

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 25, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Rabbi Stuart Weinblatt, president, Washington Board of Rabbis, Potomac, MD, offered the following prayer:

The prayer I humbly offer to You, dear G-d, on behalf of the leaders of this great Nation, and in this hallowed assembly is one of thanks.

We thank You for the many blessings You have bestowed upon this land, and its people; for the noble goals of our Founding Fathers, and for living in a country with elected Representatives devoted to bringing those ideals and the promise of that vision into reality. For abundant resources and wealth, for unprecedented intellectual greatness and achievements, we are ever appreciative.

In that spirit, we pray, for the ability to share the precious gifts of life and liberty, of freedom and equality.

Help us to conserve and preserve our resources for the benefit of future generations. Help us to use our prosperity for the betterment of all. Help us to use the gifts of wisdom and the G-d-given talents of our people with prudence.

Bless us with the strength and desire to strive to create Your kingdom here on Earth. In that context, we pray that the elected Representatives of our people in whom we have placed our sacred trust shall be guided by wisdom and compassion, by truth and justice.

As the Psalmist recognized, "Truly Your majestic presence fills the whole Earth." For as Jacob exclaimed, "How full of awe is this place. Surely the Lord is in this place; and I knew it not."

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.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. KOSTMAYER. 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. 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 269, nays 128, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—269

Ackerman	Espy	Luken, Thomas
Akaka	Evans	Manton
Alexander	Fascell	Markey
Anderson	Fazio	Martinez
Andrews	Fish	Matsui
Annunzio	Flippo	Mazzoli
Anthony	Florio	McCloskey
Applegate	Foglietta	McCurdy
Archer	Foley	McEwen
Atkins	Ford (TN)	McHugh
AuCoin	Frank	McMillen (MD)
Barnard	Frost	Mfume
Bartlett	Gaydos	Miller (CA)
Bateman	Gedjenson	Miller (WA)
Bates	Gephardt	Mineta
Beilenson	Gibbons	Moakley
Bennett	Glickman	Mollohan
Berman	Gonzalez	Montgomery
Bevill	Gordon	Morella
Bilbray	Grandy	Morrison (CT)
Boggs	Grant	Morrison (WA)
Boland	Gray (IL)	Mrazek
Bonior	Gray (PA)	Murtha
Borski	Green	Myers
Bosco	Guarini	Nagle
Boucher	Gunderson	Natcher
Boxer	Hall (OH)	Neal
Brennan	Hall (TX)	Nelson
Brooks	Hamilton	Nowak
Brown (CA)	Harris	Oakar
Bruce	Hatcher	Oberstar
Bryant	Hayes (IL)	Obey
Bustamante	Hayes (LA)	Ortiz
Byron	Hefner	Owens (UT)
Campbell	Hertel	Packard
Cardin	Hochbrueckner	Panetta
Carper	Holloway	Patterson
Carr	Hopkins	Pease
Chapman	Horton	Pelosi
Chappell	Hoyer	Penny
Clarke	Huckaby	Pepper
Clement	Hughes	Perkins
Coelho	Hutto	Petri
Coleman (TX)	Jeffords	Pickett
Collins	Jenkins	Pickle
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Price
Conte	Johnson (SD)	Quillen
Conyers	Jones (TN)	Rahall
Cooper	Jontz	Rangel
Coyne	Kanjorski	Ravenel
Crockett	Kaptur	Ray
Darden	Kasich	Richardson
Davis (MI)	Kastenmeier	Rinaldo
de la Garza	Kennedy	Ritter
DeFazio	Kennelly	Robinson
Dellums	Kildee	Rodino
Derrick	Kleczka	Roe
Dicks	Kolter	Rose
Dixon	Kostmayer	Rostenkowski
Donnelly	LaFalce	Rowland (GA)
Dorgan (ND)	Lancaster	Roybal
Dowdy	Lantos	Russo
Downey	Latta	Sabo
Dreier	Leath (TX)	Saiki
Durbin	Lehman (CA)	Savage
Dwyer	Lehman (FL)	Sawyer
Dymally	Leland	Schaefer
Dyson	Lent	Scheuer
Early	Levin (MI)	Schneider
Eckart	Levine (CA)	Schulze
Edwards (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
English	Lloyd	Sharp
Erdreich	Lowry (WA)	Shaw

