# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, June 17, 1993*

The House met at 10 a.m.

Rev. Washington Johnson II, Norwood Seventh-day Adventist Church, Birmingham, AL, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Eternal God, whose mighty hands brought forth this world into an existence, we acknowledge Your presence in the 20th century. We are cognizant of Your bountiful blessings upon this great Nation, from the sandy beaches of the western coast to the majestic Appalachians.

For these magnificent works, we duly exult Your name. In our quest for world peace and justice, we entreat Your divine guidance, for we are aware that You and You alone can restore universal tranquillity and moral uprightness.

We pray Your blessings of wisdom and understanding upon our President, Members of Congress, and all others who render services to You through service to their country.

As a nation, may we aspire toward peaceful relations with all other nations, by giving the world an example of love, understanding, devotion to Your cause and purpose. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ROEMER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to designate June 5, 1993, as "National Trails Day".

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution relating to the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Organization.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 101–194, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints Walter B. Gerken, of California, to the Citizens' Commission on Public Service and Compensation.

## WELCOME TO ELDER WASHINGTON JOHNSON II

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to rise today to welcome the very distinguished Elder Washington Johnson II to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. Elder Johnson is delivering our prayer today and I am delighted that he and his family are here.

Elder Johnson is the pastor of the Norwood Seventh-day Adventist Church in Birmingham. But, he is originally from Gadsden, AL, which is in my district. So, I will always consider him and his family to be my constituents.

Elder Johnson is a highly respected spiritual leader and I know that his message today will lift our hearts and minds and give us the guidance we need throughout our day.

These prayers are a source of hope for us and I certainly appreciate Elder Johnson taking the time to travel to Washington to be with us today.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce that it will receive requests for 1-minute speeches from 10 Members on each side.

## WELCOMING THE REVEREND WASHINGTON JOHNSON

(Mr. HILLIARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor and a pleasure to be able to welcome a dynamic and inspirational man of God. The Reverend Washington Johnson of the Norwood Seventh-day Adventist Church is one of the finer constituents of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. This young man of integrity and character provides quality leadership in the district not only in the areas of spiritual concern but also for the community at large. It is with pleasure that I welcome and greet Reverend Johnson, and I know that God will continue to use him and his ministry.

Again, thank you Reverend Johnson for offering the prayer of the day.

## FLIP FLOP

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, it's summer, and a lot of my staffers are putting on their flip-flops this weekend and going to the beach. Listening to them made me think of another great flip-flop here in town—President Clinton and his policies:

First, it was the middle-class tax cut. Then it was no middle-class tax cut. Then it was cut spending. Then it became increased spending. Then it was no Btu tax. Then we were going to have a Btu tax. Now we are back to talking about a Btu tax again, but, no, we are not going to have a Btu tax.

It was allow immigrants with AIDS into our country. Then, no, we are not going to allow immigrants with AIDS into the country.

Yes; now we are back to wanting immigrants with AIDS back in the country.

It was a health care plan in 100 days. Then it was no health care plan in 100 days. Cut the White House staff. Now we are going to increase the White House staff.

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad President Clinton's flip-flops are not restricted to his feet.

## A CHANGE OF DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton campaigned on the promise to change the direction of America and to put our people back to work.

In February, the President announced his economic plan and since then a quiet confidence has begun to build across our land.

By June 1, unemployment had dipped below 7 percent for the first time in a year and a half. Interest rates have continued to drop. New home sales hit a 7-year high in April.

And most importantly, 775,000 new jobs have been created. The House passed the President's plan. The other body continues to move President Clinton's proposal forward.

As the President's plan moves ahead, so, too, will the American economy, providing its people with better jobs and a brighter future for their children.



AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

## THE PRESIDENT'S AIDS IMMIGRANT POLICY

(Mr. EVERETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, during the campaign, candidate Clinton attacked President Bush for his Haiti policy. Once in office, President Clinton adopted that policy.

Once in office, President Clinton talked about lifting the ban on allowing AIDS immigrants to enter the United States. As a result, the Nation expressed outrage. Congress voted overwhelmingly to keep the existing ban, which allowed people with AIDS to enter the country on an individual basis. President Clinton signed that legislation into law just last Friday.

So what happened when a court ruled a group of Haitian immigrants infected with the virus would be allowed into the country? President Clinton decided not to appeal. He says he may appeal later, but not now. President Clinton decided not to decide. He did so despite the American people's support of the current policy, despite the Congress' overwhelming passage of legislation, and despite a law, which he signed himself.

Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to wonder how the President reaches his decision! With each new issue, Mr. Clinton shifts his position to suit the moment. Evidently, with this issue we have gone from reforming America's health care to reforming the world's.

## IT IS CALLED HOPE

(Mrs. MEEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, there is hope in America. Our young people now see that they have the opportunity to achieve the American dream—owning a house. Just a year ago less than half of those under the age of 35 thought that they had a good chance to buy a home. Now, over 70 percent believe they have this opportunity.

There are encouraging signs that inflation is firmly under control. Long-term interest rates are at their lowest in 20 years. Mortgage rates are 10 percent less than they were on November 6, 1992.

People must have confidence if we are to succeed in turning this country around. The continued low inflation in combination with low interest rates is creating that climate of confidence that we need.

To those naysayers who are willing to promote gridlock for short-term political gain, I say that the people will not be fooled. Let us continue to rebuild America.

## AIDS-INFECTED ALIENS

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I have with me today a copy of my grandparents' 1907 immigration papers.

Eighty-five years ago when my grandparents arrived at Ellis Island they were required to be in good health. It has been the policy of the United States for over a century to require standards for new immigrants.

The law of the United States, as signed by President Bill Clinton, does not permit HIV-infected aliens to enter our country.

This week Bill Clinton ignored that law.

When my immigrant grandfather died and left my grandmother with seven children they did not have Medicaid or food stamp programs. Our family worked to survive.

Today Florida and the American taxpayers will pick up the costly medical and social support tab for AIDS-infected aliens being flown to our shores.

Mr. Speaker, before the Members of Congress, I rise to protest this action.

□ 1010

## KEEPING OUR EYE ON THE BALL

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as we move forward with our 13 appropriations bills within the tight spending restraints adopted in March, it is essential to remind ourselves of our long-term goals and objectives.

First and foremost, we aim to reduce the budget deficit and strengthen our economy. We have seen some encouraging signs. The bond market has responded favorably, inflation has stabilized, mortgage rates have dropped to record lows, new home sales hit a 7-year high in April. This has created 700,000 new jobs; in fact, unemployment has fallen below 7 percent.

Our economic plan can help sustain these trends for the long run and buoy this upswing in the housing industry. For example, the mortgage revenue bond program, an essential component of the housing economy, will become a permanent part of the Tax Code. In North Carolina alone last year this program created more than 1,200 jobs, generated $200 million in real estate activity, brought in nearly $14 million in State and local tax revenues, and enabled over 3,000 families to move into their own homes.

Mr. Speaker, renewing this important tax incentive and enacting the comprehensive economic package will bring renewed hope across this country that we can address our problems in a serious and sensible way, end the gridlock and the blame-laying, and build a better future for all of our people.

## CLINTON THE ACROBAT

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, President Bill Clinton said his Presidency was the most decisive in a long time.

That statement reminded me of a line in a song that I heard on the radio. "I must be an acrobat, to talk like this and act like that."

From his famed middle-class tax cut, to his illusionary White House staff cuts, to his mysterious Haitian immigrant policy, the President has consistently talked one way and acted another.

The President needs to understand that his low approval ratings do not stem from communication problems. They stem from his habit of saying one thing and doing another.

Mr. Speaker, the President is walking a tight rope of public opinion, and his safety net has disappeared. If he continues his acrobatic somersaults with the truth, his approval ratings are really going to crash to the ground.

## THREE STRIKES AND THE SPACE STATION IS OUT

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, in baseball we have a classic saying that it is three strikes and you are out. However, with the space station, they were recently designated with the task of redesigning and coming up with three options: an option at $3 billion, at $7 billion, and at $9 billion.

In a hearing I recently asked Mr. Golden, the Director of NASA, "Did you hit any of those three targets?" He answered "No." They did not even come close. The three options came in at roughly $25 billion, $27 billion, and $28 billion. The price tag keeps going up and up and up, and the science keeps on going down and down and down.

Mr. Speaker, I specifically ask the new Members of this body that came here to change the status and reduce the budget deficit to vote for the Roemer-Zimmer amendment next week to terminate the space station and give it its third out, not give it the five redesigns that it has already had and the three options that are over budget.

## RECOMMENDING A MANDATORY INTERNATIONAL EMBARGO ON CUBA

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, last night the United Nations Security Council took the quite dramatic step of saying that 18 months of dictatorship in Haiti are 18 months too much, and imposing a worldwide mandatory embargo against the military regime in Haiti.

Yesterday the U.S. House of Representatives adopted the following language:

> The President should advocate, and should instruct the United States Representatives to the United Nations to support and consult with Members of the Security Council with respect to, a mandatory international embargo against the totalitarian government of Cuba pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

similarly as it is doing with respect to Haiti.

> Mr. President and Secretary Christopher, we have asked you to act. We will continue to ask you to act. We await your response to the formal request of the United States House of Representatives.

## AMERICA'S ECONOMIC IMPROVEMENT TIED TO INVESTMENT IN FAMILIES AND CHILDREN

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker as the other body works to meet their Friday deadline to reach a compromise on a budget package, I have specific concerns about proposals that have been discussed.

The Ways and Means Committee put time and effort in trying to construct a package that would accomplish the goals of President Clinton's economic program. The reconciliation package passed by the House embodies all the basic elements of the President's program. In the reconciliation plan, there are enough entitlement cuts to fund $100 billion in deficit reduction and pay for important new investments including: child immunization, family preservation, and expansion of the earned income tax credit.

The reconciliation legislation passed by the House contains important elements which will enable our country to get back on track. Three of these elements are childhood immunizations, expansion of the earned income tax credit, and increased funding for food stamps. I do not believe these provisions are unnecessary or frivolous.

The purpose of the provision is to invest in our future—the children of this country. These provisions would provide vaccines to children who have no health insurance coverage; reduce the U.S. child-poverty rate, which in 1991 encompassed one out of every four children under the age of 6; and assist the estimated 5 million hungry children in the United States.

If we are going to improve our economy, it is vital for us to invest in individual Americans, especially families and children. As we continue the budget reconciliation process, I urge Congress to support programs that will ultimately rebuild our country. We cannot continue to be a Nation that neglects its children.

## ESSENTIAL REFORMS FOR OSHA POLICY

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as a participant of the Republican relay team, I stand before you today to spotlight the unwarranted costs associated with many of our regulatory practices.

Unnecessary regulations are not just stifling the economy and job growth but are putting small companies out of business.

A constituent of mine, Sy Shifler of Hagerstown, MD knows firsthand the difficulty of complying with OSHA standards. His company, Shifler Electric employs about 50 people and is a prime example of a business that suffers under superfluous restrictions.

As a construction subcontractor, he has experienced a recent surge in fines imposed by OSHA. He was recently fined $600 for an extension cord left on a site by another contractor. But because he was the electrician on the job, Sy was forced to pay.

This type of ludicrous compliance is ultimately going to cost American jobs. Less construction work will cause contractors and subcontractors to hire less people and it may result in layoffs and the closing of many small businesses' doors.

OSHA fines have become a way in which the Federal Government can collect revenues. That is simply wrong. Fines should only be given in cases of blatant disregard for safety. They should not be issued to raise money to fund more wasteful Government programs.

OSHA reforms that reduce these burdens are urgently needed if we truly want to bring this country back to economic greatness.

## ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL REFORM WILL RESTORE AMERICA'S GREATNESS

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, as recently as Tuesday of this week President Clinton said that economic reform and political reform go hand in hand. It was, therefore, very fitting and appropriate that yesterday the Senate took actions on two of those measures. For economic reform, the Senate Finance Committee has made a move toward adopting a deficit reduction-economic stimulus program, and as we know, cloture was voted on campaign finance reform moving it along toward passage.

It does seem to me that these two issues and these two matters are fundamentally at the heart of what makes America great: that is, the economic ability we have to secure jobs and to educate our families and to provide for our futures, and a respect for and a reliance upon the political system which yields these economic judgments and decisions.

□ 1020

So it is very, very encouraging to me, Mr. Speaker, that we will have a chance yet this summer to vote upon two basic elements to make America better, economic reform and political reform.

## U.S. TAXPAYERS SPENDING BILLIONS ON ILLEGAL ALIENS, NONCITIZENS

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a Federal judge has now ordered that HIV-positive Haitian immigrants be released from Cuba, and they are being brought here.

No other country would take them.

The Miami Herald reported Friday that "workers will immediately plug the Haitians into a wide network of agencies that provide cash, medical care, counseling, jobs, and other services."

The paper said, that on average, it costs $100,000 to care for someone from the time he or she is infected with HIV until death.

This is the cost just for the medical care.

Week before last, an economist from Rice University presented a new study which shows that we spend at least $12.5 billion on the approximately 5 million illegal aliens here now.

Even more significantly, the study found that there are 11.8 million legal immigrants here—noncitizens—who cost all levels of government $45 billion above the taxes they pay.

In other words, we are spending at least $57.5 billion in tax money on noncitizens.

I certainly sympathize with everyone who is living in another nation under very bad conditions.

But the fact is that this is a tremendously growing problem.

We simply cannot take in all the millions who want to come here.

Even more importantly, the taxpayers of this Nation should not have to pay out additional billions to provide all sorts of medical, employment, and welfare benefits for people who are not U.S. citizens.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO GIVE TAX INCENTIVES ON INSTALLATION OF POLLUTION ABATEMENT EQUIPMENT

(Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to let my colleagues know of legislation I am introducing today which would provide a tax incentive to small businesses who install pollution abatement equipment at their facilities.

The bill aims to promote American industry and competitiveness, help to clean the environment, and help level the playing field with other industrialized nations that offer similar incentives to encourage manufacturers to acquire antipollution equipment.

The pollution abatement industry is a relatively young industry, and I believe, as do many, that it is one in which the United States should be a world leader.

Hand in hand with this, is the fact that the United States has the most stringent environmental laws anywhere in the world. As the Clean Water and Clean Air Acts are strengthened and enforced, companies who pollute will be required to clean up their acts.

My bill will provide a tangible incentive for utilities to speed up their environmental compliance plans, which will help clean the environment as well as have a direct, positive effect on the rate of job creation in the pollution abatement industry.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to look at this initiative, and lend it their support.

## CELEBRATING LIFE AND LEGACY OF MILWARD SIMPSON

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with this body the celebration of the life of a great man and his legacy in this country, both in Washington and in Wyoming. Milward Simpson, the father of the distinguished current Senator from Wyoming, ALAN SIMPSON, passed on to a greater life this week. With his passage we are reminded of his excellence and his leadership, a great man who comes from pioneer stock in Wyoming and forged his way to represent the people of that great State in the Governor's office and in the U.S. Senate.

In Wyoming, Milward Simpson is history. I grew up in Cody, WY, where Milward had his home, along with his sons, Pete and Alan. Milward Simpson was the kind of guy who took an interest in children, took an interest in making sure that young people were able to go to high school, had them living in his home so he would make sure they would go to high school. He had that same concern for people, and that same willingness to be concerned with many others, as he rose through State and national office. Through his deeds, honesty, and statesmanship, we know his contributions to this great country and my State are etched in our collective memory.

His passage is a loss to us all. His life enriched us all.

## SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1993

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make our colleagues aware that along with Senator DODD and my colleagues, Mr. OWENS and Mr. SERRANO, I have introduced the Safe Schools Act of 1993, which would provide $75 million to combat crime and violence in our Nation's schools. It would give local districts the flexibility to spend that money with a plan as they see fit to combat drugs and violence in the schools.

Let me relate some shocking statistics.

According to a 1990 survey by the National Centers for Disease Control, 1 in 5 high school students carries a weapon at least once a month in America for self-protection or use in a fight.

In 1991, a U.S. Department of Justice statistic showed that approximately 100,000 students of the Nation's 45 million students bring guns to school.

In 1992, the American Medical Association reported that guns had become second only to automobile accidents as the leading cause of death among young adults.

According to the national crime survey, almost 3 million crimes occur on or near school campuses every year, which breaks down to 16,000 per school day, or one every 6 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot wait any longer. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill. President Clinton and Secretary Riley both are on board. America needs this law.

## RESTORING U.S. LEADERSHIP IN POPULATION STABILIZATION

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today my friend TONY BEILENSON and I have introduced the International Population Stabilization and Reproductive Health Act, legislation which will restore U.S. global leadership in efforts to curb population growth and improve access to family planning services worldwide. Senators BINGAMAN and SIMPSON have introduced similar legislation in the Senate.

In recent years, it has become evident that population growth is a critical factor in air and water pollution, deforestation, civil unrest, and political instability. Moreover, the status of women in a particular country directly corresponds to its ability to achieve sustainable development and reduce fertility rates.

With this in mind, our legislation establishes population stabilization as a principal objective of U.S. foreign policy, authorizes increased funding for family planning services, literacy and education programs for women and girls, basic health and nutrition programs for women and children, and the bill establishes an AIDS prevention and control fund for research, treatment, and prevention of AIDS around the world.

This bill is not about more foreign assistance. It is about foreign assistance priorities. I urge my colleagues to join in support of this vitally needed legislation.

## SENDING THE AMERICAN DREAM ABROAD

(Mr. APPLEGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to praise LEE HAMILTON and BEN GILMAN for doing what they have done in cutting down on the foreign aid package.

Let me say that foreign aid in my district is anathema. People do not like it. I have high unemployment. We are losing businesses and jobs, we are losing our young people. Our people are losing their health insurance. The quality of life is leaving. They cannot buy the cars, they cannot get the education, house, clothe and feed their families like they once did.

Why? Because we are sending our jobs to other countries in the world. Yet we are asking our people to cough up more money in taxes, and asking more domestic programs to be cut so that other people in the world can enjoy the things that we want to enjoy with our own money.

Since 1980 we have spent $3 trillion on defense to defend a lot of these countries of the world, who then in turn burn our flag, condemn our people and, yes, in some instances they kill our kids. And I am just saying, let us use some common sense. Let us listen to the American people for a change.

□ 1030

## A MESSAGE FOR THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, this morning I have a message for the President of the United States.

Like the words of the song, "Pick yourself up, dust yourself off, and start all over again."

We have 3½ years to go here, and we want to have a fair fight. Mr. President, the American people do not appreciate piling on. They do not like the idea of kicking somebody when they are down. They like to see a fair fight, and we would like you to get back up on your feet and get back into the ballgame with us.

Can you not hear what they are saying to you? They are beckoning to you, Mr. President—come back, come back to us—do the things that you pledged, keep the promises that you made during the campaign, reduce taxes on the middle class, cut the deficit by 50 percent, put in place those structural reforms that you promised us that will in fact lead to permanently balanced budgets.

And when you do quit fumbling and bumbling from one misstep to the next, we will be there again to challenge you on a daily basis so that we can have a complete debate in this country.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The gentleman should address his remarks to the Chair, not to the President.

## FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 200 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 200

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2295) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and making supplemental appropriations for such programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Appropriations and which shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the pending question shall be the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Appropriations now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be designated and shall be debatable for twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and against provisions in the bill if so amended, are waived. If the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, then the bill as so amended shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. No further amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed, may be offered only by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been finally adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 200 will allow the House to consider H.R. 2295, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal 1994. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

The rule provides that after general debate, the pending question shall be the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Appropriations and now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee on Appropriations. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and against provisions in the bill if amended are waived.

The rule provides that if the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, then the bill as amended shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

Under the rule, no further amendment to the bill is in order except for the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed and by the named proponent or a designee. The amendments shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The amendments shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Finally the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2295 is the foreign operations, export financing and related programs appropriations bill for 1994. The bill provides for $13 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1994 which is $956 million below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1993 and is $1.4 billion below the President's request.

Recommendations in this bill reflect several new trends which include continuing deficit reduction. The bill contains large reductions in virtually all accounts and will require new approaches to the delivery of aid.

The bill displays a new policy emphasis on emerging democracies and provides a total of $2.5 billion in technical and humanitarian assistance for the new Independent States of the former Soviet Union and $400 billion for Eastern Europe and the Baltics.

The bill also reflects a continuing shift from security and military assistance to economic development and the alleviation of poverty. The bill places special emphasis on children and provides $530 million for child survival activities through the Agency for International Development and UNICEF. The bill also provides funding for basic education, displaced children, and for children in Romania and Cambodia.

The bill provides $785 million for export and trade related programs and provides a subsidy appropriation of $700 million for the Export Import Bank and $40 million for the Trade and Development Agency which is the same level of funding provided last year.

In the security assistance programs, the committee has recommended significant spending reductions. For the

Economic Support Fund, the Committee has provided $2.3 billion which is a reduction of $217 million from the President's request.

The bill also contains $219 million for the Peace Corps and $100 million for international narcotics control and provides funding for various environmental initiatives including the United Nations Environment Fund and AID's Office of Energy. The bill provides $20 million for biodiversity programs and $15 million for the Montreal Protocol Facilitation Fund.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 200 will expedite consideration of this important bill. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule because it severely limits the right of House Members to offer amendments to this foreign operations appropriations bill.

Only four first-degree amendments are made in order by this rule, plus one second-degree, substitute amendment by the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, we have strongly protested restrictive rules on appropriations bills before because they take away the most fundamental constitutional prerogative of this House, and that is the power of the purse.

Under this rule, Members will not be allowed to offer the usual amendments to reduce or strike amounts appropriated by this bill. That is a travesty on the rights of this House, its Members and the people we represent who want us to cut spending.

And believe me, we are talking about real money, lots of dollars, big bucks, in this foreign aid bill—nearly $13 billion for fiscal year 1994, and over $1.5 billion in supplemental funds for the current fiscal year.

If ever we needed to exercise our control over the purse strings and make spending cuts, this is the bill. And yet, this rule denies us that full right.

Mr. Speaker, some 33 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee on this bill. And while some were withdrawn, and others required waivers, several legitimate cutting amendments were denied by the Rules Committee. Those Members, Republicans and Democrats alike, and the people they represent, are being disenfranchised by this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the Rules Committee for making in order my amendment to reduce spending for the Export-Import Bank, as well as the amendment I have cosponsored with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], and Mr. MFUME and Mr. RANGEL to delete the $1.6 billion for the former Soviet Union.

But I regret that other Members of this House will not have the same right to reduce or strike spending items that they think are excessive. That is the way it should be and has been in the past. Let's not forfeit this fundamental power we have over the purse strings of this Government by acceding to such restrictive rules.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is again important to point out that this is the second general appropriations bill to come through the Rules Committee to this floor in this session. And it is the second time the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has not requested a rule.

Once again the subcommittee chairmen rather than the chairman are requesting these rules. I think that is wrong.

I again want to commend the full committee chairman Mr. NATCHER on the principled stand he has taken in trying to avoid coming to the Rules Committee to protect unauthorized and legislative provisions in these bills. He is standing up for the regular authorizing and appropriations process.

Only when we begin to put our foot down on these matters will we begin to restore the committee system and a strong authorization-appropriations process in this House.

We can't very well point the finger at the other body for legislating on appropriations bills when our own dirty fingerprints are all over such provisions as well.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the entire bill in this case would have been subject to a point of order had we not granted this rule since the authorization bill has not been enacted.

To remedy this, we offered an alternative open rule up in the Rules Committee yesterday. It would have waived clause 2 of rule XXI against the unauthorized provisions in the bill, but not against legislative language.

That would have been a fair and reasonable compromise, it seems to me, yet it was rejected on a party line vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of this restrictive rule so that we can once again allow House Members to work their will on amendments to cut spending as they have for most of the 205-year history of this House.

On the bill itself, I have many concerns, but the one that bothers me most is the $2.5 billion giveaway to the former Soviet Union, $1.6 billion of which is in the form of a supplemental for 1993.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the floor I argued that it was necessary to secure reimbursement for the majority of our aid to the former Soviet Union, and we passed my amendment, a sense-of-the-House amendment to that effect.

I also spoke in favor of the Kyl amendment which would have reduced the authorization for Russia aid by $700 million.

The reasons I gave were fiscal restraint and accountability to the voters. The same reasons dictate that we defeat this appropriation bill here today. A $2.5 billion giveaway is simply indefensible in this day of $300 billion deficits and tax increases, and the voters won't stand for it!

But further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take issue with the substance of the administration's Russian aid package itself, which is not questioned in either this bill or the authorization bill we passed yesterday.

First, as I stated yesterday, almost none of this aid is reimbursable. It is nearly all in the form of grants. Meanwhile, our main competitor, Japan, has quietly offered their aid package for Russia and 82 percent of it is reimbursable. Once again, we are the sugar daddy and Japan laughs all the way to the bank.

Yesterday, this House passed my amendment that expressed the sense of Congress that a similar percentage of our aid to Russia ought to be reimbursable. This was a step in the right direction, but there needs to be more teeth put into this concept.

Second, there ought to be an acid test applied to every penny of this aid, even if it is reimbursable, and that is: Does it promote the building of democratic and free market institutions in the recipient country?

Mr. Speaker, the administration's program does not meet this test.

Let's take a look at three of the Clinton proposals which account for well over half of what the administration promised at Tokyo in April.

First, $500 million for a privatization fund. Now who, except for perhaps the Nation magazine, is not for privatization? But providing subsidies for these newly privatized firms is highly problematic. These firms will mostly be run by the same bureaucrats who ran them under Communism.

They are bound to maintain a cozy, non-market oriented relationship with government ministries. You can just see the enormous potential for politicization and corruption with this fund.

Second, $150 million in assistance for the state-owned oil and gas sector, which is still a monopoly and is subject to controls that keep prices well below market.

Mr. Speaker, these two ideas will likely lead not to the marketization of Russia, but to a continued state corporation.

Third, $150 million to build houses for returning Russian soldiers.

This is outrageous. At a time when we are sending our own soldiers out into the cold, we are going to build houses for an occupation army? Besides, the program is unnecessary. All reports are that the Russian withdrawal is proceeding anyway.

So tell me, why would we want to engage in centrally planned ransom, when this is something the Russians should do, and are already doing?

Mr. Speaker, the administration has fashioned an aid package for Russia which is based mostly on the very government-to-government aid that has failed so miserably in the Third World.

It is the very sort of aid which we on the Gephardt codel to Russia were warned to avoid.

Several reformist Russian parliamentarians reiterated these sentiments here in Congress in May. These are the people who know their system best. They live with the corruption every day. They are no doubt laughing at our naivete at this very moment.

Mr. Speaker, the best thing we could do right now is reject H.R. 2295.

It would allow us to fashion a new approach to foreign aid; one that requires small budgets, requires reimbursement for more of our aid, and one that sunsets programs that perpetuate the statist mentality in the recipient countries.

If we had an open rule, we could operate and remedy these failures that are prevalent throughout this bill.

Defeat this rule and let the entire House work its will.

H. RES.__ PROVIDING AN OPEN RULE FOR THE FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2295)

"That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2295) making appropriations for foreign operating, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year 1994, and making supplemental appropriations for such programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and the amendment made in order by this resolution, and which shall not exceed one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The provisions of clause 2, rule XXI are waived only against unauthorized programs and provisions but not with respect to any legislative provisions. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions."

Explanation: This amendment to the proposed rule provides for a one-hour, open rule for the consideration of H.R. 2295, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI only against the unauthorized programs and provisions in the bill but not against any legislative provisions.

---

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED TO H.R. 2295 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1994

1. Burton—Cuts $41 million in development aid, the amount requested for Developmental Aid to India.

2. Burton—Cuts International Military Education and Training (IMET) funding by $345,000, the amount requested for India.

3. Inslee—Reduces the funding for Foreign Operations (except AID-Population development assistance) by 1% and increases the Population development assistance fund by the aggregate amount reduced.

4. Conyers—Increases from $979 million to $1,744 billion the amount allocated to DoD for the purpose of providing assistance to the former Soviet Union. The $765.5 million increase is then to be directed to the DoL for funding a summer jobs program for poor American youths.

5. Callahan—Strikes Title VI, supplemental appropriations for the former Soviet Union.

6. Callahan—Strikes Title VI, supplemental appropriations for the former Soviet Union.

7. Kyl—Strikes $703.820 million out of assistance for former Soviet Union, leaving $200 million.

8. Solomon—Strikes FY 1994 funds for aid to the former Soviet Union.

9. Solomon—Strikes 50% of $979 million in FY 1993 supplemental funds, to be disbursed through DoD, for aid to the former Soviet Union.

10. Solomon—Strikes 50% of $630 million in FY 1993 supplemental funds designated as foreign assistance funds for the former Soviet Union.

11. Solomon—Strikes the $979 million supplemental FY 93 appropriation for the former Soviet Union under the heading of "Department of Defense, Operation and Maintenance". (Same as Delay #29)

12. Solomon—Reduces assistance for the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union from $903,820,000 to $451,910,000.

13. Solomon—Reduces appropriations for the Export-Import Bank from $700,000,000 to $621,767,018.

14. Solomon—Strikes the $630,000,000 supplemental FY 93 appropriations for the former Soviet Union under the heading of "Assistance for the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union".

15. Traficant—Across-the-board cut of 10% except for Contributions to the International Development Association; Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank—Fund for Special Operations; Contribution to the Asian Development Fund; Contribution to the African Development Fund; International Organizations and Programs; Development Assistance Fund; Population, Development Assistance; Development Fund for Africa; African Development Foundation; Inter-American Foundation; Peace Corps; International Narcotics Control; and Trade and Development Agency.

16. Traficant—Across-the-board cut of 5% with the same exceptions as amendment #15.

17. Traficant—Aross-the-board cut of 1% with the same exceptions as amendment #15.

18. Goodling—Prohibits IMET funds to nations that do not maintain a 25% vote with the U.S. in the UN General Assembly. Exempt humanitarian and developmental assistance, and narcotics-related assistance.

19. Orton—Strikes the Housing Guaranty Program Account ($134,317,000).

20. Durbin—Conditions aid to Russia on a Presidential certification that (1) Russian and CIS forces have been withdrawn for the Baltic states or negotiated agreements between Russia and the Baltics have been completed, including a timetable for withdrawal; and (2) Russia has undertaken good faith efforts to end other military practices that violate the sovereignty of the Baltics or interfere in Baltic airspace or territorial waters, has not introduced additional troops into the Baltics without Baltic permission, and has not imposed an economic blockade or interrupted energy supplies. Contains exception for funds for officer housing and for food, clothing, medicine, other humanitarian supplies.

21. Kasich—Strikes paid-in capital contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)($55,821,000) and the corresponding provision on limitation on callable capital contribution to the IBRD.

22. Kasich—Reduces the paid-in capital contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) from $55,821,000 to $40,000,000. Reduces the corresponding callable capital contribution to the IBRD from $1,804,879,000 to $1,293,333,400.

23. Kasich—Strikes paid-in capital contribution to the Asian Development Bank (ADB)($13,026,366) and the corresponding provision on limitation on callable capital contribution to the ADB.

24. Kasich—Reduces the amount for operating expenses of the Agency for International Development from $501,760,000 to $476,672,000.

25. Roth—Requires the President to deobligate unexpended funds which have remained obligated for a period of more than 3 years but have not been expended. Grants the President authority to waive this requirement on a case-by-case basis.

26. Rangel—Strikes the total amount of aid for the former Soviet Union, including the $1.6 billion FY '93 supplemental and the $904 million FY '94 appropriation.

27. Smith (TX)— Establishes a reserve account for salaries and expenses, beginning with FY '94, of 5% of the amount incurred for those salaries and expenses for the previous year. Provides that the President make recommendations to Congress as to the use of the reserve funds and provides fast track procedures for consideration of the President's recommendations.

28. DeLay—Prohibits any funds in this act to be used for elephant conservation of preservation. ($7 million)

29. DeLay—Deletes section containing $979 million in FY 1993 supplemental funds, to be disbursed through DoD, for aid to the former Soviet Union.

30. DeLay—Prohibits any funds in this act to be used in any way to encourage or allow entry into this country an alien with AIDS or infected with HIV.

31. Brown (CA)—Strikes the exemption which allows AID to pursue activities in the informal sector that contribute to the violation of internationally recognized worker rights.

32. Obey—Substitute to Burton #1, Reduces appropriation for Development Assistance from $816,000,000 to $811,900,000.

33. Rangel—Limitation on funds for provisions relating to Cuba.

AMENDMENTS MADE IN ORDER TO H.R. 2295, FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1994

A committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill to be considered as pending (20 minutes).

(Listed in the order they will appear in the report.)

1. Kasich (#21)—Strikes paid-in capital contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) ($55,821,000) and the corresponding provision on limitation on callable capital contribution to the IBRD (30 mins).

2. Burton (#1)—Cuts $41 million in development aid, the amount requested for Developmental Aid to India (20 mins).

3. Obey (#32)—Substitute amendment to Burton (20 mins).

4. Solomon (#13)—Reduced appropriations for the Export-Import Bank from $700,000,000 to $696,421,462 (30 mins).

5. Callahan/Solomon/Mfume/Rangel (#5)—Strikes Title VI, supplemental appropriations for the former Soviet Union (60 mins).

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES—95TH–103D CONGRESS

| Congress (years) | Total rules granted [1] | Open rules [2] | | Restrictive rules [3] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 95th (1977–78) | 211 | 179 | 85 | 32 | 15 |
| 96th (1979–80) | 214 | 161 | 75 | 53 | 25 |
| 97th (1981–82) | 120 | 90 | 75 | 30 | 25 |
| 98th (1983–84) | 155 | 105 | 68 | 50 | 32 |
| 99th (1985–86) | 115 | 65 | 57 | 50 | 43 |
| 100th (1987–88) | 123 | 66 | 54 | 57 | 46 |
| 101st (1989–90) | 104 | 47 | 45 | 57 | 55 |
| 102d (1991–92) | 109 | 37 | 34 | 72 | 66 |
| 103rd (1993–94) | 22 | 5 | 23 | 17 | 77 |

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities, 95th–102d Congress; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Congress, through June 17, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES—103D CONGRESS

| Rule number and date reported | Rule type | Bill number and subject | Amendments submitted | Amendments allowed | Disposition of rule and date |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H. Res. 58—Feb. 2, 1993 | MC | H.R. 1: Family and medical leave | 30 (D–5; R–25) | 3 (D–0; R–3) | PQ: 246–176 A: 259–164 (2/3/93) |
| H. Res. 59—Feb. 3, 1993 | MC | H.R. 2: National voter registration act | 19 (D–1; R–18) | 1 (D–0; R–1) | PQ: 248–171 A: 249–170 (2/4/93) |
| H. Res. 103—Feb. 23, 1993 | C | H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation | 7 (D–2; R–5) | 0 (D–0; R–0) | PQ: 243–172 A: 237–178 (2/24/93) |
| H. Res. 106—Mar. 2, 1993 | MC | H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments | 9 (D–1; R–8) | 3 (D–0; R–3) | PQ: 248–166 A: 248–163 (3/3/93) |
| H. Res. 119—Mar. 17, 1993 | MC | H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993 | 13 (D–4; R–9) | 8 (D–3; R–5) | PQ: 247–170 A: 248–170 (3/10/93) |
| H. Res. 132—Mar. 17, 1993 | MC | 1335: Emergency supplemental approps | 37 (D–8; R–29) | 1 (not submitted) (D–1; R–0) | A: 240–185 (3/18/93) |
| H. Res. 133—Mar. 17, 1993 | MC | H. Con Res. 64: Budget resolution | 14 (D–2; R–12) | 4 (1–D not submitted) (D–2; R–2) | PQ: 250–172 A: 251–172 (3/18/93) |
| H. Res. 138—Mar. 23, 1993 | MC | H.R. 670: Family planning amendments | 20 (D–8; R–12) | 9 (D–4; R–5) | PQ: 252–164 A: 247–169 (3/24/93) |
| H. Res. 147—Mar. 31, 1993 | C | H.R. 1430: Increase public debt limit | 6 (D–1; R–5) | 0 (D–0; R–0) | PQ: 244–168 A: 242–170 (4/1/93) |
| H. Res. 149—Apr. 1, 1993 | MC | H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993. | 8 (D–1; R–7) | 3 (D–1; R–2) | A: 212–208 (4/28/93) |
| H. Res. 164—May 4, 1993 | O | H.R. 820: Natl. Competitiveness Act | N/A | N/A | A: Voice Vote (5/5/93) |
| H. Res. 171—May 18, 1993 | O | H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993 | N/A | N/A | A: Voice Vote (5/20/93) |
| H. Res. 172—May 18, 1993 | O | H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act | N/A | N/A | A: 308–0 (5/24/93) |
| H. Res. 173—May 18, 1993 | MC | S. J. Res. 45: U.S. forces in Somalia | 6 (D–1; R–5) | 6 (D–1; R–6) | A: Voice Vote (5/20/93) |
| H. Res. 183—May 25, 1993 | O | H.R. 2244: 2d supplemental approps | N/A | N/A | A: 251–174 (5/26/93) |
| H. Res. 186—May 27, 1993 | MC | H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget reconciliation | 51 (D–19; R–32) | 8 (D–7; R–1) | PQ: 252–178 A: 236–194 (5/27/93) |
| H. Res. 192—June 9, 1993 | MC | H.R. 2348: Leg. branch appropriations | 50 (D–6; R–44) | 6 (D–3; R–3) | PQ: 240–177 A: 226–185 (6/10/93) |
| H. Res. 193—June 10, 1993 | O | H.R. 2200: NASA authorization | N/A | N/A | A: Voice Vote (6/14/93) |
| H. Res. 195—June 14, 1993 | MC | H.R. 5: Striker replacement | 7 (D–4; R–3) | 2 (D–1; R–1) | A: 244–176 (06/15/93) |
| H. Res. 197—June 15, 1993 | MO | H.R. 2333: State Dept | 53 (D–20; R–33) | 27 (D–12; R–15) | A: 294–129 (6/16/93) |
| | | H.R. 2404: Foreign Aid | | | |
| H. Res. 199—June 16, 1993 | C | H.R. 1876: Ext. of "Fast Track" | N/A | N/A | |
| H. Res. 200—June 16, 1993 | MC | H.R. 2295: For. Ops. appropriations | 33 (D–11; R–22) | 5 (D–1; R–4) | |

Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous Question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

□ 1050

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON], the chief deputy whip.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and this bill.

This is the key bill that fuels our foreign policy. The cornerstone of the Clinton foreign policy is in this bill. Let us allow the President to run foreign policy.

I can remember many times when my colleagues on the other side supported President Bush on his foreign policy initiatives. We have a new President. He is going to be in Tokyo for the G–7 meetings. The worst thing that we could do is to send a signal that we are not supporting the President on his Soviet aid package, that we are not supporting the President on his Middle East peace process, that we are not supporting the President on a very constructive increase in development assistance for Africa. This bill emphasizes development assistance over military assistance.

Mr. Speaker, there is a killer amendment, the amendment on Soviet aid, the Callahan amendment. We should reject that very strongly.

What are the Soviet people going to think if the United States cannot deliver? What are our allies in Europe going to think if they perceive the United States as weak in supporting the Soviet aid package?

Passage of this bill is in our interest. America will make money. American business will make money from the Soviet package. We spent billions of dollars on the cold war. Now this small amount of money can help win the peace.

Mr. Speaker, let us not embarrass President Clinton on his first foreign policy test. These are the first foreign policy votes we are casting in the House. This is an enormously important bill. The rule is fair.

The Burton amendment that we defeated yesterday is up again in a show of fairness.

Mr. Speaker, later today we will vote on the foreign aid appropriations bill, a bill I support because it is money spent in America's self-interest. Part of that bill appropriates funds for Russia.

I can think of few things that rival in importance our efforts to cultivate democracy in the former Soviet Union. As a nation, it is in our economic and security interest to ensure that Russia move peacefully to democracy and a market economy. As the Russian economy gains strength:

Our markets will grow; our exports will increase; new American jobs will be created; and the U.S. economy will benefit.

In addition, this bill provides $400 million to support the dismantling of nuclear weapons, obviously providing a lasting benefit to each and every American.

Mr. Speaker, we have literally spent trillions of dollars to win the cold war. It would be a cruel and unforgivable act to balk today and block the appropriation of a few billion dollars to help win the peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] has expired.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina, it is my understanding this is an eminently fair rule.

Did we not yesterday vote on the same amendment of the gentleman from Indiana on India?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the answer is yes, and we will have an opportunity to vote again today on basically the same thing.

It is a very fair rule. It was worked out by those on the majority and the minority, and it is a fair rule.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin

has been enormously constructive in his efforts to develop a bipartisan bill, and with my good friend from New York also.

I am surprised at his concern over the rule. I participated in many meetings where it was emphasized that Members of the minority were getting most everything that they wanted in terms of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York, to ask if that is not correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] has again expired.

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

Let me just say as the gentleman leaves the well that I have great respect for him, as he knows.

But you know, for 205 years on the floor of this body, Mr. Speaker, we have always had the right to offer legitimate germane striking amendments. We are not allowed on this.

Again, I was gracious to the subcommittee chairman. We have great respect for him, but the truth of the matter is there are Members on both sides of the aisle that are being denied.

We do thank the gentleman for making the amendments in order that they did, but again every Member, all 435 of us, ought to have the right to work our will.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding me time. I plan to make comments on the bill when we get to general debate, but I want to take a moment to reflect on one aspect of this bill with which I have been involved with for some years.

Since I have been a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, the members of the subcommittee and the House as a whole have struggled to find the proper balance in our Nation's relationship with our allies in the eastern Mediterranean, Greece and Turkey.

Turkey was a cold war ally who has deemed crucial to our defense along the southern flank of the Soviet Union and now has a role to play in guiding the newly crated Moslem majority nations of Central Asia to take the path of secularism and eschew the militant fundamentalism of Iran and Iraq. Greece has been a strong, supportive ally of the United States in every war this country and is playing a very positive, moderating role in the potentially explosive Balkan situation. It is beneficial for the United States to have close relations with both Greece and Turkey and the subcommittee has gone out of its way to treat the two nations comparably.

I believe, however, that we have come to a point where we must reassess carefully our relations with Turkey. In a time of very tight foreign assistance budgets—sending this year is approximately 50 percent of what it was in 1985—we obviously must prioritize our spending. I believe that we should base difficult spending decisions on shared values with the nations we assist, and Turkey is a nation that must improve substantially in several areas.

Turkey is cited by the United States Department and all the major human rights groups as having an abysmal human rights record. As chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus I try to assess the general direction a country is going in with respect to its human rights practices. If the country is genuinely trying to improve its human rights record and is getting incrementally better—even though they may not yet be up to international standards—I consider that to warrant ongoing support.

I am sorry to say that I have seen no signs that Turkey is moving in the right direction. On the contrary, human rights conditions in Turkey remain medieval. Arbitrary arrests, torture in detention, and terrible prison conditions are everyday facts of life in Turkey despite constant United States calls for improvements. In addition, although Turkey has legitimate security concerns regarding the Kurdish separatist movement, the PKK, Turkey's treatment of its own Kurdish population is simply unacceptable.

Turkey's failure to use its influence to resolve the ongoing division of Cyprus is also a very problematic aspect of our relationship that is severely hampering closer relations. Last year, the Appropriations Committee indicated that it would carefully monitor the positions adopted by all parties in the last year's U.N. talks. After the talks ended inconclusively, the U.N. Secretary General and the Security Council implicitly blamed Mr. Denktash for adopting an intransigent position at odds with the Set of Ideas drafted by the U.N. after consultations with both sides.

The report to the foreign assistance authorization bill that passed yesterday reflects very accurately that the Turkish-Cypriots—who are supported by 35,000 Turkish troops on the island of Cyprus—refused to negotiate in good faith and calls on them to adopt a more cooperative approach. The Foreign Affairs Committee also makes it clear that it believes that the Turks are a key to solving this ongoing problem and calls on them to use their influence to bring about a resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned that we are providing $125 million in cash grants and $405 million in loans to buy military items to a nation whose values apparently so sharply deviate from our own. I strongly support the underlying bill for many, many reasons, I commend the chairman for bringing it to the floor and I urge Members to vote for it. At the same time, I urge Members to keep an eye on Turkey and judge for themselves during the next year whether its human rights practices and position on Cyprus warrant continued high levels of assistance.

□ 1100

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with whom I served on that committee for many, many years and a classmate of mine.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], my friend, for yielding this time to me. I enjoyed working on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with him, and I wish he were still on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I speak on this rule is because sometimes it is not easy to understand the rationale that governs the Committee on Rules. It is almost as if the guidelines for the Committee on Rules revolve solely around whim and caprice.

The reason I say that is because I had a very important amendment before the Committee on Rules and asked that this amendment be ruled in order. Two years ago, the House adopted this same amendment during action on the foreign aid bill. Now, when it is preeminently the time to address the question of AID funding, the Committee on Rules has refused to allow the amendment.

Two years ago, the Committee on Rules allowed this very amendment, and this amendment was approved by this body, 216 to 203, although leadership was opposed to it and although most of the committee was opposed to it. But when the Members came to the floor of the House to vote, Mr. Speaker, they voted for it.

It was inspiring for me to see the Members assert themselves when they voted for my amendment. Of course, when the House-Senate conference committee met subsequently, the power structure reasserted itself, and the conference refused to accept this amendment, even though this House had voted 216 to 203 to accept the amendment.

So, the Committee on Rules, by their action on this rule, is really thwarting the will of this House; not the leadership and the committee chairman, but the Members. This rule before us prevents the House from a full, and fair and free debate.

Many Members have real questions about this bill, and I ask the members of the Committee on Rules, "What are you afraid of? Why didn't you allow this amendment? The House voted on it 2 years ago and they approved it."

There are other real questions about this bill. This bill will send $12 billion overseas, just weeks after the majority passed the largest tax increase in history, including a $29 billion tax on seniors' Social Security benefits. Mr. Speaker, America is overextended and we must focus on our domestic problems for a change. We must have a free and open debate on foreign aid. I ask my colleagues to vote against this rule so that the Committee on Rules will make in order amendments like mine that this entire House should debate and decide. It is not fair for the Committee on Rules to shut off the entire House by saying: "No, you can't vote on this amendment."

Mr. Speaker, the majority leadership is proposing that only five amendments be allowed to this bill.

If this rule is adopted, Members will be prevented from offering amendments to all but a handful of the provisions of this legislation.

This is the foreign aid appropriations bill.

It contains: $7.3 billion in economic assistance to foreign countries, $1.8 billion in contributions to international financial organizations, and $3 billion in foreign military aid.

That is a total of $12.1 billion to be sent overseas.

But this proposed rule would allow only 5 amendments; and one of those is a substitute for another. So, there are really only four issues open for amendment.

It is clear from this rule that the Democrat leadership cares more about ramming foreign aid through Congress than it does for saving money for the American taxpayers.

Our national debt is $4.1 trillion.

Our annual deficit is $400 billion.

Even with a trillion dollars a year in revenues, one Federal dollar in three is borrowed money.

Interest costs of $200 billion a year eat up one tax dollar out of every five sent to Washington. And in the face of this fiscal disaster, what is the Democrats' priority?

Here it is—$12 billion in foreign spending.

I doubt whether the American people, if they knew what was going on, would approve of this bill.

Certainly the people of northeast Wisconsin would say "no."

In my annual questionnaire, with almost 30,000 responses, the vote against foreign aid is overwhelming—9 out of 10.

I am sure that sentiment is the same across our State.

So, I urge my colleagues to join with me today and vote "no" on this rule and vote "no" on foreign aid giveaways that the American people do not want and cannot afford.

And to the Democrat leaders of this House, I say: "If you are going to tax Social Security by $29 billion, just so you can push another $12 billion overseas, your day of reckoning with the American people is coming."

