hoke
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kim
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Manton
Martinez
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Miller (FL)
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt

Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Quillen
Radanovich
Reed
Richardson
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Salmon
Saxton
Schaefer
Scott
Shadegg
Shaw
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stump
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thornberry
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
White
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—13

Allard
Browder
Ensign
Flake
Gephardt
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lincoln
McDade
Scarborough
Schiff
Studds
Thornton
Yates

□ 2212

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. McDade against.

Messrs. CASTLE, GUNDERSON, and WHITFIELD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RADANOVICH

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 268, noes 153, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 217]

AYES—268

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Chabot
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goodlatte
Gordon
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Saxton
Scarborough
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Sisisky
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Stokes
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Thomas
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Williams
Wolf
Woolsey
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—153

Archer
Armey
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Boehlert
Bonilla
Boucher
Brewster
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Campbell
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Combest
Cramer
Crane
Deal
DeLay
Dellums
Dicks
Doggett
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Frost
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Gunderson
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heineman
Herger
Hostettler
Houghton
Hyde
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
King
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
McCrery
McDermott
Meek
Meyers
Miller (FL)
Minge
Montgomery
Murtha
Myers
Nethercutt
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Quillen
Rahall
Regula
Richardson
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Sabo
Sanford
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schroeder
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stenholm
Stump
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornberry
Vento
Walker
Ward
Waxman
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Allard
Browder
Flake
Gephardt
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lincoln
McDade
McIntosh
Metcalf
Schiff
Studds
Thornton
Yates

□ 2220

Mr. SAXTON and Mr. BALDACCI changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 217, my intention was to vote ''no''. I inadvertently pressed the ''aye'' button. I ask that the RECORD reflect accordingly.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the RECORD reflect my strong support of the Bonior-Radanovich amendment to the foreign operations bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 127, noes 296, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

AYES—127

Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bonior
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Canady
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Foglietta
Geren
Gillmor
Goodling
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)

Johnson, Sam
Jones
King
Klug
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Martinez
McInnis
McKeon
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Neumann
Nussle
Orton
Owens
Parker
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Porter
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Salmon
Schaefer
Seastrand
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Vucanovich
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Wilson
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—296

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Burr
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cremeans
Cummings
Davis
de la Garza
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Stupak
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Torkildsen
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Allard
Browder
Flake
Gephardt
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lincoln
McDade
Schiff
Studds
Thornton
Yates

□ 2228

Mr. SHADEGG changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 2230

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Chair for his professionalism today and his tolerance.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina) having assumed the chair, Mr. HANSEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3540) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TEJEDA. Mr. Speaker, I was in transit to Washington from my district earlier today and missed rollcall votes 210, 211, and 212. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall 210; ''no'' on rollcall 211; and ''no'' on rollcall 212.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3562, THE WISCONSIN WORKS WAIVER APPROVAL ACT

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–604) on the resolution (H. Res. 446) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3562) to authorize the State of Wisconsin to implement the demonstration project known as ''Wisconsin Works,'' which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 4, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The purpose of this letter is to inform you that I hereby resign from the Committee on Small Business.

Sincerely,

EARL F. HILLIARD,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 447) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 447

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and that they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

To the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, EARL BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

To the Committee on Small Business, EARL BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

To the Committee on International Relations, EARL HILLIARD of Alabama.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RIGHTS OF THE ALBANIAN PEOPLE IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in expressing support for those ethnic Albanian citizens of