Shumway	Stenholm	Valentine
Shuster	Stokes	Vento
Sisisky	Stratton	Visclosky
Skaggs	Studds	Volkmer
Skelton	Sweeney	Walgren
Slattery	Swift	Waxman
Slaughter (NY)	Synar	Weldon
Smith (FL)	Tallon	Whitten
Smith (IA)	Tauzin	Wilson
Smith (NE)	Taylor	Wise
Smith (NJ)	Thomas (GA)	Wolpe
Solarz	Torres	Wortley
Spratt	Torricelli	Wyden
St Germain	Towns	Wyllie
Staggers	Trafficant	Yates
Stallings	Traxler	Yatron
Stark	Udall	

NAYS—128

Armey	Gregg	Porter
Badham	Hammerschmidt	Pursell
Baker	Hastert	Regula
Ballenger	Hefley	Rhodes
Barton	Henry	Ridge
Bentley	Herger	Roberts
Bereuter	Hiler	Rogers
Bilirakis	Hunter	Roth
Bliley	Hyde	Roukema
Boehrlert	Inhofe	Rowland (CT)
Broomfield	Ireland	Saxton
Brown (CO)	Jacobs	Schroeder
Buechner	Kolbe	Schuetz
Bunning	Konnyu	Sensenbrenner
Burton	Kyl	Shays
Callahan	Lagomarsino	Sikorski
Chandler	Leach (IA)	Skeen
Cheney	Lewis (CA)	Slaughter (VA)
Clay	Lewis (FL)	Smith (TX)
Clinger	Lightfoot	Smith, Denny
Coats	Livingston	(OR)
Coble	Lott	Smith, Robert
Coleman (MO)	Lowery (CA)	(NH)
Coughlin	Lukens, Donald	Smith, Robert
Courter	Lungren	(OR)
Craig	Mack	Snowe
Crane	Madigan	Solomon
Dannemeyer	Martin (IL)	Stangeland
Daub	Martin (NY)	Stump
Davis (IL)	McCandless	Sundquist
DeLay	McCollum	Swindall
DeWine	McCrery	Tauke
Dickinson	McDade	Thomas (CA)
DioGuardi	McMillan (NC)	Upton
Dornan (CA)	Meyers	Vander Jagt
Edwards (OK)	Michel	Vucanovich
Emerson	Miller (OH)	Walker
Fawell	Molinar	Weber
Fields	Moorhead	Wheat
Galleghy	Murphy	Whittaker
Gallo	Nielson	Wolf
Gekas	Oxley	Young (AK)
Goodling	Parris	Young (FL)
Gradison	Pashayan	

NOT VOTING—34

Aspin	Gingrich	McGrath
Biaggi	Hansen	Mica
Bonker	Hawkins	Moody
Boulter	Houghton	Nichols
Dingell	Hubbard	Olin
Duncan	Jones (NC)	Owens (NY)
Feighan	Kemp	Spence
Flake	Lipinski	Watkins
Ford (MI)	Lujan	Weiss
Frenzel	MacKay	Williams
Garcia	Marlenee	
Gilman	Mavroules	

□ 1129

Mr. STOKES changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."
So the Journal was approved.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

RABBI STUART WEINBLATT

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to introduce to you, Rabbi Stuart Weinblatt, of Temple Solel in Bowie, MD.

A native of Baltimore, he graduated with high honors from the University of Maryland with a degree in history. I came to know Stu Weinblatt during his student days when he served for 3 years as director of State affairs for the University of Maryland student government. In that capacity, he was liaison to the State legislature, where I served as a member of the senate.