Mr. Speaker, this rule is not worthy of the democratic process. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for having yielded this time to me.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I never heard more nonsense in my life than I just heard from the previous speaker. If the gentleman is going to lecture the House on the rules, it would be nice if he understood them first. And the fact is that the gentleman's amendment, under an open rule, would not be allowed on this bill because it is a legislative amendment. The gentleman's amendment belongs on the authorization bill. He happens to be a member of the authorizing committee.

I say to the gentleman, "Don't blame the Appropriations Committee for not trying to legislate on an appropriations bill. We get lectured from your committee all the time about how we should not interfere in your jurisdiction. Your amendment would not be in order on this bill under an open rule, and, if you don't know it, you ought to, gentleman from Wisconsin."

The second point I will simply make is that every single amendment being allowed on this bill is a Republican amendment. Every single amendment being allowed is a Republican amendment.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, there is an exception, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. No, Mr. Speaker, mine is a substitute. That amendment would be in order, under an open rule, to the Burton amendment. There is no change in the handling of the Burton amendment from what would be the case under an open rule. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has an opportunity to offer his amendment. I would have a right to offer a substitute. That is the same if we were operating under an open rule.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] ought to go back and study the rules book before he asks the Appropriations Committee to legislate on an appropriations bill.

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

Let me just say to my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] who I have great respect for, that he is right, that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] would be legislating in an appropriations bill and that would not be allowed under an open rule.

However, Mr. Speaker, in most of the rules that come before this floor we waive those points of order to allow legislating in appropriations bills. We have done it for the gentleman walking down in the well now, for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], on many, many occasions, and I supported him.

I might also point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], that he does have an amendment. It is a substitute amendment. But the truth of the matter is that this bill the gentleman brings to the floor would not be able to come to this floor under the rules of the House if we did not waive points of order because the bill is unauthorized. So I just point that out, being friendly about it.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin and ask him, "Aren't you from the same State as the gentleman, by the way?"

Mr. ROTH. We are neighbors, and we are good friends, and I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for having yielded to me. He, the gentleman from New York, serves on this Committee on Rules. I have been before the Committee on Rules many, many times,

I think what it boils down to is: "If the Rules Committee says your amendment is germane, it's germane. If they say it isn't, it isn't."

That is about the size of it; is that not correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. It sure is.

Mr. Speaker, I really wish we were going to have the opportunity to debate and offer amendments on this floor dealing with the issue of aid for the former Soviet Union. The issue is whether we are going to give that aid in the form of grants and gifts, or whether we are going to give that aid in the form of a loan and credits, or whether we are going to barter the aid that we are giving, which means that they have to pay us back either in goods, in natural resources, in commodities, or in products that they produce in their country. But at least collateralize it, and make sure we are going to get repaid, the taxpayers are going to be repaid.

But we cannot have that debate on the floor here today, and that is too bad.

Mr. Speaker, having said all that, I would just urge defeat of the rule.

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

□ 1110

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment on the rhetoric I have heard on this rule from across the aisle.

Members of the majority and the minority joined together in crafting this rule. It is a very fair rule. It allows quite a number of amendments.

The Members on the other side keep talking about a fair rule and an open rule. They do not really want an open rule, because when they tell us what they would like as far as an open rule is concerned, what they describe is not really an open rule. What they want is what they want, and if they cannot have it, then they start complaining about open rules. They vote for closed rules quite often in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 263, nays 160, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

YEAS—263

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Callahan
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Yates

NAYS—160

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—11

Barcia
de la Garza
Fields (TX)
Henry
McDade
Neal (NC)
Pelosi
Pickle
Wilson
Wynn
Young (AK)

□ 1133

Messrs. THOMAS of Wyoming, KYL, and ROYCE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BATEMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A notion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). Pursuant to House Resolution 200 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. 2295) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and making supplemental appropriations for such programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

□ 1133

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. 2295) with Mr. RICHARDSON 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 Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, this is the second appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 to come before the House.

I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], chairman of this subcommittee, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the ranking minority member on the subcommittee. This is one of the most difficult bills to bring to the floor that we have on our Committee on Appropriations. All of the 14 Members composing the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations are able members of our committee and able Members of the House. I want to commend them on a good bill.

At this time, on the Committee on Appropriations, we have marked up 12

of our 13 bills in subcommittee. We have completed five full committee mark ups. Next week we have seven more scheduled.

Members on the committee from both sides of the aisle have helped, and I want my colleagues to know that I appreciate it. I want to commend the chairman of this subcommittee and the ranking member and all of the other subcommittee members for a job well done.

I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that the bill that we bring to the House today is an absolutely, totally bipartisan bill. As I said in the full committee and in the Committee on Rules, I do not think there was a partisan comment made through the entire consideration of this bill, including the hearing process. I want to very much express my appreciation to all the members of the subcommittee, and particularly to the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who has replaced our old friend, Mickey Edwards, as the ranking Republican on the subcommittee this year.

I would also like to thank the staff, Terry Peel and Bill Schuerch, Mark Murray, Lori Maes, Karen Brown, Mike Marek, and the minority staff, Dean Sachett, Jim Kulinowski, and Bob Lester, and all of the associate staff who worked to make this bill the bipartisan product it is today.

Mr. Chairman, a vote for this bill today will cut the President's request for foreign assistance by $1,400,000,000. It will reduce last year's expenditures by $1 billion. It will bring the bill in over $800 million below the committee's budget ceiling under the 602 authority for budget authority, and I think it represents an effort to do things in a very different way from past bills.

Two examples. One is the fact that this bill makes excruciating cuts in a number of accounts in the bill.

□ 1140

For example, when the administration finishes setting aside the funding that it is planning to use for the Middle East, we will be cutting for the rest of the world for economic support funds by 37 percent, and we will be cutting our foreign military aid by 52 percent for those same regions of the world. It will mean that this bill, which has been cut about 30 percent since I became chairman a number of years ago, is being cut by another $1 billion from last year's level. And yet within that squeezed bill we are able to meet the administration's request to fully fund assistance for the former Republics of the former Soviet Union.

We did that by receiving the cooperation of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], and the ranking Republican on that subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE]. So we were able to take $979 million in allowed but unappropriated defense money and use it instead to fund the 1993 supplemental for Russian aid.

I would simply make one other point before yielding the floor. I know this is not a very popular bill to vote for. It is probably the most difficult appropriation bill, with the possible exception of the legislative appropriation bill, to bring before the House. But the fact is that there is a price for participation in the world. There is a price for leadership of the world if you intend to play a leadership role.

We are the only remaining superpower in the world, and it is in the interest of our taxpayers, it is in the interest of our young people who might otherwise have to fight in foreign wars for us to be making these limited kinds of expenditures, to try to stabilize the economic and social conditions which could otherwise lead to chaos and lead to conditions around the world which would require our direct military involvement.

I have never understood people who are willing to pay $200 or $300 billion a year to build the weapons of war, but are not willing to spend a tiny fraction of that amount, 1 percent of the budget, in order to try to create the economic and social conditions that can avoid the use of war as a tool of national policy. So I would simply say that if Members want to cast a vote for deficit reduction, vote for this bill.

The Russian aid which we are providing supplements something which has been going on since the Iron Curtain fell under President Bush's administration. The fact is we have been able to save well over $900 billion in military expenditures because Gorbachev and Yeltsin have been running the Soviet Union rather than the old boys who ran it before. This is a tremendous savings to our taxpayers. It is a tremendous blessing to the entire world.

This bill, for a tiny fraction of those savings, tries to tie down those political and economic gains. It is well worth the price, and I urge Members to give their bipartisan support for the product.

I include for the RECORD details of the expenditures in the bill, as follows:

## FY 1994 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2295)

| | FY 1993 Enacted | FY 1994 Estimate | Bill | Bill compared with Enacted | Bill compared with Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I - 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 | 62,180,100 | 70,126,332 | 55,821,000 | -6,359,100 | -14,305,332 |
| (Limitation on callable capital) | (2,010,512,700) | (2,267,418,063) | (1,804,879,000) | (-205,633,700) | (-462,539,063) |
| Contribution to the Global Environment Facility | 30,000,000 | 30,810,000 | 30,000,000 | ..... | -810,000 |
| Total, contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development | (2,102,692,800) | (2,368,354,395) | (1,890,700,000) | (-211,992,800) | (-477,654,395) |
| Contribution to the International Development Association | 1,024,332,000 | 1,250,000,000 | 1,024,332,000 | ..... | -225,668,000 |
| Contribution to the International Finance Corporation | 35,761,500 | 50,000,000 | 35,761,500 | ..... | -14,238,500 |
| Total, World Bank Group | (3,162,786,300) | (3,668,354,395) | (2,950,793,500) | (-211,992,800) | (-717,560,895) |
| Budget authority | 1,152,273,600 | 1,400,936,332 | 1,145,914,500 | -6,359,100 | -255,021,832 |
| Limitation on callable capital | (2,010,512,700) | (2,267,418,063) | (1,804,879,000) | (-205,633,700) | (-462,539,063) |
| Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank: | | | | | |
| Inter-regional paid-in capital | 56,466,000 | 57,313,368 | 56,166,000 | -300,000 | -1,147,368 |
| Fund for special operations | 20,272,000 | 20,576,000 | 20,164,000 | -108,000 | -412,000 |
| (Limitation on callable capital) | (2,202,040,000) | (2,235,076,561) | (2,190,283,457) | (-11,756,543) | (-44,793,104) |
| Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund | 90,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 75,000,000 | -15,000,000 | -25,000,000 |
| Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank | (2,368,778,000) | (2,412,965,929) | (2,341,613,457) | (-27,164,543) | (-71,352,472) |
| Contribution to the Asian Development Bank: | | | | | |
| Paid-in capital | 38,014,303 | 13,026,366 | 13,026,366 | -24,987,937 | ..... |
| Development fund | 62,500,000 | 170,000,000 | 62,500,000 | ..... | -107,500,000 |
| (Limitation on callable capital) | (278,518,000) | ..... | (95,438,437) | (-183,079,563) | (+95,438,437) |
| Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank | (379,032,303) | (183,026,366) | (170,964,803) | (-208,067,500) | (-12,061,563) |
| Contribution to the African Development Fund | 103,893,000 | 135,000,000 | 132,300,000 | +28,407,000 | -2,700,000 |
| Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development: | | | | | |
| Paid-in capital | 60,000,000 | 61,000,000 | ..... | -60,000,000 | -61,000,000 |
| (Limitation on callable capital) | (140,000,000) | (163,381,400) | ..... | (-140,000,000) | (-163,381,400) |
| Total, contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development | (200,000,000) | (224,381,400) | ..... | (-200,000,000) | (-224,381,400) |
| International Monetary Fund | | | | | |
| United States quota, International Monetary Fund | 12,313,857,000 | ..... | ..... | -12,313,857,000 | ..... |
| Total, contribution to International Financial Institutions | (18,528,346,603) | (6,623,728,090) | (5,595,671,760) | (-12,932,674,843) | (-1,028,056,330) |
| Budget authority | 13,897,275,903 | 1,957,852,066 | 1,505,070,866 | -12,392,205,037 | -452,781,200 |
| (Limitation on callable capital) | (4,631,070,700) | (4,665,876,024) | (4,090,600,894) | (-540,469,806) | (-575,275,130) |
| Department of State | | | | | |
| International organizations and programs | 310,000,000 | 390,000,000 | 339,500,000 | +29,500,000 | -50,500,000 |
| International Fund for Agricultural Development (by transfer) | (15,000,000) | ..... | ..... | (-15,000,000) | ..... |
| Total, title I, contribution for Multilateral Economic Assistance | (18,838,346,603) | (7,013,728,090) | (5,935,171,760) | (-12,903,174,843) | (-1,078,556,330) |
| Budget authority | 14,207,275,903 | 2,347,852,066 | 1,844,570,866 | -12,362,705,037 | -503,281,200 |
| (Limitation on callable capital) | (4,631,070,700) | (4,665,876,024) | (4,090,600,894) | (-540,469,806) | (-575,275,130) |
| TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE | | | | | |
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT | | | | | |
| Agency for International Development | | | | | |
| Development Assistance Fund | 1,037,480,000 | 921,480,000 | 816,000,000 | -221,480,000 | -105,480,000 |
| Population, development assistance | 350,000,000 | 400,000,000 | 392,000,000 | +42,000,000 | -8,000,000 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa: | | | | | |
| Development assistance | 800,000,000 | 800,000,000 | 784,000,000 | -16,000,000 | -16,000,000 |
| Africa disaster assistance | 100,000,000 | ..... | ..... | -100,000,000 | ..... |
| Private sector revolving fund: | | | | | |
| Operating expenses | 1,347,000 | ..... | ..... | -1,347,000 | ..... |
| Subsidy appropriations | 4,057,000 | ..... | ..... | -4,057,000 | ..... |
| (Estimated level of direct/guaranteed loans) | (81,319,000) | ..... | ..... | (-81,319,000) | ..... |
| American schools and hospitals abroad | 30,000,000 | ..... | ..... | -30,000,000 | ..... |
| Transfer | 500,000 | ..... | ..... | -500,000 | ..... |
| International disaster assistance | 48,965,000 | 148,965,000 | 145,985,000 | +97,020,000 | -2,980,000 |
| Housing and other credit guaranty programs: | | | | | |
| Subsidy appropriations | 16,407,000 | 16,407,000 | 16,078,000 | -329,000 | -329,000 |
| Operating expenses | 8,407,000 | 8,407,000 | 8,239,000 | -168,000 | -168,000 |
| (Estimated level of guaranteed loans) | (150,000,000) | (110,000,000) | (110,000,000) | (-40,000,000) | ..... |
| Subtotal, development assistance | 2,397,163,000 | 2,295,259,000 | 2,162,302,000 | -234,861,000 | -132,957,000 |
| Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund | 42,677,000 | 44,151,000 | 44,151,000 | +1,474,000 | ..... |
| Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development | 512,000,000 | 512,000,000 | 501,760,000 | -10,240,000 | -10,240,000 |
| (By transfer) | (4,300,000) | ..... | ..... | (-4,300,000) | ..... |

## FY 1994 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2295)—Continued

| | FY 1993 Enacted | FY 1994 Estimate | Bill | Bill compared with Enacted | Bill compared with Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General | 39,316,000 | 39,916,000 | 39,118,000 | -198,000 | -798,000 |
| Debt restructuring | 50,000,000 | 45,427,000 | 7,000,000 | -43,000,000 | -38,427,000 |
| Subtotal, Agency for International Development | 3,041,156,000 | 2,936,753,000 | 2,754,331,000 | -286,825,000 | -182,422,000 |
| Economic Initiatives | | | | | |
| Economic support fund | 2,670,000,000 | 2,582,000,000 | 2,364,562,000 | -305,438,000 | -217,438,000 |
| Rescission | | | -185,000,000 | -185,000,000 | -185,000,000 |
| International fund for Ireland | 19,704,000 | 20,000,000 | 19,600,000 | -104,000 | +19,600,000 |
| Assistance for the Philippines: Multilateral assistance initiative for the Philippines | 40,000,000 | 40,000,000 | 20,000,000 | -40,000,000 | -40,000,000 |
| Assistance for Eastern Europe | 400,000,000 | 408,951,000 | 400,000,000 | | -8,951,000 |
| Assistance for former republics of the Soviet Union | 417,000,000 | 903,820,000 | 903,820,000 | +486,820,000 | |
| (1993 Supplemental - Foreign Operations) | | (630,000,000) | (630,000,000) | (+630,000,000) | |
| (1993 Supplemental - Defense) | | (979,000,000) | (979,000,000) | (+979,000,000) | |
| Demobilization and transition fund (by transfer) | (29,000,000) | | | (-29,000,000) | |
| Subtotal, Economic Initiatives | 3,546,704,000 | 3,934,771,000 | 3,502,982,000 | -43,722,000 | -431,789,000 |
| Total, Agency for International Development | 6,587,860,000 | 6,871,524,000 | 6,257,313,000 | -330,547,000 | -614,211,000 |
| Independent Agencies | | | | | |
| African Development Foundation | | | | | |
| Appropriations | 16,905,000 | 16,905,000 | 16,905,000 | | |
| Inter-American Foundation | | | | | |
| Appropriations | 30,960,000 | 30,960,000 | 30,340,000 | -620,000 | -620,000 |
| Overseas Private Investment Corporation | | | | | |
| Loan subsidies: | | | | | |
| Direct | | 2,937,000 | 2,717,000 | +2,717,000 | -220,000 |
| Guaranteed | 9,800,000 | 6,863,000 | 6,348,000 | -3,452,000 | -515,000 |
| Total | 9,800,000 | 9,800,000 | 9,065,000 | -735,000 | -735,000 |
| Operating expenses | 8,128,000 | 8,128,000 | 7,518,000 | -610,000 | -610,000 |
| (Limitation on direct loans) | | (20,712,000) | | | (-20,712,000) |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (650,000,000) | (375,027,000) | | (-650,000,000) | (-375,027,000) |
| Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation | 17,928,000 | 17,928,000 | 16,583,000 | -1,345,000 | -1,345,000 |
| Total, Funds Appropriated to the President | 6,653,653,000 | 6,937,317,000 | 6,321,141,000 | -332,512,000 | -616,176,000 |
| Peace Corps | | | | | |
| Appropriations | 218,146,000 | 219,745,000 | 219,745,000 | +1,599,000 | |
| Department of State | | | | | |
| International narcotics control | 147,783,000 | 147,783,000 | 100,000,000 | -47,783,000 | -47,783,000 |
| Montreal Protocol Facilitation Fund (by transfer) | (15,000,000) | | | (-15,000,000) | |
| Migration and refugee assistance | 620,688,000 | 640,688,000 | 670,688,000 | +50,000,000 | +30,000,000 |
| United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund | 49,261,000 | 49,261,000 | 19,261,000 | -30,000,000 | -30,000,000 |
| Anti-terrorism assistance | 15,555,000 | 15,555,000 | 15,244,000 | -311,000 | -311,000 |
| Total, Department of State | 833,287,000 | 853,287,000 | 805,193,000 | -28,094,000 | -48,094,000 |
| Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance | 7,705,086,000 | 8,010,349,000 | 7,346,079,000 | -359,007,000 | -664,270,000 |
| (By transfer) | (48,300,000) | | | (-48,300,000) | |
| (Limitation on direct loans) | | (20,712,000) | | | (-20,712,000) |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (650,000,000) | (375,027,000) | | (-650,000,000) | (-375,027,000) |
| (Estimated level of direct/guaranteed loans) | (231,319,000) | (110,000,000) | (110,000,000) | (-121,319,000) | |
| TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE | | | | | |
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT | | | | | |
| International Military Education and Training | 42,500,000 | 42,500,000 | 21,250,000 | -21,250,000 | -21,250,000 |
| Foreign Military Financing Program: | | | | | |
| Grants | 3,300,000,000 | 3,231,657,000 | 3,175,000,000 | -125,000,000 | -56,657,000 |
| (Limitation on administrative expenses) | (26,000,000) | (25,558,000) | (23,558,000) | (-2,442,000) | (-2,000,000) |
| Direct concessional loans: | | | | | |
| Subsidy appropriations | 149,000,000 | 120,263,000 | 46,530,000 | -102,470,000 | -73,733,000 |
| Administrative expenses | 200,000 | 194,000 | | -200,000 | -194,000 |
| (Estimated loan program) | (855,000,000) | (855,000,000) | (769,500,000) | (-85,500,000) | (-85,500,000) |
| FMF program level | (4,155,000,000) | (4,086,657,000) | (3,944,500,000) | (-210,500,000) | (-142,157,000) |
| Subtotal, Foreign military financing program | 3,449,200,000 | 3,352,114,000 | 3,221,530,000 | -227,670,000 | -130,584,000 |
| Reappropriation (deobligation/reobligation) authority (sec. 515): | | | | | |
| Foreign military financing | | 500,000 | 500,000 | +500,000 | |
| Total, Foreign military assistance | 3,449,200,000 | 3,352,614,000 | 3,222,030,000 | -227,170,000 | -130,584,000 |
| Special Defense Acquisition Fund: | | | | | |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (225,000,000) | | | (-225,000,000) | |
| Fund elimination | | -266,000,000 | -266,000,000 | -266,000,000 | |

## FY 1994 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2295)—Continued

| | FY 1993 Enacted | FY 1994 Estimate | Bill | Bill compared with Enacted | Bill compared with Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Peacekeeping operations | 27,166,000 | 77,166,000 | 75,623,000 | +48,457,000 | -1,543,000 |
| Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund | ..... | 50,000,000 | 10,000,000 | +10,000,000 | -40,000,000 |
| Total, title III, Military assistance programs | 3,518,866,000 | 3,256,280,000 | 3,062,903,000 | -455,963,000 | -193,377,000 |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (251,000,000) | (25,558,000) | (23,558,000) | (-227,442,000) | (-2,000,000) |
| (Estimated loan program) | (855,000,000) | (855,000,000) | (769,500,000) | (-85,500,000) | (-85,500,000) |
| TITLE IV - EXPORT ASSISTANCE | | | | | |
| EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES | | | | | |
| Limitation of Program Activity: | | | | | |
| Subsidy appropriations | 757,000,000 | 757,000,000 | 700,000,000 | -57,000,000 | -57,000,000 |
| (Estimated loan program) | (15,500,000,000) | (16,500,000,000) | ..... | (-15,500,000,000) | (-16,500,000,000) |
| Administrative expenses | 45,683,000 | 46,295,000 | 45,369,000 | -314,000 | -926,000 |
| Negative subsidy | -16,533,000 | -51,783,000 | -51,783,000 | -35,250,000 | ..... |
| Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States | 786,150,000 | 751,512,000 | 693,586,000 | -92,564,000 | -57,926,000 |
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT | | | | | |
| Trade and Development Assistance | | | | | |
| Trade and development | 40,000,000 | 60,000,000 | 40,000,000 | ..... | -20,000,000 |
| Total, title IV, Export assistance | 826,150,000 | 811,512,000 | 733,586,000 | -92,564,000 | -77,926,000 |
| (Estimated loan program) | (15,500,000,000) | (16,500,000,000) | ..... | (-15,500,000,000) | (-16,500,000,000) |
| Grand total, all titles: | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 26,257,377,903 | 14,425,993,066 | 12,987,138,866 | -13,270,239,037 | -1,438,854,200 |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (251,000,000) | (25,558,000) | (23,558,000) | (-227,442,000) | (-2,000,000) |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (650,000,000) | (375,027,000) | ..... | (-650,000,000) | (-375,027,000) |
| (Limitation on direct loans) | ..... | (20,712,000) | ..... | ..... | (-20,712,000) |
| (Limitation on callable capital) | (4,631,070,700) | (4,665,876,024) | (4,090,600,894) | (-540,469,806) | (-575,275,130) |
| (Estimated level of direct/guaranteed loans) | (231,319,000) | (110,000,000) | (110,000,000) | (-121,319,000) | ..... |
| (Estimated loan program) | (16,355,000,000) | (17,355,000,000) | (769,500,000) | (-15,585,500,000) | (-16,585,500,000) |

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2295.

I would first like to take this occasion to commend Mr. OBEY and Mr. LIVINGSTON for providing the following provisions in this legislation: For providing sufficient funding levels to honor our Camp David commitments to Israel and Egypt and for providing $2.5 billion for Russia and the former Soviet Republics to facilitate their transition to democracy and a free-market economy.

I believe that these appropriations to Israel, Egypt, Russia, and the former Soviet Republics will translate into expanded United States exports, new jobs and reduced United States defense expenditures.

I also commend them for the multilateral banks cut of 23 percent and for zeroing out funding for the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Finally, I commend them for retaining the Kemp/Kasten language prohibiting U.S. funding of abortions and for the refugee assistance funding which I believe addresses basic humanitarian needs.

Madam Speaker, foreign aid is a concept that is all too often mischaracterized as a giveaway program to other countries. It is seen by many people as an effort by the American Government to give money away when it should be used here at home.

This is not a fair representation of the facts. The fact is that foreign aid is a wise investment. It is an investment which benefits our economy and our Nation far more than it costs.

To make an informed decision on the value and merits of foreign aid, several questions must be answered. These are the same questions anyone would ask themselves when deciding on whether or not to invest their own money.

The first question we must answer is "What does foreign aid cost?" For the fiscal year 1994 budget, foreign aid is $9.7 billion. While this sounds like a large amount of money, it is important to remember that this figure represents less than 1 percent of the total budget and only slightly more than two-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product. These numbers pale in comparison to the amount of return we receive from them.

This brings up the second question, "What return do we see for the money we invested?"

By providing economic assistance to other countries, we actually create our own markets for trade. For example, a Pentagon study found that the money given to our allies to purchase military equipment from American defense contractors actually injects $20 to $30 billion a year into the U.S. economy. This is responsible for the creation of more than 200,000 jobs for American workers.

Through foreign aid, we are able to stabilize the economies of other countries and, therefore, open up new avenues for exports. Consider the export promotion programs which are funded through foreign aid. In 1991, alone, these programs helped generate more than $16 billion in American exports and over 300,000 jobs.

In my home State of Alabama many companies have been able to expand their exports due to gains made through foreign aid. Alabama exports $134 million in textiles, $113 million in lumber products, and $300 million worth of agriculture products. Alabama's total exports for 1990 totaled almost $3.4 billion and accounted for more than 68,000 jobs.

Foreign aid is also preventative medicine. By strengthening fledgling democracies and equipping them to defend themselves, we create allies. We also avoid the future risk of being forced to send in our own troops to calm a trouble spot. This results in both future peace dividends and future export markets.

Many people automatically associate foreign aid and humanitarian aid and are critical of it because there are needy people in this country. Humanitarian aid is only a small part of foreign aid but one that shows tremendous benefits. Although it only costs each American 16 cents per year, U.S. humanitarian aid is responsible for fully immunizing 80 percent of all children in developing countries, eradicating smallpox, and saving 20 million people from starvation in Africa during the last decade.

Traditionally, Americans have not been supportive of foreign aid. In 1947, only 17 percent of the American public approved of President Truman's Marshall Plan. Yet through this investment of our money, we were able to make allies out of enemies; markets out of battlefields; and order out of chaos. Now, there are other areas of the world that need this same assistance—this same opportunity to grow. Mr. Speaker, I submit that to refuse this aid would be to forget the lessons of the past and ignore the opportunities and possibilities for the future.

In conclusion, Madame Speaker, I would like to encourage my fellow Republicans to join me in support for H.R. 2295. The budget request in H.R. 2295 is $1.4 billion below

President Clinton's fiscal year 1994 budget request and $1.1 billion below foreign aid appropriations for fiscal year 1993.

For all of the above reasons, I would urge my fellow Republicans to give careful consideration to and support for H.R. 2295.

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

Madam Chairman, I rise in vigorous support of H.R. 2295. First I would like to offer my sincere congratulations and thanks to Chairman OBEY and his staff for their bipartisan approach to the fiscal year 1994 foreign operations appropriations bill. It has been a pleasure to work with them on this. They have bent over backward to be cooperative and helpful, and since this is my first year as the ranking member of the subcommittee, I truly appreciate the efforts of the chairman to accommodate me and my staff as we familiarized ourselves with the many nuances of this often contentious and controversial bill.

Madam Chairman, I am happy to report that H.R. 2295 continues a recent downward trend in foreign aid spending by cutting $1.4 billion from President Clinton's fiscal year 1994 request and $1.2 billion from last year's foreign aid level. This bill is also $840 million below our subcommittee's 602(b) allocation. All titles are cut below fiscal year 1993 levels, and with almost every account taking at least a 2 percent cut.

H.R. 2295 contains no earmarks, but provides sufficient funding levels in relevant accounts to allow the President to honor the Camp David commitments.

The cuts in H.R. 2295, while necessary to reflect the changes in the world and the budgetary constraints under which this body operates, do not come without pain.

The cuts in H.R. 2295 while necessary to reflect changes in the world and budget constraints, do not come without pain. I am concerned about cuts in assistance to our ally, Turkey. As the only predominantly Muslin nation with a secular, democratic government, Turkey can be an example to the emerging Muslin states of the former Soviet Union. Turkey is a staunch ally who supported us fully during the Gulf war at great economic expense.

I am also concerned about the $217 million cut in Economic Support Funds [ESF]. After Israel and Egypt receive their ESF allotments under the Camp David accords, only $350 million remains to service the rest of the world. Effectively, ESF monies for all other countries have been cut by 38 percent. Likewise, grant military assistance for all countries besides Israel and Egypt has been cut by 57 percent. The United States has many interests around the world and these cuts diminish our ability to effectively meet the needs of many of our friends.

I could elaborate on other cuts that perhaps in past years might not have been taken, but were necessary this year.

Especially hard hit in H.R. 2259 were the multilateral banks which are cut about $449 million, a full 23 percent under last year. U.S. arrearages to the multilateral banks will increase to about $822 million. And while I am no fan of the multilateral banks, it should be noted that these arrearages will only diminish our voting share in the banks and lessen our ability to influence decisions about lending practices and loan recipients.

One bank which I am very pleased to say received a zero figure, no funding at all, is the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The chairman and I agreed that extravagant expenditures by that bank's president, paired with the fact that the bank spent twice as much on its facilities, its staff and its overhead as it did on development in Eastern Europe, more than justified withholding the $70 million request for EBRD.

H.R. 2295 is far from perfect, but there are some bright spots in the legislation. I am pleased that funding for the Peace Corps was not cut, and in fact, increased by a modest $5.1 million over fiscal year 1993 levels to $220 million. That is a fine institution which is doing a very good job around the world, and especially in Russia and the newly Independent States.

I am also pleased that we are able to find a creative solution to offset a $57 million cut in the Export-Import Bank subsidy appropriation. This cut was the last made in the bill and was done reluctantly. Fortunately, because of the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. LIGHTFOOT's persistence, and Chairman OBEY's flexibility, we are able to transfer $125 million in additional moneys from the Russian aid package to Exim to promote United States exports to the NIS. U.S. exports will be enhanced, resulting in jobs for Americans because of this shift.

Lastly, Madam Chairman, perhaps the most controversial and the most important aspect of H.R. 2295 is the $2.5 billion in aid for Russia and the newly Independent States. By fostering democracy and free enterprise in Russia, and by helping them dismantle their nuclear arsenal and resettling their troops so they do not become lost and revolutionary, we are ultimately helping ourselves.

□ 1150

A democratic free-market Russia will be a boon for United States business interests and exports, and if we are successful in bringing Russia into the fold of Western industrial nations, the savings to the United States in defense expenditures alone will more than pay for the small amount of Russian aid in H.R. 2295.

Most importantly, the peace and the tranquility of future generations around the world will be bolstered tremendously. I will expand on my support for Russian aid in my comments in opposition to the Callahan amendment later on.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague doing this. I am not going to be able to be here for a while. The gentleman is making a very important point, and I must say that within the bill, as I understand it, there is approximately $3.175 billion for foreign military finance programs. Is that correct?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, that is right. That is correct.

Mr. LEWIS of California. The gentleman has spoken to the need for assistance to that emerging country that is so important in terms of our hope for freedom in the world, and I very much appreciate that and intend to support that portion of the bill.

What concerns me, and I would like to have my colleague just respond in part now, and we can discuss it further from this point. As I understand it, there is $3.175 billion for foreign military finance programs. But the vast percentage of those moneys go to three countries. They are Egypt, Israel, and Russia. I understand that, as well.

But I also understand the bill only leaves then about $50 million for all of the rest of our friends in the world. Now, I know that my friend would support our having a broader base of support for those other allies, and I am wondering just kind of out loud if maybe it is not time for us to think about moving that portion of our appropriations to another bill rather than having it tied to foreign assistance. If we could do that, we might very well broaden the base.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I think the gentleman has raised a very important point. In view of the fact that we are in a new administration, and they are feeling their way in foreign policy, we want to provide them as much flexibility as possible. We have not provided them with any earmarking in this bill, but there exist major world commitments, what with Camp David, and the President's commitments to Russia. We really cannot avoid tightening of the belt because of budget restrictions. So this year's priorities are set in stone.

But next year is another year, and I give warning, just as the gentleman has pointed out, we are going to have to reassess our priorities. I am serving notice on the administration that we need to sit down and really take a hard look at where we want to go from here. We need to determine whether we can afford to concentrate all of our foreign aid budget in the pockets of just a few countries.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I would say to my friend that I have always known my friend to be very quick on his feet, but his response is most thoughtful, and I appreciate it.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], a member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2295, the foreign operations, export financing, and related programs appropriation bill of 1994.

First, I want to commend our chairman, DAVID OBEY, for the fine work he has done in moving this bill to the floor. As a new member of the subcommittee, I want to thank him and his terrific staff for all the help they have given me. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to talk about two foreign policy triumphs addressed in this bill.

The first is peace in the Middle East. Back in 1979, our President, Jimmy Carter, brokered a peace treaty between Israel and Egypt that ended 30 years of war. That peace treaty has saved countless Israeli and Arab lives over the past 14 years. It may also have saved American lives. The aid we provide to Israel and Egypt in this bill is part of that Camp David agreement.

It is not inexpensive. But it is far, far less expensive than the cost of war.

Another related United States triumph can also be seen in this bill: $80 million for the resettlement of Soviet and Ethiopian Jews in Israel. It was our country that fought to get the Soviet Jews out of Russia. It was our country that worked directly to get the Ethiopian Jews on those planes to Israel.

Refugee assistance is a tribute to us as a country—and, on a personal note, it is a tribute to DAVID OBEY, who has dedicated himself to helping refugees, in Israel and throughout the world.

The other triumph that can be seen in this bill is in our aid to the former Soviet Union. We won the cold war. The Soviet Union is no more.

Instead of spending $4 trillion for nuclear weapons, we can spend $2.5 billion to ensure that no Fascist or Communist threat arises from the ashes of the Soviet state.

Aid to Russia is a defense expenditure, a small amount of aid to ensure that our children will not be threatened by a new totalitarian Russian state in the future.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Let us not make the mistake we made when World War I ended and America hid its head in the sand. The result was a Second World War 20 years later.

Let us learn from history. Let us do the right thing. Let us enact this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like now to enter into a colloquy with the Chair of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill, and I want to commend the chairman for his leadership on what is always a tough piece of legislation. I would ask if the chairman would be willing to engage in a colloquy.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to engage in a colloquy.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1993 foreign operations appropriation contained a range of exchange programs for students and other professionals from the former Soviet States. Included in this package was a graduate student program modeled after the Edmund Muskie Fellowships.

The Muskie Fellowship Program enables students from the former Soviet Union to study for 1 to 2 years in American universities in the fields of business administration, economics, law, and public administration. It has enabled many promising young students, who will undoubtedly play a key role in the transition to a market economy, to have a high-quality education in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I would very much like to see a similar program modeled after the Muskie Program be applied to Eastern Europe as well. While it is important to focus on the transition to democracy and a market economy in Russia, investments in Eastern Europe are very critical, and the same needs for trained economists, businessmen, and public officials that exist in Russia also exist in Eastern Europe.

Because of the justifiable need to avoid earmarks and maintain flexibility for the President concerning aid to both Russia and Eastern Europe, I know that the fiscal year 1994 legislation does not contain specific proposals for how exchanges will be funded under the President's assistance package. But I would ask the chairman if he would be willing to support funding for the Muskie Program, or a similar model, for both the former Soviet States and Eastern Europe, when this issue arises in conference with the other body.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, let me say that I certainly appreciate the gentlewoman's position and share her interest in making certain we do not forget about Eastern Europe, even as we do focus on the Soviet Union.

Undoubtedly the issue will arise as we work with the other body in conference. I would be very happy to work with the gentlewoman to try to see to it that funding may be applied to both Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the chairman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the story is told of the Member who went back to his district and addressed a group of his constituents regarding foreign assistance. In the heat of his oration he promised them, "This year I will cut foreign aid $150 billion and next year I will cut the rest."

Mr. Chairman, we do not have anything like that amount of resources devoted to foreign assistance. This bill appropriates $13 billion for all of the U.S.'s foreign assistance programs in the coming absolute year. That is 0.8 percent of the $1,500 billion Federal budget, and the amount of foreign assistance and the percentage both are shrinking. In the wake of World War II in the late forties, the United States was spending nearly 3.25 percent of its gross national product on foreign aid. In 1985, Congress appropriated $21 billion in foreign assistance, about 0.4 percent of our GNP. This year, in the wake of the cold war, we are appropriating $13 billion, less than 0.25 percent of the GNP. We could eliminate all foreign assistance and make only a 4-percent dent in our deficit for this year, but we would lose much of our influence overseas.

I would make the case that we are not spending too much on foreign aid. The end of the cold war represents a golden opportunity for the United States to extend its influence around the globe and be a true leader in promoting a sharing of our values of human rights, democracy, the rule of law and free markets. Newly free and developing nations are hungry for change. Totalitarian ideology is on the run around the globe. While we see and read about the terrible genocide in the Balkans, we must recognize that the nature of news is essentially negative and remind ourselves Democracy and a new respect for human rights are germinating and growing in South and Central America, the former Soviet Union and Asia. We stand on the threshold of a new world that no one envisioned 10 years ago. As the sole remaining superpower, the United States cannot abdicate its responsibility to lead.

One benefit of the changed global situation is enhanced U.S. security. We are safer now than we have been in over 40 years. As a consequence, we are able to reduce our military expenditures substantially. Without the economic, military, and development assistance in this bill our ability to project U.S. influence overseas would be limited to military options, and the defense budget would not be able to be reduced as substantially as is planned.

The best example of this trade off is the $2.5 billion in assistance included for the States of the former Soviet Union. This small investment in securing the fragile democracy there may ultimately save us tens or hundreds of billions of dollars if we can help ensure that totalitarianism and a new militarism does not return to Russia.

This may be a difficult political vote for some Members. I urge those Members to keep in mind that this bill is not a giveaway. It is in our best national interest to provide this funding. That—our own national interest—is the bedrock of any nation's foreign policy and the basis of all our foreign assistance programs.

I would like to mention several items in the bill that I believe are of special importance.

The subcommittee has provided ample funds in the ESF and FMF accounts to fully meet our Camp David commitments to Israel and Egypt and has made it very clear in this bill that it expects the administration to disperse these funds as it has in the past. Israel is the United States' most important ally in the Middle East. More importantly, it is a haven for refugees from the former Soviet Union and Ethiopia, where they have been persecuted, both officially and unofficially, for hundreds of years.

The funding that the United States provides to Israel helps it maintain its qualitative military edge in a region where all but one of its neighbors refuse to recognize its right to exist. It also assists the Israelis in assimilating the huge number of new arrivals and provide decent housing and economic opportunity for them. I am very pleased that the Foreign Operations Subcommittee has included these funds and that the Foreign Affairs Committee showed clear support for Israel by earmarking them.

This bill also makes a strong statement about the importance of strengthening bilateral and multilateral voluntary family planning programs. H.R. 2295 contains $392 million for the AID population program and $50 million for the United Nations Population Fund.

Rapid population growth is one of the most pressing problems facing the world. Poverty, environmental degradation, malnutrition, and infant and child mortality caused by improperly spaced births are all direct results of the lack of adequate global access to voluntary family planning services. In addition, as Prof. Paul Kennedy clearly lays out in his latest book, rapid population growth that is not accompanied by economic growth is a politically destabilizing force. The highest growth rates in the world today are in the Arab States of the Middle East.

World population is presently increasing by 1 billion people every 11 years. The human misery and irreversible environmental problems caused by population growth will only increase without action. This bill addresses this urgent need and makes substantial increases in funding for population programs.

The bill also forcefully addresses the pressing problem of global environmental degradation with a central focus on promoting sustainable development. As the report to accompany the bill makes clear, economic growth must be predicated on sustainable use of resources, rather than their exploitation. Funding is provided for an appropriately structured global environmental facility, which is designed to assist developing countries pursue projects with global environmental benefits, focusing on four areas: First, global warming, second, biological diversity, third, pollution of international waters, and fourth, stratospheric ozone depletion. In addition, funding for the AID biodiversity program and the global warming initiative are maintained, renewable energy programs are promoted, and the important roles of women and fertility in development are highlighted. Environmental issues know no national borders and assisting developing nations to promote sustainable development and address environmental problems helps people in both the developing nations and our own.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close by thanking the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the ranking minority member—who has done a truly outstanding job in his first year in the position—for navigating this bill through the subcommittee and committee with great skill and in a strictly bipartisan way.

I would also like to thank the staff of the subcommittee—Terry Peel, Bill Schuerch, Mark Murray, Lori Maes, and Karen Brown, a detailee from AID—for the long hours they have put in to bring this bill to the floor and their attention to detail. Finally, thank you to the staffers of the members of the subcommittee including Dean Sackett, Mr. LIVINGSTON's able and diligent assistant, Bill Deere, Nancy Tippins, Jim Kulikowski, minority staff on the full committee, Carolyn Bartholomew, David Orlin, Nancy Alcalde, Michael Rosenberg, and Virginia Johnson.

I urge Members to support this important legislation.

□ 1200

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 7 minutes to another member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin, DAVE OBEY and the gentleman from Louisiana, BOB LIVINGSTON on a job well done. This is not a popular or easy bill to write and, within the limited resources available, they have done a fine job.

I offered an amendment at subcommittee to increase funds for the Eximbank. The bill report now includes language detailing that $125 million of the Russian aid account will go to Exim and other credit export programs.

I believe that helps take care of a difficult problem and I commend both DAVE and BOB for their continuing efforts to find more money for Exim. At the conclusion of these remarks I would like to engage Mr. OBEY and Mr. LIVINGSTON in a colloquy.

At subcommittee markup of the bill, I also offered an amendment conditioning aid to the newly independent States of the former Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact countries to their halting arms sales to terrorist nations. In addition, the amendment conditioned aid to these nations on Presidential certification that they were not selling components that could lead to the development of ballistic missiles or weapons of mass destruction.

I offered this amendment as an expansion of a provision in last year's bill in which Congress required negotiations with Russia to reduce arms sales to Iran.

At the request of Chairman OBEY, I withdrew the amendment and, working with committee staff and the State Department, developed report language.

The report language in the bill requires a report to Congress on the types and amounts of arms and component sales to terrorist states by any former Soviet Republic or Warsaw Pact nation. Most importantly, the report requires an assessment of how these sales effect regional strategic balances for the United States and its allies.

I am concerned about how these sales could eventually effect regional strategic balances. For example, it is reported that Ukraine has sold Sunburn-class antiship cruise missiles to Iran. This was part of a larger, three way deal that also included Russian tanks and planes.

For those of you unfamiliar with the Sunburn-class missile, it travels at mach 2.5, 15 feet above the water. Our Navy has no defense against such a missile. Interestingly, the Washington Post reported on Sunday that the Department of Defense is trying to buy $600 million of these missiles so they can learn how to defend against it.

I want Members to know that I support aid to the former Soviet Union because it is in our Nation's best interest to help these countries make a successful transition to a market economy.

However, it is not in our national interest to give any country foreign aid money, that destabilizes a region with arms sales to terrorist nations.

I know the State Department has been hard at work on this problem. So far, the Russians have been willing to discuss this problem. The report language in the bill allows Congress to measure the progress of negotiations between the United States and Russia,

among others. If progress is not made, we will revisit this issue next year with stronger measures.

The people of the former Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact nation's must make a determination of what is in their own national interest, the short-term gain of weapons sales to nations which support terrorism or, the long-term benefits of a market economy and help from the West. I suggest they take note of our concern and end these sales sooner, rather than later.

In closing, I want to urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is easy to bash this bill, to vote against it because it makes you look like you are doing something about the deficit.

This bill is small in relation to our entire budget, less than 1 percent of what we will spend this year. But it is huge in the amount of good it does, for our long-term national interest in Russia, for allies like Israel, and for the numerous programs to help suffering people all over the world.

This bill represents the best of the American spirit, our ability to reach out and help others, even when times are tough here at home. I hope this House will strongly support this bill.

At this time I would like to engage the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, and our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. LIVINGSTON, in a colloquy, if I may.

First of all, to the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. Chairman, in the report accompanying this year's bill, we encourage the transfer of $125 million from the Russian aid account to the Export-Import Bank and other export credit programs.

I commend both of you for working within the tight constraints of this bill to find additional funds for these very important programs.

Is it the intention of the committee that the transferred funds are to be used solely for programs in support of U.S. exports to the new Independent States? Further, given the nature of Exim's mission, when does the committee envision the transfer of funds to take place?

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

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

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, the gentleman from Iowa is correct, the $125 million transferred from the Russian aid account is for Exim and other export credit programs only in the new independent states.

I appreciate the gentleman's concern about the prompt transfer of funds from the Russian aid account to Exim. Obviously Exim cannot commit funds to applicants if it is unsure of the total amount available for commitment.

Given the fact that the $125 million transfer appears to be part of the administration plan, I expect the transfer to occur in a very timely manner.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, let me concur in the opinion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. It is very difficult for Exim and the Trade Development Agency to do their job if $125 million is being controlled by the newly Independent States task force.

□ 1210

To hold these funds in limbo for any great amount of time is not fair to applications for American exports to other parts of the world. If the $125 million is not transferred to Exim and other export credit programs in a timely manner, I would say that the Appropriations Committee would have to consider revisiting the issue and perhaps resort to outright reprogramming of the funds.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank both gentlemen for their clarification and support in this matter. I urge my colleagues to support the bill as a whole.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2295, the foreign operations appropriations bill.

I want to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for bringing to the floor a bill that truly represents America's new role in the international community following the end of the cold war.

I am particularly pleased that they and other members of the Appropriations Committee have had the foresight and wisdom to understand the critical importance of America's need to invest in the former Soviet Union's quest for freedom and democracy.

As a nation, America cannot miss this opportunity of a lifetime to perpetuate our ideals of freedom to the peoples of Russia and the new Republics.

The funding contained in this bill is not just throwing dollars overseas. It is direct and specific investment set to impact on the most productive segments of the Russian economy. This is an investment in the cruelest sense of the word. Our failure to help Russia during its transition to democracy will cost this Nation billions of dollars in the future should they fail to make the trip.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important bill and ask that we pass it in a timely manner.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], another member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2295 in a modified version.

Later on I intend to offer an amendment which will, I think, make this a better bill and give us further opportunity and more extended opportunity to debate the section of the bill that relates to foreign aid to Russia.

A foreign aid bill is a difficult bill to handle, and I would like to commend Chairman OBEY for the manner in which he has handled it, as well as ranking member LIVINGSTON. Handling a foreign aid bill I would parallel to changing diapers in the life of a father. It is certainly something that is not a pleasant thing to do, but it is a necessary thing to do, and it is very necessary that we do try to spread democracy and try to help our neighbors who need this help desperately, and certainly Russia is one of those countries that needs help. It is not my purpose with the amendment that I intend to introduce to do any harm toward that effort to help Russia in her efforts to move more rapidly towards democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee chairman for bringing this bill to the floor in the manner in which he has and for the courtesies that he has extended to me during this debate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK].

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, if I could engage in a brief colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, nuclear proliferation is a serious military threat to the United States and its allies. A key tool to address this threat is the International Atomic Energy Agency, the U.N. watchdog on nonproliferation.

We have appropriated, or will, $2.5 billion for Russia and the former Soviet Republics and recommend that it be used for a number of important programs, including nuclear reactor safety and energy and environmental initiatives.

The International Atomic Energy Agency is spending a good deal of resources on nuclear safety and nonproliferation activities in the former U.S.S.R. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin whether the committee would recommend that a mere $10 million of the $2.5 billion in aid to the newly Independent States be used as an additional U.S. contribution to the International Atomic Energy Agency for nonproliferation safeguard and nuclear safety activities. I yield to the gentleman for his reaction.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to the gentleman, I think that is a very good idea and I would be very surprised if there is any problem in the committee in following that line.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for his

longstanding leadership on these important issues.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to begin by announcing my support for the legislation and commend the committee chairman and the ranking member and all members of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the excellent work they have done in crafting what is perhaps the best bill we have seen on this subject in memory, and they have done it under difficult financial and fiscal conditions.