Stu Weinblatt is no stranger to political activism or to Capitol Hill. In his high school days, he was named a William Randolph Hearst U.S. Senate scholar, entitling him to study for a week here in Washington. As a college student, he sponsored a registration drive which added 9,000 new voters to the rolls. He also served as an intern both to Baltimore Congressman Sam Friedel on the House Administration Committee and to Congressman Clarence Long.

Following his graduation from the University of Maryland, Stu Weinblatt attended Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati and studied for 1 year in Israel.

Before coming to Bowie's Temple Solel, he served 2 years at Miami's Temple Betham.

Since coming to Temple Solel in 1981, Rabbi Weinblatt has taken an increasingly active role in a wide variety of community affairs. Most notably, he now serves as the president of the Washington Board of Rabbis.

Rabbi Weinblatt has participated in a number of demonstrations in the vicinity of the Soviet Embassy here in Washington on behalf of Soviet Jews.

Earlier this year, he traveled to the Soviet Union where he met with Yuli Kosharovskiy, who has been a refusenik for 17 years, longer than virtually anyone else still in the Soviet Union.

Following his return from the Soviet Union, Rabbi Weinblatt has continued his work on behalf of Soviet Jews. These efforts include a protest he organized in March at the Soviet Embassy in behalf of Yuli Kosharovskiy.

While meeting with a large group of refuseniks in Moscow, Rabbi Weinblatt also met with several of our colleagues, including Tom Lantos. Following the rabbi's moving comments at the end of that meeting, Congressman and Mrs. Lantos suggested that Rabbi Weinblatt should one day give the invocation here in the House. His

presence today is a result of that meeting and their invitation.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2426. An act to designate 16th Street, Northwest, in front of the Polish Embassy as "Solidarity Corner."

THE POLITICS OF ATHLETICS

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

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, today I read with disgust Joseph Sobran's article on the South African runner Zola Budd. The U.S. Olympic Committee has allowed itself to become a tool of hatred singling out one individual on which to unload its vengeance. Sobran said in the last paragraph of his article:

Zola Budd has been targeted as a sort of class enemy, guilty by ancestral association. The forces that have converged on her epitomize in miniature the form of oppression typical in this century: indiscriminate revenge disguised as social justice.

One month ago I wrote to the Olympic Committee about their involvement in politics.

In my letter I stated:

Mr. Miller, I am simply taking this opportunity to register my opposition to the current state of the relationship between the world athletic community and the Republic of South Africa. I sincerely believe that change cannot be wrought from the outside; rather, it has to come from within. Banning Zola Budd or other competitors from exercising their God-given right to go and do as they wish is incredibly heavy-handed and smacks of fascism.

The ugliness of sanction without regard is summed up by the victim who said, "I have been made to feel like a criminal. I have been continually hounded, and I can't take it anymore."

RIGHT TO KNOW

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

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, if knowledge is power, than three little words are indeed mighty. The words are: Right to Know.

July 1, 1988, will be an important day for millions of Americans. That is the day they will begin to learn what is contained in the air they breathe, the water they drink, the ground on which their homes are built and their children play.

It is the day when the key right to know provision of Superfund takes effect.

When people who live near chemical plants can find out what is in the air, and what it means for their own health and safety, then for the first time plans and policies can be made on the basis of fact. We celebrate our Nation's independence on July Fourth, but July 1 will be an independence day as well. Independence from fear, and from environmental ignorance.

But, for the true power of this concept to be felt, two things must happen.

First, corporate America must be dedicated to making it work by fully complying. July 1 must be more than just another deadline for industry or the Federal Government to simply shrug off.

And second, the attention that will accompany July 1 must be used to focus on a whole range of air pollution issues that simply aren't getting the attention that their danger merits. Acid rain, incinerator emissions, and other unseen pollutants are serious problems.

The right to know must be only a first step. The right to be healthy comes next.