EBRD

Mr. Chairman. I rise in support of the legislation. Mr. Chairman, this Member would particularly note his strong approval of the committee's decision not to appropriate a single dollar of the administration's request of over $70 million for the European Bank for reconstruction and Development [EBRD]. As the ranking member of the Banking Committee's subcommittee which authorizes and conducts oversight over the U.S. involvement in the EBRD and other MDB's—the Subcommittee on International Development, Finance, and Trade—this Member fully shares appropriator's outrage at the capricious behavior and blatant excesses of EBRD President Jacques Attali.

Mr. Chairman, there are extremely serious questions of leadership when the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development spends over $87 million to refurbish their personal offices that are located on the most posh section of London, or when they shell out $78,000 for a staff Christmas party, or when the Bank orders 1.2 million dollars' worth of Italian marble for the Bank's lobby because the marble that had been in the lobby was not the proper color. Indeed, the Bank has spent more in overhead than it has dispersed in loans. As the appropriator's report correctly notes, this behavior gives the strong impression that the EBRD leadership is more interested in feathering their worn nest than in helping the countries of Eastern and Central Europe that the Bank was created to help. This Member would note that the EBRD's behavior casts a pall upon all multilateral banking institutions, and that is most unfortunate.

Last week, the G-7 finance ministers, including Treasury Secretary Bentsen, have made it clear that major changes in EBRD management and policies are necessary. In the next few weeks a comprehensive outside audit will to be completed, and, hopefully, this should provide added impetus for change. Certainly, everyone agrees that a fundamental shakeup is needed at the EBRD. The June 12, 1993 edition of the Economist notes that the European members of the Bank had decided to keep Mr. Attali in his place as President, but to appoint a manager—the American No. 2 at the World Bank—who would strictly oversee operations. Clearly the Bank needs operational oversight. As the Economist states:

> Two years after its creation, it still has no clearly useful role. Loan disbursements have been slow. The bank's staff of 700 is too concentrated in London; if is to lend to small and medium-sized firms in Eastern Europe, it needs more people in the field.

This Member would go even further, and continue to strongly urge that the change at the EBRD should begin with the firing of Jacques Attali as the Bank's President. If Mr. Attali feels it is essential to charter jet aircraft whenever he travels, and if he feels it is necessary for him to live in imperial splendor, let him pay for it with his own money, and let him do so in the private sector. But the United States should have no part in supporting the outrageous lifestyle of Jacques Attali.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask and implore the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. OBEY, and ranking minority member Mr. LIVINGSTON, if it is their firm ironclad intentive to maintain the House position in conference against any funds for the EBRD fiscal year in 1994?

NAA ROSE-ROTH OUTREACH

Mr. Chairman, second this Member also would raise a matter that relates to Eastern Europe and the Baltic nations. As the chairman of the committee is aware, the fiscal year 1993 foreign assistance appropriations—Public Law 102-391—directed that to the maximum extent possible, the principal Agency for International Development [AID] officer in each SEED country should have primary responsibility for the day-to-day implementation of the assistance program. It is entirely appropriate that the people on the ground have maximum flexibility in tailoring the most effective assistance package possible. This Member fully supports the effort and get AID headquarters in Washington out of the business of micromanaging the field offices.

However, in setting out language to achieve this laudable goal, there has been an unintended victim. It turns out that it is near impossible to get the necessary country-officer approval for several multilateral programs that seek to draw participants from all the SEED countries. Consequently, AID has become reluctant to fund multilateral efforts such as the Rose-Roth outreach program of the North Atlantic Assembly, and the American Bar Association's multilateral attempt at building legal institutions. This Member would note that the Rose-Roth program—named after the distinguished former NAA President, CHARLIE ROSE and another distinguished NAA leader, Senator WILLIAM ROTH of Delaware—has been an extremely effective instrument in bringing Eastern European parliamentarians together to discuss security matters such as the status of Russian troops in the Baltics and nuclear weapons in the Ukraine.

In the foreign assistance authorization that was approved yesterday by this body, we included report language that acknowledged and approved of your effort to increase the flexibility of local AID program officers. But we also noted that such an effort was in no way intended to preclude or make unduly difficult AID support for multilateral initiatives such as the Rose-Roth outreach program of the North Atlantic Assembly. This report language is designed to give AID the flexibility they feel they need so that they may support worthy multilateral initiatives.

This Member would ask the chairman whether the interpretation set forth by the authorizing committee is in keeping with the interpretation of the appropriators?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for any comments he would like to make.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman that this committee will under no circumstances, if I have anything to say about it, provide one dime for the European Development Bank so long as it is being run in the present manner by the present Director. That Bank simply does not get it. The president of the Bank does not understand that taxpayers sweat damned hard for their money and they have the right to expect it to be spent in a manner more consistent with that recognition, and that Bank simply has not gotten the message.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate those strong words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I just want to emphasize what the chairman has said. There was unanimous agreement, strong agreement of all the members of the committee that the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development has grossly wasted their resources. They have served as an example for the way a multilateral bank should not behave. We will hold to that position all the way through the conference.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Finally, in the previous appropriation bill there was a direction with respect to the distribution of seed money, the country's specific aid officer has specific responsibilities for making decisions. That has created some problems for multilateral assistance programs to the ABA and the Rose-Roth seminar.

I believe we have report language now both in the authorization and appropriations bills which would at least

express our concerns that things like the Rose-Roth seminar that attempt to provide assistance with seed money on a multilateral basis could go forward with flexibility.

I yield to the committee chairman for his expression on the subject.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

To the ranking member, is that the gentleman's intention? I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is correct.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure Chairman ROSE would like to associate himself with my remarks in this respect, and I thank the committee for their understanding.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to thank Chairman OBEY, the ranking minority member, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and the committee staff for their excellent work on this bill. In particular, the bill contains a great deal of enlightened language regarding U.S. policy in Central America.

If the State Department follows these recommendations, this country would be engaged—for the first time in more than a decade—in a constructive, farsighted policy in a region of the world that has been alternatively abused and neglected.

The committee has sought to encourage development that will protect and sustain democracy in the countries of Central America. Achieving these goals will require that we maintain adequate levels of economic and development aid. But it will also require that the President and the State Department follow through on the policy recommendations contained in this bill. Such action will keep these countries on the road to true democracy, and protect the well-being and rights of their poorest and most vulnerable citizens. I commend the work of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has done and urge the House to support this bill.

□ 1220

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, while we all recognize the need to cut spending, I want to take a moment to express my concern that the United States follow through on its expressed support for peace and economic recovery in Central America. We must maintain our commitment to reconciliation and sustainable growth and development in that region.

The United States has pledged significant assistance over the long term to Nicaragua and El Salvador as part of the national reconciliation which those countries are undergoing. Support for the human, economic, and environmental recovery of the Central American nations is in our national interest. It will help to stabilize the region, facilitate more trade, and stem illegal immigration.

Failure to support long-term recovery in the region is courting the demise of democratic initiatives in the region and increases the potential that Central America will fall back into renewed crisis and civil unrest.

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

Again, Mr. Chairman, I just want to take this opportunity to thank the chairman and all of the staff of the committee, majority, minority, and all of the members of the subcommittee and the full committee, for their cooperation. This has been my first chance as ranking member, and it has been a pleasure to work with the chairman and all of the folks involved to bring together this bill which I believe is a truly remarkable and historical bill. I urge all of the Members of this body to support it. I think that future generations will depend on the fact that this bill will be successful in years to come.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to echo the comments made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. I also neglected to mention the tremendous help we got from Bob Lester at AID in drafting this legislation.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 2295, the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

I would like to congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], making his debut as ranking minority member, for bringing to the floor a fiscally restrained foreign aid bill that still manages to address the key issues of the times.

This is a restrained bill, providing $12.98 billion for 1994, and $1.1 billion reduction from 1993, and $1.4 billion below the President's budget request.

The bill also provides an additional $1.6 billion in 1993 funding—unspent funds available under the applicable defense and international spending caps—for aid to Russia and the other newly independent republics. The issue we will be debating today—whether to strip out that additional aid to Russia under the Callahan amendment—is an issue of major historic significance.

It was Thomas Jefferson who said, in words now engraved on the Jefferson Memorial, "I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." For the last half century, after the defeat of fascism, the tyranny we swore our hostility against was the spread of communism from the Soviet Union. Communism, based on thought control, abolition of freedom of speech, of expression, and of worship, elimination of the free-market economy, militant expansionism, and military might, was inimical to our way of life. We, as Americans, and as leaders of the Free world, stood firm, and never swayed from that unmovable hostility that led to communism's collapse in the U.S.S.R.

Now, it is a new world for the people of the old Soviet Union, as they struggle to establish a new way of life based on principles that are ours—democracy, a free-market economy, freedom of expression, of immigration. And, as a result, it is a new world for us, no longer based on confrontation. It is up to us, this Congress, in working with the President, to decide what the new relationship with our former adversaries will be, to help shape the world we had hoped for so long that our children, or if not our children, then our grandchildren would live in.

Santayana said that "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." I remember, running for Congress for the first time in 1962, at a Republican rally, turning on the TV sets, to hear President Kennedy tell the Nation of the blockade against Soviet ships bringing missiles into Cuba, as we stood on the verge of nuclear war.

I remember the moment, during the Yom Kippur war, when Soviet surface to air missiles sited in Egypt were decimating the Israeli Air Force, when President Nixon took our forces, for the second time in history, to the highest level of military readiness short of nuclear war.

Put that in contrast to the cooperation of all nations, including Russia, that allowed United Nations Forces, under United States command, to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait, and to stop an aggressor nation like Iraq in its tracks.

Look at what this new relationship, if it succeeds will mean for the United States. At the height of the cold war, 1962, over 8 percent of our gross domestic product went to defense. At the height of the Reagan buildup, defense was 6.3 percent of our GDP. Today, defense is 4.3 percent of GDP, and under this administration, if it has its way, the defense share is projected to be down to 3 percent by 1998.

At the height of the cold war, almost half, 47 percent, of the Federal budget went to defense. At the height of the Reagan buildup, defense was 27 percent of the Federal budget. Today, defense is 19 percent, and the President wants to take it to 13.5 percent by 1998.

Since Gorbachev came into office in 1985, defense has been cut in real terms every single year. Since 1988, 533,000 military and DOD civilians have been taken off the rolls. Since 1991, over 130,000 troops have been pulled out of Europe and 120 domestic, and over 700 overseas military bases, have been set for closure. Over 120 weapons programs have been canceled or stopped, including such Desert Storm war-winners as the F–117 Stealth fighter, the Patriot surface to air missile, the laser-guided smart bombs, the M–1 tank, the Bradley fighting vehicle, and the F–14 and F–15 fighters. And then, of course, there is the promise of an end to the nuclear face-off.

All it takes to turn this around is for the changes in Russia not to succeed. The United States could sit back, and let history take its course, or we can try to lead, to help a very old country adapt to very new and difficult political and economic changes. The stakes have never been higher. The potential has never been greater.

The worst thing that can happen would be to let this new world, that is within our grasp, slip away for lack of trying. This foreign aid appropriations bill, more so than any time in the recent past, merits our support.

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise today in support of H.R. 2295, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act. In particular, I wish to support the efforts of the committee and the administration to support peace in the Middle East. My colleague, NITA LOWEY, has spoken on the critical importance of U.S. assistance for stability in the Middle East. I agree wholeheartedly. However, this aid is also crucial for Israel's continued progress toward economic reform. Like Russia, Israel is in the midst of shedding the burden of a huge state sector and moving toward a free-market system. At the same time, it is struggling to absorb nearly 500,000 new immigrants and create decent jobs and housing for them. To meet these challenges, the Rabin government is undergoing significant structural reform.

In the last 2 years alone, the budget deficit has been cut by more than 50%. Israel's budget contains deep cuts in defense, housing, and consumer subsidies, with much of the savings devoted to education and infrastructure development. More than $575 million in State-controlled assets have been sold, with $1 billion in further sales planned. These reforms are starting to pay off. Israel has seen strong economic expansion, export growth, and job creation, together with deep cuts in inflation. Israel's GDP grew by 6.4 percent in 1992, one of the highest growth rates in the world. Inflation was reduced from 18 percent to 9.4 percent, a drop of almost 50 percent. More than 80,000 jobs were created in 1992.

However, these welcome developments could evaporate if peace is not realized. As in this country, spiraling defense costs could undermine all efforts at fiscal reform. As we should support aid to Russia, we should also support aid to Israel and Egypt in fulfillment of our obligation under the Camp David accords. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill. Thank you.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the foreign appropriations legislation before the House today.

Let me state, for the record, that I do not oppose the concept of foreign assistance in general. I understand and support our country's economic and humanitarian assistance to developing countries. However, I cannot in good conscience, support more than $13 billion in foreign aid today, when my congressional district, and other economically distressed communities, are starved for a domestic assistance package that does not materialize.

Why should my constituents accept sending their tax dollars overseas when they desperately need vital housing, health services, education, drug counseling, and infrastructure investment? Even in the midst of a slow and jobless recovery from an economic recession that hit poor and working families most hard, this Congress was unable to pass a $16 billion stimulus package to revitalize our communities.

If this Government cannot commit the adequate resources to find shelter for our people, or protect them as they walk through their neighborhoods, then I cannot support this funding for foreign assistance.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my concern for H.R. 2295, the foreign operations appropriation bill. First, I would like to commend Chairman OBEY for his hard work in formulating a streamlined foreign assistance package.

H.R. 2295, which is $1.4 billion less than the administration requested, is a balanced package which will allow the United States to assist developing countries in their quest to join the world community. While I support many of the provisions in H.R. 2295, the continuance of United States assistance to the Government of Turkey without assurances that the blockage imposed on Armenia will be lifted, does not allow me to support this legislation.

I find it appalling that the United States continues to give hundreds of millions of dollars to a country, Turkey, which is impeding efforts to deliver aid to the starving Republic of Armenia.

The Turkish Government has publicly stated it will not allow humanitarian assistance destined for Armenia, including International Red Cross aid, to cross over Turkish soil. Turkey's actions have caused the international community, including the United States, to resort to dangerous transportation corridors through the war-torn Republic of Georgia to deliver aid to Armenia.

The actions by the Turkish Government to ignore United States requests to deliver humanitarian assistance to Armenia is a blatant disregard for human life. As an advocate of bringing accountability to our foreign aid program, I firmly believe that assistance to Turkey at the present time is ill advised.

We must send Turkey a clear message that denial of International Red Cross aid to the Republic of Armenia will not be tolerated. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the foreign aid package on the floor today.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the Appropriations Committee for its continued support for the ban on military aid to Indonesia. Indonesia remains a human rights violator of gross proportions and should not be reconsidered for such aid until its government reforms its treatment of the people of East Timor.

Since the invasion of East Timor in 1975, many thousands of people on East Timor have disappeared, victims of the murderous policies of the Indonesian Government. In addition, 17,000 people remain on an Indonesian Government black list which prohibits their entry or exit from the country. Among those prohibited from leaving is Gabriela Pinto, the wife of Constancio Pinto, a student at Brown University in Rhode Island. Since Mr. Pinto's escape from East Timor in 1992, Gabriela Pinto has been under constant surveillance and has been repeatedly interrogated and intimidated by Indonesian Government officials.

The Portuguese Government officially informed Indonesia on May 7 of this year that both Gabriela Pinto and her young son Tilson will be accepted upon arrival. On May 8, the Indonesian military police informed Gabriela Pinto that she would not gain her freedom until she turned in the names of people in the underground movement, a movement in which she is not involved. Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, who Chairs the other body's Foreign Affairs Committee, filed a formal request for the emigration of both Gabriela and Tilson with Indonesia's Foreign Minister, Mr. Alatas, who stated that their departure would not be prohibited. In conjunction with the Portuguese Government, the International Red Cross transmitted a formal request to the Indonesian Government for their emigration. Yet, they both are still prohibited from leaving East Timor.

As this international appeal continues, Gabriela Pinto continues to be harassed and threatened by the military police. The most recent interrogation that we know of lasted 5 hours and was conducted on June 4 by a staff officer of an Indonesian commander.

I call on the Government of Indonesia to allow Gabriela Pinto out of East Timor to join her husband, and to allow all of its people to live freely without fear of violence and intimidation.

Finally, despite prior assurances to the contrary, the Indonesian Government has refused to allow the ICRC unrestricted access to the detainees in Indonesia. This is a deplorable situation that must be remedied.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Foreign Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (H.R. 2295), and particularly the $3 billion in assistance it would provide to the nation of Israel.

I recently returned from an extraordinary visit to Israel. This was my second visit to that nation, 10 years after the first, and there were, of course, numerous physical changes. But nothing on the streets or over the landscape was really unexpected or startling. Israel is a modern nation developing at a pace which leaves its counterparts in the dust. Although presently quite impressive, this real estate, agricultural, and high technology boom was well underway in 1983.

The big difference in 1993 is the optimism and the preoccupation with the future not merely in terms of tomorrow's security but also in projections for prosperity in the next few decades. Israel is destined to play a major role in a new economic order for the Middle East.

The present optimism is fueled partially by the influx of Jews from Russia who bring many assets to Israel's high technology agenda. The doctors and engineers with violins may represent the finest products of the failed Soviet experiment. These gifts from Gorbachev are already having a significant impact on Israeli society including politics.

Although at the other extreme in terms of technological know-how, the Jews from Ethiopia—about 45,000 to date—have brought home the Judaism of King David and the Temple. Israeli leaders describe these newcomers as strong, resilient, patient, and quick to adapt, especially the youth. We met some of these extraordinary youth who in physical appearance were not unlike the children I see

everyday in my district. But in their relationship to their society and their government, these youth experience a world of difference.

The Ethiopian youth and their families are the beneficiaries of the same absorption program that Israel provides for all immigrants. But according to the Minister in charge of absorption, the government is more flexible and goes much further to nurture the most productive possible integration of Ethiopians from a rural and pastoral culture into the modern culture of their new homeland. Certainly the 250 Ethiopian youth at the Yemen Orde residential school which we visited received every possible form of academic, personal, and social assistance. As a result of the government's concrete manifestations of concern the performance of the Ethiopian students and their post-graduate achievements are comparable to their Israeli-born fellow students.

Israel's aggressive outreach to the black Jews of Ethiopia in a world saturated with racism and ethnic conflicts will stand in history as one of this tiny nation's unique triumphs. One should not oversimplify or minimize the challenges generated by the presence of a small minority of blacks in the midst of a predominantly white nation. But with its eyes wide open Israel has nobly accepted these challenges.

Despite the endless state of siege, Israel has survived and prospered as a result of its deep leadership pool which spawns tough and resilient politicians. Many of these same leaders have also displayed great wisdom and creative vision. Making peace is no less difficult than surviving in war. The same combination of toughness, resilience, wisdom, and vision is still needed. After 6 days of dialog and analysis one leaves Israel confident that the present leadership has all of the attributes necessary to forge a broad and enduring peace.

The future of our modern civilization is inextricably interwoven with the future of Israel and the Middle East. In support of the completion of the peace process the United States and the rest of the world should provide Israel and the region with as much assistance as possible. At stake is a pivotal portion of the fate of human kind.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2295 and the vital security and economic assistance it would provide to the nation of Israel.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the pending question is the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the reported bill.

The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

(For the text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, see ensuing pages of this RECORD. Following the 20 minutes of debate, and the rollcall vote on this said amendment.)

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to take the full 10 minutes.

The amendment now before us will simply adopt the committee's recommendations which would, in effect, cut the President's request by $1.4 billion. A vote for this committee substitute is a vote to cut the international banks by $450 million, or 23 percent, from the President's request. It is a vote to zero fund the European Development Bank, denying them the $70 million which they asked for. It will cut U.N. programs by $50 million. It will cut development assistance by $113 million. It will cut economic support funds by $217 million. It will cut military assistance by $85 million. It will cut Export-Import Bank by $57 million.

Mr. Chairman, the committee bill is $840 million less than the amount allocated to us under the 602(b) budget authority allocation. I would urge Members to support the committee bill cut, as reported.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking minority member and as a Republican, as a conservative, I want to say that this Member will never object when the chairman of a committee stands up and voluntarily moves to cut the President's request by $1.4 billion, especially on a topic of this nature.

So, I wholeheartedly endorse the gentleman's amendment. I support it. All of my remarks preceding this point were intended to relate to this amendment. I join in it, and I urge our Members to support the amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Twenty-five Members are present, not a quorum. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The Chair will announce this is a regular quorum call followed by a 5-minute vote.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 234]

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de Lugo (VI)
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez

Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walker
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 1246

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred fifteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in understanding that this is a vote on the Obey amendment which cuts last year's foreign aid appropriation by $1 billion and the President's request by $1.5 billion?

The CHAIRMAN. The question of the gentleman from Lousiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is technical and is not a parliamentary inquiry. Debate does indicate that the gentleman's question is correct.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for a recorded vote. Five minutes will be allowed for the vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 423, noes 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

AYES—423

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—16

Bachus (AL)
Cox
de la Garza
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fields (TX)
Henry
Hunter
McDade
Neal (NC)
Pelosi
Pickle
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Sangmeister
Vucanovich
Wilson
Young (AK)

□ 1255

So the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment and is considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2295

*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 foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, namely:*

*TITLE I—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 share of the paid-in share portion of the increases in capital stock for the General Capital Increase, $55,821,000, to remain available until expended.*

*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 expended.*

*LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS*

*The United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of increases in capital stock in an amount not to exceed $1,804,879,000.*

*CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION*

*For payment to the International Development Association by the Secretary of the Treasury, $1,024,332,000, for the United States contribution to the replenishment, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds appropriated under this heading are available subject to authorization.*

*CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION*

*For payment to the International Finance Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, $35,761,500, for the United States share of the increase in subscriptions to capital stock, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the amount appropriated under this heading not more than $5,364,000 may be expended for the purchase of such stock in fiscal year 1994.*

*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, $56,166,000, and for the United States share of the increases in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations, $20,164,000, to remain available until expended.*

*LIMITATION ON 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 $2,190,283,457.*

*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, $75,000,000 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 paid-in share portion of the United States share of the increase in capital stock, $13,026,366, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds appropriated under this heading are available subject to receipt by the Congress of the President's budget request for such funds.*

*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), $62,500,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds appropriated under this heading are available subject to authorization.*

*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 increases in the capital stock in an amount not to exceed $95,438,437: Provided, That the authority provided under this heading is available subject to receipt by the Congress of the President's budget request for such authority.*

*CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND*

*For payment to the African Development Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury, $132,300,000, for the United States contribution to the sixth replenishment of the African Development Fund, to remain available until expended.*

*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, $339,500,000: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for the following: the United Nations Fund for Science and Technology, the G–7 Nuclear Safety Fund, the OECD Center for Cooperation with European Economies in Transition, and United Nations Electoral Assistance activities: 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 unless the President certifies to the Congress that the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) has terminated all activities in the People's Republic of China, not more than $36,215,500 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for UNFPA: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for UNFPA until March 1, 1994, unless the President has made the certification referred to in the previous proviso.*

*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, 1994, unless otherwise specified herein, as follows:*

*AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT*

*DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FUND*

*For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $816,000,000.*

*POPULATION, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE*

*For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 104(b), $392,000,000: 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 nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.*

*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, $784,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out chapters 1 and 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be transferred to the Government of Zaire.*

*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.*

*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, $145,985,000 to remain available until expended.*

*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, $44,151,000.*

*OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT*

*For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667, $501,760,000.*

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

*For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667, $39,118,000, which sum shall be available for the Office of the Inspector General of the Agency for International Development.*

*HOUSING GUARANTY PROGRAM ACCOUNT*

*For the subsidy cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, of guaranteed loans authorized by sections 221 and 222 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $16,078,000: Provided, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $110,000,000: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize loan principal, 100 percent of which shall be guaranteed, pursuant to the authority of such sections: Provided further, That the President shall enter into commitments to guarantee such loans in the full amount provided under this heading, subject to*

*the availability of qualified applicants for such guarantees. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out guaranteed loan programs, $8,239,000, all of which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.*

*DEBT RESTRUCTURING*

*For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, 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, $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.*

*ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND*

*For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II, $2,364,562,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995: Provided, That 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, 1993, whichever is later: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this heading that are made available for Egypt shall be provided on a grant basis, and of which sum cash transfer assistance may be provided with the understanding that Egypt will undertake significant economic reforms which are additional to those which were undertaken in previous fiscal years: Provided further, That in exercising the authority to provide cash transfer assistance for Israel and Egypt, the President shall ensure that the level of such assistance does not cause an adverse impact on the total level of nonmilitary exports from the United States to each such country: Provided further, That it is the sense of the Congress that the recommended levels of assistance for Egypt and Israel are based in great measure upon their continued participation in the Camp David Accords and upon the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for Zaire: Provided further, That not more than $50,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to finance tied-aid credits, unless the President determines it is in the national interest to provide in excess of $50,000,000 and so notifies the Committees on Appropriations through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: Provided further, That none of the funds made available or limited by this Act may be used for tied-aid credits or tied-aid grants except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: Provided further, That none of the 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 may be used for tied-aid credits: Provided further, That as used in this heading the term "tied-aid credits" means any credit, within the meaning of section 15(h)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, which is used for blended or parallel financing, as those terms are defined by sections 15(h) (4) and (5), respectively, of such Act: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 1995.*

*INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR IRELAND*

*For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of part I 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 expended.*

*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, $400,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for economic assistance 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.*

*ASSISTANCE FOR THE NEW INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION*

*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, $903,820,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the provisions of 498B(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall apply to funds appropriated by this paragraph.*

*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 section 9104, title 31, United States Code, $16,905,000: Provided, That, when, with the permission of the President of the Foundation, funds made available to a grantee under this heading 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.*

*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 section 9104, title 31, United States Code, $30,340,000.*

*OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION*

*PROGRAM ACCOUNT*

*For the subsidy cost as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, of direct and guaranteed loans authorized by section 234 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as follows: cost of direct and guaranteed loans, $9,065,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $7,518,000: Provided, That the funds provided in this paragraph shall be available for and apply to costs, direct loan obligations and loan guaranty commitments incurred or made during the period from October 1, 1993 through September 30, 1995: Provided further, That such sums are to remain available through fiscal year 2002 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal year 1994, and through 2003 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal year 1995.*

*The Overseas Private Investment Corporation is authorized to make, without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by 31 U.S.C. 9104, such noncredit expenditures and commitments within the limits of funds available to it and in accordance with law (including an amount for official reception and representation expenses which shall not exceed $35,000) as may be necessary.*

*PEACE CORPS*

*For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), $219,745,000, 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, 1995: Provided further, That not to exceed $3,000,000 from amounts appropriated under this heading may be transferred to the "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Peace Corps, Account", as authorized by section 16 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended.*

*DEPARTMENT OF STATE*

*INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL*

*For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $100,000,000.*

*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 and assistance to refugees, including contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; 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; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; $670,688,000: Provided, That not more than $11,500,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Office of Refugee Programs of the Department of State.*

*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)), $19,261,000, 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 Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 which would limit the amount of funds which could be appropriated for this purpose.*

*ANTI-TERRORISM ASSISTANCE*

*For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 8 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $15,244,000.*

*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, $21,250,000: Provided, That up to $300,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for grant financed military education and training for any country whose annual per capita GNP exceeds $2,349 on the condition that that country agrees to fund from its own resources the transportation cost and living allowances of its students: Provided further, That the civilian personnel for whom military education and training may be provided under this heading may also include members of national legislatures who are responsible for the oversight and management of the military: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for Indonesia and Zaire.*

*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, $3,175,000,000: Provided, That funds appropriated by this paragraph that are made available for Israel shall be available as grants and shall be disbursed within thirty days of enactment of this Act or by October 31, 1993, whichever is later: Provided further, That funds appropriated by this paragraph that are made available for Egypt shall be available as grants: Provided further, That funds made available under this paragraph shall be nonrepayable notwithstanding any requirement in section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act.*

*For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, of direct loans authorized by section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act as follows: cost of direct loans, $46,530,000: Provided, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans of not to exceed $769,500,000: 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 Portugal, Greece and Turkey only on a loan basis: Provided further, That the principal amount of loans made available for Greece and Turkey shall be made available according to a 7 to 10 ratio.*

*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, Guatemala, Peru, and Malawi: 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: 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 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 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: Provided further, That not more than $23,558,000 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 $290,000,000 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 the fiscal year 1994 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: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading, and no employee of the Defense Security Assistance Agency, may be used to facilitate the transport of aircraft to commercial arms sales shows.*

*SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND*

*Notwithstanding section 51 of the Arms Export Control Act, collections in excess of obligational authority provided in prior appropriations Acts shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.*

*PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS*

*For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $75,623,000.*

*NONPROLIFERATION AND DISARMAMENT FUND*

*For necessary expenses for a "Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund", $10,000,000, to remain available until expended, to promote bilateral and multilateral activities: Provided, That such funds may be used pursuant to the authorities contained in section 504 of the FREEDOM Support Act: 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 funds appropriated under this heading may be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.*

*TITLE IV—EXPORT 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, $700,000,000: 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 2009 for the disbursement of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance and tied-aid grants obligated in fiscal year 1994: 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, $45,369,000: 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.*

*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, $40,000,000.*

*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 "International Organizations and 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, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Iran, Serbia, 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, 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: Provided, That the exercise of such authority shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.*

*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 the "Agency for International Development" are, if deobligated, hereby continued available for the same period as the respective appropriations under such headings or until September 30, 1994, 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 deobligation and 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.*

*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 chapter 1 of part I, section 667, and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, 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 or obligated 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.*

*(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.*

*(c) None of the funds provided in this Act to the Agency for International Development, other than funds made available to carry out Caribbean Basin Initiative programs under the Tariff Schedules of the United States, section 1202 of title 19, United States Code, schedule 8, part I, subpart B, item 807.00, shall be obligated or expended—*

*(1) to procure directly feasibility studies or prefeasibility studies for, or project profiles of potential investment in, the manufacture, for export to the United States or to third country markets in direct competition with United States exports, of import-sensitive articles as defined by section 503(c)(1) (A) and (E) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 2463(c)(1) (A) and (E)); or*

*(2) to assist directly in the establishment of facilities specifically designed for the manufacture, for export to the United States or to third country markets in direct competition with United States exports, of import-sensitive articles as defined in section 503(c)(1) (A) and (E) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 2463(c)(1) (A) and (E)).*

*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 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 "Development Assistance Fund", "Population, Development Assistance", "Development Fund for Africa", "International organizations and programs", "American schools and hospitals abroad", "Trade and development agency", "International narcotics control", "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", "Anti-terrorism assistance", "Foreign Military Financing Program", "International military education and training", "Inter-American Foundation", "African Development Foundation", "Peace Corps", or "Migration and refugee assistance", shall be available for obligation for activities, programs, projects, type of materiel assistance, countries, or other operation 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 20 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 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. (a) 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 for any programs for the Palestine Liberation Organization (or for projects whose purpose is to provide benefits to the Palestine Liberation Organization or entities associated with it), 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, 1995.

(b) The United States shall not make any voluntary or assessed contribution—

(1) to any affiliated organization of the United Nations which grants full membership as a state to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood, or

(2) to the United Nations, if the United Nations grants full membership as a state in the United Nations to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood,

during any period in which such membership is effective.

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 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 CONCERNING 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. The Congress reaffirms its commitments to Population, Development Assistance and to the need for informed voluntary family planning.

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 Afghanistan, Cambodia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Jordan, Liberia, Malawi, Peru, Sudan, Togo, 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.

FAMILY PLANNING, 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 such individuals shall not be included within any personnel ceiling applicable to any United States Government agency during the period of detail or assignment: Provided further, 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, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Iran, Syria, North Korea, People's Republic of China, or Laos 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 "1993" and inserting in lieu thereof "1994".

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 Title I through V of this Act may be obligated and expended subject to section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956.*

*DEPLETED URANIUM*

*SEC. 527. None of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be made available to facilitate in any way the sale of M-833 antitank shells or any comparable antitank shells containing a depleted uranium penetrating component to any country other than (1) countries which are members of NATO, (2) countries which have been designated as a major non-NATO ally for purposes of section 1105 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 or, (3) Taiwan: Provided, That funds may be made available to facilitate the sale of such shells notwithstanding the limitations of this section if the President determines that to do so is in the national security interest of the United States.*

*OPPOSITION TO ASSISTANCE TO TERRORIST COUNTRIES BY INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS*

*SEC. 528. (a) INSTRUCTIONS FOR UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of each international financial institution to vote against any loan or other use of the funds of the respective institution to or for a country for which the Secretary of State has made a determination under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979.*

*(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "international financial institution" includes—*

*(1) the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, and the International Monetary Fund; and*

*(2) wherever applicable, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.*

*PROHIBITION ON BILATERAL ASSISTANCE TO TERRORIST COUNTRIES*

*SEC. 529. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, 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. 530. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to the regular notification requirements 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 and 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. 531. All Agency for International Development contracts and solicitations, and subcontracts entered into under such contracts, shall include a clause requiring that United States marine insurance companies have a fair opportunity to bid for marine insurance when such insurance is necessary or appropriate.*

*STINGERS IN THE PERSIAN GULF REGION*

*SEC. 532. 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.*

*PROHIBITION ON LEVERAGING AND DIVERSION OF UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE*

*SEC. 533. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be provided to any foreign government (including any instrumentality or agency thereof), foreign person, or United States person in exchange for that foreign government or person undertaking any action which is, if carried out by the United States Government, a United States official or employee, expressly prohibited by a provision of United States law.*

*(b) For the purposes of this section the term "funds appropriated by this Act" includes only (1) assistance of any kind under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; and (2) credits, and guaranties under the Arms Export Control Act.*

*(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit—*

*(1) the ability of the President, the Vice President, or any official or employee of the United States to make statements or otherwise express their views to any party on any subject;*

*(2) the ability of an official or employee of the United States to express the policies of the President; or*

*(3) the ability of an official or employee of the United States to communicate with any foreign country government, group or individual, either directly or through a third party, with respect to the prohibitions of this section including the reasons for such prohibitions, and the actions, terms, or conditions which might lead to the removal of the prohibitions of this section.*

*DEBT-FOR-DEVELOPMENT*

*SEC. 534. 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 the heading "Agency for International Development" and any interest earned on such investment may be for the purpose for which the assistance was provided to that organization.*

*LOCATION OF STOCKPILES*

*SEC. 535. Section 514(b)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "$389,000,000 for fiscal year 1993, of which amount not less than $200,000,000 shall be available for stockpiles in Israel, and up to $189,000,000 may be available for stockpiles in the Republic of Korea" and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000,000 for stockpiles in Israel for fiscal year 1994".*

*ASSISTANCE FOR PAKISTAN*

*SEC. 536. (a) The date specified in section 620E(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows: "September 30, 1994".*

*(b) None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be obligated or expended for Pakistan except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.*

*SEPARATE ACCOUNTS*

*SEC. 537. (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 (including the Philippines Multilateral Assistance Initiative) 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 appropriate 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.*

*(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 (including the Philippines Multilateral Assistance Initiative) 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 FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS*

*SEC. 538. (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, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.*

*COMPLIANCE WITH UNITED NATIONS SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAQ*

*SEC. 539. (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 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, 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 into its customs territory, and*

*(2) the export of its products to Iraq.*

*POW/MIA MILITARY DRAWDOWN*

*SEC. 540. (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 1994, as may be necessary to carry out subsection (b).*

*(b) Such defense articles, services and training may be provided to 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.*

*(d) 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, defense services, and military education and training provided under this section.*

*MEDITERRANEAN EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES*

*SEC. 541. During fiscal year 1994, the provisions of section 573(e) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1990, shall be applicable, for the period specified therein, to excess defense articles made available under sections 516 and 519 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.*

*PRIORITY DELIVERY OF EQUIPMENT*

*SEC. 542. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the delivery of excess defense articles that are to be transferred on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act to NATO allies and to major non-NATO allies on the southern and southeastern flank of NATO shall be given priority to the maximum extent feasible over the delivery of such excess defense articles to other countries.*

*ISRAEL DRAWDOWN*

*SEC. 543. Section 599B(a) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1991 (as amended by Public Law 102–145, as amended, and Public Law 102–391), is further amended—*

*(a) by striking out "fiscal year 1993" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1994"; and*

*(b) by striking out "Appropriations Act, 1993" and inserting in lieu thereof "Appropriations Act, 1994".*

*CASH FLOW FINANCING*

*SEC. 544. 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.*

*RESCISSION*

*SEC. 545. Of the unexpended balances of funds (including earmarked funds) made available for fiscal years 1987 through 1993 to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $185,000,000 are rescinded.*

*AUTHORITIES FOR THE PEACE CORPS, THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION AND THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION*

*SEC. 546. 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. 547. 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-HERCEGOVINA*

*SEC. 548. (a) Congress finds as follows:*

*(1) the United Nations has imposed an embargo on the transfer of arms to any country on the territory of the former Yugoslavia;*

*(2) the federated states of Serbia and Montenegro have a large supply of military equipment and ammunition and the Serbian forces fighting the government of Bosnia-Hercegovina have more than one thousand battle tanks, armored vehicles, and artillery pieces; and*

*(3) because the United Nations arms embargo is serving to sustain the military advantage of the aggressor, the United Nations should exempt the government of Bosnia-Hercegovina from its embargo.*

*(b) Pursuant to a lifting of the United Nations arms embargo against Bosnia-Hercegovina, the President is authorized to transfer to the government of that nation, without reimbursement, defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense of an aggregate value not to exceed $50,000,000 in fiscal year 1994: Provided, That the President certifies in a timely fashion to the Congress that—*

*(1) the transfer of such articles would assist that nation in self-defense and thereby promote the security and stability of the region; and*

*(2) United States allies are prepared to join in such a military assistance effort.*

*(c) 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.*

*(d) 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.*

*SPECIAL AUTHORITIES*

*SEC. 549. (a) Funds appropriated in title II of this Act that are made available for Haiti, 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-Hercegovina, 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 Cambodian organization that he determines is cooperating, tactically or strategically, with the Khmer Rouge in their military operations.*

*(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 with regard to the key countries in which deforestation and energy policy would make a significant contribution to global warming: Provided, That such assistance shall be subject to sections 116, 502B, and 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.*

*POLICY ON TERMINATING THE ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL*

*SEC. 550. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—*

*(1) since 1948 the Arab countries have maintained a primary boycott against Israel, refusing to do business with Israel;*

*(2) since the early 1950s the Arab League has maintained a secondary and tertiary boycott against American and other companies that have commercial ties with Israel;*

*(3) the boycott seeks to coerce American firms by blacklisting those that do business with Israel and harm America's competitiveness;*

*(4) the United States has a longstanding policy opposing the Arab League boycott and United States law prohibits American firms from providing information to Arab countries to demonstrate compliance with the boycott;*

*(5) with real progress being made in the Middle East peace process and the serious confidence-building measures taken by the State of Israel, an end to the Arab boycott of Israel and of American companies that have commercial ties with Israel is long overdue and would represent a significant confidence-building measure; and*

*(6) in the interest of Middle East peace and free commerce, the President must take more concrete steps to press the Arab states to end their practice of blacklisting and boycotting American companies that have trade ties with Israel.*

*(b) POLICY.—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.*

*Titles I through V of this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1994".*

*TITLE VI—FISCAL YEAR 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS*

*The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, namely:*

*FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT*

*ASSISTANCE FOR THE NEW INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION*

*For an additional amount for the "Assistance for the new independent states of the former Soviet Union" and for related programs, $630,000,000, to be available upon enactment and to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $500,000,000 may be made available for a special privatization and restructuring fund: Provided, That the United States contribution for such fund shall not exceed one-quarter of the aggregate amount being made available for such fund by all countries: Provided further, That the provisions of section 498B(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall apply to funds appropriated by this paragraph.*

*DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE*

*OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE*

*OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES*

*For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Defense Agencies", $979,000,000, to be available upon enactment and to remain available until September 30, 1994: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer such funds to other appropriations available to the Department of Defense for the purposes of providing assistance to the new independent states of the former Soviet Union: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer such funds to appropriations available to the Department of State and other agencies of the United States Government for the purposes of providing assistance and related programs for the new independent states of the former Soviet Union for programs that the President determines will increase the national security of the United States: Provided further, That the amounts transferred shall be available subject to the same terms and conditions as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That the authority to make transfers pursuant to this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority of the Department of Defense.*

*This title may be cited as the "Supplemental Appropriations for the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union Act, 1993".*

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, no further amendment shall be in order except those amendments printed in House Report 103–134. The amendments may be considered in the order printed, may be offered only by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question. Debate time for each amendment shall be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1, printed in House Report 103–134.

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 28, line 5, strike "$816,000,000" and insert "$775,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute amendment made in order under the rule. I think it is the understanding that we will be combining the time on the two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may offer his substitute at this time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 28, line 5, strike "$816,000,000" and insert "811,900,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

□ 1300

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had a lengthy debate on the issue of human rights violations, particularly in the northwestern part of India, in a place called Punjab and Kashmir. We had, after the lengthy debate, a vote, and my amendment to cut $41 million in developmental assistance from the authorization bill for India was defeated by a vote of 230 to 202.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment today is very similar to the amendment yesterday, except that it does not, because we cannot legislate on an appropriations bill, it does not specifically state that the amount of money we want to cut in the amount of $41 million in developmental assistance will come out of the Indian developmental assistance that this country will grant to them.

However, I would like it to be clear in the debate that that is the purpose of my amendment. I have discussed this with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. Mr. OBEY is going to propose an amendment to my amendment which would reduce the amount cut by 90 percent. I am prepared to accept that amendment, because I am more concerned about sending a strong message to the Indian Government than I am about the amount of money to be cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, yesterday we defeated this amendment by a vote of 230 to 202. I was very disappointed at that result, and could only assume that my colleagues in the House did not know all the information with respect to what is really going on in northern India, and specifically in the Punjab region of northern India.

That is why I rise today in strong support of the Burton amendment. The fact is that this goes back at least several hundred years in terms of a conflict between the religious minority of the Punjab and the religious majority of the entire State of India. In 1984 the Sikh minority in Amritsar was specifically attacked inside the walls of the Golden Temple, and there was a massacre that occurred at that time, reigniting ancient hatreds between the two factions.

It is absurd that the U.S. Congress should now be earmarking money that would go to support any kind of foreign aid to India when the kind of atrocities that are occurring in the Punjab region continue to this day.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues in the House strongly to defeat any attempt to continue to fund India with foreign aid. It is wrong that we should be involved in the funding of what are very blatant and clear human rights abuses, where a religious minority is being persecuted by a majority. That is essentially what is at the bottom of this argument. That is the basis of what is going on here.

I want my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be very aware that voting against this amendment is essentially a vote to continue the kind of human rights and religious persecution that includes tremendous torture and atrocities to keep going on in northern India, and specifically in the Punjab region.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the concerns about human rights that are being expressed by the supporters of this amendment. God knows my record in this House has been a strong one in support of human rights. The problem with the amendment is that it does not do what it is described as doing.

The amendment suggests that we should cut $41 million out of the development account in order to express our unhappiness with the human rights situation in India. The fact is that the amendment does not cut aid to India. In fact, most of the money India gets is in a different account, the population account. They get $21 million out of the $41 million which is spent in India in the population account, not in this account.

I have offered my amendment, which would reduce the cut in the gentleman's amendment from $41 to $4.1 million, because while I am willing to cooperate in an effort to send a signal of concern on human rights, I am not willing to swallow an amendment which will kill a large number of children. The fact is that if we cut $41 million out of the development account, which we have already cut by $105 million from the administration request and $221 million from last year's level, that means simply that we will be killing a good number of children.

A $141 million cut in the Child Survival Program, for instance, is estimated to result in the deaths of 25,000 children who would otherwise be served by that program. In the AIDS-Prevention Program, which this account funds, a cut of $41 million we are told would result in 15,000 children not being served.

In the health programs that this account funds, we are told a cut of $41 million could result in the killing of almost 200,000 kids based on our ability to immunize a sufficient number of children and provide them with oral rehydration salts, for instance.

I would simply say that if people want to argue the issue of India, they ought to do what they did yesterday and take it to the authorizing bill. We had that debate yesterday. This amendment does not cut aid to India, it simply cuts $41 million out of the development assistance account. No one who cares about the survival of the poorest children in this world wants to do that.

That is why I have offered a substitute which would limit that cut to $4 million, so that the point is made about the concern on human rights without savaging programs that are meant to deal with the most unfortunate kids on God's green Earth.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for working with us on this amendment. We do have a difference of opinion on whether or not my amendment would have caused the death of a lot of children over there. However, I want to make it clear that that was not our intent. We are giving India about $150 million in various aid projects, and $41 million is in developmental assistance. We are giving probably $100 million in food aid through other programs, so it was not the intention of this gentleman from Indiana to endanger the lives of anybody in India.

However, we did feel very strongly that we should send a strong signal to the Indian Government in as many ways as possible that the human rights atrocities that are taking place in places like Punjab, Kashmir, Nagaland, among Moslems, Sikhs, Christians, and others in that country should come to a halt.

I appreciate the gentleman's efforts to assist us in sending that signal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Burton amendment. Yesterday I paid close attention to the arguments that were given on both sides of this debate. India receives a grant total of about $150 million in aid from the United States. The Burton amendment is suggesting that we withhold $41 million of that aid, development aid, unless India improves its human rights conditions. What could be a better request of a country receiving our aid than that it improve its human rights status in order to receive the money from the people of the United States of America?

There are two central arguments that were used against the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] yesterday. No. 1, and we heard it again today, by withdrawing our aid, this $41 million, that we are hurting the poorest of the poor. In fact, now we hear we are killing children.

Let me note, and I hope the American people will understand, that we are talking about $41 million of their

money that we are giving to another country, and by not giving it to them we are being accused of being against children and hurting the poor.

India itself spends $8.2 billion a year for the last 3 years on weapons, including nuclear weapons. How can anyone claim that for us to try to promote human rights in India by using $41 million as leverage to promote human rights that we are attacking the poor in India and the children in India, when they themselves are spending billions, $8.2 billion a year, on weapons? That argument does not hold water.

The second argument against this resolution is that it is unbalanced, that there is violence on both sides. Yes, when people are being attacked they sometimes commence violent acts to defend themselves.

□ 1310

And yes, there are some people who are a little unbalanced there, who have seen their families murdered, and seen their women raped. The fact is when the government commits human rights atrocities there is a reaction.

The underlying tension in the Kashmir, for example, is caused by India's refusal, continual refusal since 1948 to permit an election so that the people of the Kashmir can determine their own destiny. When you have violence being committed against Sikhs, and against Christians, and against Muslims, you are going to have violence in return.

It is time to stop the violence. It is time for the United States to stand up for the human rights. That is how to create a more peaceful society.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, despite the remarks of the gentleman in the well, the facts are as follows: India gets $100 million in Public Law 480. Public Law 480 is not in this bill. India, in the account being cut by this amendment, only gets $21 million, and the gentleman is trying to cut it by $41 million, claiming that is going to penalize India.

The fact is you've got your facts screwed up, I say to the gentleman from California. The fact is you are going after the wrong account, and the fact is that if you do cut this account by $41 million, there will be thousands of kids who die, not just in India, but in Africa, in Latin America, in Asia, you name it. They will die.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, although the gentleman makes some very strong points, we do have a little difference of opinion on this. My main objective is to send a strong message.

The $41 million is not the important factor. The important factor is that a message is sent that the United States of America wants these human rights violations stopped, and these atrocities stopped. And I think with his cooperation, we are sending that message.

Once again, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for working with us on this.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is again trying to signal his displeasure with the Indian Government on human rights issues. Yesterday, his amendment to the authorization bill to cut the $41 million in development aid to India was defeated, with the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Subcommittee on Asia speaking out in opposition. We debated at length yesterday over the wisdom—or, indeed, the lack of wisdom—of cutting development aid, intended for the poorest and vulnerable citizens of India as a means of putting pressure on the Government of India. We also discussed the fact that the violence and unrest in India has many sides, with the Government in conflict with various separatist movements.

Today's amendment by Mr. BURTON is even more misguided. Not having succeeded in amending the authorizing bill, the gentleman is now proposing that we cut the amount of aid intended for India—$41 million—with no solid provisions for where the cut will actually come from. Thus, under the guise of trying to send a message to the Indian Government, this amendment cuts development aid not only to the poor people of India, but to poor and vulnerable people throughout the developing world. It is hard to see how such a cruel step could be construed as a pro-human rights amendment.

What I find most disturbing about this amendment is that it sets its sights on the wrong target. The development assistance in question goes to such areas as health care, child immunizations, AIDS education, programs to improve the status of women, feed hungry children, provide clean drinking water and better housing—in brief, humanitarian programs in the best tradition of American assistance to people who truly need our help. Terminating this humanitarian assistance is not the right way to make America's moral persuasion felt in the world.

Voting for this amendment may make some of us feel like we've done something in the name of human rights. But, in reality, the amendment completely misses the point. We can do better than hollow, symbolic gestures that achieve no meaningful results. Let's use our relationship and our influence with India to promote the values of human rights that are so important to every one of us. Let us not cut off those people who desperately need this development assistance. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman in the well will listen to what I am about to say. India spends $8.24 billion, that is $8,240 million a year on nuclear weapons and the development of other nuclear systems, while its neighbor, Pakistan, is not getting any support from the United States because it has started, or is alleged to have started a nuclear development program.

If India wants to, they could cut $100 million, $1 billion out of their massive defense budget, like we are doing here in the United States, to take care of some of its poor itself.

So I think the gentleman's argument ought to be directed at the Indian Government asking why they do not reduce just a little bit their defense spending like we are doing here in the United States to take care of their own poor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for purposes of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, yesterday for the first time in recent years the authorization bill for foreign assistance includes strong language on human rights as it relates to the violations of a number of minority groups that have occurred over the last several years in India. The gentleman from Wisconsin is asking to reduce the Burton funding by 90 percent. Could he indicate to me his feeling about the Indian Government and the way it has been dealing with its human rights abuses? I think it is most important that Members understand that there does not seem to be dissent here in our criticism about the way these issues have been handled.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I personally feel that India has a long way to go in meeting its human rights responsibilities, which is why I am willing to cooperate in making a small reduction to communicate that point. But I am not willing to accept a $41 million cut which will kill a lot of innocent kids, because somebody brings to the legislative floor a blunderbuss rather than a rifle.

Mr. FAZIO. But the gentleman is supportive of language that was included in the authorization yesterday, and is putting the pressure on the Indian Government to make the changes in the way their police and military have been functioning in Punjab, and Kashmir, and other parts of the country?

Mr. OBEY. I think the Indian Government would be mistaken if it did not recognize the unhappiness reflected in this amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. The gentleman's opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is because it is an

across-the-board cut, and cannot then be a rifle shot into one country?

Mr. OBEY. The amendment does not even get to India. The amendment hits every place in the world, and is, in my view, draconian.

Mr. FAZIO. My purpose in asking the question was to point out the broad support that exists here on the floor for the intent of the gentleman from Indiana's amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to emphasize what we do agree on here. The audience listening in may have observed that in the first place there is a commonality in terms of the personalities of both Members, that they do not mince words, they do not pull their punches. Both are straightforward leaders of this House.

The fact is that neither do they disagree on the fact that there are gross human rights violations going on in India. People are being killed, they are being tortured, some are being burned, or buried alive, solely because they happen to be Sikhs, or because they happen to be Kashmiris. What the Indian military is doing is in complete contradiction to everything America and American foreign policy stands for.

And we are not, whatever the results of this amendment, we are not saying that we are turning our backs on this, that we are ignoring it or that we think that it should be in any way discounted. The fact is that America and this House of Representatives objects in the strongest possible terms to the torture and the execution that is going on by the Indian military and the Government in Punjab and in Kashmir. It is wrong, and we will continue the battle in any appropriate way to punish the Indian military for this. And both Members agree we do not want to punish children. We do not want to punish innocent civilians. The point is that innocent civilians are being severely punished and tortured, and it should not be allowed to continue.

Whatever the results of this, the House of Representatives is in agreement. The facts are the facts. It is wrong, and we will no longer tolerate it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

□ 1320

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment and to support your substitute amendment.

This would set an entirely wrong precedent for United States relationships with India and other parts of the world, as you have indicated from where the cuts would come. It is a misguided attempt to isolate India at a critical time in its political, economic, and cultural development.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I respect the concerns of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for human rights issues throughout the world. However, drastically cutting United States assistance to India will not help the cause of human rights in India. I suggest to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, that this matter is more complex than his amendment would have us believe. I am afraid that, if passed, this amendment would only serve to strengthen the hands of those extremists and fundamentalist groups within India that have been bent on tearing that secular democracy apart.

By simply punishing and isolating India, this amendment would only hinder India's efforts to arrive at a solution to a difficult and complex domestic problem. Additionally, India has the world's sixth-largest economy, and only a strong democratic India is going to be able to move forward in the way we want.

I urge my colleagues to support the substitute offered by the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

It is not the intent of my amendment or the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] to isolate the Government of India or the Indian people.

I respect and have great admiration for the Indian people, but I do disagree strongly with the human rights violations being perpetrated by the military at the direction of the Indian Government.

In Punjab, Kashmir, and in a place nobody has heard of called Nagaland where Christians are being persecuted as well as Muslims, in Kashmir, and the Sikhs in the Punjab. So it is not our intention to isolate India. It is our intention to send a very strong signal to the Indian Government, and hopefully from governments around the world, that we want human rights violations stopped in those areas.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Burton amendment.

I am glad that the gentleman from Wisconsin had the foresight to introduce a substitute amendment.

India is the world's largest democracy, and at a time when the United States and India are moving closer together in our bilateral arrangements and relations, this is not the time to start cutting developmental aid to India or to any other nation.

India needs American investment. India needs American cooperation, and with the collapse of the Soviet Union, relations between the United States and India have the ability to become closer than ever. We in Congress must try to enhance that relationship.

India is a very important country. Cutting aid to India will not change anything for the better. I fear that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana would have the opposite effect. If there is some dissatisfaction, I believe that it can be handled on a bilateral basis.

This sends the wrong message at the wrong time. We ought to be moving closer together for closer relations with India.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

This vote should not be viewed by our colleagues as a referendum on the human rights situation in India. Even those Members who agree with the assessment of that situation given by the author of this amendment should recognize the utter folly of cutting these funds, dedicated to relieving the plight of the poorest of the poor, because you are concerned about the actions of the police or the military.

You will not be penalizing a single soldier, or Government official, or police officer, by voting for this amendment. You will, however, punish the hungry, the homeless, the sick, those afflicted with AIDS, the very young, the very old, and the disadvantaged. In that sense, this amendment will inevitably have exactly the opposite effect intended by its author. That is why the human rights community, even where they find serious cause for concern, does not endorse cutting development assistance. Neither should the Members of this House even if they agree with the gentleman from Indiana's assessment of the situation in India.

There is one more consideration I would ask my colleagues to give careful attention before they vote. We are not dealing here with a totalitarian regime. India is the world's most populous democracy. Its leaders are accountable to the voters. No democratically elected government can be seen by its voters as changing course under the threat of a cut in aid by the United States. No Member of this House would want to face his or her constituents after having given in to such pressure and it is fanciful to believe that elected officials in other countries would behave differently.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LEHMAN). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, which side is entitled to close debate?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entitled to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the terms of this debate are all wrong. First of all, this is not a discussion of human rights. This is not the same bill that was up yesterday, the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] that was beaten in this House by a rather substantial margin. This is not even the son of Burton nor the grandson of the great-grandson of Burton. This has nothing to do with India and nothing to do with human rights in India.

Those of us who are on the opposite side of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] have every bit as much concern about human rights as does he. But the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and, indeed, his whole debate on this amendment today are completely off the mark. The amendment yesterday was completely unbalanced.

Those who are interested in human rights want to see India improve, but we also want to see everybody improve.

Nothing was mentioned in his whole discussion yesterday or any of his discussion today about Sikh militants blowing up the Prime Minister of India and other human rights. We cannot have that happen consistently. We have tried to be balanced.

I have spoken to everybody who offered language in the legislation that went through yesterday. They accommodated every Member who had human rights concerns. We took the language that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] had incorporated into the bill. We accepted the language offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] in his amendment which puts Presidential certification on aid to India, on IMET, but what the gentleman does here today has nothing to do with India at all.

He would take $41 million away from those people in this world, young children, who need it the most. He does not mention India. He takes it out of the whole fund.

I do not understand the logic of taking $41 million, how it hurts India, if you deprive health care to children in Nepal, and AIDS-prevention education for people in Thailand.

This is a shotgun approach. You are shooting at the wrong people. This is going to kill children all over and has nothing to do with India.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this debate is not binding upon the President of the United States, as has been mentioned in the well. But this debate will serve as a guide to our State Department and other agencies that it is our intent to send a very strong signal to India that we want these human rights violations stopped because of the cut of $4.1 million in developmental assistance.

Now, there are 1.1 million troops in Punjab and Kashmir, and I do not know how many are in Nagaland, torturing Christians, as are being tortured in Kashmir and Punjab.

But the fact of the matter is we cannot, as human beings who believe in human rights, turn our backs on the atrocities that have taken place.

I do not deny that there may have been some attacks from the other side in response to these human rights abuses. Nevertheless, we need to let the Indian Government know that we, as a nation, stand solidly against these human rights atrocities.

The gentleman from Wisconsin voted against my amendment yesterday. I believe he voted against it last year when we passed it, trying to send a signal, by 219 to 200. But the gentleman from Wisconsin has acknowledged, as the gentleman from New York who just spoke, that there are human rights violations taking place in India.

I do not deny that there are human rights violations taking place elsewhere in the world. But we have to take these on one at a time, because a shotgun approach simply will not work.

I feel very, very strongly, as I have for the past 5 years, about these violations. I believe that my amendment, as amended by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], will send a signal.

□ 1330

It is not going to dramatically hurt children in India, the way that Mr. OBEY has amended this. They are spending over $8 billion per year on military hardware in India. This is not really going to affect the balance of aid that is going to help the disadvantaged in that country.

It is an amendment that is very essential to send a signal. I appreciate very much the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] working with us on this.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Chairman, as those of you who know me know, my favorite philosopher is Archie the cockroach. Archie said once, "Did you ever notice that when a politician gets an idea, he often gets it all wrong?" And, frankly, that is what this amendment does, well-meaning though it may be.

We are told by the sponsors of the original Burton amendment that it is not the intention of the amendment to kill children. The problem is that politicians often do a lot of things that they do not intend to do. And this time, the amendment which is offered does not cut aid to India, although the debate has been on India. What the amendment does is to cut the development account in this bill by twice as much as the entire aid which the administration provides to India under this account.

I also point out that President Clinton has in his budget cut the aid request for India by about 20 percent below the level requested by President Bush last year.

So I have offered this amendment, as I said earlier, my amendment to the Burton amendment, because while I am willing to cooperate in sending a signal that we need an improvement in the human rights situation in India, I am not willing to kill an awful lot of kids in the process, in India or anywhere else.

I do not think it is wise to reduce our ability to fight AIDS worldwide, I do not think it is wise to reduce our ability to provide childhood immunizations to prevent thousands and thousands of children's deaths. And if we do not adopt my substitute, those deaths will occur.

I think prudence and rationality indicate that the Obey amendment pass.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time within which a recorded vote, if ordered, may be taken on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], as amended or not, without intervening business or debate following the vote on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 425, noes 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

AYES—425

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abercrombie | Barrett (WI) | Bonior |
| Ackerman | Bartlett | Borski |
| Allard | Barton | Boucher |
| Andrews (ME) | Bateman | Brewster |
| Andrews (NJ) | Becerra | Brooks |
| Andrews (TX) | Beilenson | Browder |
| Applegate | Bentley | Brown (CA) |
| Archer | Bereuter | Brown (FL) |
| Armey | Berman | Brown (OH) |
| Bacchus (FL) | Bevill | Bryant |
| Bachus (AL) | Bilbray | Bunning |
| Baesler | Bilirakis | Burton |
| Baker (CA) | Bishop | Buyer |
| Baker (LA) | Blackwell | Byrne |
| Ballenger | Bliley | Callahan |
| Barca | Blute | Calvert |
| Barcia | Boehlert | Camp |
| Barlow | Boehner | Canady |
| Barrett (NE) | Bonilla | Cantwell |

Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—14

de la Garza
Fields (TX)
Hall (OH)
Henry
McDade
Neal (NC)
Pelosi
Pickle
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Slaughter
Tucker
Washington
Williams
Young (AK)

□ 1353

Messrs. THOMAS of California, TOWNS, and JACOBS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I was unable to be present for the rollcall vote No. 236. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], or his designee, debatable for not to exceed 30 minutes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. 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. SOLOMON: Page 45, line 7, strike "$700,000,000" and insert "$696,421,462".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

Mr. Chairman, I have already outlined several objections I have to the foreign operations appropriation bill, and another is the $700 million subsidy appropriation for the Export-Import Bank. The amendment that I offer now will strike just $3.5 million from the subsidy appropriation. Three point five million dollars is the amount of subsidy appropriation that would leverage $78 million in loans to China that was just approved by the White House. The loan is in connection with the purchase of equipment for a Government-owned iron ore mine in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this loan, which has not yet been disbursed, should be blocked, if at all possible. If not, we in Congress should send the message that similar loans will not go through in the future.

Mr. Chairman, these types of loans, like, most of our aid to the former Soviet Union, are simply incomprehensive to the bulk of the American people.

How can we explain this to them?

In fiscal 1992, Exim provided over $424 million worth of assistance, direct and indirect, to the People's Republic of China, and so far, in fiscal year 1993, that total stands at $236 million, and this is in addition to $2.5 billion in World Bank loans, most of it supplied by the United States of America Treasury.

Can we really make the case that it is in our constituents' interest to send their hard-earned money to China in order to shore up State-run industries, Government-owned industries? And of course, this is not even to mention China's abysmal human rights record, its unfair trade practices, and its roguish outlaw foreign policy.

Now many of my colleagues know that I am a very severe critic of the Chinese regime. In fact, I have a resolution before the Committee on Ways and Means right now that would terminate MFN status for China, which is one reason I brought in this amendment here today. Why is it? Because this regime continues its massive repression of its own people and the people of Tibet, which many of us on both sides of the aisle have taken the floor and have talked about in recent days.

□ 1400

Mr. Chairman, the next part of my statement is most interesting to Members on both sides of this aisle, because the people of the Republic of China have been running up huge trade surpluses against the United States of America, our free market, business and industry, unfairly discriminating against our own products. In fact, in the first quarter of this year our trade deficit with China grew by 25 percent more than in 1992.

In 1993 alone our trade deficit with the People's Republic of China increased by 50 percent, from $12.5 to $18 billion, and that means more and more

textile workers in America being put out of work because of these unfair trade practices.

Mr. Chairman, China is engaged in a massive military buildup that is making many Asian countries nervous. It pursues an outlaw foreign policy by selling missiles to Pakistan, giving nuclear technology to Iran, and by supporting the most roguish foreign policy government in the world today, North Korea.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is long past time to start registering our discontent with China, and my amendment would be just one small step in that direction.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Export-Import Bank is a critical element in our efforts to promote a more favorable balance of trade and stimulate employment for American firms. The fiscal year funding level for Exim subsidy is expected to result in 275,000 additional American jobs, a far better ratio of investment to job creation than virtually any other Federal program.

The potential for using the leverage that Export-Import Bank financing provides is enormous. Industry estimates based on potential customers indicate that Export-Import program authority of $18 to $20 billion could be used to provide American jobs in 1994, requiring a subsidy level of $1.1 to $1.3 billion. The recession in Japan, and throughout the world is driving demand for alternative credit sources. Without those sources, economic growth will be retarded, starting here in the United States. Exim financing is especially critical at this time for the U.S. aerospace industry which faces the twin challenges of defense reductions and financial instability of many U.S. airlines.

Frankly, I hoped that we would be able to provide at least some increase in Export-Import Bank funding in this bill. But I recognize the very real fiscal constraints we face and note that the bill already makes a $57 million reduction in this program from the administration request. But I welcome the language included in the committee report that encourages that up to $125 million of the funds provided for the newly Independent States be transferred to Exim to meet the demands of these states in order to avoid further competition for scarce credit resources.

This amendment seeks to cut an additional $3.5 million for Exim, which translates to support for $70 million in U.S. exports and 1,350 American jobs. The author intends that this will somehow punish the Government of China for a wide range of actions that all of us find objectionable. The administration has embarked on a policy that will forcefully and directly address our very legitimate disagreements with the Chinese Government. This amendment will not even impact the transaction to which the gentleman objects, which incidently had as its primary beneficiary a firm in Milwaukee, WI.

What the amendment will do is erode our ability to finance some transaction that in all likelihood will have absolutely nothing to do with China. This is clearly a case of cutting off our nose to spite our face and ought to be soundly rejected.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, having said all that and making my point, and since my resolution of disapproval of most favored nation status for China will be on the floor early next week or the week after, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment from floor consideration so we can get on with the Callahan-Solomon-Mfume-Rangel amendment which deals with the question of whether or not we are going to grant loan aid or barter aid to the former Soviet Union.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for withdrawing the amendment. I think it is the correct thing to do. But I want to make clear that the Export-Import Bank subsidies which we provide in this bill are not subsidies to any foreign country. They are in fact subsidies which enable American corporations to export their products to other countries.

If we have a trade imbalance with China, for instance, the Export-Import Bank helps to correct that, because the Export-Import Bank helps make it possible to export our products, not just to China, but to other countries. So I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] withdrew his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 103-134.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

Mr. CALLAHAN. 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. CALLAHAN: Page 85, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 87, line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this amendment to strike title VI from this bill, which is about $1.6 billion in supplemental appropriations for the former Soviet Union.

Let me say that I truly appreciate the courtesies which have been extended to me and the patience that Chairman OBEY, as well as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], have shown in offering me the opportunity, both in subcommittee and in the full committee, to address my concerns, which are true concerns.

I am not here to demagogue aid to Russia. I am here simply to tell Members that title VI, which is just a portion of the moneys that we are giving to Russia to aid them in their efforts to formulate a democracy, should be reconsidered. We should send back a free-standing bill to the subcommittee and to the full committee and ultimately to this House, a measure which would give us the opportunity to attach such restraints as we want to attach to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, passage of this amendment will not impact the foreign aid bill. It still permits the bill to go forward with the aid to Israel that many Members are concerned about. It still gives us the opportunity to do those things which are necessary to do in the form of foreign aid, but without title VI which is $1.6 billion of the amount of money that we are going to give to Russia.

It still gives the administration the opportunity to continue in their efforts to aid Russia in her time of need. It still gives them an adequate supply of money, about $1 billion, with which to continue the programs which are currently in existence.

It simply tells Russia that when we reformulate title VI and bring it back to the floor of the House, that they are going to have to assist the United States of America in trying to spread democracy, not only in Russia, but around the world.

It will give them a message that we are going to request, in whatever bill we come back with, an opportunity for Russia to assist us with the problems that we have in Cuba. It will give us an opportunity to tell Russia that she has got to stop selling conventional arms to Serbia, which we feel are still getting into Bosnia. It will tell Russia that we have got to do something about North Korea, and that we need her assistance to insist that they stop their race to develop a nuclear capability. It will tell Russia that we do not want to give Iran and Iraq submarines which ultimately could do harm to worldwide freedom and democracy.

It does no harm to the foreign aid bill. It simply tells us that we should go back to committee, we should discuss in more detail, and we should certainly send Russia an indication that we want to help. That we are going to ensure that you do achieve your new found goals of a democratic form of government, but that you are going to do it in a different way.

My suggestions that I would come forth with in the subcommittee if we were successful in formulating a new policy for Russia would simply say that you are going to buy a lot of American-made products. It would simply mean if they wanted to build 5,000

new homes for their retired military people, if that is what it takes to formulate a democracy, well, then, that is what we should do. But maybe we should build these homes here in the United States in the form of a modular building and send these homes over on a ship flying an American flag into any Russian port, to show them that the American people are behind them and that this is our contribution to make sure that they are successful.

The amendment provides the administration with the capability of continuing the programs which are in existence today, but it gives this Congress an opportunity to report back and have a debate on how we want to send this money, and I think that this money should be spent in such a way as to help our own people here in the United States of America.

If we are going to tell the American people that they should sacrifice, that we need to increase taxes to the extent that we voted just a couple of weeks ago, if we tell the American people we are going to take $1.6 billion of this money and we are going to send it to Russia without any strings attached, then I think that we are negligent in our duty to the American people.

The American people understand that we should help Russia, but they do not understand that we should send them money in an unbridled sense and let them spend it in any way, shape, or form, and at the same time to have no encouragement to Russia to help us formulate democracy all over the world.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the best deficit cutting vote that anyone can make today is to oppose the Callahan amendment.

In 1985 I was meeting with a number of Russians in this very building. Their delegation was headed by Mr. Scherbitsky, who then ran the Ukraine for the Russian Communist Party. They got word that Mr. Chernenko, the last of the old boys who ran that country, had just died. They cut short their visit here to the United States and went home.

□ 1410

At that time President Reagan was estimating that our defense cost for the next 5 years would be $1 trillion 34 million. We would up spending $563 billion less on defense over the next 5 years, because Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Yeltsin were running the country rather than the old boys who ran it before that time. In the next 3 years, we saved an additional $290 billion.

Russian arms exports to the Third World have now dropped from $30 billion to $2.5 billion. That is a far cry from what this country expected when, in 1962, two graduate students were sitting, one in the University of Michigan, one at the University of Wisconsin, studying Russian government and language and wondering how we were going to deal with them over the next two generations.

The student studying at the University of Michigan was Strobe Talbott; the student studying at the University of Wisconsin was me. We are now working on opposite ends of Pennsylvania Avenue to try to help the transition from what had been the most powerful military, totalitarian government in the history of the world into a fledgling democracy.

Now, the odds are not in favor of success. Every time that Russia has had a temporary opening to the West, in the end they have closed in upon themselves, and have become more dark force than they were before.

We owe it to our children, in my view, to try to make this time different. I think it is easy to forget that just 3 months ago we were watching American news magazines carry the cover story "Yeltsin's Last Stand."

We cannot determine what happens in Russia, but what we can do is to try to help along the most important historical change since the end of World War II.

I know there are those in this Congress who say, "Well, let's do it my way. Give them the aid but do it a little bit differently."

But the fact is, the signals have been called. They were called first by President Bush in his meetings with Mr. Yeltsin. They have now been called by President Clinton in his meetings with Yeltsin. And to slash this aid at this time that would send a disastrous signal to the Soviet Union, and it would, in fact, discredit the very democratic forces that we are trying to help.

In the 1920's, we were faced, as a society, with a similar choice. In Germany, the Weimar Republic was dying because of the incredible economic turmoil that faced that government. The West ignored what was happening. Hitler exploited those frustrations, came to power, and only 400,000 Americans were killed. Only 700,000 Americans were wounded, and only 40 million to 50 million people died worldwide.

We have paid a terrible price to get to this point in history. Every soldier who died in World War II did so to bring peace to the world. The process was interrupted by Russian aggression over the past 50 years. And every soldier who died in Vietnam and every soldier who fought or died in Korea, again, fought to bring peace to the world.

We are finally at the point where it may be possible to finish the job, as far as the old Soviet Union is concerned, and we owe it to every person who died or fought in World War II, in the Korean war and the Vietnam to take the steps this bill contemplates today.

We also owe it to every taxpayer. if we take the total amount of money which this country has spent to win the cold war and divide it by the number of taxpaying families paying income tax today, that comes out to a bill for every American family of about $82,000 to win the cold war.

It would be the height of folly for us to not to tie down that victory by taking the step that we are taking here today.

I ask every Member of this House, take this rare occasion to change history. Vote against the Callahan amendment. Vote for the committee product.

You will be glad you did and so will your children.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I am a cosponsor of this amendment, and I support it entirely. And I do recognize that this great Nation of ours has a responsibility to give some type of assistance to Russia or any other country that we can afford to do it, especially when it is so directly related and tied to our national security.

But to put this in just one bill, without allowing the Members to have an opportunity to evaluate the type of cost that this is going to be and whether or not they can make amendments or how they would want to fashion it, I think it is wrong.

The chairman of the committee that I respect, he and the great work that they were doing, refer to the fact that we owe it to the veterans of Korea and Vietnam. I would like to remind him that I am a Korean veteran. I spent a year in combat in Korea. I fought the Communists. I came home with the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star.

In my community, there are so many young men and now women that served their country in combat and during times of war. And yet, when we say we owe it to them, I find that 50 percent of the homeless that we see in our great Nation are veterans, are veterans.

One may think that this is one way to thank the veterans for the sacrifices they have made, but I would strongly suggest that if one really wants to help the veterans of the United States, there is a more direct way and a more honest way that one can do it.

Not too long ago I walked on the House floor and heard one of our leaders speaking about this Nation's responsibility to the poor and to the homeless and to the jobless and, most important, to the hopeless. I had no idea that he was talking about the people in Russia.

I hear over and over again debate that, My God, if you don't show that

America is there when you need them, if you don't send some type of signal that you expect the contribution that they are making toward peace and to give them assistance when they need it, my God, these people might go the route of becoming violent.

And then the argument goes, And then what would it cost? This is money-saving type of thing. This isn't expenditure, the waste of billions of U.S. dollars. We are getting ahead of the curve. That is what we are doing. We are making an investment.

And I say, my God, isn't this the argument that so many of us have made on the floor as it relates to our constituents?

I know it sounds parochial and lacks the sophistication of seeing the broad picture, but I would suggest to my colleagues, when the kids drop out of school and have to walk the crime-ridden streets, exposed to automatic gunfire, having lack of training, when we see no job opportunities, no competency, even, in holding a job. When we take a look at our prison system and find that we have more people in prison today than any nation, per capita, on the face of the Earth and, in New York, we pay up to $60,000 a year to keep them in jail, over half of the people that are laying in the street today have drug and alcohol problems—if one of them gets pregnant and gives birth to a child, it costs us $6,000 a day in a hospital, a day in a hospital to keep that child alive, and we know it is going to cost millions if the child is born deformed or with any mental incompetency that, again, that society would have to take care of.

□ 1420

We can look on and on and see what we are not investing in these inner cities, but yet when it reaches the point that a kid feels that he has no hope and no future and he is willing to take the risk and join in in massive illogical insanity in destroying his own community, then we find it easy to find the funds to send in the National Guard, to pay the local police, and to keep them in jail at an expense that would be much less if we did for them what we intend to do for Russia.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude by saying that the Members can count on me at some time and place to be just as sophisticated as them in trying to relieve the pains of people, no matter where they are located on this Earth, if we can afford to do it. However, I strongly suggest, if we have this much compassion, we might think of starting off at home first.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

In response to the gentleman who just spoke in the well, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to point out that for all my time in this House I have supported vigorously the education and the health and the job training and the housing and veterans programs here at home that he is talking about. Not one dime of aid to the Soviet Union is coming out of any program to help people here at home. This program is being funded by reductions in our other foreign aid accounts and by taking almost $1 billion out of the military budget.

If Russian reform fails, the defense budget will go up so fast there will be no room in our budget for any of the education or health or job initiatives that the gentleman from New York says he wants to see funded.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of aiding our country by aiding the nations of the former Soviet Union, and against the amendment offered by our colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

We are told that the American people, already overburdened with taxes, facing a huge deficit, should not be asked to send tax dollars to the former Soviet Union. However, these same American people paid trillions in taxes over the years to defeat Soviet communism. We sacrificed thousands of lives. For decades we have lived in fear and anxiety of nuclear destruction.

Are we now going to say our cold war sacrifices were worthless, our fears about nuclear war will never end?

Will we say all our suffering for decades means nothing because the Congress refuses to follow through, as we should, to capitalize on our great victory and help the Russian people transform their old discredited system? Is that what we really want to tell our constituents, that it has all been in vain?

Have we come this far, have we sacrificed so much money and lives, have we endured decades of anxiety and tension, have we done all this to now turn our backs at the last moment when our great victory can be consolidated by helping democracy and free enterprise grow and survive? Have we won another ear, only to lose another peace?

When we visited Ukraine and Russia in April, we heard the words and phrases of the new situation: "hyperinflation, vouchers, privatization." In my mind, after having visited there on four previous occasions, there was one word in Ukraine and Russia that transcended all the rest, and that word was "hope."

Early in the cold war, when I first came to Washington, there was an American who left the Communist Party, and his exposé of Communist duplicity at great cost to himself was so stirring that one admirer said of him, "He has not returned from hell with empty hands." The same can be said about millions of Russians and Ukrainians and others who have endured so many decades in the Communist-made hell called the Soviet Union. They have not returned from hell with empty hands. They hold in their hands one thing I never thought I would see that they would possess in my time: hope.

They have returned from hell with hands ready to work in rebuilding not only new nations but new laws and new markets, new ways of life. However, they can fall prey to demagogs of the left and the right. They can get weary of the long struggle for democracy and free enterprise. They can lose the hope that now sustains them. Their fate is in their hands, but we can offer a helping hand.

To the older Members of this body I would say that we have known nothing in our adult lives except the fight against one totalitarianism or another: fascism, naziism, communism. Now, in the aftermath of what John Kennedy called the twilight struggle, can we turn away from people who have suffered so much from totalitarianism and who now want to have what we have, and are willing to work for it?

This morning's press carried an account of President Yeltsin's influence on the Congress of Soviet Deputies in fashioning a new constitution. How? A bicameral legislative body, three branches of Government, like ours, and the right to own private property. My goodness, look at the progress that is being made and recognize it.

To our younger Members I would say, when they get older and look back at life, they will discover that there are only a few big moments that stand out, moments that help define their characters or which their characters helped define. This is one of them.

I would urge my colleagues, by all means, to seize this particular moment and vote against this amendment. Do the right thing in really minuscule economic terms, relatively speaking here. I am sure for their children, future generations are going to be deeply grateful for that action that we take this very afternoon.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, an earlier speaker said that the money for these funds earmarked for Russia in no way comes out of money for education, health, welfare, and so forth. I would remind the gentleman that it all comes out of the same pot; an empty pot at that, an empty pot at that.

Mr. Chairman, I have been arguing for 2 days that it would be irresponsible to plow $2.5 billion into the former Soviet Union. These appropriations would add to our $300 billion deficit, pushing up the cost of interest, depriving money from health, education, welfare, et cetera.

Mr. Chairman, it would arouse the ire of the voters, it would continue the failed status quo of our aid policies, and do nothing to help the former Soviet Union people.

It is for this reason that I have teamed up with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], the coauthors of this amendment that would strike the entire $1.6 billion supplemental appropriation for just this year, not next year.

Mr. Chairman, if we pass this amendment, let us look at what would happen. First and foremost, we will have $1.6 billion right in our hands to put to better use. We all might differ on how the better use might be. My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], just outlined what he felt that use ought to be. I would prefer deficit reduction. Clearly, anything would be better than sending it to a far-off land where it is sure to line the pockets of corrupt officials and a new breed of Russian mafioso.

Let me tell the Members, we saw them when we were over there, that at this very minute they are absconding with already the millions of U.S. dollars already in the pipeline, depositing them in Swiss bank accounts and other bank accounts around this world.

Second, we will begin to regain the respect of the American people, of whom, according to the last poll that came out yesterday on CNN, says less than a third of the people have confidence in we, the Congress.

Third, we will open a window of opportunity to have a substantial debate on the nature of foreign aid. Someone will say that this would be a disaster. We will leave Boris Yeltsin out in the cold. That is absolutely not true. We did not give Mr. Yeltsin money when he was fighting his last stand that the gentleman mentioned just the other day. We gave him the moral support that he needed, we did not write him a check.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on this floor ought to be how are we going to disburse aid. I want to help Mr. Yeltsin, I want to help those poor Soviet people throw off the shackles of communism, but the Japanese, in giving their same amount of aid, are giving it in the form of loans and credits to be repaid to the Japanese Treasury. What are we doing? We are giving it in the form of grants and gifts, not to be repaid, not to be bartered.

□ 1430

The former Soviet Union has the greatest natural resources in the world. They can pay for this aid that we are giving them, and we can use that money to either reduce the deficit, like I want to do, or to put it to programs that are going to help the American people, like our American soldiers who are being furloughed because we are cutting our military budget, being put out on the streets without jobs and without houses so that we can take that money and give it to the Soviet Union, so they can furlough their soldiers, but give them new housing and pay their salaries. That does not make any sense. It is not reasonable, gentlemen.

Now reasonable people can disagree. We want to help. But it is a question of how we help. That is what should be debated on the floor. It is not.

If we pass this amendment we will come back to argue this the way we should have argued in the first place and come up with the right kind of aid. And again I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, an earlier speaker said that none of these funds earmarked for Russia in any way comes out of money for education, health, welfare, and so forth. I will remind the gentleman that it all comes out of the same pot—and an empty pot at that.

Mr. Chairman, I have been arguing for 2 days now that it would be irresponsible to plow $2.5 billion into the former Soviet Union. These appropriations will add to our $300 billion deficit, arouse the ire of the voters, continue the failed status quo of our aid policies and do nothing to help the former Soviet people.

It is for that reason that I have teamed up with Mr. CALLAHAN of Alabama, Mr. RANGEL of New York, and Mr. MFUME of Maryland to coauthor an amendment to H.R. 2295 that would strike the entire $1.6 billion supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1993.

Mr. Chairman, if we pass this amendment, let's look at what will happen: First and foremost, we will have $1.6 billion right in our hands to put to better use. Now we all might differ on how to use that money—I would prefer deficit reduction—but clearly anything would be better than sending it to a far off land where it is sure to line the pockets of corrupt officials and a new breed of Russian mafiosos, that are this very minute absconding with millions of United States dollars already in the pipeline—that money is piling up in private Swiss bank accounts and other countries around the world.

Second, we will begin to regain the respect of the American people, of whom, according to a poll released yesterday, says less than a third have confidence in Congress.

Third, we will open a window of opportunity to have a substantive debate on the nature and role of foreign aid.

Now some will say that this would be a disaster. We will leave Boris Yeltsin out in the cold. This is not true. Our amendment would leave in place the $904 fiscal year 1994 appropriation for Russia, and that, of course, is in addition to the billions of United States and Western aid dollars that are already in the pipeline.

Certainly we ought to side with Boris Yeltsin and all other reformers in that part of the world, but is striking $1.6 billion from a Western aid package that totals $43 billion tantamount to leaving Yeltsin out in the cold? Clearly not.

Yeltsin is a clever, able man who seems to be taking care of himself just fine. He gained the upper hand over the hard-liners in March and April without this $1.6 billion gift. He did it by going to his people. We helped, certainly, but we helped by giving him moral and diplomatic support, and not by handing him a check.

The Callahan-Solomon amendment will not leave Boris Yeltsin out in the cold. But it would allow us to come back later and debate how this aid ought to be disbursed. It is simply a vote for fiscal sanity.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, we have just emerged from a 45-year-old cold war when we were haunted by the specter of nuclear weapons. Now that the cold war is over, the nuclear weapons are still there. There are 30,000 of them and they are aimed at us.

For us to abandon a nuclear-armed country to chaos, to the Fascist chaos that is waiting to take over should the fledgling Democratic efforts fail, is utter folly. We are about to win the race and we sit down in the track before we cross the finish line.

Us versus them, as I heard the gentleman from New York talk about our own needs, and of course, they are legion. There is not enough money in this Government to pay for all of the needs of the people in this country. We know that. But it is not us versus them. It is us and them, because what happens in Russia, what happens in the former Soviet Union will have a direct effect on peace in future generations and on our economy. To turn what have been 300 million enemies into 300 million customers will do an immense amount of good for their people and for our people.

Access to oil, to natural gas, to rare metals, to minerals, they have a boundless amount of them over there, and when we become trading partners instead of adversaries, the benefits will be incalculable.

The revolution of 1991 was fought without a shot being fired, and the Soviet Empire dissolved that had held us in bondage and hostage for 45 years. Do we want to ignore it and stand aside while it turns into a new Yugoslavia? Do we want all of the newly Independent States ethnically divided, religiously different to start fighting each other?

The transition from empire to new democracy, the transition from Communist dictatorship to a free-market country is painful and difficult. We are foolish, we are very foolish indeed if we do not assist them in making that transition.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN].

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because of the strong economic, political

and military relationship between the new, Independent Soviet Republics and Cuba.

Although there have been previous press reports indicating that these ties may be cut, recent articles have clearly pointed to a real attempt at continuing the bad old ways. I would like to read part of an article that was published in the Miami Herald just 2 days ago.

Gen. Ulises Rosales del Toro, Cuba's armed forces chief of staff, told reporters that military cooperation would be included in efforts to improve overall relations between the two countries.

"Logically, this collaboration can certainly include a strong cooperation with the Russian armed forces," he said. Asked about arms, he said only: "We have sufficient arms to defend our revolution."

TRYING TO RECOVER TRADE

Experts in Russian-Cuban relations say that a recent ceremony is a symptom of increasingly warm ties between the two countries, which are trying to recover part of the trade they lost after the collapse of the Soviet bloc.

Yuri Pavlov, a former Soviet official who headed the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Latin American Department in the late 1980s, said in an interview in Miami Tuesday that "there is a general tendency in Russian foreign policy in recent months to re-establish economic relations with countries where the Soviet Union had active trade and cooperation."

"Because of the disastrous economic situation in Russia, the Russian government is trying to export as much as it can," Pavlov said.

Pavlov said Russia is also in desperate need of sugar and wants to increase trade to try to recover part of the $25 billion Cuba owes to the former Soviet Union.

The drastic drop in bilateral trade—from $13 billion in 1989 to $500 million in 1992—has moved many Russian officials to lobby for a revamping of the two countries' commercial ties, he said.

So as we see, there will be real attempts to revamp these commercial ties between Cuba and Russia. So the United States taxpayer gives money to Russia, and Russia turns around and gives help to Cuba.

Cuba is run by a completely totalitarian regime. Fidel Castro believes in a repressive, oppressive, totally regimented society which abuses human rights.

Just this week the renowned Human Rights Watch released a report which said, "Beatings, worsening conditions reported in Cuban jails."

True reforms must be called for, and we must call for them today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Chairman, last year I rose to express my concern that the lion's share of the aid under the Freedom Support Act would go to Russia at the expense of the other Republics of the former Soviet Union. In our efforts to strengthen democracy in Russia, we must not ignore the equally important democratic challenges facing us in newly independent nations such as Ukraine.

Unfortunately, last year this is exactly what happened. Russia received 62 percent of all the Freedom Support Act funds. In comparison, Ukraine received less than one-tenth of what Russia got. On a per capita basis, Ukraine was third from last of all the former Soviet Republics. Only Uzbekistan and Azerbaijan received less per capita, and Azerbaijan is ineligible to receive aid because of its blockade of Armenia.

We must address this unbalance in aid levels. The economic and political transition in Ukraine and the other former Soviet Republics are no less difficult than in Russia and deserve our attention. With 52 million people, Ukraine is the fifth-largest nation in Europe—it was the industrial base of the Soviet Union and breadbasket of the entire region. It is imperative that we strengthen our ties with Ukraine.

Ukraine has legitimate security concerns that must be addressed. For good reasons, Ukrainians feel dwarfed by Russia. They remember the Czarist treatment of Ukraine, Stalin's imposition of collective farming, and the millions of Ukrainian deaths excused by this notion that to make an omlette, you have to break eggs.

During a recent congressional delegation visit to Ukraine and Russia, I could not help but notice that Russian Vice President Rutskoi still had an old map of the Soviet Empire hanging in his office.

I am heartened to see that Ikraine's security concerns are being approached on a more equitable basis. Les Aspin and Strobe Talbot made some constructive proposals last week in Kiev. The administration is correct in reversing the Bush policy of isolating Ukraine. This sentiment was echoed in a Washington Post editorial this weekend.

The aid provided under this legislation must reflect this new approach. Language that is in the report is a promising step in this direction. I agree that we must initiate a larger, more effective assistance program for Ukraine.

Our best interest will be served by helping all of the new democratic nations. As long as these nations are pursuing a course that respects human rights and self-determination, they deserve our help.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his leadership and for allowing me the time to express my views on this issue.

□ 1440

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment being offered by Representatives CALLAHAN, SOLOMON, MFUME, and RANGEL. This amendment would eliminate $1.6 billion in supplemental assistance to Russia and the former Republics of the Soviet Union.

Clearly, there are strong arguments for supporting Russia and the former republics at this time. What is even more clear, however, is the fact that America must choose its budget priorities carefully if we want to strengthen our economy and restore our budget for a healthy, prosperous future. Only our highest, most essential priorities can be funded right now and so we must choose our spending carefully. For me, there is no question who needs our help the most, and Russia is not it.

In my district in Illinois, there are serious, urgent, tragic, frightening matters that need the aid and attention of the U.S. Congress. Families and young people are at the very end of their rope. They are poor, they are tired, they can't find work, and they are losing hope. Even more distressing are the children in my district who are starting out their lives with significant social, economic, educational, and nutritional disadvantages. The programs that we have designed to make up such gaps are not reaching all the kids who need them. Fewer than half of eligible young children can attend Head Start, barely half of those eligible receive WIC money, and 15 percent of Illinois children have no health insurance at all. This cannot continue.

Improving these statistics and helping the young people in my district is my priority and, considering the activities of the other body, now is the moment to begin to take care of ourselves and our own cities. This morning, the budget bill that will profoundly shape the future of millions of American is being considered by the Senate Finance Committee. Despite the desperate situation in my district and others, cuts in Medicare and the earned income tax credit are being seriously considered. The fact that these cuts are considered viable options, and are open to debate, is a clear indication to me that the little funding available must stay here at home where it's needed so that we do not continue to rob from one hungry American to feed another.

I simply cannot in good conscience ship American dollars to Russia when my own constituents and other Americans are so in need of help. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

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

Mr. MFUME. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to insert my remarks in support of the amendment and join the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus and the chairman of the New York delegation in strong support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 13 months ago—in May 1992—103 Members sent a letter to President Bush saying "We cannot support your plan for additional assistance to the former Soviet Republics until you have first addressed the issue of jobs and economic growth for America."

In our consideration today of H.R. 2295, we are again addressing this issue of the relative priority of jobs in this country and jobs in Russia. H.R. 2295, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations, has the effect of giving more favorable budgetary treatment to aid the former Soviet Union than Congress is giving to aid America's cities and towns. The Committee on Rules denied my request to offer an amendment to H.R. 2295 that would have eliminated this anomaly by suing the same financing technique for summer jobs for America's poor youth that H.R. 2295 uses to pay for aid to Russia.

Let me explain this point. H.R. 2295, as reported, appropriates $13 billion for foreign aid. Included in this total is $2.5 billion in aid for Russia and the other former Soviet Republics. Only about $900 million of this $2.5 billion is an appropriation for fiscal year 1994. The remaining $1.6 billion is contained in title VI of H.R. 2295 as a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1993 to be spent through fiscal year 1994. These supplemental funds are in addition to the $1.6 billion in Russian aid approved by the previous Congress, most of which—according to press reports—has not yet been spent.

The $1.6 billion in supplemental fiscal year 1993 funds is not paid for by cuts in other Federal programs in fiscal year 1993. Instead, title VI simply appropriates an additional $1.6 billion. First, it appropriates $630 million in additional foreign aid funds for the former Soviet Union. Second, it appropriates an additional $979 million for operation and maintenance for the Department of Defense and permits the Secretary of Defense to transfer these funds to the Department of State and other agencies for the purpose of providing assistance to the former Soviet Union. The Callahan-Solomon-Mfume-Rangel amendment would strike the entire $1.6 billion.

Critics of President Clinton's stimulus program said they could not support increasing the Federal budget deficit in order to finance additional Federal programs for summer jobs and other high priority domestic programs. Given this political reality, I cannot now support increasing the Federal budget deficit by $1.6 billion in order to finance additional aid for Russia.

Russia can use additional foreign aid. But there is no question that additional funds are also needed for summer jobs in this country. Last month the House of Representatives approved about $230 million for the general summer jobs program as part of H.R. 2244, the second supplemental appropriations bill. This extra summer jobs money was, of course, offset by cuts in other domestic programs.

Even with this additional $230 million, there will be $81 million less for jobs this summer than there was last summer: $1.159 billion last year and $1.078 billion this year.

The $230 million recently approved by the House, combined with the funds approved by the previous Congress, will meet only about 15 percent of the need throughout the country. There are 5 million poor American youth ages 14 to 21. Yet there will only be funds for 763,000 jobs this summer unless we take further action.

The need is tangible. Mayor Dinkins of New York City testified last month before the Government Operations Subcommittee chaired by Mr. TOWNS that in New York City there are 100,000 young people looking for jobs this summer, but funds for only 27,000. In Detroit, there are already 30,000 applications for summer jobs, but funds for only 6,100. Richmond, VA, has funds for only 400 summer jobs and more than 2,000 applications. President Clinton recognized the need for additional summer job money when he requested $1 billion as part of his stimulus program.

Summer unemployment is not a racial issue. According to data from the Bureau of the Census, 46 percent of poor youth are white; 28 percent are black; 20 percent are Hispanic; and 6 percent are American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian, or Pacific Islander.

In conclusion, I support the amendment because I am unwilling to increase the Federal budget deficit to help Russia when we are not prepared to increase it to help poor youth in both our large cities and our rural areas.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to delete title VI of the foreign ops, export financing, and related program appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us, as most of you know, provides $2.5 billion in aid to the newly independent states and the former Soviet Union. Mr. Chairman, an aid amount of this sort should be, at least in my opinion, considered as a freestanding bill. It ought to be brought to this floor under a separate vote.

What we are proposing to send to the Soviet Union, or the former Soviet Union, is the type of support that many Americans across the country are also calling for for themselves. Farmers would approve Congress appropriating domestic Federal assistance to develop agribusiness and technical assistance programs. Small and minority business persons would approve Congress appropriating a new domestic small business enterprise zone. Many businesses and others in our districts would approve an enhanced Federal role in promoting trade and investment.

Our own country is struggling with military down-sizing, base closures, and economic conversion, to name a few. Surely we can find a way to provide enhanced assistance for our own people to deal with these mounting problems.

To provide the former Soviet Union with $2.5 billion in direct spending now without a separate vote, I think, would be unfair to the American people. To defeat the domestic stimulus package in April and then somehow mysteriously pass Russian aid in June will create the perception that our priorities are in the wrong place. What a strange and bedeviling juxtaposition that is. It will be perceived that we are out of touch, quite frankly, with many in America who believe that many of us ought to be looking inwardly as well.

How fair is it to provide direct spending to the former Soviet Union, while only offering American citizens a few tax incentives and a few tax credits?

Mr. Chairman, I, along with many in this House, voted for the President's economic stimulus package. That bill, as you know, would have assisted our districts significantly by providing a one-time infusion of assistance. However, with the demise of that package, the hopes of our domestic and urban aid falls upon the concept of empowerment zones now and enterprise communities. These programs do not involve direct spending initiatives like what we are voting on today. These programs are for incentives and credits to lure businesses back into beleaguered communities.