BAYTOWN'S FRED HARTMAN TURNS 80

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

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment today to salute a constituent on the occasion of his 80th birthday, Fred Hartman of Baytown, TX, was 80 years young last week. Happily, he celebrated his birthday in good health, of sound mind, and with an energy level greater than this 36 year old. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may recall that in 1985 I took to the House floor to inform the House of the Baytown Chamber of Commerce's decision to name Mr. Hartman "Baytown's Man of the Last Half Century." At that time I recounted Fred Hartman's distinguished journalism career and his unequalled record of community service. I might also add that he has served Baylor University well, his alma mater, and is one of Baylor's most outstanding and distinguished alumni. In both his professional life and in his service to his community, Fred Hartman has improved the lives of thousands of men and women who live and work in East Harris County.

Today my message is simple and sincere and it is short, and that message is if you will indulge me, Mr. Speaker, happy belated birthday, Fred, and many happy returns.

OUTLAWING SATURDAY NIGHT SPECIALS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Governor Schaefer of Maryland and the Maryland State legislators for banning Saturday night special handguns. They are on the right track.

Mr. Speaker, our crime statistics in America are frightening. There is more murder in Chicago than all of England. There is more murder in Los Angeles than all of Canada. Mr. Speaker, 10,000 people were killed by handguns last year, and even our police are outgunned. The simple fact is that you do not need a machinegun to hunt rabbits. Our policies are all screwed up. No one in Congress wants to take guns off the people, but we need a more rational policy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend James and Sarah Brady for raising the consciousness level of America to this great problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add that the only shame of it all is that Maryland has to do it. It should have been done by the Congress of the United States of America.

□ 1140

DISSOLUTION OF FADA

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

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to a bill that was introduced last week. This bill's purpose is to dissolve the Federal Asset Disposition Association [FADA], which was chartered by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in 1985.

I am somewhat perplexed by the actions of some of my colleagues on the Banking Committee for pursuing this course of action. It is true that until recently—until a new chief executive officer, Gerald Carmen, took control—FADA was not operating at a profitable and efficient level. Recently, however, FADA has shown a profit. I believe that FADA has just begun to turn the corner to fulfill its purpose, which is to sell off distressed assets from failed thrifts with the help of experts in the private sector.

When discussing the livelihood of any organization it is important to consider the immediate status of that firm. It is important to note that FADA has disposed of over \$700 million of distressed assets, and has provided the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation with \$538,000 in the first quarter of 1988. Furthermore, FADA sold assets in excess of \$525,000 in April alone. This is quite

an improvement and one which should be allowed to continue until we can better evaluate the improving record of FADA.

We also need to look at the fine leadership since the end of February of this year. Not only has Mr. Carmen been able to collect \$538,000 for FSLIC, but he has taken drastic steps to ensure efficiency. For example, he has disposed of excess office space and has dropped FADA's payroll by \$2 million. In addition, Mr. Carmen earns far less than the previous CEO of FADA.

It is quite obvious that the new leadership at FADA has taken fundamental steps to transfer FADA from an inefficient organization to one which will help recover some of the massive losses of the thrift industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to carefully examine the recent improvements at FADA, to keep a watchful eye on FADA in upcoming weeks, and then after several months revisit the status of FADA. I sincerely believe that FADA will continue to show profits and that results will speak for themselves. However, if it becomes increasingly clear that FADA is not improving, then, and only then, do we need to take appropriate action regarding FADA.

AN APPEAL TO CONTRAS AND SANDINISTAS

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

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you and my colleagues today to urge the parties involved in the peace process in Central America to put aside their feelings of distrust and continue negotiating a peaceful end to the war in Nicaragua.

The cease-fire has saved lives. Before the cease-fire, nearly 500 Nicaraguans a month died in Sandinista-Contra conflicts. After the Sapoa agreement, about 50 a month have died.

Not only is the peace process vital to the humanitarian needs of Nicaragua, but it is crucial to the economic interests of all Central America. We are all aware that economic instability and political strife continue to permeate the daily existence of Central America.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in appealing to the Sandinistas and Contras to put aside the bitterness born of 8 long years of strife and agree to extend the cease-fire for 30 days.

I urge the negotiators to continue their efforts to strive for a settlement to their many differences.

Finally, I request that the administration do all in its power to promote peace and democracy in Central America.

PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO MOSCOW POSITIVE CONTINUATION OF FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with many of my colleagues in wishing President Reagan well as he goes to Moscow to initiate the summit agreement with Secretary Gorbachev.

This is a continuation, and a positive continuation, of those policies which this President has brought to our country and to our foreign policy area which have led to 8 years of peace and prosperity. As part of those policies, the INF Treaty is in my opinion a major and a historic step forward, and it is also my hope that the Senate will soon ratify that treaty and that out of this meeting in Moscow we will see developed a consensus from which we can move on to arms control in the area of START negotiations.

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND DEMOCRATIC PARTY?

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

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, we have all been asked from time to time: What is the difference between the Republican and Democratic parties? Yesterday President Reagan provided the answer that I am going to give. He said that somehow there is something inherently wrong with giving average working Americans a 60 days' notice before they are going to lose their jobs. Somehow I guess these people do not need the time to decide how their home mortgage is going to be paid or whether the kids are going to have to be pulled out of school or some of the other average decisions that working Americans have to make.

The President did not express the same sense of outrage when some of his friends got a little help upon losing their jobs. The chairman of Bendix Corp. received a \$4 million golden parachute when he lost his job. The chairman of Revlon left with \$35 million when Pantry Pride took over in 1985 and he lost his job. The chief of RCA received \$2.3 million as a going-away present when he lost his job. The CEO of St. Regis received \$12.6 million when St. Regis was acquired by Champion International and he lost his job, and Champion paid his taxes on that \$12.6 million as well.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has helped us to prove that there is a difference after all between the parties, and the President may have unwittingly helped give the termination notice of this decade to one of his

better friends at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

CONGRESSIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN INTERN PROGRAM

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment this morning to share some information about a program that I have taken part in since I have been in Congress.

Through the Congressional Senior Citizen Intern Program, I am able to sponsor a senior citizen from my home district to come out to Washington, DC, for 1 week as an intern on my staff. During their stay in Washington, that senior citizen intern has a very busy schedule of press meetings, briefings on topics of special interest to the elderly, and a series of tours and receptions around the Capitol Hill area.

The two senior citizen interns that I sponsored were chosen from a group of very highly qualified applicants from my district, and they both have been community leaders back home. They share a desire to learn more about the legislative process and bring that knowledge back to the Fourth Congressional District of Illinois.

Since its start in 1973, the Congressional Senior Citizen Intern Program has brought more than 1,500 senior citizens to Washington, DC, to participate. Everyone benefits from this program—the community at home, myself and my staff, and certainly the interns all gain from the exchange of information. That is the type of program that we all ought to be involved in and that we should not pass up.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be joined by over 70 of my colleagues today in the introduction of a resolution for "National Tourism Week" for 1989. This special week has become one of our Nation's most popular commemorative weeks. Thousands of Americans in every State and territory participate each year in exciting events in honor of tourism.

I am especially pleased to be introducing this legislation during a time when we have a very special group of people from nine Southeastern States in town. Today in Washington, members of the tourism industry from: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia are hosting their annual hoedown on the Mall. This hoedown was established in

1984 as a way to thank Members of Congress from those nine States for helping make this special week a reality. Their hoedown has quickly grown into the premier tourism event of the year.

This organization personifies the tourism industry. These people work together diligently to promote our cities, our States, and our major attractions throughout the Southeast. They generously bring their entertainment, their crafts, as well as two attributes southerners are so famous for—their great southern cooking and old fashioned hospitality. It's a pleasure to have this special group in town and to be part of their festivities. I encourage all Members from these nine States to join us tonight under the big tent on the Mall.

DON REGAN: A NO-CLASS ACT

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, former White House Chief of Staff, Don Regan, has written a book to "set the record straight" about his service in, and particularly about, his departure from the executive mansion. His real purpose, of course, is revenge on Nancy Reagan, ostensibly for using her influence with her husband to have him leave.