Tax incentives and tax credits are good approaches, nonetheless, but these communities need similar provisions such as the ones that are included in this Russian aid bill.

The promotion of democracy and of democratic institutions should, in fact, be a worldwide endeavor by the United States, but there are many nations, from the First World through the Third World, who are also struggling for democracy.

Equally, there are many nations, from the First to the Third World, whose markets could be developed and opened up to U.S. interests.

There are many pent-up needs here at home and abroad that must be addressed by this Congress. Thousands of our people across this country are unemployed and homeless. Those are more than just urban problems. They are American problems.

When we talk about the problems of the American farmer and families trying to put their kids through school and develop the sort of society where crime does not eat us up, we must begin, also, to look at the needs here at home. And yet we are told, when we want to work with those communities, that we are driving up the deficit and providing pork.

Russian aid should be brought up under a separate vote, and if there is nothing to fear but fear itself, why do we not just go ahead and do that? Otherwise, we put on this clock of mystery, and we roll it into this bill, and we roll it before this public, and pretty soon we roll it over the American people.

I ask the Members of this body to be courageous, to call for a separate vote, so we can go on the record once and for all and to support this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Republican whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for yielding me this time.

This is a very interesting day if you watch who is speaking up here on the various alliances that have been made for and against trying to help democracy and freedom and free enterprise in Russia.

I understand that some of my closest friends, with the greatest of sincerity, believe that it is useful to cut out over $1.6 billion from helping the people of Russia achieve prosperity and freedom.

Let me say that there are at least two levels where I think that is wrong. I think it is wrong, first of all, out of the narrowest American self-interest. You look at the impact of the Chernobyl reactor, and then you look at the $100 million we would spend on nuclear reactor safety, and you ask yourself: What is it worth to the next generations to help the people of Russia take what everybody on the planet admits are 17 badly designed Chernobyl-style plants and try to avoid the kind of disaster which we all lived through and which we all saw and which has had such an enormous impact on the people of Ukraine?

You look at the money that would be spent on the small-business enterprise fund, and you say to your friends who believe in small business, whether it is small business in the inner city or it is small business across America, for my conservative friends who believe in it so deeply: What could be more American than to help the people of Russia turn from communism, from a centralized dictatorship, to a small business enterprise fund?

All of my friends who talk about the importance of privatization, why would you cut out privatization technical assistance if you want freedom and free enterprise and prosperity and all those things we believe in as Americans; how could you block this effort to help the people of Russia?

But beyond that, there is a second level of American self-interest. We create local jobs through world sales. We have a chance today to reach out to 160 million people who could easily be one of our most important markets for the next generation.

We know now what the Japanese are doing. They are reaching out, because they want the export market. We know what the Germans are doing. They are reaching out, because they want that export market.

What are some of my very shortsighted friends saying? They are saying, "Let us give up a generation of jobs. Let us give up a generation of world sales. Let us be small-minded and stay here at home, and let us not go out and create the markets of the future."

These same friends later on will give speeches about unemployment. But the fact is we have a chance today to do what we can to make the world safer so our sons and daughters do not die in a war and so our cities are not incinerated. We have a chance to do what we can today to help the spread of democracy, the rule of law, and free elections so that the values we cherish can be shared by more people. We have a chance today to help teach an entire nation the virtues of free enterprise so that together we can be more prosperous, so we can have better jobs with higher pay.

Or we can turn away from the future. We can turn toward the past. We can cut out this legitimate investment, 1 percent of our defense spending at its peak, 1 percent, for a better, safer, more prosperous world.

I urge you to vote "no" on this well-meaning but wrong amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. To my dear friend from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], and to my dear leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], I say we want the same things that you want for Russia.

The only problem is we believe there is a better way to do it than to give American taxpayers' money that we do not have to the Soviet Union. Let me give you some facts. Since 1990 there has been pledged to the Soviet Union almost $139 billion in moneys from throughout the world, and they have not been able to spend it all. In fact, probably half of it is still in the pipeline.

□ 1450

And what has happened with that money? They are continuing to send oil to Castro's Cuba.

What else are they doing with that money? They are selling weapons to terrorist states. They have sent $10 billion of our taxpayers' dollars into Swiss bank accounts for crooked Soviet officials. In addition to that, they are funding their space station, their space station, while we are cutting our space station.

Now, we all want Boris Yeltsin to succeed. We do not want a resumption of the cold war. But how can we do this? We can better do it by buying minerals from the Soviet Union, a business deal. They are one of the largest countries in the world, with the largest mineral deposits in the world, and instead of giving them our hard-earned taxpayers' money, why don't we buy oil from them? They are the largest oil producer in the world. Why do we not buy gold, manganese, nickel, diamonds, silver, instead of giving them our taxpayers' money?

We can do that, and that is the way we should be doing it, in a businesslike way. We will be helping Boris Yeltsin, we will be expanding their economy, we will be sending industry over there to get these minerals out of the ground, thus producing jobs. We will make them self-sufficient and we will get them heading in the right direction, which we all want, toward a more stable Russia, a more stable former Soviet Union and a more stable world.

But to give them taxpayers' dollars that are going down a rathole is the wrong thing to do.

I am sorry I have to oppose my dear leadership, but I do in this particular case.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, just for the hell of it, there ought to be some relationship between the facts and what we say on this House floor. Let me simply point out the gentleman says that $10 billion of American taxpayers' money has been stolen in Russia. That is a neat trick, considering the fact that so far they have only gotten half a billion dollars in total funding from us.

Where does the gentleman get those whacky numbers? The fact is we do not give the Russians cash. This money provides technical assistance. It provides money to help defuse their nuclear weapons. It provides money for exchanges.

We do not give checks to the Russians. I would suggest to the gentleman, if he wants to participate in the debate, he ought to get his facts straight.

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

Mr. OBEY. No; I am sorry I do not have the time.

The fact is that the Soviet Union is getting technical assistance, they are getting educational assistance, they are getting privatization assistance; they are not getting checks. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong opposition to the amendment and for the provisions in this bill. We have an historic opportunity. We need to seize it; we need to seize it in a bipartisan fashion, as is being done. Frankly, I rose when the minority whip [Mr. GINGRICH] was speaking so that I could associate my remarks with his.

We need to do this because this money invested today will save us vast sums in the future if it in fact helps crate a stable economic, cultural, political, and social environment in Russia alone, not to mention the other CIS States.

So I rise in strong support of the committee proposal.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6½ minutes to the distinguished ranking member on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

You know, Mr. Chairman, nobody contends that it is not in the interest of every American citizen, or all the people in the entire world, to help dismantle the 14,000 missiles, the some 30,000 nuclear-tipped warheads that are in the former Soviet Union. Nobody should quarrel that it is in our best interest to see to it that some 30,000 Russian youngsters and political leaders come over here to understand the American way of life. But the Callahan amendment would eliminate the possibility these efforts will be realized.

Nobody should quarrel with the fact that it is in the United States' interest to promote technical and monetary assistance to emerging private enterprises and help privatize the incredibly inefficient businesses in the old Soviet Union. The Callahan amendment would gut that effort.

Nobody should contend that it is not in the American interest to provide humanitarian aid to people afflicted by Chernobyl and people afflicted by one of the worst medical systems in the history of the world, brought on by a totalitarian regime, a failed Communist empire which existed over the last 70 years, if it ultimately meant that those people would be friendly to Americans and would want to live in peace with us.

Nobody should really even contend that it is not in the American interest to help resettle troops in the Baltic nations and others spread throughout Eastern Europe if it meant that they would come home to Russia, lay down their arms, live in peace and harmony, learn the free enterprise system, join the industrialized, civilized world, and not revolt against their existing fledgling democracy.

Nobody should say that these moves are not in our interest. But if the Callahan amendment is adopted, these will not happen.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a changed world. To my friends on this side of the aisle I would say it is changed because of us, because Ronald Reagan, President of the United States, said it was in the national interest to go forward, to spend more money on our troops, spend more money on defense, on equipment, on planes, tanks, and all our war paraphernalia, to give us a stronger defense system in order to stand up to the "Evil Empire," so that we could look at all totalitarian leaders of the old Communist system and say, "We are not going to let you take another inch of world territory," and so that we could ultimately prevail and win the cold war.

We won it, folks, and now we have a responsibility to win the peace. And this little package of $2.5 billion, inclusive of the $1.6 billion that Mr. CALLAHAN would cut, is just a small investment in the future of mankind.

Yes, it would provide for troop withdrawal, but there were 4.5 million Soviet troops all over the eastern half of the world in 1985; today there are about 2 million. In 1991, 220,000 in East Germany alone; today, there are 113,000 in all of Eastern Europe.

Back in 1991, there were 140,000 troops in the Baltic States; today there are only about 40,000 there. In the next couple of years the Soviet Union will be reduced to an army the size of ours or lower and the troops will be out of Europe and out of the Baltic countries.

We have won the cold war and, as I say, it is time now for us to lead and provide for peace. If we do not, we do risk repeating history. What happened to Germany after World War I? Hitler rose and formed a military-industrial complex that threatened the entire world. Do we want to let the likes of a Vice President Rutskoi do exactly the same thing in Russia? All we have to do is cut $1.6 billion under the Callahan amendment, and that could happen.

President Yeltsin is right now formulating a constitutional convention that would provide a democratic way of life for all the Russian people. If we pull the rug out from under him with this amendment, he might fail, and they might once again—not be Communists, because that failed, but they might be totalitarian, and they might use those missiles against us one day, instead of dismantling them.

Mr. Chairman, I would only say that, God willing, all of us would live to be 90 years old, sit back in our rocking chairs, and if the world is at peace and if we voted for this bill, we can say that we contributed to the peaceful future of generations to come, and take great contentment from that fact.

On the other hand, if the world goes to chaos and anarchy, and if we have voted against this bill, we will have wreaked havoc upon ourselves and our progeny. Let us not take that chance.

Let us commit to our children, our grandchildren, and their grandchildren, that we are going to invest in peace and prosperity for the entire world and not just us in the United States.

Vote against the Callahan amendment.

□ 1500

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would note to the gallery that expressions of support or nonsupport are prohibited.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the comments of two of our esteemed colleagues; first of all, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], who challenged the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] on his facts. I would like to respond for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] since he was not yielded time.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] made the point that about $10 billion in Western aid has been the subject of capital flight and found its way into banks out of Russia.

The question was, Where did he get the information?

Well, first of all, Russian Vice President Rutskoy has admitted that about a billion dollars a month has been lost through capital flight.

Next, the Journal of Commerce has said that last year Russia sent $10 billion to foreign banks. That was the figure of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

One Journal analyst, and I am quoting now, questioned "whether the West is wasting much of the money it is spending helping the economy."

Another one stated, "It seems useless to put additional money into the economy."

Michael Camdessus, who is the Managing Director of the IMF, on March 8, 1993, in a Reuters Business Report said:

> There is no sense sending limited resources to Russia if in the absence of more coherent, more effective monetary fiscal policies, the credits are immediately going to end up in bank accounts in Zurich, Paris, or London.

I think we all understand the fact that it is not possible to protect this money and that a lot of it is going to Western banks. It is not going for the purposes for which it was intended. That is one of the reasons for being very careful about spending more money than we can keep control of in this bill.

And to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], who said that if we send them more money, the Russians will be able to reform their energy system and not build Chernobyl-style reactors and so on; that is a very laudable purpose. I would feel a lot better about that, however, if the Russians were not funding the construction of a system much like the Chernobyl kind of reactor in Cienfuegos, Cuba. It seems to me they ought to reciprocate a little bit if they are going to use that kind of an argument to get our money.

The arguments of my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] are very well meaning, I know, and they are very high-sounding; but I think it is somewhat ineffective to suggest that if we just send more money that we are going to solve the problem.

As a matter of fact, I know of no one more eloquent than my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] in arguing that merely sending money to the liberal welfare state, for example, the inner-cities, is going to solve the problems of welfare, crime, and corruption, and so on.

Reform, not necessarily just more money, is the answer, and that is what some of us are arguing here.

Of the $140 billion that the GAO says has been committed from Western nations, only about $40 billion has been spent. The rest is in the pipeline.

Our argument is simply that it does not necessarily make economic sense to be committing this kind of money when you cannot control it, you cannot be sure it will not go to other places than those for which it is intended.

Finally, of this $1.8 billion, $1.6 billion is unauthorized, and ordinarily around here we do not appropriate money that is unauthorized.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

First of all, I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] that we are trying to arrive at the same solution, but I think the gentleman fails to see the solution to a very simple problem.

We do not want to give Russia money. We want to trade them or barter for it. Titanium is only purchased in two parts of the world. One is South Africa. The other is Russia. Why can we not trade that which puts their workers to work?

It is the same thing the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] referred to. That is called trade. That is not called welfare.

I remember a time in this country when it was heard, "The redcoats are coming. The redcoats are coming." We did pretty well without foreign aid helping us. I think we came out well because the issue was right. This issue is right.

I can remember sending millions and billions of dollars to the Philippine Islands to Marcos. We bought a heck of a lot of shoes for Imelda, and the $10 billion that is going into aid and into Swiss banks, I think our taxpayers could use it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the final 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, how awesome it is for me to stand in this well and debate probably some of the most brilliant people I have ever met, including the leadership of the minority side and the leadership of the majority side.

Many of you who have spoken in opposition to this amendment today have visited Russia, and I have not. It is a great disadvantage to me, I will admit, not having been there and not having had the opportunity to speak with the Russian leaders and not to see firsthand the needs of the Russian people; but I still have a responsibility, and all of you have missed the point of the Callahan amendment.

It is not my point not to assist Russia, but to the contrary, to assist Russia in her time of need. That is what the Callahan amendment ultimately will do.

My amendment simply allows this body to send Russia a message along with our aid which will be forthcoming and which will come forth with my assistance and not my opposition.

Yes, we must help Russia. I have heard many distinguished gentlemen of the House stand and talk about how we owe this to our children to do this, and yes, you are absolutely right. We do owe it to our children to do this because we are going to have to borrow money to do this and our children are going to have to pay it back. Ironically, we are probably going to have to borrow it from foreign nations.

There are certain segments of the language in this bill that currently exist which I seek to extract which gives me some heartburn.

Are we going to take $1 billion from our own national defense and send it to Russia in an unbridled manner, without any indication or message that we want them to help us democratize the world, that we want them to send a message to Cuba, that we want them to send a message to other terrorist nations, that we want them, the Russians, to send a message to North Korea and to Serbia that we want worldwide democracy?

The purpose of the removal of title VI does not in any way, shape, or form, deny us the opportunity to bring back, in just a couple weeks, a measure which can be debated and which can indeed have those measures that we are all concerned about in our message to Russia.

Should we not consider the possibility if we are going to, No. 1, deny our retired military people the same rights to have a home paid for? If we are going to send them the money to build 5,000 new homes for their retired soldiers, should we not consider the possibility of maybe sending some modular home manufacturers here in the United States to facilitate that need? Should we not even consider that?

Maybe I am wrong. Maybe my intelligence level is so inferior to the leadership of this House that I cannot comprehend the logic of what I am saying; but I believe the people that I represent in this Congress understand what I am saying, and I believe that the people you represent back in your respective districts would demand that if we are going to do this, that we do it in a responsible fashion and not just write a check and send it to them without the message that should come with it.

Would it not be wonderful if those modular homes, as a hypothetical example, were being brought into Russia on American flagships with the American flag flying on top of them so the Russian people could know that we are supporting them, that we want them to have what we already have, and that is a free government and democracy?

Would it not be wonderful if the surplus commodities that we send as a result of the new bill were shipped over there on an American ship, with American commodities that our farmers have grown?

So you have missed the point. I urge you to adopt the Callahan amendment. We will come back in a couple weeks and responsibly debate this issue of aid to Russia.

□ 1510

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to suggest to the gentleman from Indiana that the last person in the world I would cite for my statistics would be Mr. Rutskoi, the principal Russian opponent to the democratization process going on in the Soviet Union and the person who is the enemy of all the actions that we are trying to take in Russia.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], and others who have worked so hard on this legislation.

Let me commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN]. I commend his sincerity and know that he is well-meaning in his amendment. I respectfully disagree with his view and urge Members to vote against his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when we were in Russia, all of the people we met said, "Don't give us a fish because we can only eat for one day. Teach us how to fish so that we can eat for a lifetime."

This program is specifically designed to give the people of Russia the ability, over time, to be self-sustaining, to achieve capitalism, to achieve private property, to achieve democracy, and to achieve a growing economy that will not require huge amounts of money from the West or anyone else.

I urge Members to look at the specific provisions in the plan. Most of it has to do with teaching people how to run an economy: exchange programs, programs for enterprise funds, programs for technical assistance, a privatization fund.

Mr. Chairman, we saw a privatization effort in an entire city in Russia that will be helped and supported by these efforts.

Over 70 percent of the money does not go to the Russian Government, does not go to bureaucrats in Russia, but goes to the people in Russia, or to people in the United States to support private American efforts in Russia.

This is a good program, it is a well thought out program, and I think it will be a successful program, and the administration has told us they will

continue to work with us to make sure that the program is working as we go along.

To my friends on the Democrat side who have supported this amendment because they believe that, by doing this, we are sapping programs that we need here in America, and there are some on this side who believe that as well, let me say this: I passionately believe that we need to do more for our people. We need to build housing. We need to educate. We need to do something about our cities. We need to train. There is a whole list of things that we need to do in this country, and we need to get our deficit down.

It is not a happy moment to be saying, "Let's borrow some more money, increase our own deficit, to do something to help Russia toward capitalism and democracy," but I say to my colleagues in the House that this is the most important issue of our lifetime. We have waited 45 years for this moment, and this is the moment. If we fail, if they fail, we will go back to a time and a set of expenditures on our part that will make us all heartsick. We will not have money for training or for the things that we should be doing today.

My colleagues are precisely right. We are not doing what we should do, but we cannot do those things by having failure in Russia.

I, just one more time, want to refresh our memory about Harry Truman. In 1947 we were in greater debt than we are today. We were at the end of a war. We were exhausted from a war. We were bankrupt in this country. And Harry Truman had the courage, and the American people followed when he said, "It is in our deep self-interest to get Western Europe back on its feet so that it doesn't go Communist." We spent $40 million in today's terms on the Marshall plan, and the American people did not favor that plan. Fourteen percent of the American people, by the Gallup poll, were for the Marshall plan, but the President and a bipartisan group in this Congress, Republican and Democrat, stood behind Harry Truman, and we did the right thing, and Western Europe was saved, and it saved us billions and trillions of dollars that could be used to invest in our people and our economy.

That is what is at stake today, and I urge Members, Republicans and Democrats, to stand behind the right policy in 1993. Vote against the Callahan amendment and vote for this legislation.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, is it not true, as this Member understands it, that Members coming now to vote on this bill would, in fact, not be killing Russian aid? Does the vote merely separate the aid vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MFUME. Let me restate it, Mr. Chairman.

Does this particular amendment allow Members to vote for the amendment and then for Russian aid also?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot interpret the substance of the amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 289, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

AYES—140

Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Archer
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barcia
Bartlett
Becerra
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Blute
Bonilla
Brewster
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Chapman
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dornan
Duncan
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fields (LA)
Flake
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gekas
Goss
Grams
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hilliard
Hoke
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Kim
Kingston
Kyl
Lancaster
LaRocco
Lewis (FL)
Machtley
Manzullo
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mfume
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moorhead
Murphy
Nussle
Packard
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Sanders
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thurman
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Valentine
Velazquez
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Waters
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—289

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (TX)
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Ballenger
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Calvert
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Coleman
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hyde
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Ravenel
Reed
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thornton
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Underwood (GU)
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Walker
Washington
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—10

de la Garza
Fields (TX)
Henry
McDade
Pelosi
Pickle
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Swett
Unsoeld
Young (AK)

□ 1540

Ms. HARMAN and Messrs. BACHUS of Alabama, TEJEDA, LEWIS of California, and STRICKLAND changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SANDERS, HALL of Texas, ROYCE, BECERRA, ZELIFF, and EWING changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1540

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally so that the House may receive a message.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBERSTAR) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

□ 1541

## FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 103–134.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KASICH

Mr. KASICH. 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. KASICH: Page 23, strike lines 14 through 18.

Page 23, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 24, line 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on this side of the aisle, because I want to make an appeal to the majority to at least give some consideration to what I am trying to do in this World Bank amendment. I think when the Members hear the facts they will be unable to reach any other conclusion than that we need not to shut the Bank down, but we need to withhold the $56 million capital increase that the World Bank is asking for.

Why do I say that, Mr. Chairman? I just want the Members on this side to listen to the facts, along with the Republican Members of this Congress. I want the Members to think about this. The World Bank is now rebuilding its headquarters. It is going to cost, the rebuilding of their headquarters, $250 million to rebuild the World Bank headquarters. That is despite a cost-cutting effort that they have made to take out the pure marble floors and, instead, substitute terrazzo floors.

We closed the European Development Bank down because of the marble problems. The same thing is going on in the World Bank headquarters, $250 million. That is only the beginning of what is going on at this uncontrolled, unaudited operation.

First-class travel, first-class travel by the World Bank, costs the World Bank $30 million a year. Do the Members understand what I am saying? If the people who work at the World Bank decided to fly coach and not first class they would save $30 million a year.

A person can go play golf, if they happen to know someone who works at the World Bank, at the World Bank golf course out in Potomac, MD. Do the Members know why they built it? Because there were some diplomats in town who could not join Burning Tree, and they needed a place to play golf, so they opened up the Bretton Woods Golf Course, owned jointly by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. That is just the beginning.

They are fed by world class chefs, and the operating costs of the World Bank are $1 billion a year. So they own their own golf course, they fly first class at a cost of $30 million a year, they are rebuilding their building at a cost of $250 million, and their average employee salary costs $123,000.

That sounds like the kind of benefits that we would like to have for an operation that is being very successful. We would think that, wouldn't we? I also forgot to tell the Members, by the way, they do not pay income taxes on the $123,000 salary.

So, $250 million for a new building, $30 million in first-class travel costs, they own their own golf course, they pay no taxes. And what else? Their failure rate. Their failure rate of loans, their failure rate of their projects, is 37.5 percent. It has grown over the last 10 years. Almost 40 percent of the projects that they are involved with are deemed failures, and that estimate has not been made by an independent outside officer. The 37.5-percent failure rate is an internal World Bank audit.

What are we asking them to do? Oh, by the way, testifying against the World Bank loans, just so the Members know, because their loans have resulted in environmentally destructive projects, how about this: The Environmental Defense Fund, the Sierra Club, the Friends of the Earth, and the National Wildlife Federation testified that the World Bank projects are environmentally destructive. They are displacing millions of people all over the Earth.

They made loans last year to Iran, $5 billion in loans that the United States objected to, $5 billion. They just thumbed their nose at the United States and said, "We are going to do it anyway. If you don't like it, though."

What are we proposing in this amendment? We are saying that we do not want to close down the World Bank, but we are saying do not increase the flow.

Let me tell the Members another thing they have to understand. There is a $10 billion margin. If we do not give them the $56 million, it does not matter, because they have enough loan margins and enough reflows to be able to make $10 billion more in loans than what they are currently planning.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members, there is no consistency for this $56 million increase. They have a track record of failure. They have no independent audit. The Wapenhans Report, the Morris Report, every report that has looked at them has said they are out of control. The head of the Treasury of Canada said they have a deteriorating portfolio. They have a margin to make these loans, and I am saying, please, in the House, can we just step up to the plate and approve one reform measure?

We are not going to jeopardize Russian aid or any kind of aid in this proposal. We can come back a year from now and increase the flow if we have to. Yesterday, we did not accept the hard choice on AID. We got three-quarters of a loaf, not the full loaf. This one, it just speaks for itself. Their projects are not making sense, they are environmentally damaging, their internal operations are out of control, their costs are going through the roof.

I am asking my Democrat friends, my colleagues that run into me on the stairs and in the gymnasium and sidewalks and say "That is a good idea but I just cannot vote with you," come on, let us belly up here and let us cast a vote that sends a message to the World Bank that says to them "What you are doing is not tolerated anymore in this country. We want it to be fixed."

□ 1550

And I ask you to approve the amendment that I am offering along with my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], that just restores some sanity and fiscal operation to the way in which we are going to conduct our foreign policy operations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, to suggest that we ought to eliminate funding for the

World Bank because we do not, for instance, like the fact that some of their people travel first class on airplanes, would make about as much sense as eliminating the White House because we did not like the fact that John Sununu did the same thing.

The fact is that the World Bank, because of their management operations, produced the Wapenhans Report which is going to be the subject of a thorough review in the following months, and that is one of the reasons why we have already cut the funding for the bank by 20 percent.

I want to point out that the contribution to the World Bank were not negotiated by Bill Clinton. They were negotiated by George Bush. We had no international obligation to pay the money to the Bank until the Congress authorized that funding. It has now done so, and we have no choice but to pay the money. Despite that fact we cut their funds to demonstrate the fact that we are unhappy with the management of the Bank, and if they do not correct those problems they will meet the same fate that the European Development Bank met when we provided zero budgeting.

But, the fact is that despite the assurances of the gentleman who just offered the amendment, the World Bank is planning to offer $9 billion in loans to Russia over the next 3 years. We will endanger their ability to do that if we pass this amendment today.

I want to also point out that we only provide 19 percent of the funding for the World Bank. If we pull the plug on the World Bank, the pressure will come on the United States to pay a heck of a lot more than 19 percent in order to fund those same loans. The World Bank is the way we leverage other countries to provide assistance to countries like Russia rather than having to do it all ourselves.

I want to make three points.

Our contributions to the World Bank enable us to continue to expand export markets which mean crucial jobs in the United States. In the industrialized countries of the world, you have had about a 31-percent increase in our export markets. In the developing counties you have had twice that increase in export markets. That means an awful lot of jobs for American citizens.

I want to also point out that American firms have received 39 percent more in procurement last year than the United States contributed to all of the development banks. We contributed $1.6 billion. American corporations wound up earning $2.2 billion from that same World Bank in their programs. That has produced for the United States 42,000 U.S. jobs. If you want to throw that away, be my guest. I do not think it is prudent.

I also want to point out that because we leverage lending ability, the $62 million appropriation which we provided last year to the World Bank has resulted in $1,120,000,000 in procurement from the bank during the same period of time for American business. I think that is a good deal for the United States in terms of jobs. It is a good deal in terms of a return. I do not think Members are going to find very much better return in the entire Federal budget.

I want to make one additional point. If we eliminate our funding for the World Bank, that will not eliminate the management problems that the gentleman has talked about. That will not eliminate the World Bank. What it will do is give the Japanese management control of the bank. How much business do you think American corporations are going to get if the Japanese are running the affairs of the bank? I think you know what the answer is to that question.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the gentleman yielding me the time. I just want to make it very clear we are not pulling the plug on the World Bank. We are just saying that this year it will not get an appropriation from us, and the reason we are saying that is it has enough money from the flow of past loans to cover all of its expenditure needs and more. But we sure as heck need to send the World Bank a message.

A former employee of the World Bank, Michael Irwin, wrote a July 1991 article in U.S.A. Today. He said, "The World Bank is hypocritical in prescribing financial discipline and savings for developing countries while it lavishes handsome salaries and other benefits on its own bureaucrats," and "moreover, the bank's continued internal malaise and financial extravagance, along with the lack of any 'graduates' from its lending program raise serious questions about whether the U.S. or any Western nation should give the institution another dime."

As a Peace Corps volunteer, I have a hard time reconciling the World Bank and the way it functions, its golf course, its high-paid tax-free salaries, with the idea that it is supposed to be helping Third World nations.

Testifying on March 1, 1993, before Mr. OBEY's subcommittee, the House Appropriation Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, were environmental groups that talked about the World Bank. Friends of the Earth said, "(The World Bank's) withholding of most of the information generated in project preparation, its failure to provide for local participation on the part of its putative beneficiaries and the poor quality of its projects are causes for deep concern." And they go on to say, "The U.S. should seek G-7 support for withholding funding * * * until a reform plan is in place and operating successfully."

The National Wildlife Federation said in testimony before the committee, "If, in the future, the World Bank were able to make deep and sustainable reforms in its ways of doing business * * * there might be room for a renewal of U.S. participation. However, over the years I have become convinced that something drastic is needed to create a will to reform. Nothing short of a U.S. cutoff of funds will do it."

The Environmental Defense Fund and the Sierra Club testified before Mr. OBEY's subcommittee and said, "We have reached the conclusion that it would be environmentally, socially and economically irresponsible to appropriate any funds for either the IBRD—The World Bank—or IDA, given alarming evidence of the World Bank's lack of the most basic accountability and sense of responsibility for the environmental and social impact of its projects."

We have the Morse Commission that raised serious questions about what the World Bank was doing, with the Sardar Sarovar Dam in India. The Commission documented "a history of omissions, unmet deadlines and ex post facto revisions" that the Commission concluded amounts to "gross delinquency." Time magazine raised serious questions about what the World Bank is doing with the rainforests throughout the world. Environmentalists have reason to be concerned about the World Bank.

Then we have the World Bank's own report, the Wapenhans Task Force, which attribute the World Bank's failure to back sound investments to a number of factors such as:

A systematic and growing bias by staff in favor of optimistic rate of return expectations at appraisal.

The relentless pursuit of quantitative targets, or what has been coined inside the Bank, the pressure to move money.

A decline in financial management expertise and experience.

Insufficient management attention regarding the overall performance of the portfolio.

And we have the Canadian Auditor General saying, "Given Canada's growing financial exposure, the highly uncertain environment and the lack of adequate information on the quality of each institution's loan portfolio, prudence is recommended * * *." They are taking a good look at the World Bank.

Then we have the committee's own report of June 10, 1993, accompanying this bill and it says: "Last year the committee stated its frustration that there is no independent professional, nonpartisan body which carries out a reasonable oversight function addressing the international financial institutions."

Then they talk about the Wapenhans Report and the Morse Commission, and tell us, "the committee is disturbed with the findings of these reports which indicate declining portfolio performance, borrowers' noncompliance with legal covenants, and the finding of

an atmosphere in which moving bank loans is apparently more important than loan and project quality."

□ 1600

The report suggests that the Bank's pervasive preoccupation with new lending and its emphasis on loan approval rather than on loan implementation, and its conclusions, leads both staff and borrowers to view loan appraisal as a promotional rather than an objective process. The committee is uncertain how the Bank decisionmakers and staff are held accountable for the decisions and actions.

This is the report of the committee that is presenting the budget to us. This is its concern. And yet they want us to continue to fund the World Bank?

The World Bank does not need this appropriation of $56 million. It has enough money coming in from payment of past loans.

What I know for sure is its employees do not need a golf course. They do not need a new building.

This Bank is supposed to fund Third World nations. It is not supposed to be a boondoggle for the people who operate it.

We need to wake up the World Bank. I urge Members to support the Kasich amendment, and not provide additional funds to this organization in fiscal year 1994.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I simply want to make two points. The construction program of the World Bank is paid for by earnings out of the Bank. It is not aid for out of U.S. taxpayers' money.

The golf course which is being referred to is a golf course that was built in the 1950's because at that time the District of Columbia golf courses would not allow racial minorities to play on their courses, so it was built by a financial institution, the dMF so that racial minorities would have someplace to provide a recreational experience.

I suggest that the blame for that does not lie with the Bank. It lies with the past history of this community.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], the distinguished ranking minority member on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, first, let me put this amendment in perspective.

It is understandable that there are reservations at this time about foreign aid of any nature, let alone through international financial institutions. But if we take a historical perspective, there are two things that should be stressed. If we take the decisive events of this century—World War I, World War II, and the cold war—it is interesting that after World War I we treated the losers with such punitiveness that World War II was precipitated.

After World War II, we responded with generosity and created a safer world. But that generosity toward the losers stemmed almost exclusively from the United States. Because in the wake of World War II we created, through the Bretton Woods agreements, institutions like the World Bank, now we are able, not only to contemplate, but in effect compel burden-sharing. We now provide about 20 percent of the resources of the World Bank. That means that 80 percent comes from others.

If we withdraw the sums contemplated in this amendment, by a fourfold dimension we will be withdrawing support from Japan, France and others for world trade, much of which disproportionately comes to benefit jobs creation here in the United States.

Let me say also that in addition to leveraging dollars the World Bank leverages principles. It presses free markets. It presses the kinds of reforms this institution wants but that individual countries have a hard time gathering sufficient political will to advance.

As far as management is concerned, I think this institution ought to know that the World Bank is American-led. Barber Conable, probably the preeminent Member of this body in the 1970's, cut 10 percent of the staff at the World Bank. He did a superb job of leading. Like Conable, the current head of the World Bank is a former marine, Lewis Preston, who took a tenfold pay cut to work for the World Bank.

This implication that top management is weak should not stand.

But most importantly, we must look to the people we are trying to help by this regulation, those behind the Iron Curtain. If communism is not going to give away to nihilism or ultranationalism, hope has to be given to market economics and trade. That is what the World Bank supports, and that is what this institution ought to support.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Wisconsin brought up the issue of jobs.

Last year we lent $2.5 billion to China so they could send their products into this country and steal our jobs at the same time that we are debating whether we ought to give them an MFN.

We not only gave $2.5 billion to China but $500 million to Iran. And you want to talk about the jobs issue?

It is going to be our jobs that are going to be lost, not theirs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield sucb time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The fact is that this committee has already cut the World Bank callable capital by $450 million, because that was the same amount they lent Iran. We wanted to see to it that they paid a heavy price for it, and they do under the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, I rise in strong opposition to the Kasich amendment.

I will give you a few facts in the time available. First, not one penny of what we contribute, or any nation contributes, to the World Bank goes for administrative costs there. Those are all charged to the borrower.

Second, U.S. citizens who are employed by the bank do pay taxes to the U.S. Government.

Under convention people employed by international institutions do not pay taxes to the country in which the institution is located.

The Kasich amendment would cut $56 million, but, in fact, it has the impact, because it is leveraged 118 times, which makes it undoubtedly the most single cost-effective element in our entire foreign aid budget, and the impact would be to lose $6.6 billion in World Bank lending.

The United States currently has a procurement benefit to our industries of about $1.1 billion as a result of projects funded by the IBRD.

This jeopardizes the U.S. board leadership in the largest financial institution in the world whose annual loans are $22 billion. Can you imagine the impact upon the world economy?

It undermines assistance and transition to free markets in former Communist countries.

It eliminates, as I said, I think, one of the most cost-effective programs of all.

We have heard some comments about its impact upon the environment. Unfortunately, most of those impacts that you hear about, that you read about, are 10 years old. Because of dramatic reforms that were pushed by the Congress during the Conable administration of the bank, it has been a remarkable turnaround. This year alone the World Bank will be lending over $2 billion for projects which promote and benefit the environment.

Last year, for example, the World Bank lent about three-quarters of a billion to Brazil for projects with pro-environmental goals.

The problems are in the past. The problems are not in the future.

At the current time, I urge my colleagues to reject the Kasich amendment.

As the budget gets tighter and tighter for international programs, we must put our money where the payoff is greatest for U.S.

economic, trade, and political interests. This amendment unfortunately singles out for elimination of what this Member believes might well be the single most cost-effective item in the entire foreign aid budget.

The capital contribution to the World Bank eliminated by this amendment leverages burden-sharing by other countries at a ratio greater than $4 for every $1 of U.S. contribution, and it leverages development financing by private capital markets of more than $32 for every $1 of U.S. government contribution.

The amendment strikes $55.8 million in capital contributions to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development [IBRD] arm of the World Bank—that $56 million is the only budget saving in the amendment—and also cancels the backup capital pledge of $1.8 billion. This backup pledge does not and will not result in any cost to the Treasury but allows the World Bank to provide intermediation so that private capital markets provide billions in lending to stimulate global economic growth in poor countries that cannot access private capital markets on their own. For every $1 of capital the United States Government puts into the World Bank, the World Bank has lent $118; that is more than 100 to 1 cost-effectiveness ratio because of international burden-sharing and bringing in the private capital markets. Tell me where you can find that kind of leverage elsewhere in an international program or a U.S. Government program.

The World Bank is a well-run institution, formerly headed by our esteemed colleague from New York, Mr. Barber Conable, and presently headed by Mr. Lewis Preston, the distinguished and able former head of J.P. Morgan Bank. It has a triple AAA credit rating on Wall Street. It finances all of its operating costs out of service charges on loans paid by borrowing countries. None of the $56 million we are talking about here goes to pay a penny of the World Bank's administrative costs. This contribution pays the U.S. equity share in the capital of the institution, and determines the weight of the U.S. voice in board discussions. The U.S. is currently the largest single shareholder and perceived leader of the institutions. Other countries would jump at the chance to pass the United States in shares and influence in the Board of the single largest financial institution in the world if we give them the chance. Remember it only costs them about $60 million to pick up our entire annual share.

There is a parochial interest for the United States, too. IBRD lending in support of well-designed development projects abroad benefits U.S. companies and U.S. exports. Last year, U.S. companies won procurement contracts worth more than $1.1 billion. That creates or supports more than 20,000 U.S. jobs. U.S. procurement and exports alone gave more than an eighteenfold return on the $62 million Congress appropriated for the IBRD in fiscal year 1993. This is the type of cost-effective contribution the amendment would cut.

Because the World Bank can mobilize more assistance, at a far lower budget cost than bilateral aid, the United States consistently relies on the World Bank to address country and regional issues of critical importance to U.S. interest. For instance, the IBRD mobilized more than $4.4 billion during the last 2 years to support the transitions to market economies in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania. Support for Russia has begun and there is up to $9 billion more in the pipeline when Russia is ready to implement its economic reform agenda seriously. Would we rather be paying that kind of money dollar for dollar out of bilateral aid, instead of multilateral aid using private capital markets, leveraged at better than 100 to 1?

This Member has worked hard for a number of years at getting exactly the kinds of reforms in the World Bank that the gentleman from Ohio is demanding. There has been significant progress on the environmental review and issues during the last 10 years, largely due to pressure from the U.S. Government at the instigation of Congress. Indeed, the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development last year gave the World Bank responsibility for administering the permanent global environment facility because it was the best institution for the job. There are old projects and projects designed before environmental consciousness became widespread which have been targeted as horror stories. But what is important is what the currently approved projects look like. All projects now have an environmental impact assessment prepared, and a substantial portion of the World Bank's portfolio this year—over $2 billion—will go to projects that promote and benefit the environment, according to Treasury estimates.

The gentleman from Ohio is concerned about resettlement issues. So is this Member. The World Bank pulled out of the Narmada Dam project in India this year because of the inadequate implementation of resettlement policies by the Government of India. There is no stronger way for the institution to send a message about the need for careful consideration of the rights of those displaced and disadvantaged by development projects.

This Member believes that there continue to be reforms needed in the World Bank. This view is strongly shared by the management of the World Bank, which commissioned the recent Wapenhans study of the quality of Bank-financed projects. Serious measures are being considered for action to address quality problems and to open the Bank's policies to more public scrutiny and review in order to spot emerging problems earlier. Without effective U.S. advocacy on the board of the World Bank, these concerns may never receive the attention and support they deserve. Other governments do not take nearly as proactive a position on environmental and management reform efforts in the IBRD as the United States has taken and continues to take.

For these reasons I strongly urge opposition to this amendment. It will eliminate the most cost-effective item in this entire bill and dramatically reduce U.S. influence in the major institution of the international economic arena. Economic policy and trade are emerging as the central arenas of competition in the post-cold-war world, and this Member would not want to erode our capabilities and preparedness, especially by the type of unilateral disarmament action as is proposed by this amendment by the distinguished and respected gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, in summary fashion permit me to list the following points:

EFFECT OF AMENDMENT TO REDUCE/ELIMINATE PROPOSED $55.8 MILLION IN PAID-IN CAPITAL TO THE IBRD

IBRD has consistently demonstrated its value as a highly cost-effective instrument for promoting U.S. interests.

For every dollar of U.S. paid-in capital, the World Bank has lent $118.

IBRD lending abroad benefits U.S. business: Last year, the IBRD awarded U.S. companies procurement contracts amounting to $1,120 million. This was more than 18 times larger than the $62 million Congress appropriated for the IBRD in FY 1993; IBRD support for economic reform and development expands the import capacity of borrowing countries; for example, the IBRD played a major role in helping to revive the economies of Latin America providing $27 billion in new commitments over the last five years.

Because the IBRD can mobilize far more assistance than is feasible from our bilateral account, the United States consistently relies on the bank to address country and regional issues of critical importance to U.S. interests. Current examples include:

(1) Assistance to support market economies in the countries of Eastern Europe. IBRD commitments to Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Romania over the past two years totalled $4.4 billion.

(2) Support for Russia and other countries of the Former Soviet Union. There have already been three IBRD loans totalling $760 million to Russia; a $610 million Oil Rehabilitation project will be considered on June 17. Assuming good progress on reform efforts, IBRD commitments to Russia over the next three years could total as much as $9 billion.

(3) Support for the new government in South Africa. The IBRD is preparing a lending program for South Africa which could reach as much as $1 billion annually once there is an agreement on a new government.

The extent to which the IBRD serves U.S. interests substantially outweighs its budgetary cost. In sum, it provide very good value for our money.

A further reduction or the elimination of funding for the IBRD could generate uncertainty in capital market on the reliability of future USG support for the Bank.

---

REBUTTAL TO CONGRESSMAN KASICH'S ARGUMENT THAT THE WORLD BANK PROJECTS CONTRIBUTE TO THE DESTRUCTION OF RAINFORESTS

1. The World Bank approved over 200 projects last year, some of which were specifically directed at protection of the environment in the developing world.

A. In this year alone, the Bank will have lent over $2 billion for projects which promote and benefit the environment.

B. Last year, the World Bank lent about $750 million to Brazil for projects with pro-environmental goals, of which $176 million was targeted specifically to project rainforest areas and biodiversity in the Amazon River Basin.

B. The Bank also supports afforestation efforts and projects to create protected areas. For example, with Bank support, the Philippines created 10 protected areas.

2. The projects with environmental problems were for the most part approved long before the Bank strengthened its guidelines on the environment.

A. Last year, the Bank adopted a new forest policy paper, a significant improvement over its previous policy, which had support from many in the NGO community.

B. The Bank also put in place environmental procedures for preparation of environmental impact assessments.

REBUTTAL TO CONGRESSMAN KASICH'S ARGUMENT THAT THE "WORLD BANK LOANS DISPLACE TENS OF THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE AND PAY THEM A SMALL PERCENTAGE OF THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF THEIR PROPERTY"

1. The vast proportion of World Bank projects do not involve any population displacement. They create jobs, not destroy homes. (For example, the World Bank created 2,000 jobs in Bangladesh rebuilding homes, streets and industrial sites following a cyclone last year. And, some 11,000 jobs were created in Senegal recently by a project to build schools, highways and other infrastructure entities.)

2. The World Bank has explicit guidelines to limit displacement when it is necessary, and to ensure that the recipient government provides fair compensation. The compensation issue is controversial usually only because the project itself adds to property values.

3. These guidelines are strongly followed. In fact, the Bank found that the Government of India was not complying with its guidelines at the Narmada Dam project there, and yanked its support from the project. (This project is being continued by India, however, despite the World Bank pullout.)

4. The Bank's decision to pull out of Narmada sends the strongest message possible that it places highest priority on adherence to its displacement and compensation guidelines.

Mr. Chairman, for these and many other reasons I urge my colleagues to vote against the very harmful amendment from my good-intentioned and distinguished colleague from Ohio Mr. KASICH.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to defeat the amendment.

I think improvements are required in the way in which the World Bank functions, but I think this amendment cutting out all of the funds of the World Bank is a grave error and will do damage to people who do not deserve to be damaged.

No one who works at the World Bank, I believe, will be a nickel poorer if we adopt this amendment. No one who works at the bank will eat any less well if we adopt the amendment. But the people in various parts of the world who have been the beneficiaries of some of the programs will suffer.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Multilateral Institutions, along with the ranking member who spoke, the gentleman from Nebraska, I have undertaken to try to get some improvements. We cannot legislate for the World Bank. We can, however, make it clear to the U.S. Treasury that in the absence of certain improvements we do not think we will be able to go ahead.

I have met with environmental organizations, I have met with nongovernmental organizations representing various African groups, and we have begun a process in a bipartisan way. We just voted on an authorization by 19 to 1 for the International Development Association, but it affected the World Bank itself.

We have begun a process in which I believe you are going to see some significant administrative improvements in the World Bank, and an appeals process being set up so people who are aggrieved by projects will have a place to go that is independent, and much better transmission of information.

I know that I can tell you that many of the groups that have been most critical of the bank are now hopeful, not convinced that everything is fine, but believing that we are on a path that could lead to significant improvement.

The problem is that by simply adopting this amendment we cut off our leverage for improvement, and more importantly, we deny the capacity of the institution to do some good.

□ 1610

We jeopardize aid to Russia and other places that should not be penalized.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, last Saturday afternoon I was coming back from a trip to Wisconsin, and I landed in the Chicago airport, and I bought myself a piece of pizza, and I walked into a little area, this little restaurant area. There were no seats. There was a lady there who reminded me an awful lot of my mother. She was a lady that had a little towel. Do you know what her job was? Her job was to go to all the little counters when people got up and they left. Her job was to go over and clean the counter. And she stood there, I watched her for half an hour, stand there waiting, like this, standing there waiting for people to get done with their food so she could go and clean the place where they were eating. She was doing that to earn money.

I thought about that lady, and I thought about the tax bill, I thought about all the Government spending. Do you know what I thought? I almost walked up to her. I thought she would probably think I was crazy. But I wanted to go up to her and I wanted to say, "Ma'am, what do you think about what is going on in Washington right now? With the Social Security tax, the energy tax, all the waste you hear about, the Pentagon toilet seats, and all these programs you hear about?" If I had told her, "Do you know, ma'am, do you know the executives down at the World Bank are averaging $123,000 a year and they don't pay a dime in taxes? You know, ma'am, you have to do it because we have to help somebody overseas even though the loan portfolio program in the projects are failures. We got to get up here and we have to talk this rhetoric because we have to go out and help the world. But as for you, you just keep cleaning those tables, you just keep on coming to work and working your fingers to the bone, and you just keep paying taxes. And you know what, if there is a little bit of waste in Washington and if the bureaucrats are living too high on the hog and if the programs don't work, if they are destroying the environment, do you know what, ma'am? Don't worry about it. We are going to get around to fixing it," even though over the last 10 years the portfolio failure has grown. Things have gotten worse. There is no way that anybody could argue they have gotten better.

Do you know what I would have to tell that lady? "Tough, you pay the taxes, you keep going to work, you keep cleaning the tables."

Do you know what I am going to tell her, that there is a group of people in this House of Representatives who want to stand up for that lady, that want to clean it up, that want to fix it. And if you want to stand with that lady, you come to the floor today not to close down the World Bank but to send an important message that they have to tighten their belts, they can do their loans with the money they have and stop the rip-off of the taxpayers.

Pass the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Chairman, how many times have you heard somebody before say that we need to destroy something in order to save it? I heard that in Vietnam. It was no more persuasive then than it is today. I want to answer some of the ridiculous allegations made about the bank.

First of all, as to construction costs, I want to point out that the construction project now going on at the World Bank is costing about $112 per square foot. That is in the middle of the range in this city for commercial construction. It is meant to replace a 50-year-old building which had to be replaced because of an impossible asbestos problem.

The golf course which is talked about is not a World Bank golf course, it is an IMF golf course. World Bank employees can join that golf course and use it if they want, but they pay the fees themselves. You do not, and neither do the taxpayers.

As the gentleman from Nebraska pointed out, we do not pay administrative expenses for the World Bank. The World Bank pays for those administrative expenses out of their own earnings, and they charge those who borrow from the bank, not those who lend to them.

Mr. Chairman, I would also point out that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] talks about his concern for environmental causes. I checked to see. He and I were both rated by the League of Conservation Voters. His record is 25 percent in support of the environment, mine is 85 percent.