Mr. Regan is a notorious sexist and one can imagine his reaction when he discovered that the President's wife was encouraging his boss to fire him. In the book Regan declares that the spouse of a President should have no role in Presidential decisions, even regarding those who purport to serve the President. Undoubtedly that parallels well his general philosophy on the role of women in America, which relegates them to work in the kitchen and about the house and, perhaps, some small talk.

If it weren't for the fact that almost all of the Reagan administration's problems began when Don Regan took over as Chief of Staff, bringing as he did to that task virtually no background in or understanding of political governance, one could dismiss his book as mere boorishness.

But let's remember that at the time of the President's call, all of Washington was aware that Don Regan had to go—it was only a question of when. That Regan did not call the President to offer his resignation but required the President to call him, says exactly what his book says about its author: the man simply has no class.

□ 1150

TEXAS CHILI DAY IN U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we convene today after a week or so of thunderstorms and muggy, humid weather in Washington, DC. Folks are having a hard time getting out of bed and coming to work in the morning, and they feel tired and worn out at the end of the day.

Mr. Speaker, folks around here need a break. And on this rainy morning in Washington, I've got just what the doctor ordered—a steaming cup of Texas red—real, honest-to-goodness 2-alarm Texas venison chili.

I want to advise my colleagues in this House and their staffs that today is our annual "Texas Chili Day," and we will be serving the bona fide, authentic dish in room H-128 from 12 noon until the chili runs out.

Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage all my colleagues to take advantage of the opportunity to warm their stomachs and lift their hearts, and join us for a cup of Texas venison chili this afternoon.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4002

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 4002.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my full support to National Tourism Week for 1989. I recognize the importance of the travel and tourism industry which generates billions of dollars each year in Federal, State, and local tax revenues.

This is a very important industry to my State of Alabama. In fact, the Alabama Bureau of Tourism and Travel ranks tourism as Alabama's No. 1 industry.

We welcomed more than 10 million visitors from out of state to Alabama last year. These tourists generated more than \$4 billion in Alabama during 1987 and that meant jobs for more than 78,000 people.

Our State is working hard to attract more tourists and we have a great deal to offer. From the mountains and lakes of north Alabama to Mobile and the beaches at Gulf Shores, Alabama offers a wide variety of attractions.

Of course I'm partial, but I think my district is one of the most beautiful in the State. We have a number of lakes, parks, and historic sites throughout Alabama's Fourth District.

I hope that my colleagues and all our friends from across America will take the opportunity to visit Alabama. I am very proud of what my district and my State have to offer. We really have it all.

HOW GORBACHEV CAN MAKE THE SUMMIT MEANINGFUL

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, most Americans are not aware that President Reagan's visit to the Soviet Union coming up in the next hours is his fourth summit with the General Secretary of the Soviet Union. That is an all-time record for all American Presidents, including Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who first started to have these summit meetings.

I am for the summit, frankly. But I have not changed my mind, nor do I believe President Reagan has, that the Soviet Union's Government is an evil government running an evil empire.

I have been to the Soviet Union five times. I find it one of the most fascinating places on Earth to visit. It is like going to the dark side of the moon. There are Western, European similarities, and yet such grievous differences.

I think the summit process can be used to the advantage of freedom. But it was Stalin himself who said that "one man's life is important; a million deaths is nothing."

If the President will ask about one human being, just one, it will go a long way toward showing the world that Mr. Gorbachev truly is a different kind of Soviet leader and a reformer.

There is a special man who is only one of two non-Americans ever to have been designated an honorary citizen of this country. The first was Winston Churchill decades ago. The second one was in President Reagan's first year, initiated by the gentleman from California, Mr. Tom Lantos, on the Democratic side of the aisle, and supported by me and others on this side. That man is Raoul Wallenberg.

Khrushchev admitted that Raoul Wallenberg, a Swedish hero who saved literally 100,000 Hungarian Jews—the number 100,000 is entered into St. Peter's book on Raoul Wallenberg. It was admitted by Khrushchev that Raoul Wallenberg was a prisoner at least up through 1948. Auran Shiffron of Israel claimed he saw him in his 34th year of captivity. I met with a school friend of his, Ambassador Per Anger, just a few days ago over in the

Rayburn Building. Ambassador Anger looked very healthy.