Now, I do not apologize for my position on the environment, nor do I apologize for the environmental position of the bank. I think they are making great progress on that.

Lastly, I would point out that if you gut this institution, the practical effect will be two things: First of all, you will deny them the ability to make the loans that they need to accomplish the changes we are trying to get in the Soviet Union; Nine billion dollars worth of pending loans to the Soviet Union are out of that institution. If they do not make those loans, who do you think is going to be asked to make them? Uncle Sam, that is who.

Right now, under the World Bank, we pay only 19 percent of the total cost to support that institution. It was set up by the Wise Men at the end of World War II so that Uncle Sam would not have to bear the entire burden for trying to provide economic development around the world. This is the way that we get our allies and our trading partners to meet their financial obligations in order to help develop those parts of the world that need development.

If we wipe out our ability to lead that bank, who becomes the lead contributor and who therefore gets to name the next director? The Japanese.

I ask you, do you believe that American corporations would be able to continue to earn $1.1 billion last year off of the American investment of $62 million if the Japanese were in control?

If you believe that, I have a bridge in my district I would like to sell you.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. Eliminating 64 percent of our aid package for the former Republics of the Soviet Union would undermine a major tenet of United States foreign policy and would jeopardize the future of a free, democratic Russia.

It would weaken the forces of democracy and would bolster the so-called Red-Brown coalition that seeks a return to totalitarianism and the cold war. Passage of this amendment might save $1.6 billion in the short run. But in the long run, it could eliminate the peace dividend and make more likely a return to the cold war footing that cost this Nation $4 trillion over the last 40 years. That would be a colossal mistake.

In April, I joined Chairman OBEY and the majority leader on a study mission to Russia and Ukraine. What I saw there was incredible progress, and incredible need. Throughout both countries there are hundreds of thousands of people who are dedicated to building modern democratic states with shriving free enterprise systems.

But they do not have the tools; 75 years of communism left Russia with an antiquated banking system and with an archaic legal system. Without outside assistance, there is no way that the people of the former Soviet Union could build a free society and a market economy. This bill helps provide those tools.

The aid for Russia and the other former Soviet States in this bill will establish exchange programs so that Americans can teach Russians how to build a democratic system and how to establish the rule of law. It will allow American corporations to go into Russia and the other States and help develop their energy industry. It will let American farmers help Russians to create a market-driven food production and distribution system.

In short, it will help create a modern economy and a business partner for American enterprise. Helping Russia and the other former Soviet Republics is not an act of charity. It is self-interest.

It also is an investment in peace and prosperity for this country. It will help prevent a new cold war and, as Russia's private sector grows, it will mean thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in trade for the United States.

The Russian aid in this bill is not just good for the people of Russia. More important, it is good for the people of the United States.

That is why we must defeat this amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2295, the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I would like to extend my congratulations and thanks to Chairman OBEY for his leadership in developing this balanced bill which strives to meet diverse and growing foreign aid needs at a time of severe budget constraints. I would also like to commend the ranking minority member Mr. LIVINGSTON for his work in crafting this bill, which has bipartisan support. Finally, I would like to thank the Subcommittee staff, Terry Peel, Mike Marek, Mark Murray, Bill Schuerch, Lori Maes, and Karen Brown, for their assistance in addressing issues of particular concern.

The bill as passed by our subcommittee addresses pressing global funding needs while reducing overall spending. It appropriates a total of $13 billion, $1.4 billion less than the President's request. At the same time, it is true to our foreign aid priorities, providing much-needed assistance for refugee programs and for the newly emerging states of the former Soviet Union. As we developed this bill, we also tried to provide the highest possible funding levels for other priority needs, including family planning, the environment, and children.

The aid to the former Soviet Republics contained in this bill is a sound investment in global security. If the former Republics do not successfully make a peaceful transition to market economies and democratic states, we face the real possibility of an explosion of regional conflicts which would dwarf the tragic situation in the former Yugoslavia. Assistance provided now can save us from increased defense and military expenses in the future.

The report to H.R. 2295 contains a number of other provisions which I would like to note for the record. I thank Chairman OBEY for his interest in including human rights within the items of special interest portion of the report. The language highlights the subcommittee's support for making promotion of human rights around the world a primary consideration in United States foreign policy. Given the distressing push for cultural relativism in human rights by some of the world's worst human rights abusers, it is essential that the United States articulate our unwaivering commitment to human rights at every opportunity.

I am pleased that the report includes strong language about the importance of designing foreign assistance programs to address the needs of women in development. The Subcommittee urges the Agency for International Development [AID] and agency contractors, as well as other agencies involved in development assistance, to ensure that opportunities are designed to assist women in activities critical to their self-reliance and development. Women in the developing world play vital roles in their national economies. We must ensure that our foreign assistance programs recognize and foster women's contributions.

This bill also includes funding for programs to address two of the world's most serious problems, population growth and AIDS. While both of these global threats are health problems, they have far-reaching implications for all aspects of life, economic, political, social, and environmental, not only in the developing world, but also in the developed world. Unless we take real steps to address the global population and the global AIDS crises, our efforts to promote development assistance will not succeed. This foreign operations appropriations bill funds important programs, including the U.N. Population Fund, the WHO Global AIDS program, and AID programs for population assistance and AIDS prevention. These programs merit our support.

I would like to thank Chairman OBEY for including report language addressing several particular concerns of mine relating to the multilateral development [MDB] institutions. I hope that the language relating to the environmental assessment procedures of the private sector lending facilities of the MDB's will be taken seriously and will be used to expand public involvement in the planning stages of bank projects.

The report includes language expressing concern about the increase in World Bank loans to China and instructing the administration to seek support among our allies for restricting loans to China until and unless there are fundamental human rights improvements. I will be following up on this issue with the administration and will continue to monitor closely the World Bank's loans to China.

Mr. Chairman, there are many more good programs and provisions contained in this bill upon which I could elaborate. The final one which I would like to make a point of noting, however, is my support for the full level of funding for Israel and Egypt. This bill, for the first time since I have served in Congress, contains no earmarks of any sort. I would like to reaffirm for the record that this policy of no earmarks does not represent any weakening of our support for aid to Israel and Egypt, or any lack of commitment to the Middle East peace process. The report to the bill clearly states the committee's support for full funding for Israel and Egypt and the President is also on record in support of this funding.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to congratulate once again Chairman OBEY and Representative LIVINGSTON for their dedication and commitment to developing and funding sound foreign policy programs. I am proud to have been able to work with them on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it. Thank you.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in support of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill. In my view, there are numerous, serious problems with the bill as reported out of the committee * * * so much so, that under most circumstances, I would simply oppose the bill's final passage.

But, in the final analysis, those serious problems are outweighed by the strategic importance to the United States of providing aid to Israel and Russia.

As every member of this body knows, Israel is perhaps our most critical strategic ally. Israel is the lone outpost of democracy in the volatile and strategically important Middle East. Former U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick is correct when she argues that it is in our best national interest to continue support to Israel; far better to provide that nation with financial aid than to see a bloody war break out in that region that would cost us far more both in dollars and, worse, human lives. The funds provided in this bill to assist in the total security of Israel represent the wiser, and less expensive course to take.

Mr. Speaker, the United States, the recognized leader of the world, cannot now afford to retreat into the false promise of isolationism. Isolationism will ultimately cost far more than aid; isolationism will be viewed as weakness, and weakness invites aggression. Peace, as always, comes through strength.

The same principle applies to Russia. As Ambassador Kirkpatrick again has observed, failure to support the struggling democratic government of Russia at this critical time would be penny-wise and pound-foolish. If Mr. Yeltsin and the democratic forces are subverted by hard-liners, Russia would become an international nightmare that Ambassador Kirkpatrick likens to "a Yugoslavia with nuclear arms." None of us wants to live in a world with that kind of instability and danger. A wise program of assistance to Russia at this time is the best hope to prevent that dangerous scenario from becoming a devastating reality that could once again place the world under the constant threat of nuclear conflict.

The nuclear threat aside, ignoring these two areas of our world—Israel and Russia—threatens to drag our Nation into expensive military confrontations. That possibility alone convinces me that support of this bill is the only prudent course of action.

That is unfortunate because there is much that is wrong with this bill.

Yes, this bill cuts about 10 percent—$1.4 billion—from the President's imprudent request.

Yes, it is about $1 billion below what was appropriated a year ago.

Yes, it includes vital funding for the Export-Import Bank which finances so many of our overseas sales by Boeing and other premier U.S. exporters.

While those are all moves in the right direction, this bill does not go nearly as far as most overburdened taxpayers of the Eighth District tell me they would have liked. Indeed, as I meet with taxpayers in communities like Renton, Auburn, or Kent, I hear genuine concern about the burden that is being placed upon them by their local, State, and Federal Governments. They do not request that we spend additional dollars on foreign aid that has little discernible connection to our national interest. Likewise, as I meet with people in Issaquah or Maple Valley, I hear a constant plea: keep America strong, but reduce unnecessary spending wherever possible.

Mr. Speaker, that could have been done in this bill. Just yesterday, we voted on a foreign aid authorization act that included serious reforms to the bilateral aid program administered through the Agency for International Development [AID]. In fact, we even approved a "Sunset Provision" that would have ended AID funding past fiscal year 1995. Yesterday, we passed an authorization that included a provision that I have cosponsored that would allow us to barter goods directly between our Nation and aid recipients: if a nation has strategic minerals to trade directly for United States grain, as is the case with Russia, there is no reason to deny our using that more direct, efficient, and creative way of directing aid in exchange for commodities that our own Nation needs. The authorization bill also included needed conditions on any aid to Cuba.

Unfortunately, this appropriations bill does none of those things. There is unnecessary spending in this bill. There is no reform of AID. Barter is disallowed. There are no conditions on aid to Cuba.

These are disturbing deletions, Mr. Speaker. AID employs 3,000 people and distributes roughly $7 billion of our precious tax dollars every year. And while doing so, that agency has been plagued with mismanagement and inefficiencies—so much so that even the Washington Post editorialized that the agency should be subjected to serious reform or perhaps even abolished. Some examples are instructive.

My colleague and friend from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, has pointed out that, in Rwanda, American contractors took 200 tons of needed food provided by AID, sold it, and used the ill-gotten proceeds to build a private tennis court. Where were AID officials?

Officials at AID shipped millions of condoms to Egypt for population control, then stood by as the condoms ended up in the hands of children who used them for balloons. Where were AID officials?

Also in Egypt, AID decided it was in our Nation's interest to use tax dollars from America to buy and disseminate ice cream makers to Egyptian schools. What were AID officials thinking?

With these inexplicable events in mind, Mr. KASICH and others tried to amend the authorization bill to require tough and necessary reforms at AID: prohibiting assistance to countries that have defaulted on U.S. loans, and sunsetting the agency on September 30 of next year unless it had implemented real reforms and reduced the number of nations on the assistance rolls.

While that amendment, which I supported, did not pass, the House did at least agree to sunset AID after 1995. That is only appropriate and right, Mr. Speaker, in light of the very real and tough economic problems right here at home.

Yet, this Foreign Operations appropriations bill denies any reform of AID. Instead, this bill offers only—business as usual—at the scandal-plagued AID.

It did not have to be that way, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, it should not have been that way. The American people, and taxpayers in the Eighth District of Washington, need to know that normal procedures in the House would have allowed us to offer amendments to the appropriations bill. I am convinced that the House, representing those hard-working Americans who must pay the tax bills, would have voted for the same kind of money-saving reforms that we included in the authorization had there been an opportunity for Members to vote for the reforms. Without question, we would have put conditions on aid to the Communist regime in China.

Instead, the Rules Committee said we were not allowed to freely offer amendments to reduce spending on those programs that cannot be justified at a time of persistent, huge Federal budget deficits. Instead, a mere handful of amendments was allowed, and the status quo at AID was specifically protected. That is tragically wrong, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, we were forced to make a choice that was unnecessary: whether to support vital aid to Israel and Russia that could stave off potential wars, or oppose the business as usual approach to foreign aid and run the risk of dangerous destabilization in the Middle East or the former Soviet Union.

Ultimately, my vote must go to support stability in the Middle East and democracy in Russia. Those are our highest national priorities among elements in this bill. But I want to state for the record that there remains a clear need to reform and reduce aid programs that are less than top priorities, or that are downright wasteful. American taxpayers will not and should not put up with such a lack of responsibility from their Congress.

So, with regrets about the way this has been handled by the Rules Committee, and with a strong desire to go much further in terms of reducing unnecessary foreign aid, I am compelled to support the bill.

Our final hope now must be that a conference bill might come back before the House that will allow us to vote for aid to Israel and Russia, for vital funding for the Eximbank, and for reform and reduction of less important aid programs. From Washington, DC to Enumclaw, Washington, that's what taxpayers want.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 216, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

AYES—210

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allard | Baker (LA) | Bateman |
| Applegate | Ballenger | Bentley |
| Archer | Barcia | Bevill |
| Armey | Barlow | Bilirakis |
| Bachus (AL) | Barrett (NE) | Bliley |
| Baesler | Bartlett | Blute |
| Baker (CA) | Barton | Boehner |

Bonilla
Brewster
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Clement
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fingerhut
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gillmor
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lambert
Lancaster
Laughlin
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Lloyd
Machtley
Manzullo
Martinez
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meehan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murphy
Myers
Nussle
Oberstar
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Rowland
Royce
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Valentine
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Washington
Wise
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—216

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Barca
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Callahan
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
de Lugo (VI)
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Knollenberg
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lantos
LaRocco
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—13

Browder
de la Garza
Fields (TX)
Henry
Kopetski
McDade
Neal (MA)
Pelosi
Pickle
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Swett
Weldon
Young (AK)

□ 1639

Ms. E.B. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. HEFNER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. MCCOLLUM, BLILEY, and OBERSTAR changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that a personal explanation appear in the RECORD that I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 238 had I been present.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON, 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. 2295) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and making supplemental appropriations for such programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 200, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

H.R. 2295

*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 foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—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 share of the paid-in share portion of the increases in capital stock for the General Capital Increase, $55,821,000, to remain available until expended.

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 expended.

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of increases in capital stock in an amount not to exceed $1,804,879,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

For payment to the International Development Association by the Secretary of the Treasury, $1,024,332,000, for the United States contribution to the replenishment, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That funds appropriated under this heading are available subject to authorization.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

For payment to the International Finance Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, $35,761,500, for the United States share of the increase in subscriptions to capital stock, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the amount appropriated under this heading not more than $5,364,000 may be expended for the purchase of such stock in fiscal year 1994.

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, $56,166,000, and for the United States share of the increases in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations, $20,164,000, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON 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 $2,190,283,457.

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, $75,000,000 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 paid-in share portion of the United States share of the increase in capital stock, $13,026,366, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading are available subject to receipt by the Congress of the President's budget request for such funds.

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), $62,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading are available subject to authorization.

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 increases in the capital stock in an amount not to exceed $95,438,437: *Provided*, That the authority provided under this heading is available subject to receipt by the Congress of the President's budget request for such authority.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

For payment to the African Development Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury, $132,300,000, for the United States contribution to the sixth replenishment of the African Development Fund, to remain available until expended.

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, $339,500,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for the following: the United Nations Fund for Science and Technology, the G-7 Nuclear Safety Fund, the OECD Center for Cooperation with European Economies in Transition, and United Nations Electoral Assistance activities: *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 unless the President certifies to the Congress that the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) has terminated all activities in the People's Republic of China, not more than $36,215,500 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for UNFPA: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for UNFPA until March 1, 1994, unless the President has made the certification referred to in the previous proviso.

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, 1994, unless otherwise specified herein, as follows:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $811,900,000.

POPULATION, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 104(b), $392,000,000: *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 nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

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, $784,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out chapters 1 and 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be transferred to the Government of Zaire.

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.

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, $145,985,000 to remain available until expended.

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, $44,151,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667, $501,760,000.

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

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667, $39,118,000, which sum shall be available for the Office of the Inspector General of the Agency for International Development.

HOUSING GUARANTY PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the subsidy cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, of guaranteed loans authorized by sections 221 and 222 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $16,078,000: *Provided*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $110,000,000: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize loan principal, 100 percent of which shall be guaranteed, pursuant to the authority of such sections: *Provided further*, That the President shall enter into commitments to guarantee such loans in the full amount provided under this heading, subject to the availability of qualified applicants for such guarantees. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out guaranteed loan programs, $8,239,000, all of which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

DEBT RESTRUCTURING

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, 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, $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II, $2,364,562,000, to remain available until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That 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, 1993, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading that are made available for Egypt shall be provided on a grant basis, and of which sum cash transfer assistance may be provided with the understanding that Egypt will undertake significant economic reforms which are additional

to those which were undertaken in previous fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in exercising the authority to provide cash transfer assistance for Israel and Egypt, the President shall ensure that the level of such assistance does not cause an adverse impact on the total level of nonmilitary exports from the United States to each such country: *Provided further*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the recommended levels of assistance for Egypt and Israel are based in great measure upon their continued participation in the Camp David Accords and upon the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for Zaire: *Provided further*, That not more than $50,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to finance tied-aid credits, unless the President determines it is in the national interest to provide in excess of $50,000,000 and so notifies the Committees on Appropriations through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available or limited by this Act may be used for tied-aid credits or tied-aid grants except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That none of the 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 may be used for tied-aid credits: *Provided further*, That as used in this heading the term "tied-aid credits" means any credit, within the meaning of section 15(h)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, which is used for blended or parallel financing, as those terms are defined by sections 15(h) (4) and (5), respectively, of such Act: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 1995.

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR IRELAND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of part I 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 expended.

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, $400,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for economic assistance 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.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE NEW INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

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, $903,820,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the provisions of 498B(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall apply to funds appropriated by this paragraph.

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 section 9104, title 31, United States Code, $16,905,000: *Provided*, That, when, with the permission of the President of the Foundation, funds made available to a grantee under this heading 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.

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 section 9104, title 31, United States Code, $30,340,000.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the subsidy cost as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, of direct and guaranteed loans authorized by section 234 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as follows: cost of direct and guaranteed loans, $9,065,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $7,518,000: *Provided*, That the funds provided in this paragraph shall be available for and apply to costs, direct loan obligations and loan guaranty commitments incurred or made during the period from October 1, 1993 through September 30, 1995: *Provided further*, That such sums are to remain available through fiscal year 2002 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal year 1994, and through 2003 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal year 1995.

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation is authorized to make, without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by 31 U.S.C. 9104, such noncredit expenditures and commitments within the limits of funds available to it and in accordance with law (including an amount for official reception and representation expenses which shall not exceed $35,000) as may be necessary.

PEACE CORPS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), $219,745,000, 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, 1995: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $3,000,000 from amounts appropriated under this heading may be transferred to the "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Peace Corps, Account", as authorized by section 16 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $100,000,000.

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 and assistance to refugees, including contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; 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; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; $670,688,000: *Provided*, That not more than $11,500,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Office of Refugee Programs of the Department of State.

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)), $19,261,000, 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 Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 which would limit the amount of funds which could be appropriated for this purpose.

ANTI-TERRORISM ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 8 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $15,244,000.

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, $21,250,000: *Provided*, That up to $300,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for grant financed military education and training for any country whose annual per capita GNP exceeds $2,349 on the condition that that country agrees to fund from its own resources the transportation cost and living allowances of its students: *Provided further*, That the civilian personnel for whom military education and training may be provided under this heading may also include members of national legislatures who are responsible for the oversight and management of the military: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for Indonesia and Zaire.

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, $3,175,000,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated by this paragraph that are made available for Israel shall be available as grants and shall be disbursed within thirty days of enactment of this Act or by October 31, 1993, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated by this paragraph that are made available for Egypt shall be available as grants: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this paragraph shall be nonrepayable notwithstanding any requirement in section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act.

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, of direct loans authorized by section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act as follows: cost of direct loans, $46,530,000: *Provided*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans of not to exceed $769,500,000: *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 Portugal, Greece and Turkey only on a loan basis: *Provided further*, That the principal amount of loans made available for Greece and Turkey shall be made available according to a 7 to 10 ratio.

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, Guatemala, Peru, and Malawi: *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: *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 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 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: *Provided further*, That not more than $23,558,000 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 $290,000,000 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 the fiscal year 1994 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: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading, and no employee of the Defense Security Assistance Agency, may be used to facilitate the transport of aircraft to commercial arms sales shows.

SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND

Notwithstanding section 51 of the Arms Export Control Act, collections in excess of obligational authority provided in prior appropriations Acts shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $75,623,000.

NONPROLIFERATION AND DISARMAMENT FUND

For necessary expenses for a "Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund", $10,000,000, to remain available until expended, to promote bilateral and multilateral activities: *Provided*, That such funds may be used pursuant to the authorities contained in section 504 of the FREEDOM Support Act: *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 funds appropriated under this heading may be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

## TITLE IV—EXPORT 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, $700,000,000: *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 2009 for the disbursement of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance and tied-aid grants obligated in fiscal year 1994: *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, $45,369,000: *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.

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, $40,000,000.

## 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 "International Organizations and 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, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Iran, Serbia, 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, 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: *Provided*, That the exercise of such authority shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

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 the "Agency for International Development" are, if deobligated, hereby continued available for the same period as the respective appropriations under such headings or until September 30, 1994, 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 deobligation and 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.

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 chapter 1 of part I, section 667, and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, 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 or obligated 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.

(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.

(c) None of the funds provided in this Act to the Agency for International Development, other than funds made available to carry out Caribbean Basin Initiative programs under the Tariff Schedules of the United States, section 1202 of title 19, United States Code, schedule 8, part I, subpart B, item 807.00, shall be obligated or expended—

(1) to procure directly feasibility studies or prefeasibility studies for, or project profiles of potential investment in, the manufacture, for export to the United States or to third country markets in direct competition with United States exports, of import-sensitive articles as defined by section 503(c)(1) (A) and (E) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 2463(c)(1) (A) and (E)); or

(2) to assist directly in the establishment of facilities specifically designed for the manufacture, for export to the United States or to third country markets in direct competition with United States exports, of import-sensitive articles as defined in section 503(c)(1) (A) and (E) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 2463(c)(1) (A) and (E)).

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 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 "Development Assistance Fund", "Population, Development Assistance", "Development Fund for Africa", "International organizations and programs", "American schools and hospitals abroad", "Trade and development agency", "International narcotics control", "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", "Anti-terrorism assistance", "Foreign Military Financing Program", "International military education and training", "Inter-American Foundation", "African Development Foundation", "Peace Corps", or "Migration and refugee assistance", shall be available for obligation for activities, programs, projects, type of materiel assistance, countries, or other operation 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 20 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 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. (a) 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 for any programs for the Palestine Liberation Organization (or for projects whose purpose is to provide benefits to the Palestine Liberation Organization or entities associated with it), 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, 1995.

(b) The United States shall not make any voluntary or assessed contribution—

(1) to any affiliated organization of the United Nations which grants full membership as a state to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood, or

(2) to the United Nations, if the United Nations grants full membership as a state in the United Nations to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood,

during any period in which such membership is effective.

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 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 CONCERNING 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. The Congress reaffirms its commitments to Population, Development Assistance and to the need for informed voluntary family planning.

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 Afghanistan, Cambodia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Jordan, Liberia, Malawi, Peru, Sudan, Togo, 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.

FAMILY PLANNING, 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 such individuals shall not be included within any personnel ceiling applicable to any United States Government agency during the period of detail or assignment: *Provided further*, 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, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Iran, Syria, North Korea, People's Republic of China, or Laos 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 "1993" and inserting in lieu thereof "1994".

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 Title I through V of this Act may be obligated and expended subject to section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956.

DEPLETED URANIUM

SEC. 527. None of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be made available to facilitate in any way the sale of M-833 antitank shells or any comparable antitank shells containing a depleted uranium penetrating component to any country other than (1) countries which are members of NATO, (2) countries which have been designated as a major non-NATO ally for purposes of section 1105 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 or, (3) Taiwan: *Provided*, That funds may be made available to facilitate the sale of such shells notwithstanding the limitations of this section if the President determines that to do so is in the national security interest of the United States.

OPPOSITION TO ASSISTANCE TO TERRORIST COUNTRIES BY INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 528. (a) INSTRUCTIONS FOR UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of each international financial institution to vote against any loan or other use of the funds of the respective institution to or for a country for which the Secretary of State has made a determination under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "international financial institution" includes—

(1) the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, and the International Monetary Fund; and

(2) wherever applicable, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

PROHIBITION ON BILATERAL ASSISTANCE TO TERRORIST COUNTRIES

SEC. 529. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, 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. 530. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to the regular notification requirements 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 and 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. 531. All Agency for International Development contracts and solicitations, and subcontracts entered into under such contracts, shall include a clause requiring that United States marine insurance companies have a fair opportunity to bid for marine insurance when such insurance is necessary or appropriate.

STINGERS IN THE PERSIAN GULF REGION

SEC. 532. 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.

PROHIBITION ON LEVERAGING AND DIVERSION OF UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE

SEC. 533. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be provided to any foreign government (including any instrumentality or agency thereof), foreign person, or United States person in exchange for that foreign government or person undertaking any action which is, if carried out by the United States Government, a United States official or employee, expressly prohibited by a provision of United States law.

(b) For the purposes of this section the term "funds appropriated by this Act" includes only (1) assistance of any kind under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; and (2) credits, and guaranties under the Arms Export Control Act.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit—

(1) the ability of the President, the Vice President, or any official or employee of the United States to make statements or otherwise express their views to any party on any subject;

(2) the ability of an official or employee of the United States to express the policies of the President; or

(3) the ability of an official or employee of the United States to communicate with any foreign country government, group or individual, either directly or through a third party, with respect to the prohibitions of this section including the reasons for such prohibitions, and the actions, terms, or conditions which might lead to the removal of the prohibitions of this section.

DEBT-FOR-DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 534. 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 the heading "Agency for International Development" and any interest earned on such investment may be for the purpose for which the assistance was provided to that organization.

LOCATION OF STOCKPILES

SEC. 535. Section 514(b)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "$389,000,000 for fiscal year 1993, of which amount not less than $200,000,000 shall be available for stockpiles in Israel, and up to $189,000,000 may be available for stockpiles in the Republic of Korea" and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000,000 for stockpiles in Israel for fiscal year 1994".

ASSISTANCE FOR PAKISTAN

SEC. 536. (a) The date specified in section 620E(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows: "September 30, 1994".

(b) None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be obligated or expended for Pakistan except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

SEPARATE ACCOUNTS

SEC. 537. (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 (including the Philippines Multilateral Assistance Initiative) 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 appropriate 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.

(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 (including the Philippines Multilateral Assistance Initiative) 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 FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 538. (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, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

COMPLIANCE WITH UNITED NATIONS SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAQ

SEC. 539. (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 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, 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 into its customs territory, and

(2) the export of its products to Iraq.

POW/MIA MILITARY DRAWDOWN

SEC. 540. (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 1994, as may be necessary to carry out subsection (b).

(b) Such defense articles, services and training may be provided to 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.

(d) 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, defense services, and military education and training provided under this section.

MEDITERRANEAN EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES

SEC. 541. During fiscal year 1994, the provisions of section 573(e) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1990, shall be applicable, for the period specified therein, to excess defense articles made available under sections 516 and 519 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

PRIORITY DELIVERY OF EQUIPMENT

SEC. 542. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the delivery of excess defense articles that are to be transferred on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act to NATO allies and to major non-NATO allies on the southern and southeastern flank of NATO shall be given priority to the maximum extent feasible over the delivery of such excess defense articles to other countries.

ISRAEL DRAWDOWN

SEC. 543. Section 599B(a) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1991 (as amended by Public Law 102-145, as amended, and Public Law 102-391), is further amended—

(a) by striking out "fiscal year 1993" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1994"; and

(b) by striking out "Appropriations Act, 1993" and inserting in lieu thereof "Appropriations Act, 1994".

CASH FLOW FINANCING

SEC. 544. 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.

RESCISSION

SEC. 545. Of the unexpended balances of funds (including earmarked funds) made available for fiscal years 1987 through 1993 to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $185,000,000 are rescinded.

AUTHORITIES FOR THE PEACE CORPS, THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION AND THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

SEC. 546. 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. 547. 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-HERCEGOVINA

SEC. 548. (a) Congress finds as follows:

(1) the United Nations has imposed an embargo on the transfer of arms to any country on the territory of the former Yugoslavia;

(2) the federated states of Serbia and Montenegro have a large supply of military equipment and ammunition and the Serbian forces fighting the government of Bosnia-Hercegovina have more than one thousand battle tanks, armored vehicles, and artillery pieces; and

(3) because the United Nations arms embargo is serving to sustain the military advantage of the aggressor, the United Nations should exempt the government of Bosnia-Hercegovina from its embargo.

(b) Pursuant to a lifting of the United Nations arms embargo against Bosnia-Hercegovina, the President is authorized to transfer to the government of that nation, without reimbursement, defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense of an aggregate value not to exceed $50,000,000 in fiscal year 1994: *Provided*, That the President certifies in a timely fashion to the Congress that—

(1) the transfer of such articles would assist that nation in self-defense and thereby promote the security and stability of the region; and

(2) United States allies are prepared to join in such a military assistance effort.

(c) 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.

(d) 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.

SPECIAL AUTHORITIES

SEC. 549. (a) Funds appropriated in title II of this Act that are made available for Haiti, 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-Hercegovina, 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 Cambodian organization that he determines is cooperating, tactically or strategically, with the Khmer Rouge in their military operations.

(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 with regard to the key countries in which deforestation and energy policy would make a significant contribution to global warming: *Provided*, That such assistance shall be subject to sections 116, 502B, and 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

POLICY ON TERMINATING THE ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL

SEC. 550. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) since 1948 the Arab countries have maintained a primary boycott against Israel, refusing to do business with Israel;

(2) since the early 1950s the Arab League has maintained a secondary and tertiary boycott against American and other companies that have commercial ties with Israel;

(3) the boycott seeks to coerce American firms by blacklisting those that do business with Israel and harm America's competitiveness;

(4) the United States has a longstanding policy opposing the Arab League boycott and United States law prohibits American firms from providing information to Arab countries to demonstrate compliance with the boycott;

(5) with real progress being made in the Middle East peace process and the serious confidence-building measures taken by the State of Israel, and end to the Arab boycott of Israel and of American companies that have commercial ties with Israel is long overdue and would represent a significant confidence-building measure; and

(6) in the interest of Middle East peace and free commerce, the President must take more concrete steps to press the Arab states to end their practice of blacklisting and boycotting American companies that have trade ties with Israel.

(b) POLICY.—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.

Titles I through V of this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1994".

## TITLE VI—FISCAL YEAR 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, namely:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

ASSISTANCE FOR THE NEW INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

For an additional amount for the "Assistance for the new Independent States of the former Soviet Union" and for related programs, $630,000,000, to be available upon enactment and to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $500,000,000 may be made available for a special privatization and restructuring fund: *Provided*, That the United States contribution for such fund shall not exceed one-quarter of the aggregate amount being made available for such fund by all countries: *Provided further*, That the provisions of section 498B(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall apply to funds appropriated by this paragraph.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Defense Agencies", $979,000,000, to be available upon enactment and to remain available until September 30, 1994: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense

may transfer such funds to other appropriations available to the Department of Defense for the purposes of providing assistance to the new independent states of the former Soviet Union: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer such funds to appropriations available to the Department of State and other agencies of the United States Government for the purposes of providing assistance and related programs for the new independent states of the former Soviet Union for programs that the President determines will increase the national security of the United States: *Provided further*, That the amounts transferred shall be available subject to the same terms and conditions as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the authority to make transfers pursuant to this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority of the Department of Defense.

This title may be cited as the "Supplemental Appropriations for the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union Act, 1993".

□ 1640

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. WALKER. No, Mr. Speaker, but I demand a vote on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, we cannot hear what is being said.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The vote is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 239]

AYES—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—16

de la Garza
Fields (TX)
Gephardt
Goodlatte
Henry
Hunter
Inglis
McDade
Neal (MA)
Pelosi
Pickle
Rose
Sangmeister
Swett
Thomas (WY)
Young (AK)

□ 1657

So the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WOLF. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOLF moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2295, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 49, line 16, after "Serbia", insert ", Sudan".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this motion would add the Nation of Sudan to the list of nations which are prohibited from receiving any direct aid from the United States Government. The seven nations which are on this list already are considered international pariahs—Iraq, Serbia, and Cuba for example.

This amendment will not cut off any humanitarian aid to starving people. UNICEF, Feed the Children, World Vision, and others can still conduct their humanitarian work. U.S. Government food and medical programs can still

continue to the starving people, but no direct aid may go to the Government.

Sudan has earned the right to be on this list. The Government of Sudan is torturing and killing its own people. They are denying humanitarian shipments of food to the starving and they are conducting indiscriminate high altitude bombings of villages and towns. In short, they are silently committing a genocide of an entire culture in southern Sudan.

Right now 4 million people risk starvation. In the past decade as many as 500,000 have already died.

Our own State Department has made available gruesome new evidence that the Sudanese are actively involved in slavery. Taking hundreds of women and children from their homes in the south for forced labor within Sudan or exporting them to other countries—namely Libya—to serve as slaves. This is happening today, not 100 or 200 years ago.

I urge everyone to read the July edition of Vanity Fair magazine about the horrible conditions within Sudan. Once the Government of Sudan stops these actions, we can help them.

Support this motion to recommit. Send a clear message to the Government of Sudan—stop the famine. Stop the slavery. Stop the killing.

□ 1700

This amendment would not cut off any humanitarian aid to starving people. UNICEF, Feed the Children, World Vision, and others can still conduct their humanitarian work. The U.S. Government food and medical programs can still continue aiding the starving people, but no direct aid would go to the Government.

I urge everyone to read Vanity Fair this week, which details the atrocities by the Sudanese Government. Once they change, then we can deal with the aid question and be helpful, but until that time there will be no aid.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, because the committee has had concern over the human rights situation and other atrocities in Sudan, the committee has already in its recommendations placed that country on the list of countries for which all spending must be submitted to Congress under the notification process.

However, the committee has no objection to including Sudan on the list of countries which cannot receive direct assistance. I do want to point out, however, that this does not preclude United States humanitarian assistance to people in need in southern Sudan. This assistance will not go through the Government, but through the private voluntary organizations.

With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, the committee has no objection to the gentleman's motion.

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

Mr. OBEY I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the minority concurs in the gentleman's remarks and shares his views.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 2295, back to the House with an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 49, line 16, after "Serbia", insert ", Sudan".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 309, nays 111, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 240]

YEAS—309

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burton
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dornan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Levy
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Santorum
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spratt
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Watt
Waxman
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—111

Applegate
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Becerra
Bilirakis
Bonilla
Brooks
Bunning
Buyer
Callahan
Canady
Chapman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeFazio
DeLay
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
English (OK)
Everett
Fields (LA)
Flake
Gallegly
Gekas
Goodling

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Goss | Miller (FL) | Sensenbrenner |
| Hall (TX) | Minge | Shuster |
| Hancock | Mollohan | Slattery |
| Hansen | Montgomery | Smith (MI) |
| Hayes | Moorhead | Smith (OR) |
| Hefley | Murphy | Solomon |
| Hefner | Myers | Spence |
| Herger | Neal (NC) | Stark |
| Hughes | Nussle | Stearns |
| Hutchinson | Orton | Stump |
| Hutto | Packard | Tanner |
| Inglis | Petri | Tauzin |
| Inslee | Pombo | Taylor (MS) |
| Jacobs | Poshard | Thomas (CA) |
| Johnson, Sam | Quillen | Thurman |
| Kim | Rahall | Towns |
| Klink | Roemer | Traficant |
| Lehman | Rogers | Velazquez |
| Lewis (CA) | Rohrabacher | Volkmer |
| Lewis (FL) | Roth | Walker |
| Lloyd | Rowland | Waters |
| McCandless | Sanders | Weldon |
| McKeon | Sangmeister | Whitten |
| Mfume | Sarpalius | Williams |
| Mica | Schaefer | Young (FL) |

NOT VOTING—14

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Cox | McDade | Thomas (WY) |
| de la Garza | Neal (MA) | Wheat |
| Fields (TX) | Pelosi | Woolsey |
| Henry | Pickle | Young (AK) |
| Hilliard | Swett | |

□ 1719

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Pelosi for; with Mr. Thomas of Wyoming against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, because of the memorial services in Wyoming for former Governor and U.S. Senator Milward Simpson, I was unable to cast my vote on rollcall votes 239 and 240, as the House of Representatives considered H.R. 2295, foreign operations appropriations for fiscal year 1994. Had I been present I would have voted: "aye" on rollcall No. 239 and "no" on rollcall No. 240.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to an unexpected obligation, I missed votes today. Had I been here, I would have voted against the rule for H.R. 2295, roll No. 233; present at the quorum call, roll No. 234; in favor of the committee substitute, roll No. 235; in favor of the Burton amendment as amended by the Obey substitute, roll No. 236; in favor of the Callahan amendment, roll No. 237; in favor of the Kasich amendment, roll No. 238; in favor of the committee substitute as amended, roll No. 239; and against final passage of the foreign operations appropriations, roll No. 240.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to state that I regret having not been present during the course of rollcall vote No. 240, on H.R. 2295, in which we voted on the aid package to the State of Israel. I am in favor of the above stated aid package and would have voted in favor of it, had I been present on the floor of the House. I am also in favor of the $80 million package which allocates moneys to Israel for the purpose of refugee assistance, especially the assistance to the Ethiopian Jews. I am a supporter of Israel and greatly understand the imperative of continuing the support of the United States for the great State of Israel.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as a result of personal family business, I was absent from a number of votes. Had I been here to vote, I would have voted the following way:

On Rollcall No. 233, on agreeing to House Resolution 200, the rule for H.R. 2295, the fiscal year 1994 foreign operations appropriations bill, "aye."

On Rollcall No. 235, the Obey amendment to H.R. 2295, the fiscal year 1994 foreign operations appropriations bill, "aye."

On Rollcall No. 236, the Obey substitute to the Burton amendment, "aye."

On Rollcall No. 237, the Callahan amendment to H.R. 2295, "no."

On Rollcall No. 238, the Kasich amendment to H.R. 2295, "no."

On Rollcall No. 239, the committee substitute as amended, "aye."

On Rollcall No. 240, final passage of the fiscal year 1994 foriegn operations appropriations bill, "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, because of a longstanding commitment, I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 2295, the foreign operations appropriation for fiscal year 1994. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidable detained during the last vote, and, indeed, entered the Chamber before the gavel fell but was unable to cast my vote. Had I been able to do so on the last rollcall, I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for having gotten here just as you turned the lights off. Had I been here for the vote on final passage, I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I was rushing up the steps when the vote closed. I was unable to cast my ballot. Had I been here for the vote on final passage, I would have cast a vote "aye."

## AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2295, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. OBEY, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be permitted to make technical and conforming changes, including section renumbering, during engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2295.

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

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2295, and that I may be permitted to include charts, tables, and other material.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1720

## REPORT ON H.R. 2445, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. BEVILL, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103–135) on the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana reserved all points of order on the bill.

## REPORT ON H.R. 2446, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. HEFNER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103–136) on the bill (H.R. 2446) making appropriations for military construction and family housing for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH reserved all points of order on the bill.

## TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. BEILENSON, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 201, Rept. No. 103–137), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 201

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2403) making

appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XXI are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order under clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill are waived except as follows: beginning with "Provided" on page 17, line 2, through "Code:" on line 5; beginning on page 19, line 22, through page 20, line 16; and beginning on page 62, line 22, through page 63, line 2. Where points of order are waived against only part of a paragraph, a point of order against matter in the balance of the paragraph may be applied only within the balance of the paragraph and not against the entire paragraph. It shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by a named proponent or a designee. That amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by its proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendment printed in the report are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 201 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 201?

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the House agreed to consider House Resolution 201.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary one-half hour of debate time to the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. QUILLEN, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 201 is the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2403, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for fiscal year 1994.

This is an open rule providing 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

The rule waives clause 7 of rule 21, which requires a 3-day layover for an appropriation bill after the report has been filed. The committee requested this waiver in the interest of timely consideration and in order to expedite the business of the House.

The rule also waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule 21 against all provisions of the bill, except the second proviso of section 101, which provides for cash awards and rewards for certain employees; section 108, regarding the establishment of user fees for label approval by the Federal Alcohol Administration Act; and section 527, which allows sick leave to be used for the adoption of a child. These provisions, which are legislation in an appropriations bill in violation of clause 2 of rule 21, are not covered by the waiver since the committees with jurisdiction objected to protecting them.

Where only a portion of a paragraph is protected, a point of order may lie only against the balance of the paragraph and not the entire paragraph.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also waives points of order against an amendment to be offered by Representatives SHEPHERD, FINGERHUT, TORKILDSEN, FOWLER, and LAMBERT, which would limit certain funding for former Presidents to 5 years after service as President. The amendment is debatable for 20 minutes and is not subject to amendment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the bill for which the Rules Committee has recommended this rule, H.R. 2403, provides $22.730 billion for fiscal year 1994 for the activities of the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, most of the agencies within the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, including the Federal Election Commission, the Office of Personnel Management, and the U.S. Tax Court.

Additional sums in the bill are made available which do not require congressional consideration in the annual appropriations process; the major item in this category is the payment of interest on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat, House Resolution 201 is an open rule; any germane amendment will be in order. I urge adoption of the rule so that the House can proceed to consideration of this appropriation measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, Mr. BEILENSON, has fully described the provisions of this rule, and I support it.

I do want to raise one point that concerns me. There was a great deal of discussion in the Rules Committee regarding an amendment which would limit funding for offices and staff for former Presidents, and this amendment was made in order and protected from points of order under the rule. There was also much debate on a related amendment offered by Mr. COBLE which would prohibit Secret Service protection for former Presidents after 1 year, but his amendment was not allowed. Although I don't fully agree with either of these amendments, I do think it's unfair to make one in order but not the other.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2403 appropriates more than $22.7 billion to fund the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and several independent agencies. This amount is $167 million over last year's amount, and exceeds the President's request by more than $723 million.

I think some of these funds can be substantially reduced, and this open rule will allow Members to offer amendments to reduce the total amount of spending in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting with my statement a comparative chart of open versus restrictive rules for the 95th through the 103d Congresses and a separate chart of open versus restrictive rules for the 103d Congress. I urge adoption of the rule so we can proceed with consideration of this important measure.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES—95TH–103D CONGRESSES

| Congress (years) | Total rules granted [1] | Open rules [2] | | Restrictive Rules [3] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 95th (1977–78) | 211 | 179 | 85 | 32 | 15 |
| 96th (1979–80) | 214 | 161 | 75 | 53 | 25 |
| 97th (1981–82) | 120 | 90 | 75 | 30 | 25 |
| 98th (1983–84) | 155 | 105 | 68 | 50 | 32 |
| 99th (1985–86) | 115 | 65 | 57 | 50 | 43 |
| 100th (1987–88) | 123 | 66 | 54 | 57 | 46 |
| 101st (1989–90) | 104 | 47 | 45 | 57 | 55 |
| 102d (1991–92) | 109 | 37 | 34 | 72 | 66 |

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES—95TH–103D CONGRESSES—Continued

| Congress (years) | Total rules granted [1] | Open rules [2] | | Restrictive Rules [3] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 103d (1993–94) | 23 | 6 | 26 | 17 | 74 |

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bill which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rule, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities, 95th–102nd Congresses; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103rd Congress, through June 9, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES—103D CONGRESS

| Rule number and date reported | Rule type | Bill number and subject | Amendments submitted | Amendments allowed | Disposition of rule and date |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H. Res. 58—Feb. 2, 1993 | MC | H.R. 1: Family and medical leave | 30 (D–5; R–25) | 3 (D–0; R–3) | PQ: 246–176 A: 259–164 (2/3/93) |
| H. Res. 59—Feb. 3, 1993 | MC | H.R. 2: National voter registration act | 19 (D–1; R–18) | 1 (D–0; R–1) | PQ: 248–171 A: 249–170 (2/4/93) |
| H. Res. 103—Feb. 23, 1993 | C | H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation | 7 (D–2; R–5) | 0 (D–0; R–0) | PQ: 243–172 A: 237–178 (2/24/93) |
| H. Res. 106—Mar. 2, 1993 | MC | H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments | 9 (D–1; R–8) | 3 (D–10; R–3) | PQ: 248–166 A: 249–163 (3/3/93) |
| H. Res. 119—Mar. 9, 1993 | MC | H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993 | 13 (D–4; R–9) | 8 (D–3; R–5) | PQ: 247–170 A: 248–170 (3/10/93) |
| H. Res. 132—Mar. 17, 1993 | MC | H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental approps. | 37 (D–8; R–29) | 1 (not submitted) D–1; R–0) | A: 240–185 (3/18/93) |
| H. Res. 133—Mar. 17, 1993 | MC | H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution | 14 (D–2; R–12) | 4 (1–D not submitted) D–2; R–2) | PQ: 250–172 A: 251–172 (3/18/93) |
| H. Res. 138—Mar. 23, 1993 | MC | H.R. 670: Family planning amendments | 20 (D–8; R–12) | 9 (D–4; R–5) | PQ: 252–164 A: 247–169 (3/24/93) |
| H. Res. 147—Mar. 31, 1993 | C | H.R. 1430: Increase public debt limit | 6 (D–1; R–5) | 0 (D–0; R–0) | PQ: 244–168 A: 242–170 (4/1/93) |
| H. Res. 149—Apr. 1, 1993 | MC | H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993. | 8 (D–1; R–7) | 3 (D–1; R–2) | A: 212–208 (4/28/93) |
| H. Res. 164—May 4, 1993 | O | H.R. 820: Natl. Competitiveness Act | N/A | N/A | A: Voice Vote (5/5/93) |
| H. Res. 171—May 18, 1993 | O | H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993 | N/A | N/A | A: Voice Vote (5/20/93) |
| H. Res. 172—May 18, 1993 | O | H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act | N/A | N/A | A: 308–0 (5/24/93) |
| H. Res. 173—May 18, 1993 | MC | S.J. Res. 45: U.S. forces in Somalia | 6 (D–1; R–5) | 6 (D–1; R–5) | A: Voice Vote (5/20/93) |
| H. Res. 183—May 25, 1993 | O | H.R. 2244: 2d supplemental approps | N/A | N/A | A: 251–174 (5/26/93) |
| H. Res. 186—May 27, 1993 | MC | H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget reconciliation | 51 (D–19; R–32) | 8 (D–7; R–1) | PQ: 252–178 A: 236–194 (5/27/93) |
| H. Res. 192—June 9, 1993 | MC | H.R. 2348: Leg. branch appropriations | 50 (D–6; R–44) | 6 (D–3; R–3) | PQ: 240–177 A: 226–185 (6/10/93) |
| H. Res. 193—June 11, 1993 | O | H.R. 2200: NASA authorization | N/A | N/A | A: Voice Vote (06/14/93) |
| H. Res. 195—June 14, 1993 | MC | H.R. 5: Striker replacement | 7 (D–4; R–3) | 2 (D–1; R–1) | A: 244–176 (06/15/93) |
| H. Res. 197—June 15, 1993 | MO | H.R. 2333: State Dept H.R. 2404: Foreign Aid. | 53 (D–20; R–33) | 27 (D–12; R–15) | A: 294–129 (6/16/93) |
| H. Res. 199—June 16, 1993 | C | H.R. 1876: Ext. of "Fast Track" | | | |
| H. Res. 200—June 16, 1993 | MC | H.R. 2295: For. Ops. Appropriations | 33 (D–11; R–22) | 5 (D–1; R–4) | A: 2633–160 (6/17/93) |
| H. Res. June 17, 1993 | O | H.R. 2403: Treasury-Postal Approps | | | |

Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous Question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, if pure parliamentary precedent were our guide, we would not be having this discussion today about a rule for the Treasury/Postal appropriations bill. Traditionally appropriations bills come to the floor without a rule, open to spending cut amendments and vulnerable to points of order in places where House rules are not upheld. So far this year we have abandoned tradition and dealt with 2 of the 13 appropriations bills under restrictive rules. Many Members complained about this heavy-handedness because we strenuously oppose efforts by the House leadership to shut Members out of the process and predetermine the outcome of the legislative process.

So today, as we take up the third of this year's spending bills, I rise to commend the leadership for moving this House back toward the normal procedures of openness and fair play. Today we will consider the Treasury/Postal spending bill under an open rule, allowing all Members the same chance to present amendments to cut spending from this bill. That is good news and I hope it signals more openness in the weeks and months to come.

It should be noted that the rule we have today includes a patchwork of waivers of House rules for certain portions of this bill that include unauthorized appropriations or legislative language, which normally are not allowed in appropriations bills. While some might argue that we should not be waiving House rules, my main concern is that if we are going to waive the rules we should do so uniformly and afford all Members an equal chance to make changes to this bill. For example, we provided the needed waivers so that four freshmen could offer an amendment to place a limit on taxpayer support for official expenses of former Presidents, which I know many of us support.

However, a similar waiver was not provided to allow Mr. SMITH of Texas the chance to offer his amendment to set aside 5 percent of this bill for deficit reduction, a proposal that enjoys broad support among Members. It is the inconsistent application of House rules that I find troubling. Of course, I also oppose in principle the waiver in this rule of the requirement that Members have 3 days to review the bill before voting on it. I just do not think we are in that much of a hurry that we could not take the few extra days, especially on a bill that seeks to spend almost $23 billion.

Again I have to ask, what's the rush? Despite these concerns, this rule does show progress toward a more open House. For that reason I hope my colleagues will support it.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. It is a relatively open rule, as rules go. I know I have often opposed rules that are anything less than open, but I believe this rule we have today is acceptable.

Members are being permitted to offer virtually any amendment they desire to strike items or cut funding in the bill. Some of those amendments I will be supporting. The majority on the subcommittee has been quite flexible in meeting the requests and concerns of the minority, and I believe that spirit of cooperation is reflected in the rule requested and approved by the Rules Committee for consideration of H.R. 2403.

I urge my colleagues' support for the rule.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] for his support for the rule, and I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for his fairly kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Pursuant to House Resolution 201 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. 2403.

□ 1735

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. 2403) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes with Mr. STUDDS 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 Maryland [Mr. HOYER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], one of our most distinguished Members of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third appropriation bill for fiscal year 1994 to come before the House. I want to commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the chairman of this subcommittee, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], the ranking minority member on the subcommittee. These are two of the ablest members on our committee and two of the ablest Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important bill. It provides for several law enforcement and other important Government agencies. All of the 11 members composing the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, like the chairman and ranking minority member, have done a good job developing this important bill. I want to commend all of them.

Mr. Chairman, we have an excellent staff on this subcommittee as we do on all 13 of our subcommittees. They have also contributed to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, next week we have seven full committee markups scheduled on the Committee on Appropriations. We are continuing to move our appropriations bills to the floor for consideration prior to the Fourth of July work period. Members of the committee from both sides of the aisle have helped me as chairman and helped our committee, and I want all of you to know that we appreciate it.

I want to commend the chairman of this subcommittee and its ranking member and all of the other subcommittee members for a job well done.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

The budget request for the Treasury, Postal Service bill was for $11.249 billion in discretionary budget authority and $11.590 billion in outlays. That request was a reduction of $34 million below 1993 enacted in budget authority and a reduction of $385 million—or almost 3 percent—below 1993 enacted in outlays. The President proposed almost no program increases—the only exception was IRS—and a reduction of 3 percent in all administrative expenses. In addition the President proposed a personnel reduction in almost all accounts of 2 percent.

The bill before you is within the 602(b) allocation in both discretionary budget authority and outlays. The proposed bill is almost the same as the actual 1993 appropriation in discretionary budget authority and is actually $456 million below the actual 1993 outlays. It does not fund all of the agencies at the levels that I would like to see them funded. But Congress needs to show the American people that we can control spending and that we can do it in a responsible way.

I believe that by establishing a system of performance management, and by establishing and refining programs to cut out waste, fraud, and abuse we can make those reductions and at the same time increase the productivity of our agencies. In the report, I have proposed actions which will set in motion a basic reform of Government. I will not elaborate on them now but I recommend that each of you read this report carefully.

I will now briefly summarize the bill by title. We are recommending an additional $4 million to Customs and $2 million to ATF above the President's budget to get them back to the 1993 level. We are recommending reducing the Internal Revenue Service Tax Law Enforcement by $35 million and tax systems modernization [TSM] program in IRS by $85 million. We have made those reductions to TSM projects which will not have productivity savings in 1994. The committee has funded all those TSM projects which had immediate productivity increases. I reluctantly reduced IRS because I know the important function they perform in deficit reduction.

The Postal Service is fully funded at the President's budget request. The reconciliation bill contains a major reform in revenue forgone which I believe to be a carefully crafted compromise. The appropriation contained in this bill is consistent with that compromise.

In the Executive Office of the President, the committee has proposed funding all the accounts at the level proposed by the President. The level proposed by the President and recommended by the committee represents a $10.7 million—9.56 percent—reduction in funding and a personnel reduction of 350—25.1 percent. Except for OMB, this committee has almost fully funded the Executive Office for all of the past 12 years. I personally voted against the cuts in the Executive Office on the floor last year when the polls indicated that President Bush was going to be reelected. I really believe that it is important for a President—Republican or Democrat—to have adequate staffing. The current administration has committed to reducing the total personnel resources available to the Executive Office of the President and has chosen to reduce both the number of FTE's and the number of detailees to the Executive Office of the President. I emphasize that the President is proposing real reductions in the Executive Office in 1994 below 1993 levels. For details of that reduction I would like to refer you to page 43 of the report.

In GSA, the committee recommends reducing all the individual court projects by 10 percent. We can do this by making the Federal courts more cost conscious in the design of their buildings. Mr. VISCLOSKY, the vice chairman of the subcommittee has been a real leader in this effort and has often expressed concern about the courts building program. The courts need to be more cost conscious about courtrooms and the lack of restraint on the part of many judges. The committee has included report language which expresses that concern.

The committee has also recommended eliminating the appropriation for the administrative conference of the United States and has reduced funding for the tax court by $1.7 million.

In title 6, General Provisions, the committee has continued the mandatory use language for FTS2000. Chairmen BROOKS, CONYERS, and SABO as well as GSA and OMB recommended this language be continued.

Again, I urge you to read and review the report. You will see a lot of report language about how we on this subcommittee can better review the agencies we have under our jurisdiction. Performance management is an important management tool that both we and the agencies need to use to more effectively manage Government and ensure effectiveness. I will not go into a lot of detail on this and many other principles because it deals in a very nonpartisan way with good Government issues that all Members can agree on.

I commend the ranking minority member, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, for the job

that he has done, and I appreciate the conscientious and faithful service of all the members of the subcommittee—Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. OLVER, Chairman BEVILL, Chairman SABO, Chairman NATCHER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill which provides a level of funding which will allow most agencies to operate at about the fiscal year 1993 level of operations. I urge the support of all Members.

□ 1740

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, let me first say it has been a great pleasure to work with my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] in my first year as ranking member on the subcommittee and his first year as chairman of our subcommittee. We have had an interesting year. We have had an exciting year so far. I really want to compliment the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] on doing his absolute level best to work with and to meet the concerns of the minority throughout this whole process. As a result, I think we have reached a degree of cooperation that might be a bit unusual in this body, but this has been a real pleasure to work on this bill.

I also would be remiss if I did not compliment the staff people on both sides of the aisle. They have worked together as a team, and as a result I think we have put together a pretty good package, with a few exceptions.

I must admit that we have faced some challenges in the past few weeks, but again I would like to commend the chairman and all the members on the subcommittee for working, very, very hard to accommodate the minority and all the members of the subcommittee both in the hearings and on the issues that were important to each of us.

Again, we have a tough year as far as meeting the funding needs in our bill. There may be a few areas where we could cut a little more, but I do commend the chairman for working to streamline and eliminate the unnecessary programs. As has been stated, we are below the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation by $35 million in budget authority and $3 million below in outlays. I think any way you describe it, this is a very tight bill.

I would also note that we are only $1 million over the fiscal year 1993 enacted level in budget authority and $456 million below fiscal year 1993 outlays. Around $200 million of that cut is in the form of technical cuts.

We are also $71.1 million below the request, and I would recommend that every Member of this body read the general statement that is included in the beginning of the report for issues such as end-of-the-year funding and traveling expenses are discussed, agencies are cautioned to review these areas.

I commend the chairman for this as well, because I think it sends a message that we are serious about doing something with the budget.

There is probably only one major area where I have a little heartburn, and that is in funding the Executive Office of the President. The Congress has usually respected and granted the President's request for funding for his offices, as the chairman pointed out, but this year has been a little unusual because there have been some unusual goings-on at the White House, particularly with respect to staffing and expenditures.

□ 1750

The President stated a goal to reduce White House staff by 25 percent. The best figure we can come up with shows only by 11.6 percent for staff in fiscal year 1994. In addition, as my colleagues know, the White House has requested a rather substantial supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1993. I believe several amendments will be offered to help the President achieve his stated goals for cuts and streamlining.

I might also add at this point, in the spirit of cooperation, that it has existed throughout our whole committee activities that disagreements that we have had have been purely on philosophy and, possibly, in interpretation on a point or two, and that is really what this body is all about.

There has been an ongoing GAO audit, at the request of the minority members of the subcommittee, of personnel records in the White House due to a reportedly large number of backdated payroll actions. We received several reports about unusual payroll transactions at the White House, and asked GAO to investigate. GAO is now nearing the completion of its investigation and has put together a substantial amount of information. Payroll backdating is a highly unusual practice which, sources tell us, has not occurred in past administrations. Therefore, I intend to offer an amendment later to reduce White House salaries and expenses accordingly.

In addition to payroll backdating, there are questions about the White House travel office firings and hiring of the President's cousin, White House influence in bringing in the FBI and the IRS, and even the whirlpool being installed in the Vice President's mansion. As a result I think there is enough doubt about enough different actions being taken by the White House that we would be negligent not to ask some questions, particularly as we can expect to be asked, once again, to approve a supplemental for the White House. We held hearings on the White House and had them come back before the subcommittee a second time; however, I am not entirely satisfied with the response we got to our questions. I don't think we can just let the matter drop.

I also am very concerned about language being deleted from the bill this year which prohibited Federal taxpayer financing of abortions under Federal employees health benefit plans. This language has been in the bill for a decade, and it is unfortunate, because surveys show that the majority of Americans oppose taxpayer financing of abortions. Unfortunately, several problems prevent us from addressing this issue today, but I am hopeful we can address this matter at a later date.

Finally, let me emphasize that the chairman and I have few other major differences in this bill with respect to policies; rather, I think our major differences lie in the dollar figures in some programs, and again, I thank my chairman for his cooperation. He did an excellent job working with us, as I mentioned earlier, and it has really been encouraging, I think, to work in a really bipartisan manner, to put a package together, and through the amendment process we can address some of those differences that we have.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN], a Member who does such an outstanding job on the committee.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Subcommittee on Treasury-Postal Service-General Government I want to say, first of all, that I am pleased, and I want to say how proud I am, to have had the opportunity to work with our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], and especially since this is his first term as chairman of that subcommittee, I am able to be a part of the goings-on and the activities of this very outstanding subcommittee. It is also a great pleasure to work with my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], and, as has already been indicated by the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Maryland, we have reached a bipartisan consensus on this committee, and I am very proud to say that we voted our bill out of subcommittee this year unanimously, and, while we might have disagreed on several rather insignificant matters, for the most part we have met our responsibilities, and we have acted in a bipartisan manner.

I would also like to commend the staff, both the majority and minority staff, and let them know how much I appreciate the help that they have given me in my initial term on this subcommittee. I look forward to serving with them for many years to come.

As has been noted, Mr. Chairman, one of the outstanding features about

this bill is that we have met our responsibilities while cutting some $456 million away from the total from the previous year. In years of a tight budget this has been extremely tough, and it was cause for a lot of soul searching done among us, but we have met our responsibilities and have done it well.

Let me briefly outline some of the responsibilities of this very important subcommittee.

First of all, in setting the appropriations for the Department of the Treasury, Mr. Chairman, we need to look at some of the agencies within the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service, for example. This is the only committee in the House of Representatives where the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service has to come to the subcommittee and request something. Normally we are used to being told what to do by the IRS, but it is good to be able to, in our operation of our system of checks and balances, determine the needs of the Internal Revenue Service.

Also, when it comes to certain law enforcement agencies, as a former district attorney I am very interested in seeing that our Federal law enforcement agencies are properly funded, and we have done that for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, as well as Customs, and other departments such as the Secret Service. I think it is absolutely important that also our Federal officers and officials, law enforcement officials, be well-trained, and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center located in Georgia, on St. Simons Island in Georgia, is meeting that responsibility. This bill contains the appropriations for the salaries for their personnel, plus about $7 million in construction for additional facilities there. Virtually every Federal law enforcement official, except for the FBI and DEA agents, are trained at this facility, and it is certainly an outstanding one.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that this subcommittee has wrestled long and hard to cut, and make responsible cuts, in this budget. It has, in a bipartisan manner, achieved its goals, and I want to ask my colleagues of the Congress to look very carefully before making any additional cuts in this bill. We are proceeding under virtually an open rule, but at the same time this puts more responsibility on us, that, before we make more cuts, to look and be sure that these cuts are justified.

Again, Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure and a privilege to serve on this committee.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN] for his kind words, and I yield 2 minutes to my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] in a brief colloquy concerning the appropriation for the Cape Girardeau, MO, Federal Building and U.S. courthouse in the bill which we are currently debating. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you very much for yours and Mr. LIGHTFOOT's efforts on behalf of this appropriation. This appropriation is a critical first step in the eventual construction of a new Federal building and U.S. courthouse in Cape Girardeau.

As you know Mr. Chairman, this project was authorized by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation in the amount of $5.6 million. However, I certainly understand the tough limitation of funds that you and others on the committee have had during the deliberations this year.

Therefore, for clarification purposes only, it is my understanding that the committee has included $3.9 million for the site acquisition of a Federal office building and U.S. courthouse in Cape Girardeau, MO, and that the design funds were to be funded from GSA's design and construction activities. I believe that by doing this we are giving the General Services Administration the maximum flexibility it needs in these times of budgetary constraints.

Mr. Chairman, is that the gentleman's understanding?

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

Mr. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I say to the gentleman, "That is, indeed, my understanding, Mr. Emerson." According to the Capital Improvement Program authorized by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the money appropriated would be for site acquisition and design of a Federal building and U.S. courthouse in Cape Girardeau, MO.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] once again for their cooperation in this matter, and I am pleased to have this clarification.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and a distinguished member of our Subcommittee on Treasury-Postal Service-General Government.

□ 1800

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

Mr. Chairman, I have a colloquy to enter into with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], but before I do that, let me simply congratulate the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for an outstanding job during his first year as chairman of the subcommittee, and also congratulate the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT]. The gentlemen have very tight money targets, and have met them.

Mr. Chairman, let me also say a word about what I know may be a controversy tomorrow, and on which I know the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has very strong feelings, and that relates to amendments to the Executive budget. I might indicate to the gentleman [Mr. HOYER], as part of history, that back in my first term on Appropriations the gentleman's subcommittee had made some reductions in the Office of the President. As a new member I offered the amendment in full committee to restore those funds, which carried, because I felt very strongly that the Congress should not be interfering with the Presidential request when it comes to operating the President's Office, just as Presidents should not interject themselves into the internal operations of the House.

Mr. Chairman, that is just a very, very important issue of comity that goes between the House, the Senate, and the President, and is very important to preserve.

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

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. of course, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] knows and I agree. The gentleman was the Speaker of the Minnesota House during the time I was President of the Maryland Senate. I know one thing, that although we were the same party, I believe that the Governor ought to set his budget and the legislative body ought to set their budget as a degree of comity and a recognition of the separation of powers.

I think that is equally important at the Federal level, and both the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and I have followed that policy pretty consistently.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I think that is a very important policy.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of the hearings the committee was informed of the favorable reports FTS2000 received from the General Accounting Office and the General Services Administration following the price redetermination process in 1992. Although some telecommunications services may be available at lower cost outside FTS2000, the committee recognizes that Governmentwide savings can only be achieved if all Federal agencies are grouped together in the same contract. The committee therefore has recommended that GSA continue the mandatory use policy unless the GSA Administrator reports that the program is no longer cost-effective. Is that the chairman's understanding of the committees position?

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is correct. We held extensive hearings on

this issue in which Chairman BROOKS, Chairman CONYERS, and many other testified on FTS2000. We have included the provision requested by the President in the bill and the gentleman's understanding of the committee's position is correct.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Again I commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for a very outstanding job in a very difficult year of putting this bill together.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

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

Mr. Chairman, Nashville International Airport will soon have regularly scheduled service to the Caribbean requiring the presence of both Customs and Immigration officials. As you know, current charter flights from the area are required to land in Miami, Orlando, and several other locations for immigration and customs inspections. These landings are an inconvenience to the traveler and an added cost to the air carrier.

With the initiation of this regularly scheduled service and in anticipation of direct international service between Nashville and Europe, is it the intention of the committee that the Customs Service promptly provide sufficient resources to adequately serve those flights upon their landing in Nashville?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT] for bringing this matter to the committee's attention. I want to tell the gentleman that we have not yet had the opportunity to fully discuss this matter with Customs, which we obviously want to do, but we are hopeful that the Customs Service can in fact promptly provide sufficient personnel and resources to quickly clear incoming international passengers upon their landing in Nashville once such regularly scheduled service is approved by the Department of Transportation.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], appreciate his help, and look forward to working with the gentleman and the committee staff to implement the committee's intentions once this service is approved.

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

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

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. INSLEE) having assumed the chair, Mr. STUDDS, 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. 2403) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## AGREEMENT CONCERNING FISHERIES OFF COASTS OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102)

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-265; 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia Concerning Fisheries off the Coasts of the United States, with annex, signed at Washington on April 8, 1993. The agreement constitutes a governing international fishery agreement within the requirements of Section 201(c) of the Act.

United States fishing industry interests have urged prompt consideration of this agreement to take advantage of opportunities for seasonal cooperative fishing ventures. I recommend that the Congress give favorable consideration to this agreement at an early date.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 17, 1993.*

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA CONCERNING FISHERIES OFF THE COASTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia (hereafter referred to as "the United States" and "Latvia", respectively, or "the Parties"),

Considering their common concern for the rational management, conservation and achievement of optimum yield of fish stocks off the coasts of the United States;

Recognizing that the United States has established by Presidential Proclamation of March 10, 1983 an exclusive economic zone within 200 nautical miles of its coasts within which the United States has sovereign rights to explore, exploit, conserve and manage all fish and that the United States also has such rights over the living resources of the continental shelf appertaining to the United States and anadromous species of fish of United States origin; and

Desirous of establishing reasonable terms and conditions pertaining to fisheries of mutual concern over which the United States has sovereign rights to explore, exploit, conserve and manage;

Have agreed as follows:

* * * * *

d. the amount of fish or tonnage of catch by species contemplated for each vessel during the time such permit is in force;

e. the ocean area in which, and the season or period during which, such fishing would be conducted; and

f. such other relevant information as may be requested, including desired transshipping areas.

3. The United States shall review each application, shall determine what conditions and restrictions may be needed, and what fee will be required, and shall inform Latvia of such determinations. The United States reserves the right not to approve applications. If permit applications are disapproved, the United States authorities will inform Latvia of the reasons for such disapproval.

4. Latvia shall thereupon notify the United States of its acceptance or rejection of such conditions and restrictions and, in the case of a rejection, of its objections thereto.

5. Upon acceptance of the conditions and restrictions by Latvia and the payment of any fees, the United States shall approve the application and issue a permit for each fishing vessel of Latvia, which fishing vessel shall thereupon be authorized to fish in accordance with this Agreement and the terms and conditions set forth in the permit. Such permits shall be issued for a specific vessel and shall not be transferred.

3. "fishery" means

a. one or more stocks of fish that can be treated as a unit for purposes of conservation and management and that are identified on the basis of geographical, scientific, technical, recreational and economic characteristics; and

b. any fishing for such stocks;

4. "exclusive economic zone" means a zone contiguous to the territorial sea of the United States, the seaward boundary of which is a line drawn in such a manner that each point on it is 200 nautical miles from the baseline from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the United States is measured;

5. "fishing" means

a. the catching, taking or harvesting of fish;

b. the attempted catching, taking or harvesting of fish;

c. any other activity that can reasonably be expected to result in the catching, taking or harvesting of fish;

d. any operations at sea, including processing, directly in support of, or in preparation for, any activity described in subparagraphs a. through c. above, provided that such term does not include other legitimate uses of the high seas, including any scientific research activity;

6. "fishing vessel" means any vessel, boat, ship, or other craft that is used for, equipped to be used for, or of a type that is normally used for

a. fishing; or

b. aiding or assisting one or more vessels at sea in the performance of any activity relating to fishing, including preparation, supply, storage, refrigeration, transportation or processing; and

7. "marine mammal" means any mammal that is morphologically adapted to the marine environment, including sea otters and members of the orders Sirenia, Finnipedia, and Cetacea, or primarily inhabits the marine environment such as polar bears.

ARTICLE III

1. The United States is willing to allow access for fishing vessels of Latvia to harvest,

in accordance with terms and conditions to be established in permits issued under Article VII, that portion of the total allowable catch for a specific fishery that will not be harvested by United States fishing vessels and is determined to be available to fishing vessels of Latvia in accordance with United States law.

2. The United States shall determine each year, subject to such adjustments as may be appropriate and in accordance with United States law:

a. the total allowable catch for each fishery based on optimum yield, taking into account the best available scientific evidence, and social, economic and other relevant factors;

b. the harvesting capacity of United States fishing vessels in respect of each fishery;

c. the portion of the total allowable catch for a specific fishery to which access will be provided, on a periodic basis each year, to foreign fishing vessels; and

d. the allocation of such portion that may be made available to Latvia.

3. The United States shall determine each year the measures necessary to prevent overfishing while achieving, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from each fishery in accordance with United States law. Such measures may include, inter alia:

a. designated areas where, and periods when, fishing shall be permitted, limited, or conducted only by specified types of fishing vessels or with specified types and quantities of fishing gear;

b. limitations on the catch of fish based on area, species, size, number, weight, sex, incidental catch, total biomass or other factors;

c. limitations on the number and types of fishing vessels that may engage in fishing and/or on the number of days each vessel of the total fleet may engage in a designated area for a specified fishery;

d. requirements as to the types of gear that may, or may not, be employed; and

e. requirements designed to facilitate enforcement of such conditions and restrictions, including the maintenance of appropriate position-fixing and identification equipment.

4. The United States shall notify Latvia of the determinations provided for by this Article on a timely basis.

ARTICLE IV

In determining the portion of the surplus that may be made available to Latvia and to other countries, the Untied States will decide on the basis of the factors identified in United States law, including:

1. whether, and to what extent, such nation imposes tariff barriers or nontariff barriers on the importation, or otherwise restricts the market access, of both United States fish and fishery products, particularly fish and fishery products for which the foreign nation has requested an allocation;

2. whether, and to what extent, such nation is cooperating with the United States in both the advancement of existing and new opportunities for fisheries exports from the United States through the purchase of fishery products from United States processors and the advancement of fisheries trade through purchase of fish and fishery products from United States fishermen, particularly fish and fishery products for which the foreign nation has requested an allocation;

3. whether, and to what extent, such nation and the fishing fleets of such nation have cooperated with the United States in the enforcement of United States fishing regulations;

4. whether, and to what extent, such nation requires the fish harvested from the exclusive economic zone for its domestic consumption;

5. whether, and to what extent, such nation otherwise contributes to, or fosters the growth of, a sound and economic United States fishing industry, including minimizing gear conflicts with fishing operations of United States fishermen, and transferring harvesting or processing technology which will benefit the United States fishing industry;

6. whether, and to what extent, the fishing vessels of such nation have traditionally engaged in fishing in such fishery;

7. whether, and to what extent, such nation is cooperating with the United States in, making substantial contributions to, fishery research and the identification of fishery resources;

8. whether, and to what extent, such nation is cooperating with the United States in matters pertaining to

a. the implementation of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 46/215 of December, 1991 on Large-scale pelagic Driftnet Fishing;

b. the conservation and management of anadromous species; and

c. the conservation of the pollock resource in the central Bering Sea; and

9. such other matters as the United States deems appropriate.

ARTICLE V

Latvia shall cooperate with and assist the United States in the development of the United States fishing industry and the increase of United States fishery exports by taking such measures as facilitating the importation and sale of United States fishery products, providing information concerning technical and administrative requirements for access of United States fishery products into Latvia, providing economic data, sharing expertise, facilitating the transfer of harvesting or processing technology to the United States fishing industry, facilitating appropriate joint venture and other arrangements, informing its industry of trade and joint venture opportunities with the United States, and taking other actions as may be appropriate.

ARTICLE VI

Latvia shall take all necessary measures to ensure:

1. that nationals and vessels of Latvia refrain from fishing for living resources over which the United States has sovereign rights to explore, exploit conserve and manage except as authorized pursuant to this Agreement;

2. that all such vessels so authorized comply with the provisions of permits issued pursuant to this Agreement and applicable laws of the United States; and

3. that the total allocation referred to in Article III, paragraph 2.d. of this Agreement is not exceeded for any fishery.

ARTICLE VII

Latvia may submit an application to the United States for a permit for each fishing vessel of Latvia that wishes to engage in fishing in the exclusive economic zone pursuant to this Agreement. Such application shall be prepared and processed in accordance with the Annex, which constitutes an integral part of this Agreement. The United States may require the payment of fees for such permits and for fishing in the exclusive economic zone. While such fees shall be applied without discrimination, the fee level may vary depending upon, *inter alia*, whether, in the judgement of the United States, vessels or nationals of Latvia are harvesting United States origin anadromous species at unacceptable levels, or whether Latvia is failing to take sufficient action to benefit the conservation and development of United States fisheries. Latvia undertakes to keep the number of applications to the minimum required, in order to aid in the efficient administration of the permit program.

ARTICLE VIII

Latvia shall ensure that nationals and vessels of Latvia refrain from harassing, hunting/capturing or killing, or attempting to harass, hunt capture or kill, any marine mammal within the exclusive economic zone, except as may be otherwise provided by an international agreement respecting marine mammals to which the United States is a party, or in accordance with specific authorization for and controls on incidental taking of marine mammals established by the United States.

ARTICLE IX

Latvia shall ensure that in the conduct of the fisheries under this Agreement:

1. the authorizing permit for each vessel of Latvia is prominently displayed in the wheel house of such vessel;

2. appropriate position-fixing and identification equipment, as determined by the United States, is installed and maintained in working order on each vessel;

3. designated United States observers are permitted to board, upon request, any such fishing vessel, and shall be accorded the courtesies and accommodations provided to ship's officers while aboard such vessel, and owners, operators and crews of such vessel shall cooperate with observers in the conduct of their official duties, and, further, the United States shall be reimbursed for the costs incurred in the utilization of observers;

4. agents are appointed and maintained within the United States possessing the authority to receive and respond to any legal process issued in the United States with respect to an owner or operator of a vessel of Latvia for any cause arising out of the conduct of fishing activities for the living resources over which the United States has sovereign rights to explore, exploit, conserve and manage; and

5. all necessary measures are taken to minimize fishing gear conflicts and to ensure to prompt and adequate compensation of United States citizens for any loss, or damage to, their fishing vessels, fishing gear or catch, and resultant economic loss, that is caused by any fishing vessel of Latvia as determined by applicable United States procedures.

ARTICLE X

Latvia shall take all appropriate measures to assist the United States in the enforcement of its laws pertaining to fishing in the exclusive economic zone and to ensure that each vessel of Latvia that engages in fishing for living resources over which the United States has sovereign rights to explore, exploit, conserve and manage shall allow and assist the boarding and inspection of such vessel by any duly authorized enforcement officer of the United States and shall cooperate in such enforcement action as may be undertaken pursuant to the laws of the United States.

ARTICLE XI

1. The United States will impose appropriate penalties, in accordance with the laws of the United States, on vessels of Latvia or their owners, operators, or crews that violate the requirements of this Agreement or of any permit issued hereunder.

2. Arrested vessels and their crews shall be promptly released, subject to such reasonable bond or other security as may be determined by the court.

3. In any case arising out of fishing activities under this Agreement, the penalty for violation of fishery regulations shall not include imprisonment except in the case of enforcement related offenses such as assault on an enforcement officer or refusal to permit boarding and inspection.

4. In cases of seizure and arrest of a vessel of Latvia by the authorities of the United States, notification shall be given promptly through diplomatic channels informing Latvia of the action taken and of any penalties subsequently imposed.

ARTICLE XII

1. The United States and Latvia shall cooperate in the conduct of scientific research required for the purpose of managing and conserving living resources over which the United States has sovereign rights to explore, exploit, conserve and manage, including the compilation of the best available scientific information for management and conservation of stocks of mutual interest.

2. The Parties shall cooperate in the development of a periodic research plan on stocks of mutual concern through correspondence or meetings as appropriate, and may modify it from time to time by agreement. The agreed research plans may include, but are not limited to, the exchange of information and scientists, regularly scheduled meetings between scientists to prepare research plans and review progress, and jointly conducted research projects.

3. The conduct of agreed research during regular commercial fishing operations on board a fishing vessel of Latvia in the exclusive economic zone shall not be deemed to change the character of the vessel's activities from fishing to scientific research. Therefore, it will still be necessary to obtain a permit for the vessel in accordance with Article VII.

4. Latvia shall cooperate with the United States in the implementation of procedures for collecting and reporting biostatistical information and fisheries data, including catch and effort statistics, in accordance with procedures which will be stipulated by the United States. Latvia shall similarly provide such economic data as may be requested by the United States.

5. Latvia shall cooperate with the United States in matters pertaining to the implementation of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 46/215 of December, 1991 on Large-scale Pelagic Driftnet Fishing, the conservation and management of anadromous species, and the conservation of the pollock resource in the central Bering Sea.

ARTICLE XIII

1. The United States and Latvia shall carry out periodic bilateral consultations regarding the implementation of this Agreement and the development of further cooperation in the field of fisheries of mutual concern, including cooperation within the framework of appropriate multilateral organizations for the collection and analysis of scientific data respecting such fisheries.

2. At the request of either Party any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this agreement shall be the subject of consultations between them.

ARTICLE XIV

The United States undertakes to authorize fishing vessels of Latvia allowed to fish pursuant to this Agreement to enter ports in accordance with United States laws for the purpose of purchasing bait, supplies, or outfits, or effecting repairs, changing crews, or for such other purposes as may be authorized.

ARTICLE XV

Should the United States indicate to Latvia that nationals and vessels of the United States wish to engage in fishing in areas within the fisheries jurisdiction of Latvia, Latvia shall allow such fishing on terms not more restrictive than those established in accordance with this Agreement.

ARTICLE XVI

Nothing contained in the present Agreement shall prejudice:

1. the views of either Party with respect to the existing territorial or other jurisdiction of the coastal State for all purposes other than the conservation and management of fisheries; or,

2. any other international rights and obligations of either Party.

ARTICLE XVII

The Agreement shall apply to the territories of Latvia, and to the United States, its territories and its possessions.

ARTICLE XVIII

1. This Agreement shall enter into force on a date to be agreed upon by exchange of notes, following the completion of internal procedures of both Parties, and shall remain in force until June 1, 1995 unless extended by exchange of notes between the Parties. Notwithstanding the foregoing, either Party may terminate this Agreement after giving written notice of such termination to the other Party six months in advance.

2. At the request of either Party, this Agreement shall be subject to review by the two Parties two years after its entry into force.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, being duly authorized for this purpose, have signed this Agreement.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this eighth day of April, 1993 in the English and Latvian languages, each text being equally authentic.

For the Government of the United States of America:

_____.

For the Government of the Republic of Latvia:

_____.

ANNEX—APPLICATION AND PERMIT PROCEDURES

The following procedures shall govern the application for and issuance of annual permits authorizing vessels of Latvia to engage in fishing for living resources over which the United States has sovereign rights to explore, exploit, conserve and manage:

1. Latvia may submit an application to the competent authorities of the United States for each fishing vessel of Latvia that wishes to engage in fishing pursuant to this Agreement. Such application shall be made on forms provided by the United States for that purpose.

2. Any such application shall specify

a. the name and official number or other identification of each fishing vessel for which a permit is sought, together with the name and address of the owner and operator thereof;

b. the tonnage, capacity, speed, processing equipment, type and quantity of fishing gear, and such other information relating to the fishing characteristics of the vessel may be requested;

c. a specification of each fishery in which each vessel wishes to fish;

d. the amount of fish or tonnage of catch by species contemplated for each vessel during the time such permit is in force;

e. the ocean area in which, and the season or period during which, such fishing would be conducted; and

f. such other relevant information as may be requested, including desired transshipping areas.

3. The United States shall review each application, shall determine what conditions and restrictions may be needed, and what fee will be required, and shall inform Latvia of such determinations. The United States reserves the right not to approve applications. If permit applications are disapproved, the United States authorities will inform Latvia of the reasons for such disapproval.

4. Latvia shall thereupon notify the United States of its acceptance or rejection of such conditions and restrictions and, in the case of a rejection, of its objections thereto.

5. Upon acceptance of the conditions and restrictions by Latvia and the payment of any fees, the United States shall approve the application and issue a permit for each fishing vessel of Latvia, which fishing vessel shall thereupon be authorized to fish in accordance with this Agreement and the terms and conditions set forth in the permit. Such permits shall be issued for a specific vessel and shall not be transferred.

6. In the event Latvia notifies the United States of its objections to specific conditions and restrictions, the Parties may consult with respect thereto and Latvia may thereupon submit a revised application.

7. The procedures in this Annex may be amended by agreement through an exchange of notes between the Parties.

---

□ 1810

## SPACE STATION "FREEDOM"

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

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today my son, Joe, is attending Space Camp in Titusville, FL, which is in the 15th Congressional District. That is the district that I am privileged to represent here in the Congress.

Tomorrow morning, my son will be graduating, along with dozens and dozens of other 12-year-olds and 13-year-olds and 14-year-olds from Space Camp. I will not be there, regrettably. I will be here trying to save the space program.

Today, Joe and his compatriots are conducting a mock space mission on a mock space shuttle. Many of those who are participating in this Space Camp say they want to be astronauts. I want to make certain they have that opportunity.

Today, the President of the United States made a good decision, a decision that will help give those young people an opportunity to explore space. Today, Bill Clinton has proposed a space station that will fly in space and that I believe will also fly in the Congress. He has shown how we can reinvent an important part of government, NASA. He has shown how we can eliminate management inefficiencies and prospective cost overruns that have dragged that program down, while still maintaining the technology and the science that have been the hallmark of NASA from the beginning.

I applaud him for what he has done. I urge my colleagues to study closely and seriously the President's proposal for redesigning and building the space station for America.

What the President has proposed will make the best possible use of the technology we have already invented as part of the space station endeavor. What he has proposed will make certain that we maintain the very important international partnership that we already have with the Japanese, the Canadians, and the Europeans, who have all contributed billions of dollars to this program.

What he has proposed will help us make certain that America's space program will remain first in the world, but he will make certain also that we make the exploration of space truly an international endeavor.

Perhaps most important of all, President Clinton has shown us how we can build a real space station while also reducing the budget deficit. He has eliminated the frills. He has eliminated the management inefficiencies. He has eliminated the cost overruns. He has kept the technology. It is the technology that will make all the difference, Mr. Speaker. It is the technology that will create the jobs. It is the technology that will create the new industries. It is the technology that will create the future.

One day my son, Joe, and others, who are at that space camp now and others who will follow them, will use that technology. They will live in that space station. They will move on from there to build a permanent base on the Moon. They will move on from there to explore the solar system, the mission to Mars and beyond.

I applaud the President, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to save the space station.

## NAFTA AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am here this evening to talk about the proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement.

I'd like to focus attention on human rights, an aspect of NAFTA that should be central to any review of the agreement but which has so far been largely overlooked.

Simply put, Mexico is not a free society. And free trade does not work where people are not free.

But let us start where the debate started.

Most of the discussion thus far surrounding NAFTA and the proposed integration of the United States, Mexican, and Canadian economies has been about jobs.

### JOBS

On the jobs issue alone, I am staunchly opposed to free trade with Mexico. I do not want American jobs—Michigan jobs—the good manufacturing jobs that support families in my district—to become our No. 1 export.

You can bet your bottom dollar that is exactly what will happen if this agreement is ratified.

American jobs have already disappeared south of the border in alarming numbers. NAFTA will only accelerate this trend—and lock it in.

Why are jobs moving south? The answer is no mystery. A minimum wage of just 58 cents an hour is powerful bait to multinational corporations hungry for easy profits.

A less obvious but far more troubling question needs to be asked. It is a question that opens up a whole host of concerns about trying to merge the Mexican economy with the United States economy.

The answer to this question gets to the heart of why those who claim NAFTA will help the people of Mexico could not be more wrong.

It gets to the heart of why the Mexican Conference of Bishops last spring boldly announced their opposition to NAFTA and the heavy social costs it will impose on Mexico's people.

And the answer to this question gets at the very heart of what it means to be an American—what it means to enjoy fundamental democratic and human rights.

The question that must be asked is this: Why are Mexican wages so low?

The answer is that the government keeps them low.

These forced, low wages are just the first piece in a puzzle of systematic repression. NAFTA threatens to be the glue that locks it all together for generations to come.

### EL PACTO AND LABOR RIGHTS

An arrangement between Mexico's authoritarian President, corporate elite, and co-opted labor leaders known ominously as El Pacto has artificially held wages to one-tenth of United States wage levels—even though productivity in many firms now equals productivity here in this country. In fact, workers in Mexico have seen their real wages actually decline over the past decade.

This break in the natural link between rising productivity and rising wages is an outrage. It violates fundamental free market principles.

Mexico's labor force should demand higher wages for higher output.

But Mexico's citizens lack their basic civil liberties that Americans would use to negotiate for what they rightly deserve. We take for granted the freedom to speak without fear, the freedom to select political representatives and labor leaders, and the freedom to organize without threat of extortion, intimidation or even murder by police and other government officials.

In Mexico, on the other hand, these fundamental freedoms are routinely denied. NAFTA will only perpetuate the denial of these rights.

Let us look at Mexico's labor unions as just one case in point.

There is no such thing as good faith labor negotiations in Mexico. While the Mexican Constitution theoretically recognizes the rights of workers to organize their own unions and to go on strike, reality is another matter.

For a union to be deemed legal, it must first be recognized by the Ministry of Labor.

The Ministry, of course, only recognizes unions that are loyal to Mexico's ruling PRI party. Such co-opted unions do not go on strike against the wishes of the all powerful President and leader of PRI.

There is no appeal process for a union that is denied recognition by the Ministry.

If one of these independent unions tries to strike, the Ministry uses the fact that the union is not recognized to declare the strike illegal. The police and even the army are then called in to make arrests and restore order.

The repression does not stop there. There are controls on legal unions if they step out of line, too.

### ARRESTS AND STRIKEBREAKING

Take the case of Agapito Gonzalez, a local leader of the Union of Journeyman and Industrial Workers in Matamoros.

Gonzalez was aggressive in his press for higher wages and better conditions for workers in the Matamoros area. By 1991, Matamoros had become the most unionized town in the border zone, with the highest wages and benefits.

In January 1992, Gonzalez was on the verge of launching strikes against several plants in the region. Owners of these plants—Americans, for the most part—met with President Salinas to complain that Gonzalez' aggressive tactics were "ruining the investment climate in Matamoros."

Within days of the meeting—and 2 days before the strike deadline—Gonzalez was arrested on trumped up charges that he had evaded taxes in 1988. He was taken to Mexico City, isolated from his family and union colleagues, and was relentlessly grilled for days, without a lawyer present, by two magistrates.

The charges were ultimately dropped, but only after Gonzalez had been held for over 6 months and the strike had been broken.

These insidious methods of repression are not limited to labor disputes. Serious political opposition of any kind is simply not tolerated by Mexico's ruling party.

### ELECTION FRAUD

Election fraud is rampant throughout Mexico, and well documented.

In State elections last summer, neutral election monitors recorded 44 types of irregularities at 200 precincts in the State of Michoacan alone. Every

single complaint was immediately dismissed by the board that oversees State elections.

Guess who controls that board? If you guessed the President and the ruling party, you guessed right.

The State electoral college then convened secretly—without even informing members of the opposition party—to certify the election results.

And here is the kicker. The fraud that took place in that election was considered relatively minor by local standards.

Frankly, the Mexican system is so heavily weighted in favor of the ruling party that outright fraud usually is not even necessary. In March, President Salinas asked 30 of Mexico's wealthiest businessmen to contribute $25 million each to PRI in preparation for the 1994 election campaign.

This arrangement is perfectly legal. It is part of a campaign finance system that will permit PRI to spend $80 million or more to retain the Presidency—compared to $100 million spent in the United States by both parties in 1992.

These private contributions, by the way, come on top of millions of dollars of Government funds which are legally spent under Mexico's system to maintain the party apparatus and run election campaigns.

POLITICAL REPRESSION

Systematic fraud, graft, and false arrest are themselves intolerable in a free and just society. But political repression in Mexico goes even deeper.

Between 1988 and 1992, 52 officials of the opposition party had been killed by federal police or hired thugs according to a report in a prominent business publication called CEO magazine.

Stop and think about that for a minute. Fifty-two people murdered for nothing more than having a different point of view.

And for having the courage to stand up for it.

Some accounts say the number of unpunished political murders during that time span actually approaches 100.

A couple of years ago, Peruvian author Mario Vargas Llosa captured the essence of how dreadfully twisted the Mexican system is. I quote:

> The perfect dictatorship is * * * Mexico, because it is a camouflaged dictatorship. It may not seen to be a dictatorship, but has all the characteristics of dictatorship. The perpetuation, not of one person, but of an irremovable party, a party that allows sufficient space for criticism, provided such criticism serves to maintain the appearance of democracy, but which suppresses by all means, including the worst, whatever criticism may threaten its perpetuation in power.

Let me take a moment here to make an important distinction.

THE PEOPLE ARE NOT THE PROBLEM

The Mexican people are not the problem. They are honest, hard-working people who want and deserve the same things that families in Michigan and all across America want and deserve.

But they are suffering under a political system that keeps them impoverished in spite of their hard work.

A system that makes them suspicious of authority in spite of their own honesty.

A system that asks them to have hope for the future but then dashes that hope at every turn.

No. The Mexican people are not the problem.

The enemy is the decades of entrenchment that have corrupted a single party system, and which have allowed that corruption to poison nearly every element of public life.

And it is an enemy that can only be defeated by decades of conscientious reform. NAFTA will not cure Mexico's ills overnight. To the contrary, this NAFTA negotiated by Bush and Salinas will reward Mexico's repressionist policies and lock in a system that exploits its own people.

CORRUPT JUDICIARY

At the root of this deeply troubled system is a judiciary that operates under only the thinnest veil of independence from the President and the rest of the executive branch. In fact, the President controls the judicial system and other administrative review procedures with almost as much of an iron fist as he controls everything else in Mexican Government.

The court's ultimate check on executive power—the power to prosecute election fraud—is denied altogether in Mexico.

Here's how:

Article 41 of the Mexican Constitution does, indeed, provide for "certainty, legality, impartiality, objectivity, and professionalism in the management of elections." It classifies the right to vote as a "right of Mexican citizenship", which is distinct from an "individual right."

The Constitution then goes on to limit judicial protection only to individual rights.

The courts are therefore barred from prosecuting or even investigating allegations of electoral fraud.

Instead, the responsibility for reviewing and ruling on charges of election fraud falls on the federal election commission and tribunal. These bodies, like everything else, are controlled by the President and his ruling party.

Election fraud aside, Mexico's judicial system is poorly equipped to administer justice even in routine cases.

Judges and magistrates at virtually every level are appointed by the President. After serving a certain amount of time in office, a loyal judge is then reconfirmed for a lifetime tenure.

This reconfirmation process in and of itself leads judges to make rulings that would be seen as favorable to the ruling party, its members, and their political and economic objectives.

But because judicial pay is so low, an incentive to accept bribes is actually built into the system. Most observers, in fact, say judges are expected to accept bribes.

Such a system is distasteful enough on its face. But in a country where 50 percent of rural families and 23 percent of urban families live below the poverty line—where nearly 20 percent live in what is considered extreme poverty—a system of justice based on one's ability to pay is an absolute travesty.

Much of what I am addressing here may be considered somewhat lofty and abstract. Allow me to step back a bit from some of this rhetoric and simply list the human rights abuses that regularly occur in Mexico.

A LITANY OF HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSE

The National Human Rights Commission—which was reluctantly established in 1990 by President Salinas as the official human rights monitor—has studied 323 cases of disappearance, 736 complaints of torture, and 10,244 instances of illegal arrest or detention.

Because these numbers are official government figures, you can be sure they only begin to scratch the surface.

The list goes on and on, political imprisonment, labysmal prison conditions, repression of the labor movement, censorship, unfair trials, and murder and assassination.

These acts are not imagined. They are real, and they are documented.

And they are committed by various police organizations and rural bosses or their hired thugs, who are often off-duty or retired members of the police or military. These groups have established a reign of violent corruption that is often ignored and sometimes explicitly protected by low-level state and federal officials.

I met recently with a woman named Marieclaire Acosta. She is a founder and president of the Mexican Commission for the Defense and Promotion of Human Rights—a non-government group set up to monitor the government's supposed human rights efforts.

She provided me with a report that details how the political and judicial system in Mexico collude to keep most human rights abusers immune from punishment.

BRINGING IT ALL TOGETHER

Let us pause for a moment and recap where we have been. I began my remarks by firmly declaring my opposition to NAFTA, and then moved on to a discussion of jobs and wages. I finally wound up talking about election fraud and judicial corruption.

This brief quote of opposition to NAFTA, written by economist Sheldon Friedman, paints the whole picture and brings it all together:

> Closer integration between the United States and Mexican economies is likely, with or without a NAFTA. What is neither inevitable nor desirable is economic integration based on an international division of labor in which Mexico supplies cheap labor and lax

enforcement of health, safety, and environmental standards—the United States supplies the consumer market—multinational corporations derive the profit—and US workers face further wage cuts and the loss of their jobs.

For Mexican workers, the benefits are doubtful. Any attempt to raise their abysmal wages will lead to complaints by multinational employers, threats of capital flight to even lower-wage countries and, if recent history is any guide, a repressive Mexican government reaction. The Mexican and border environments will continue to be despoiled by corporate polluters. Mexican workers will continue to be subjected to toxic exposures which would be illegal in the United States.

Even the staunchest of free trade advocates can understand this plain fact: Free trade doesn't work when one of the partners has a society that is not free. Free trade with Mexico won't work because Mexico isn't free. It's as simple as that.

DOING BUSINESS IN MEXICO

An article in the November 1992 issue of World Trade magazine recounts the story of Jack Andrews, an export businessman from Salt Lake City.

In 1984, he found himself in a car chase on a dusty Mexican road. Andrews had no idea why he was being chased, but when he saw that the passenger in the car chasing him was brandishing a machine gun, he did not stop to find out.