If Raoul Wallenberg is alive, release him. If he is not, Mr. Gorbachev, tell us where his remains are, return them, and you will impress deeply this Republican conservative.

TRIBUTE TO MARINE CAPTAINS STEVEN C. LESLIE AND KENNETH W. HILL

(Mrs. BYRON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, this morning in Arlington Cemetery we are laying to rest two young Marine captains who lost their lives in the Persian Gulf, Capt. Steven C. Leslie of New Bern, NC, and Capt. Kenneth W. Hill, of Thomasville, NC.

I returned last evening from hearings in the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea with these two young Marine captains' bodies. It was a very emotional arrival at Dover Air Force Base where we had a very brief ceremony welcoming them back to their native land.

These two young men, when called on by their Nation, climbed into their Cobra helicopter, part of the 167th Squadron stationed currently aboard the U.S.S. *Trenton* in the Persian Gulf. They were killed on April 18, 1988.

Our hearts go out to the families of these two young men, as well as the gratitude of their country and their Nation, for their sacrifice is one that we can never explain. This Nation should be very proud of those individuals and their comrades who are currently serving on the *Trenton*, the 400 marines that are embarked plus the Navy complement. The young men that I visited on the U.S.S. *Coronado*, the U.S.S. *Wainwright*, and I spent the night on the U.S.S. *Trenton* and the U.S.S. *Forrestal*, the aircraft carrier that has just arrived on station in the Arabian Sea, are some of the finest troops that we have sent from our shores. Let me hope and pray that they all return not the same way as Captain Leslie and Captain Hill have.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 285

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 285.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MINORITY LEADER'S REMARKS CONCERNING DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

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

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, exactly what did the minority leader of this House say as was quoted in the Washington Post on May 19, 1988? I received from the minority leader this explanation of his position, and I see nothing in the context that modifies the clear meaning. It says, regarding Jesse Jackson, and I quote:

Jackson is running second and the Democrats have got to deal with that problem at their convention. It will be surprising I think to some people when they look at that Democratic Convention out there and see one-third blacks in that composition of delegates.

What is wrong with that? First of all, it is wrong. There will be not one-third blacks in the Democratic Convention delegates, there will be fewer blacks than the proportion of their votes in November for the Democratic Party.

But more important than that, how would my colleagues feel if someone said some people will be surprised to see all of those Jews at the Democratic Convention? How would women feel if someone said people will be surprised to see all of those women out there helping to make policy at the Democratic Convention, or Hispanics?

It is no problem when a black runs second or a woman runs second. It is a source of pride since women and blacks were denied the vote for so long in this country.

The minority leader, I tell my colleagues, owes an apology, not just to Gus SAVAGE, not just to my Democratic Party, but to those all over the world who believe in democracy. Indeed, he owes an apology to America, and to make that apology right here on this floor.

VETO OF THE TRADE BILL

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the veto of the President on the trade bill means that probably there will be no trade bill this year.

What does this mean for American trade policy? It means that we cannot retaliate against unfair trade practices. It means we cannot have a viable export policy. It means we cannot do something about competitiveness. It also means to those of us from the Southwest that we cannot have an energy policy in this country because what this trade bill contained was the repeal of the windfall profit tax, criti-

cal to several Southwestern States involved in oil and gas production and critical to this Nation's energy security.

If we are going to have exploration in this country, if we are going to have a revitalization of this key industry important to our national security, that provision, the repeal of the windfall profit tax, would have been provided for in the vetoed trade bill. But no, the trade bill was vetoed over an act of discourtesy and inhumanity to the American worker.

A notification of 60 days was asked for a displaced worker when a plant closes, an act of human decency that now cannot take place. A positive American national and international policy cannot happen because of the President's veto of this good trade bill. What a shame.