Andrews and his partner narrowly escaped and made their way to the U.S. border. At Customs, they reported the incident. The local sheriff told Andrews the men chasing them were federales—Mexican federal police.

Andrews immediately knew they were after his briefcase, which contained photographs and original contracts that documented his claims against a Mexican company that had backed out of a $4 million deal.

Four of the six defendants in the Andrews case settled out of court. The key player, the Mexican Coffee Institute, was named in a 1991 default judgment in U.S. district court in California. But could Andrews collect? Of course not.

Disgruntled traders like Andrews warn that American exporters stand to lose their shirts because of widespread corruption and the lack of a reliable Mexican court system in which to address commercial disputes.

And Andrews is not alone. Thousands of small and midsize exporters have written off billions of dollars of unrecovered claims against Mexican business entities over the past 10 years.

WHERE JUSTICE IS DENIED

In another time, for other reasons, the great emancipation orator Frederick Douglass spoke words that proponents of NAFTA would be wise to heed today.

Even those who are not moved by the plight of their brothers and sisters in Mexico can at least understand the threat that corruption and repression represent.

Douglass said:

Where justice is denied, where poverty is enforced, where ignorance prevails, and where any one class is made to feel that society is an organized conspiracy to oppress, rob, and degrade them, neither persons nor property will be safe.

Justice is denied in Mexico.

Poverty is enforced by El Pacto.

The political system is organized to oppress the people.

Persons and property are not safe in Mexico.

There are those who claim that Mexico's stability depends on NAFTA.

They are dead wrong.

To the contary, NAFTA institutionalizes and codifies the relationship of injustice that is crippling Mexico today.

Shortly before he was killed—presumably caught in the cross-fire of a gun battle between two drug gangs, though an investigation of the real circumstances continues—Cardinal Juan Jesus Posadas Ocampo spoke out against NAFTA and said that Mexico was becoming a country of "the very few rich and the very many poor."

NAFTA will benefit a few at the expense of many.

That goes for both sides of the border.

Even those who first believe they will benefit should think twice about what it means to do business in a society that is not free—to forge relationships in a society where there is no accountability.

Frederick Douglass' words still ring true today. And they leave us no choice but to reject NAFTA.

□ 1830

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

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished majority whip for yielding even though he is finished. I just wanted to rise to join our distinguished whip. I think his remarks are most pertinent.

I have been most concerned because probably the real locomotive driving this so-called NAFTA is the finance section. That is not even mentioned. And if it is adopted without even having a review, we will then be allowing some of the largest banks where Congress has not authorized certain practices and actions to do this through their affiliates that will be permitted under this agreement. There has been no discussion. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

This agreement was drafted in secret. In fact, after it was announced, after the signatures by Presidents Bush and Salinas, they embargoed it. We could not get ahold of a copy of it for a month.

So I wanted to compliment our whip and to say that I am with you in the opposition to this so-called agreement.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague. I want my colleague to know that when he took the floor to unveil the financial institution cloak of this I was listening to him intently that evening and followed his remarks, and I thank him for his leadership on this.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BONIOR. There are many important side issues to NAFTA that really need to be looked at in the remaining time we have before we decide this, and I beg my colleagues to come to the well on the floor in special orders and debate this issue, because I am very fearful for the workers in Mexico and the United States.

□ 1840

Mr. GONZALEZ. Well, I thank the gentleman very much. He can be assured of my support.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman.

## VACATING 60-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER AND GRANTING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my request for a 60-minute special order to address the House on today be vacated and, in lieu thereof, that I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes on today.

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

There was no objection.

## INTRODUCTION OF THE EQUITABLE ESCHEATMENT ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Equitable Escheatment Act of 1993. This important legislation will restore fairness to the Federal rules governing competing claims by States to abandon intangible personal property. I am pleased to be joined in this legislation by Congressman JIM LEACH, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. This is truly a bipartisan effort to establish an equitable rule of escheatment for these unclaimed funds.

By way of background, I should explain this long established concept of escheatment. Escheat at feudal law was the right of the lord of a fee, more commonly thought of as an estate, to reenter upon the fee when it became vacant by the extinction of the blood, or descendants, of the tenant. This extinction might be either per defectum sanguinis or else per delictum tenentis,

where the course of descent was broken by the corruption of the blood of the tenant.

Ordinarily, this concept is applied to an estate in land, but the term is applicable to any kind of inheritance, corporeal or incorporeal.

The word "escheat," in this country, merely indicates the right of a State as sovereign to take custody of or assume title to abandoned personal property. This process is also known as bona vacantia.

The estates which are the subject of the Equitable Escheatment Act of 1993, are the securities distributions held by banks and other financial intermediaries for the accounts of customers. These distributions, usually dividends and interest, are unclaimed by their owners and the owner is unknown to the intermediary. While only .02 percent of all distributions remain unclaimed, the actual dollar amount subject to escheatment is very substantial.

The securities generating the distributions are either State or local government bonds, or publicly traded debt and equity securities of private corporations, such as IBM or General Motors.

For years the State of New York has been seizing unclaimed securities distributions, claiming that the funds should escheat to New York without regard to the owner's last known address or the intermediary's State of incorporation. From 1985 to 1991 alone, the State of New York seized more than $630 million of unclaimed dividend and interest payments.

Delaware filed suit against New York in the U.S. Supreme Court, claiming that the funds were wrongfully escheated. The other 47 States and the District of Columbia were then granted permission to intervene as plaintiffs in the lawsuit. The Court appointed a special master to hear the case.

After determining the facts of the case and hearing all arguments, the special master concluded that the unclaimed funds should escheat to the State in which the securities issuer's principal executive offices are located. The special master found that this would have resulted in the most equitable distribution of the escheated funds.

In other words, the unclaimed funds would be returned to the State in which they originated. With respect to State and local bonds, the practice of taxpayer funds of one State escheating to the treasury of another State would end. And with respect to private securities, the fruits of one State's efforts to generate local economic gain would no longer be usurped by another State.

However, the wisdom of the special master was not shared by the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court overruled the recommendation of the special master in this case of Delaware versus New York, and ruled that the unclaimed funds would escheat to the State of incorporation of the financial intermediary holding the funds. This opinion would unfairly result in a large windfall for the States of Delaware and New York, since most financial intermediaries are incorporated in those States.

The Supreme Court stated that it felt constrained by a 1965 precedent, and invited the aggrieved States to seek corrective legislation. The Court reminded the parties of a 1974 law overturning another of its escheat decisions.

The Court stated that:

> If the states are dissatisfied with the outcome of a particular case, they may air their grievances before Congress. That body may reallocate abandoned property among the states without regard to this Court's interstate escheat rules. Congress overrode Pennsylvania versus New York by passing a specific statute concerning abandoned money orders and traveler's checks, and it may ultimately settle this dispute through similar legislation.

The Court was referring to provisions contained in a 1974 banking law passed by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Those provisions were also adopted in order to establish a more equitable distribution of unclaimed funds.

The Equitable Escheatment Act of 1993 would continue that tradition of maintaining fair and equitable treatment of competing State claims to abandoned funds.

Fairness dictates that unclaimed funds be returned to the State in which they originated. Taxpayer funds of one State should not escheat to the treasury of another State, and the fruits of one State's efforts to generate local economic gain should not be usurped by another State. I urge all Members to support this legislation.

## WATERGATE AND THE GREEK CONNECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, today is the 21st anniversary of the Watergate break-in which brought down President Richard Nixon, the first President in history forced to resign from office. The real motive for the Watergate break-in has long been shrouded in secrecy and confusion

Prof. Stanley I. Kutler, a distinguished professor of history and law at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, has written a fascinating book about Watergate which seeks forth a compelling theory. The book is titled "The Wars of Watergate". In his close to 700 pages, Professor Kutler does not cite a single anonymous source. In short, it is a fully documented book. In this book, Professor Kutler details the Greek Connection theory for the Watergate break-in. According to Kutler, "Significantly, the 'Greek Connection' theory of Watergate caused the most anxiety for the longest period of time for the Nixon administration, and the agencies that served it."

In 1974, I was a member of the House Judiciary Committee which deliberated and finally voted the articles of impeachment of President Nixon because of the Watergate crimes. At the same time, between 1967 and 1974, I was chairman of the U.S. Committee for Democracy in Greece during the tragic years the Greek people suffered under the cruel military dictatorship of the Colonels.

During that period, I met the Greek journalist, Elias P. Demetracopoulos, who had escaped from Greece after the military coup. We worked together to seek a change in American policy, which supported the military dictatorship. His efforts, which were those of a true Greek patriot, were an important part of the campaign here in America that sent a message of hope to the suffering people of Greece. Mr. Demetracopoulos is a central figure in the Greek Connection theory set forth in Professor Kutler's book.

In brief, Mr. Demetracopoulos in October 1968, briefed and provided proof to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Lawrence O'Brien, that the Greek dictatorship, through its intelligence agency, KYP—which had been founded and subsequently subsidized by the CIA—transferred three cash payments totaling $549,000 to the Nixon campaign fund in 1968. The conduit was Thomas Pappas, a prominent Greek-American businessman with close links to the CIA, the Colonels, and the Nixon campaign. This transaction was not only a violation of Federal law which prohibits federal governments from contributing to Presidential campaigns, but also was a significant violation of the CIA's founding charter which prohibits any intervention in U.S. domestic affairs.

If this disclosure had been known to the American people in 1968, candidate Nixon may well not have won the very close race with Hubert Humphrey, and consequently Watergate would never had happened. The break-in in 1972, according to Kutler's interpretation, was designed first to discover and then eliminate or reduce the risk that the Democrats would use the intelligence obtained in 1968.

In my judgment, the Greek Connection theory for the Watergate break-in is the most damaging for Richard Nixon because it tarnishes his foreign policy image. Nixon was among the strongest and most shameless defenders of the Greek military dictatorship. If the Greek Connection theory is indeed correct, it would appear, ironically, that Nixon paid for his defense of the Greek Junta with his Presidency. No less an authority than the former Director of the CIA, Richard Helms, believes that Kutler's book on Watergate is by far the best book on the subject.

Mr. Demetracopoulos has paid a very high price for passing his intelligence to Larry O'Brien. The FBI thoroughly and repeatedly investigated Mr. Demetracopoulos for a period of 10 years at a cost of uncounted thousands of dollars to American taxpayers. In 1983, as chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, which has oversight authority over the FBI, I asked Judge Webster, then its Director, to clear Mr. Demetracopoulos of any wrongdoing. This he

did in 1984. Earlier, the CIA at last acknowledged a finding of no derogatory information concerning Mr. Demetracopoulos. I possess the documents of the FBI and the CIA on this matter.

I was delighted to learn recently that my FBI correspondence with Judge Webster concerning the clearance of Mr. Demetracopoulos, which provided the exact dates of his FBI investigations, contributed significantly, according to Professor Kulter, in enabling him to develop his theory concerning the Greek Connection in the Watergate break-in.

I am even more delighted to bring to the attention of my colleagues the story of Elias P. Demetracopoulos, a tenacious seeker of the truth, who persevered in his quest for justice in spite of the powers that were brought to bear in the effort to harass him into silence and to discredit him. His devotion to democracy and to the truth is truly inspirational.

## IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 111, URGING THE UNITED STATES TO SIGN AND RATIFY THE PROTOCOLS OF THE SOUTH PACIFIC NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 111, a resolution I introduced days ago that urges the administration to sign and ratify the protocols of the South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone [SPNFZ] Treaty, also known as the Treaty of Rarotonga since it was signed by the leaders of the Pacific nations on the Island of Rarotonga, Cook Islands.

With ratification of the Treaty of Rarotonga by eight countries in December 1986, the nations of the South Pacific have created a nuclear-free zone in the region to combat the specter of nuclear proliferation.

I am proud to have introduced this measure that symbolizes America's sensitivity on this issue of tremendous concern to the peoples of the South Pacific. I also want to express my deepest appreciation to the original cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 111 for their support: The Honorable GARY ACKERMAN, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia-Pacific Affairs; the Honorable HOWARD BERMAN, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Operations; the Honorable RONALD DELLUMS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; the Honorable CONNIE MORELLA, chairwoman of the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus; the Honorable JIM MCDERMOTT, secretary-treasury of the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus; the Honorable MICHAEL KOPETSKI and the Honorable PETE STARK, House leaders in the fight to stop nuclear proliferation; the Honorable MATTHEW MARTINEZ, member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and chairman of the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Human Resources; and the Honorable NEIL ABERCROMBIE and the Honorable PATSY MINK, the distinguished delegation from the great State in the Pacific, Hawaii. I submit the statements of my colleagues for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, in August 1989, my colleagues, former House Asia-Pacific Affairs Chairman Stephen Solarz, Representatives ROBERT DORNAN, and I traveled to the South Pacific, meeting with the leaders of the island nations to discuss pressing concerns of the region and America's role in addressing those needs.

Next to the threat of uncontrolled drift net fishing in the South Pacific by foreign fleets, foremost in the minds of these island leaders was our country's lack of support for the Treaty of Rarotonga. With the cessation of drift net fishing in the South Pacific, the failure of the United States to join the SPNFZ Treaty has become the most crucial issue in the region.

The Treaty of Rarotonga constitutes a symbol for the peoples of the South Pacific, expressing their high level of concern regarding nuclear weapons and the possibility of a nuclear holocaust in the region. By refusing to sign the treaty's protocols, while the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China have done so, the United States is increasingly portrayed as being insensitive to the needs and desires of its allies in the South Pacific.

If there were good and valid reasons behind our country's failure to support their friends in the Pacific on this matter of vital importance to them, perhaps I could understand. But, after lengthy review and analysis, it is clear that the Treaty of Rarotonga and its protocols would not undermine U.S. security practices or military operations in the South Pacific whatsoever. Past administrations while testifying before Congress on the SPNFZ Treaty have conceded this point.

This is reflective of the fact that our allies carefully drafted the document at every stage to accommodate U.S. interests. Provisions in the treaty, for example, specifically protect our Nation's right of air and sea passage through the treaty zone by American planes and ships carrying nuclear weapons.

Moreover, we would not be setting precedent by signing the nuclear-free protocols of the Treaty of Rarotonga. That ground was broken decades ago when the United States signed and ratified the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, a document substantially identical to the Treaty of Rarotonga protocols. The United States is also a signatory to the nuclear free zone prohibitions contained in the Antarctic Treaty, the Seabed Arms Control Treaty and the Treaty on Principles for Outer Space Exploration. Furthermore, our great Nation has supported the possible formation of nuclear free zones in the South Asia subcontinent, the Middle East and Africa.

The nations of the South Pacific rightfully ask why we have demonstrated concern for the threat of nuclear devastation to Latin Americans and the inhabitants of Antarctica, the sea floor and outer space—yet we refuse to show such sensitivity to the aspirations of the peoples of Oceania.

Our country's lack of responsiveness to the South Pacific's call for a nuclear-free zone cannot help but also be seen by those in the region as tacit encouragement for France to resume her long-criticized nuclear testing program in the Pacific. After over 100 nuclear bombs have been detonated deep within French Polynesia's Mururoa Atoll, it has been described by scientific researchers as a "Swiss cheese of fractured rock."

Leakage of radioactive waste from Mururoa Atoll's underground test sites to the surface waters and air has been predicted, and is inevitable; this embodies the environmental nightmare that the inhabitants of the South Pacific have long dreaded. It is not surprising that reports of increased cancer rates amongst Tahitians have surfaced. The damage to the marine environment can only be imagined. When France announced her nuclear testing moratorium last year, the news was occasion for great celebration throughout the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at the environmental havoc that is a necessary by-product of nuclear testing, one need only study our country's experience in the Pacific. After the United States detonated nuclear devices in the 1940's and 1950's on Bikini and Rongelap Atolls in the Marshall Islands, the ravaging effects of nuclear radiation on the islands' environment and its former inhabitants are still evident today.

As a member from the Pacific region, I have grown up immersed in the controversy of nuclear testing for a long time. This issue has been in the forefront of my mind since childhood. We Pacific Islanders know from firsthand experience the horrors of nuclear testing. Even now, decades later, the legacy of the U.S. testing program in the Marshall Islands is still being felt. People there have not forgotten memories of the offspring of Pacific Islander women infected by radiation fallout—where babies were born dead that didn't look human and were termed "Jelly Babies." These people of the Pacific are still trying to pick up the pieces of their shattered lives and culture.

Mr. Speaker, our great Nation learned a lesson from its Pacific experience that should never be forgotten. As a result, we have stopped our nuclear testing in the South Pacific. In the face of that experience and in light of United States support of nuclear-free zones around the world, how can we sit idly by while our friends in the Pacific ask for our help in stopping nuclear madness in the fragile marine environment of the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, the world stands at a moment in time where we either move forward toward global peace and harmony or we step back and sink into a morass of nuclear paranoia and Armaggedon-inspired nightmares. With France, Russia, and the entire world looking to our great Nation for leadership of nuclear nonproliferation and testing issues, America cannot shirk her duty. It is time that our Nation, the world's greatest democracy, step forward to answer the call for a world no longer held hostage to the threat of nuclear devastation.

Mr. Speaker, joining the South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Treaty would be a giant step forward for America and cannot but help enhance our Nation's leadership to extend the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and negotiation of a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

I strongly urge our colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 111, and we call upon the Clinton administration to sign and ratify the protocols of the South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD a letter to Secretary of Defense Les Aspin, and Secretary of State, Warren M. Christopher, a pamphlet entitled "Day of Two Suns," and, finally, a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 111, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, May 27, 1993.*

Hon. LES ASPIN,
*Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We write to recommend an early review of U.S. policy toward signature of the Protocols of the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone (SPNFZ) Treaty.

Such a review would appear to be appropriate not only in the context of non-proliferation policy but also because of the relevance of SPNFZ to U.S. relations with the South Pacific. SPNFZ is a significant non-proliferation measure and any support the U.S. can lend to it would strengthen the cause of non-proliferation in the region. It would also contribute to support for the extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1995. Given the importance of SPNFZ to South Pacific Forum members, U.S. accession to the Protocols would enhance U.S. influence and credibility in the South Pacific.

As we understand them, the provisions of the SPNFZ Treaty and its three Protocols do not appear to be inconsistent with U.S. national interests. The Treaty specifically respects states' rights under international law to freedom of the seas and leaves it up to individual signatories to decide whether to allow foreign ships and aircraft to visit or transit their territory.

We understand that U.S. forces continue to have reservations about the Treaty's possible impact on U.S. operational flexibility and freedom in the South Pacific. We believe, however, that the end of the Cold War offers an opportunity to re-assess the validity of past concerns about SPNFZ.

We would be interested in understanding the nature of the Administration's concerns about operational flexibility for U.S. forces in the South Pacific, and are interested in working with you in support of a policy regarding the SPNFZ Protocols that protects and promotes U.S. interests in the South Pacific and enhances U.S. non-proliferation objectives.

We are writing a similar letter to the Secretary of State.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
JIM LEACH,
LEE H. HAMILTON,
GARY L. ACKERMAN,
ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA.

---

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, May 27, 1993.*

Hon. WARREN M. CHRISTOPHER,
*Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We write to recommend an early review of U.S. policy toward signature of the Protocols of the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone (SPNFZ) Treaty.

Such a review would appear to be appropriate not only in the context of non-proliferation policy but also because of the relevance of SPNFZ to U.S. relations with the South Pacific. SPNFZ is a significant non-proliferation measure and any support the U.S. can lend to it would strengthen the cause of non-proliferation in the region. It would also contribute to support for the extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1995. Given the importance of SPNFZ to South Pacific Forum members, U.S. accession to the Protocols would enhance U.S. influence and credibility in the South Pacific.

As we understand them, the provisions of the SPNFZ Treaty and its three Protocols do not appear to be inconsistent with U.S. national interests. The Treaty specifically respects states' rights under international law to freedom of the seas and leaves it up to individual signatories to decide whether to allow foreign ships and aircraft to visit or transit their territory.

We note that, at the hearing of the Foreign Affairs Committee on 18 May, you said the U.S. was not at odds with the basic thrust of SPNFZ. You did, however, express concern about the Treaty's possible impact on the U.S.'s operational flexibility and freedom in the South Pacific.

We would be interested in understanding the nature of the Administration's concerns about operational flexibility for U.S. forces in the South Pacific, and are interested in working with you in support of a policy regarding the SPNFZ Protocols that protects and promotes U.S. interests in the South Pacific and enhances U.S. non-proliferation objectives.

We are writing a similar letter to the Secretary of Defense.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
JIM LEACH,
LEE H. HAMILTON,
GARY L. ACKERMAN,
ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA.

---

[From Day of Two Suns]

U.S. NUCLEAR TESTING AND THE PACIFIC ISLANDERS

(By Jane Dibblin)

BRAVO

At 6:45 on the morning of 1 March 1954, eight years after testing in the Marshall Islands began, the US detonated a bomb codenamed 'Bravo' on the island of Bikini. The bomb was equivalent to 17 megatons of TNT, 1,300 times the destructive force of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima, and was specifically designed to create a vast amount of lethal fallout. That morning the wind was blowing in the direction of two inhabited atolls, Rongelap and Utrik, roughly 100 and 300 miles from Bikini. During previous tests Rongelap and Utrik had been evacuated. For some reason never yet divulged, there was no attempt to evacuate them before Bravo.

The first the islanders knew of Bravo was an intense light, like a strange sun dawning in the west. Later they heard the explosion. By mid-day the fallout, a fine powder which fell from the sky, had reached Rongelap. The children had seen photos of snow, and at first the young ones played in it. This is how Lemoyo Abon, now a teacher and mother, describes her experience of the fallout:

"I was 14 at the time and my sister Roko was 12. That day our teacher had asked us—my sister and I and our two cousins—to cook rice for the other children. We got up early to do it. When we saw the bright light and heard a sound—boom—we were really scared. At that time we had no idea what it was. After noon, something powdery fell from the sky. Only later were we told it was fallout. With Roko and several cousins, I went to our village on the end of Rongelap island to gather some sprouted coconuts. One cousin climbed the coconut tree and got something in her eyes, so we sent another one up. The same thing happened to her. When we went home—ours was the main village on Rongelap—it was raining. We saw something on the leaves, something yellow. Our parents asked, 'What's happened to your hair?' It looked like we'd rubbed soap powder in it.

"That night we couldn't sleep, our skin itched so much. On our feet were burns, as if from hot water. Our hair fell out. We'd look at each other and laugh—you're bald, you look like an old man. But really we were frightened and sad."

The pale powder continued to fall until late afternoon, by which time it was about one and a half inches deep. Later it emerged that it was in fact particles of lime (calcium oxide) formed when Bikini's coral reef (a formation of calcium carbonate) melted in the intense heat of the bomb and was sucked up and scattered for miles.[13] The exact dose of radiation received by the islanders was never measured, but it was estimated that people on Utrik received 14 rem (140 msv) and those on Rongelap 175 rem (1,750 msv). The International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) now recommends that a maximum permissible total body dose to a member of the general public be 0.5 rem a year. (For an explanation of nuclear terms, see Glossary, Appendix III.)

John Anjain, a magistrate on Rongelap at the time, tells what happened over the next two days—and why his people sometimes refer to the event at the "day of two suns":

"On the morning of the 'bomb' I was awake and drinking coffee. I thought I saw what appeared to be the sunrise, but it was in the

west. It was truly beautiful with many colours—red, green and yellow—and I was surprised. A little while later, the sun rose in the east. Then some time later something like smoke filled the entire sky and shortly after that a strong and warm wind—as in a typhoon—swept across Rongelap. Then all of the people heard the great sound of the explosion. Some people began to cry with fright. Several hours later the powder began to fall on Rongelap. We saw four planes fly overhead, and we thought perhaps the planes had dropped this powder, which covered our island and stuck to our bodies. The visibility was less than one half mile at that time, due to the haze in the sky.

"The next day, early in the morning, I looked at all of the catchments with Jabwe [the health aide] and Billiet [the school principal] and we noticed the water had turned to yellow. I then warned the people not to drink from these water catchments, and told them to drink only ni [coconut milk]. The people began to get sick with vomiting, aches all over the body, eye irritations and general weakness and fatigue. After the second day most of the people were unable to move around as usual due to their fatigue. Just a few strong young men were up and about at that time and I asked them to fetch some coconuts for the rest of us to drink. On the evening of the second day a seaplane arrived from Enewetak with two men who brought some strange machines. They stayed only about 20 minutes and they took some readings of water catchments and soil, then took off again. They really did not tell us very much."

Not far from Rongelap, US Navy ships were measuring the intensity of radioactivity. They were not instructed to rescue the Rongelap people; indeed, the task force command ordered them to sail away from the area. Twenty-eight American service personnel stationed on Rongerik atoll to provide hourly weather reports were also exposed to radiation, and were not told when Bravo would be exploded. It was two days before the Navy arrived to pick up the Rongelap islanders and the US personnel—two days in which they breathed, slept and ate the fallout.

No satisfactory answer has been given as to why they were not rescued as soon as it was known that they had been in the path of the fallout. Immediate decontamination on board ship would have at least minimised some of the horrific effects of radiation sickness. Instead, belatedly, the ships took the Rongelapese to the US military base on Kwajalein island, as Etry Enos explains:

"When we arrived on Kwajalein we started getting burns all over our bodies, and people were feeling dizzy and weak. At that time we did not know if we would ever return to Rongelap and we were afraid. After two days something appeared under my fingernails and then my fingernails came off and my fingers bled. We all had burns on our ears, shoulders, necks and feet, and our eyes were very sore."

Billiet Edmond kept a diary at the time. In one of his entries he described the injuries then becoming apparent:

"After two days on Kwajalein, a group of military doctors began their studying on the victims. Nausea, skin-burns, diarrhoea, headaches, eye pain, hair fall-out, numbness, skin discoloration were among common complaints. It had been so for quite a while. The children were more critical. My 10-year-old adopted son had severe burns in his body, feet, head, neck and ears. I cannot help remembering those sleepless nights we had to hold him down onto his bed as he would have jumped up and down, scratching, rolling, as though insane.

Although I had also some burns on my back, feet and hands, and my hair was falling off, I knew I had been the least affected and I deeply felt pity about those who suffered the most."

On Kwajalein the Rongelapese were given medical treatment. It was cursory, to say the least. Film footage of that time shows lines of Marshallese people being 'inspected'. Jabwe Jojur, health aide on Rongelap, was angered by the lack of information given to the islanders about their injuries:

"When we arrived in Kwajalein we immediately showered for several hours at the military base there. After some days a medical team flew out from the US, and they are still treating us today. After three days we had burns all over our bodies, and our hair began to fall out: some people actually went bald. When we asked the Atomic Energy Commission doctors to help us understand what had happened, they did not tell us, and today they do not tell us the truth about our problems."

Once on Kwajalein, the Rongelap people met up with the people of Utrik, who had also been in the path of the fallout. Utrik is 275 miles east of Bikini and by the time the fallout arrived there it looked more like mist than snow. The Utrik people were only taken off the island 72 hours after being exposed. Jirda Biton, living on Utrik at the time of the test, recalls the evacuation:

"We all boarded the ship using rubber lifeboats. They took eight of us at a time, and because they were in such a hurry and because the waves were so big in the ocean, I fell overboard and nearly drowned. As I turned to see my island fading into the distance, it made me very sad, and I could not believe that this was happening to us. Since we got wet boarding the ship, we shivered all the way to Kwajalein.

"At Kwajalein they took us to a hospital and gave us all medical examinations and took blood samples. They then took us to a camp over on Ebeye island and told us to bathe in the lagoon every morning using soap, and we did exactly as they told us. While still on Kwajalein we saw the Rongelap people who had gotten there the previous day and we learned that we had all been affected by the fallout."

A Japanese tuna fishing boat, the Lucky Dragon, was also caught in the path of Bravo's fallout. It was 100 miles east of Bikini when the bomb was detonated. The crew members suffered headaches and nausea and by the time they reached Japan two weeks later all 23 were suffering from radiation sickness, with skin blisters and falling hair. One of the crew members, Aikichi Kuboyama, died of liver and blood damage on 23 September. The fishermen's injuries caused an international outcry and two years later the US handed over $2 million in compensation to the Japanese government.

In addition to the physical injuries and psychological trauma the Marshallese also had to contest with insulting and degrading treatment, according to Jirda Biton.

"When we were on Ebeye we had a very rough time adjusting to our new home and [an American man] came dressed up in a cat's costume. When we asked him why he was dressed up as a cat, he told us that we were like cats because we ate like animals and we did not know how to think* * *"

Ijunan Iron from Utrik was only nine when his people were taken to the makeshift camp on Kwajalein, but he has never forgotten how degrading it was: 'When we were evacuated and taken to Kwajalein, we were put into a camp with a rope around it like animals and they even posted a policeman in order to keep us inside the area.'

How far exactly did the radiation clouds from Bravo—and indeed, from the other tests—drift? Until 1982 the official US answer was that only Rongelap, Bikini, Enewetak and Utrik had been irradiated. However, a US Department of Energy study, conducted in 1978, then revealed that the fallout was more widespread than had previously been admitted.

"There are eleven other atolls or single islands that received intermediate range fallout from one or more of the megaton range tests. A number of these atolls are presently inhabited while others are used for food collection."

The atolls and separate islands listed are: Ailinginae, which received fallout from five different explosions; Ailuk, from one explosion; Bikar from two; Likiep from one; Taka from one; Ujelang (where the Enewetak people were resettled) from two; Rongerik (where the Bikinians lived for two years) from four; Wotho from two; Jemo from one and Mejit from one. The report acknowledges that there was only a 'limited monitoring programme' during the testing and 'there is little or no data on possible plutonium contamination outside Bikini and Enewetak'. It proposes a new survey using 'current aerial survey technology and instrumentation' which should give more accurate results.

---

H. CON. RES 111

Whereas the nations of the South Pacific, which share with the United States a strong interest in nuclear nonproliferation, have negotiated and signed the Treaty of Rarotonga, establishing a South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone;

Whereas the Treaty of Rarotonga came into force on December 11, 1986, and has been ratified by 11 nations;

Whereas the Treaty of Rarotonga prohibits the testing, manufacture, acquisition, and stationing of nuclear weapons in the territory of parties to the treaty and the dumping of radioactive wastes at sea;

Whereas 3 protocols to that treaty, which are open for ratification by nuclear-weapon states, require that those nuclear weapon states that ratify those protocols abide by the treaty's provisions in their territories in the region, not contribute to violations of the treaty or threaten to use nuclear weapons against its parties, and refrain from testing nuclear devices in the zone;

Whereas the Treaty of Rarotonga does not prejudice or in any way affect the rights of all nations to freedom of the seas under international law and leaves to each party policy decisions on visits or passage through its territory by foreign ships and aircraft;

Whereas the establishment of verified nuclear-weapon-free zones can reinforce the international norm of nuclear nonproliferation and build consensus for long-term extension of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) when reviewed for extension by its members in 1995;

Whereas the United States leadership to extend the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty would be further enhanced if United States signature and ratification of the protocols were part of an overall nonproliferation policy that included negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban;

Whereas Article VII of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty affirms "the right of any group of States to conclude regional

treaties in order to assure the total absence of nuclear weapons in their respective territories," and the state parties to the Treaty of Rarotonga have implemented a safeguards agreement for the region with the International Atomic Energy Agency;

Whereas it has been the policy of the United States to favor the establishment of effective nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions of nonproliferation concern and where such zones would enhance international stability and security;

Whereas the United States has set forth 7 criteria whereby the effectiveness of proposed nuclear-weapon-free zones will be judged, as follows: (1) the initiative is from the nations in the region, (2) all nations whose participation is deemed important participate, (3) adequate verification of compliance is provided, (4) it does not disturb existing security arrangements to the detriment of regional and international security, (5) all parties are barred from developing or possessing any nuclear device for any purpose, (6) it imposes no restrictions on international legal maritime and serial navigation rights and freedoms, and (7) it does not affect the international legal rights of parties to grant or deny others transit privileges, including port calls and overflights;

Whereas the United States has signed and ratified the protocols to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (the Treaty of Tlatelolco), establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America, whereby the United States committed itself not to test, manufacture, acquire, or store nuclear weapons in its territories in the region (namely Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands), not to contribute to any violation of the treaty, and not to threaten to use nuclear weapons against the parties;

Whereas the United States is also a party to the Antarctic Treaty, the Seabed Arms Control Treaty, the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, which preclude nuclear weapons from these regions;

Whereas support for these nuclear-weapon free zones does not prejudge United States policy with respect to other proposed nuclear-weapon-free zones, each of which must be judged on its individual merits in accordance with United States national interests;

Whereas in order to maintain the security of United States military forces and their ability to contribute to nuclear deterrence, the United States must preserve the principle of neither confirming nor denying whether particular United States naval vessels or other military forces possess nuclear weapons;

Whereas the protocols to the Treaty of Rarotonga do not conflict with the United States policy of neither confirming nor denying the presence of nuclear weapons on United States vessels or aircraft and do not prohibit any current or anticipated activities in United States territories in the South Pacific or elsewhere in the region; and

Whereas past administrations have stated that while the United States could not, under circumstances prior to the cessation of the Cold War, sign the protocols to the Treaty of Rarotonga, United States practices and activities in the South Pacific, Nuclear Free Zone region, then and now, are consistent with the treaty and its protocols: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That (a) it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Treaty of Rarotonga is consistent with United States security commitments in the South Pacific since it does not prohibit port calls by naval vessels which are nuclear powered or may be carrying nuclear weapons and does not create other impediments to United States military operations in support of the Security Treaty between Australia, New Zealand and the United States (ANZUS Treaty);

(2) the Treaty of Rarotonga satisfies the 7 criteria, set forth in the preamble of this resolution, which have been established by the United States Government for judging the effectiveness of proposed nuclear-weapon-free zones;

(3) signature and ratification of the protocols to that treaty would be in the national interest of the United States by contributing to a comprehensive United States nonproliferation policy that would enhance prospects for extending the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in 1995, particularly if such a policy were to include negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban agreement; and

(4) signature and ratification of the protocols would not prejudge United States policy with respect to proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions, such as those in which the presence of an effective nuclear deterrent has contributed to United States national security by enhancing stability.

(b) Noting that the executive branch has indicated that United States practices and activities in the region are consistent with the Treaty of Rarotonga and its protocols, it is therefore the sense of the Congress that the United States should sign and ratify the protocols to that treaty.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 111 which expresses the sense of Congress that the United States should sign and ratify the protocols to the Treaty of Rarotonga, which establishes the South Pacific nuclear weapons free zone. I commend the gentleman from American Samoa for his outstanding leadership in calling attention to this important nonproliferation issue.

Nuclear proliferation is a leading military threat to U.S. national security. Iran, North Korea, Algeria, and Libya are just some of the countries believed to be pursuing nuclear weapons. India, Pakistan, and Israel have achieved a nuclear weapons capability. The breakup of the Soviet Union has increased the risks of nuclear theft, diversion, or terrorism. China continues to sell nuclear and missile technology to countries in unstable regions. The United States must make nuclear nonproliferation a leading national security priority. Signing the Rarotonga Treaty is a straightforward but important step in this direction that has been far too long delayed. I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 111, concerning the establishment of a South Pacific nuclear free zone. As an original cosponsor, I want to pay particular tribute to my colleague, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for his leadership in offering this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Treaty of Rarotonga, establishing a nuclear free zone in the South Pacific, represents an important milestone in global efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. The nations of that region have banded together, resolved to prevent the introduction of nuclear-weapon states in the region. They have negotiated full-scope safeguard agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency. By their actions they have presented a forceful example to other regions of the political will necessary to assure a safer and more secure world.

The United States, which shares the goal of preventing the further spread of nuclear weapons, established seven conditions for endorsing nuclear free zones. The Treaty of Rarotonga meets all of them, and it is U.S. policy to act in compliance with the treaty's provisions. Nevertheless, the United States has not signed the treaty's additional protocols that are open to, and relevant for, nuclear-weapon states. The fact that we have not is, I believe, a vestige of the cold war. It is time to change that.

Mr. Speaker, heading the list of security challenges we face in this new world is the prospect of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In 1995, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT] is up for extension. It serves as the cornerstone of all our efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, and it is our goal to see the treaty extended indefinitely. That will be no easy task. But it will be made easier if, as part of a comprehensive nonproliferation policy that includes negotiating a nuclear test ban treaty, we also endorse the nuclear free zone in the South Pacific. There is no good reason not to, but there are many good reasons to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution offered by my good friend, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, gives us the chance to express our view that now is the time to change from a cold war mentality and to face the growing challenge of nuclear proliferation. I thank him for his efforts, urge the speedy adoption of this resolution, and urge the administration to sign the protocols to the Treaty of Rarotonga.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from American Samoa for his work on the concurrent resolution to move the United States to sign the nuclear-weapon state protocols to the Treaty of Rarotonga. His efforts bring us one step closer to realizing the dream of a nuclear free world through the establishment of a South Pacific nuclear free zone.

Representing as I do the Pacific island State of Hawaii, I would like to offer some observations from the perspective of a district which is an integral part of the Pacific archiplegaic system. During the age of exploration lasting from the 16th through the 18th centuries, European explorers "discovered" the Pacific. I enclose the word "discovered" in quotation marks, because the Pacific islands had already been discovered and populated by its indigenous inhabitants for many centuries.

Over the course of those centuries, the peoples of the Pacific acquired an intimate knowledge of the land and seas that provided sustenance and shelter. That knowledge led to the most highly developed premodern navigation technology the world has ever seen. Using their knowledge of the heavens, currents, and winds, Pacific island voyagers traveled over thousands of miles of ocean in open canoes. In Hawaii, the Polynesian Voyaging Society has revived the arts of canoe building and

navigation. The exploits of the society's voyaging canoe *Hokule'a* offers ample testimony to the achievements, skills, and knowledge of Pacific island peoples.

It is that wisdom, that sense of place, that we should consult in developing our policies for the Pacific. We should be turning to the leaders of Pacific island societies for guidance in environmental matters. It just might be, Mr. Speaker, that we have something to learn from them. By signing the Treaty of Rarotonga the island nations of the Pacific have expressed a strong desire to make the South Pacific a nuclear free zone. Their stance is based on a profound appreciation of the fragility of their oceanic environment and an abhorrence of the destructiveness of nuclear weaponry. It stems from the concept the Hawaiians call Aloha' aina, or love of the land.

With the end of the cold war, we can no longer justify a continued refusal to sign the protocols of the Treaty of Rarotonga. It is time to move forward and do our part, as the leading power in the Pacific, to make the South Pacific nuclear free zone a reality.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCDADE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), after 4:30 today, and tomorrow, on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of attending a funeral.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIGHTFOOT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, on July 28.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes on June 18.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DARDEN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes each day, on June 18 and 21.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIGHTFOOT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OXLEY in two instances.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

Mr. MACHTLEY.

Mr. ALLARD.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in two instances.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. MCCANDLESS.

Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. KING.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DARDEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. MORAN.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. SLATTERY.

Mr. GLICKMAN.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. KILDEE.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. OWENS.

Mr. BARCIA.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

Mr. SWETT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OWENS.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. WAXMAN.

## SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to designate June 5, 1993, as "National Trails Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution relating to the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation organization; to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 18, 1993, at 10 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1438. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(d)(3) (104 Stat. 1812); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1439. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-39, "Omnibus Budget Support Temporary Act of 1993," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1440. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission for Employment Policy, transmitting a report titled "Private Industry Councils: Examining Their Mission Under the Job Training Partnership Act," pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 1775; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1441. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 93-22, authorizing the furnishing of assistance from the Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund to meet the urgent needs of refugees and conflict victims in Bosnia and Croatia, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(3); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1442. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Japan for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 93-16), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1443. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from passage of S. 1, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1444. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the fiscal year 1992 report on the actuarial status of the military retirement system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1445. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1446. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 26th in a series of reports on refugee resettlement in the United States covering the period October 1, 1991 through September 30, 1992, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1447. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Acting Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, transmitting a report on the Patent Technology Sets CD-Rom Demonstration Program, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 41 note, Public Law 102-204, section 11(e); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1448. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the annual updating of the comprehensive ocean thermal technology application and market development plan, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 9005(b); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1449. A letter from the Acting Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1450. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the payment for bloodclotting factors administered to Medicare inpatients who have hemophilia, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ww

note, Public Law 101-239, 6011(c); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1451. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the annual report on intermarket coordination among financial markets and to increase financial stability and integrity, pursuant to Public Law 101-432, section 8(a); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Agriculture.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BEVILL: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2445. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEFNER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2446. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 201. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2403) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-137). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2243. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to extend the authorization of appropriations in such act, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 168. A bill to designate the Federal building to be constructed between Gay and Market Streets and Cumberland and Church Avenues in Knoxville, TN, as the "Howard H. Baker, Jr. United States Courthouse" (Rept. 103-139). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself and Mr. LEACH):

H.R. 2443. A bill to provide for the equitable disposition of distributions that are held by a bank or other intermediary as to which the beneficial owners are unknown or whose addresses are unknown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. BUNNING):

H.R. 2444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the deductibility of certain home office expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 2445. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HEFNER:

H.R. 2446. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BEILENSON (for himself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 2447. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to establish and strengthen policies and programs for the early stabilization of world population through the global expansion of reproductive choice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. HASTERT):

H.R. 2448. A bill to improve the accuracy of radon testing products and services, to increase testing for radon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H.R. 2449. A bill to establish an interagency task force to conduct a study regarding the problems affecting smaller cities in the United States and recommend actions to alleviate such problems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. VOLKMER):

H.R. 2450. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to provide shoreline projects to maintain certain flood control projects on the Mississippi and Iowa Rivers; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BUYER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. CLEMENT):

H.R. 2451. A bill to provide for the establishment of a specialized environmental medical unit to investigate the possible health effects of environmental and chemical exposures of U.S. military personnel in the Persian Gulf war and for related civilian purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KLECZKA:

H.R. 2452. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of certain agglomerated cork products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHTLEY:

H.R. 2453. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to encourage the conversion of the defense industry to commercial endeavors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2454. A bill to increase the efficiency of Government procurement; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KLINK, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. REED, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 2455. A bill to help local school systems achieve goal six of the national education goals, which provides that by the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning, by ensuring that all schools are safe and free of violence; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey:

H.R. 2456. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in order to provide an incentive for business to invest in pollution abatement property and related assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HAMBURG, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 2457. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a salmon captive broodstock program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

202. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to Social Security; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

203. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to low income housing tax credit; to the Committee of Ways and Means.

204. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, relative to health care costs; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

205. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to the Nevada test site; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Armed Services, and Education and Labor.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. CLINGER introduced a bill (H.R. 2458) for the relief of Livio B. Colosimo; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 81: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SABO, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. DEAL.

H.R. 136: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 162: Mr. MCINNIS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 349: Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 350: Mr. DIXON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Ms. SCHENK, and Ms. SHEPHERD.

H.R. 436: Mr. RIDGE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TUCKER, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 441: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 467: Mr. DE LUGO and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 509: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 535: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 624: Mr. SWETT, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 667: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 749: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 758: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 789: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 833: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 911: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 1141: Mr. BORSKI and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 1156: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1206: Mr. SCOTT and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1251: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1270: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1295: Mr. GORDON, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HEFNER, and Mrs. MORELLA.
H.R. 1296: Mr. LAUGHLIN and Mr. BRYANT.
H.R. 1389: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1392: Mr. HYDE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 1394: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 1428: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 1504: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. LEHMAN.
H.R. 1539: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.
H.R. 1553: Mr. MAZZOLI.
H.R. 1697: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. MCCRERY.
H.R. 1747: Mr. PAXON.
H.R. 1753: Mr. MFUME, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SLATTERY.
H.R. 1754: Mr. MFUME.
H.R. 1755: Mr. MFUME and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1767: Mr. KLINK.
H.R. 1769: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1818: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1872: Mr. ZELIFF and Mr. BEREUTER.
H.R. 1898: Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. KOLBE.
H.R. 1916: Mr. REED, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LAUGHLIN, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1925: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1950: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 1976: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.
H.R. 2004: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mrs. LLOYD.
H.R. 2025: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2033: Mr. WASHINGTON.
H.R. 2079: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 2094: Ms. MALONEY.
H.R. 2124: Mr. ZELIFF.
H.R. 2135: Mr. MINGE, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2140: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2152: Ms. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.
H.R. 2154: Ms. THURMAN, Mr. MINGE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KLINK, Mr. DEAL, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WASHINGTON, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2287: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. ZELIFF.
H.R. 2331: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2354: Mr. SOLOMON.
H.R. 2365: Mr. SHARP, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 2375: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2414: Mr. BUYER.
H.R. 2421: Mr. LANCASTER and Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 2434: Mr. GOSS.
H.R. 2441: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. EVANS.
H.J. Res. 61: Mr. COX, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.
H.J. Res. 86: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. PAXON, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. GOODLING.
H.J. Res. 111: Mr. KLUG, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SCOTT, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.J. Res. 131: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BATEMAN, and Ms. BYRNE.
H.J. Res. 165: Ms. THURMAN and Mr. BUNNING.
H.J. Res. 178: Mr. ORTON and Mr. GILMAN.
H.J. Res. 188: Ms. MALONEY, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. TORRES, Ms. FOWLER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.
H.J. Res. 198: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.
H.J. Res. 204: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. FROST, Mr. VENTO, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. TORRICELLI.
H. Con. Res. 73: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. SERRANO.
H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. KYL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DOOLEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Ms. SCHENK, and Mr. CONDIT.
H. Res. 12: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. MCCANDLESS.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

44. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Town Board, North Elba, NY, relative to the closing of the Plattsburgh Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

45. Also, petition of the City Council, Knoxville, TN, relative to a proposed energy tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2200

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

—Page 42, after line 24, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 313. LAND REMOTE SENSING FOR AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the use of land remote sensing data is potentially a valuable resource to anticipate potential food, feed, and fiber shortages or excesses, and provide this information to the agricultural community in time to assist farmers with planting decisions;

(2) land remote sensing data can be useful to predict impending famine problems and forest infestations in time to allow remedial action;

(3) land remote sensing data can inform the agricultural community as to the condition of crops and the land which sustains those crops;

(4) land remote sensing data can be useful to allow farmers to apply pesticides, nutrients, and water, among other inputs, to farmlands in the exact amounts necessary to maximize crop yield, thereby reducing agricultural costs and minimizing potential harm to the environment;

(5) land remote sensing data can be valuable, when received on a timely basis, in determing the needs of additional plantings of a particular crop or a substitute crop; and

(6) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, using the expertise of the Earth Observations Commercialization Applications Program, and the Department of Agriculture should work in tandem to aid farmers to obtain data conducive to sound agricultural management and greater crop yields.

(b) INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly develop a program to provide farmers and other interested persons with timely data, through land remote sensing, on crop conditions, fertilization and irrigation needs, pest infiltration, soil conditions, projected food, feed, and fiber production and any other information available through land remote sensing.

(c) ENHANCED LANDSAT PROGRAM.

(1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly evaluate the need for a satellite with synthetic aperture radar capability that could enhance the Landsat Program, as set forth in the Land Remote Sensing Policy Act of 1992 (15 U.S.C. 5601, et seq.), by providing information and data relating to agricultural resources, and which may have other commercial and research applications.

(2) In the event there is a finding of need as set forth in paragraph (1), the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly develop a proposal, which maximizes private funding and involvement in the launch and operation such satellite, and in the management and dissemination of the data from such satellite. The Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly submit the proposal, within 30 days of its development, to the House Committee on Agriculture, the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

(d) FEES.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall set appropriate fees for the dissemination of land remote sensing data under subsection (b).

(e) TRAINING.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly establish a program to inform farmers and other prospective users concerning the use and availability of land remote sensing data.

(f) AUTHORIZATION.—Funds necessary for carrying out this section may be derived from funds otherwise authorized for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

(f) SUNSET.—The provisions of this section shall expire 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.