The American people will remember this oversight that is going to hurt our country.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4637, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1989

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 457 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 457

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4637) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes, all points of order against the following provisions of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 5, lines 3 through 9; beginning on page 6, line 6 through page 31, line 5; beginning on page 31, line 12 through 42, line 7; beginning on page 42, lines 15 through 22; beginning on page 43, lines 18 through 25; beginning on page 44, line 6 through page 45, line 5; beginning on page 46, line 1 through page 47, line 4; beginning on page 48, line 20 through page 52, line 3; beginning on page 52, line 7 through page 66, line 2; beginning on page 66, line 8 through page 70, line 22; beginning on page 71, line 6 through page 98, line 24; and all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 18, line 19 through page 19, line 6; beginning on page 27, line 23 through page 28, line 16; and beginning on page 46, line 16 through page 47, line 4. The bill shall be considered for amendment by title instead of by paragraph and each title shall be considered as having been read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except for the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Said amendments shall be considered only in the order specified and if offered by the Member designated in the

report, and shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report. Said amendments and any amendments thereto shall be debatable for not to exceed twenty minutes each, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a member opposed thereto.

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 457 is a rule waiving points of order against consideration of and limiting amendments to H.R. 4637, the foreign operations, export financing, and related programs appropriation bill for fiscal year 1989. The rule waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions of the bill specified by page and line numbers in the rule. Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits consideration of unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in a general appropriation bill. The waivers are necessary because legislation authorizing certain programs funded in this bill have not yet been enacted into law and because some provisions in the bill are legislative in nature. Clause 6 of rule XXI prohibits consideration of reappropriations of unexpended balances in a general appropriation bill. The waivers of this clause are necessary to allow the transfer of unexpended balances from one account to another and the extension of the authority to obligate those funds into the new fiscal year.

Under the rules of the House, a general appropriation bill such as H.R. 4567 is privileged and does not require a rule to permit consideration. The waivers are provided to allow the House to work its will on all of the important provisions contained in the bill. The debate time on the bill will be governed by House rules and any unanimous-consent request made by the manager of the bill.

The rule provides that the bill will be read for amendment by title, with each title considered as having been read. The rule also provides that no amendment shall be in order to the bill except amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying this rule (H. Rept. 100-648), if offered by the Member designated in that report. The amendments must be considered in the order specified in the report and are not subject to amendment except as specified in the report. Each amendment shall be debatable for 20 minutes, with the time equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the rule makes in order 15 amendments to the bill and substitute

amendments for 3 of those amendments. All amendments that the rules committee was requested to include in the rule have been included. I should also point out, however, that the rule does not protect any of the amendments against possible points of order. The rule merely provides that it is in order to offer the amendments specified in the report. Those amendments are still subject to a point of order if they violate any rule of the House.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4637 appropriates \$14.3 billion for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs. This foreign aid bill is highly unusual in that it was reported out of the Appropriations Committee with bipartisan support and is strongly supported by the administration. I want to commend Subcommittee Chairman OBEY and ranking minority member MICKEY EDWARDS for the manner in which they have worked on this bill.

I urge you to support this rule so that we can move ahead with consideration of the appropriation bills.

□ 1205

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule. It sets a precedent that we will come to regret.

For years, Mr. Speaker, we have not restricted amendments on the annual general appropriation bills. Today we are restricting amendments for the first time.

We have checked with the Parliamentarian's Office, and they were not aware of any exact precedent for this rule. It is true that we have sometimes restricted amendments on continuing appropriation resolutions or on supplemental appropriations, but before today Members have had the opportunity to offer amendments on the annual general appropriations bills. Now we are taking one more step to cut off the rights of the individual Member.

Mr. Speaker, we may be told that this rule isn't really so bad, because in fact the Rules Committee made in order every amendment which a Member requested to have made in order. Technically, this is true, but it is interesting to note that out of the 30 amendments Members requested to have made in order on Monday night, only 18 were still being requested by Tuesday afternoon. A remarkable number of Members changed their minds in a very short time; 11 of these 18 amendments made in order, will not be protected if a point of order is made against them.

But even if the Rules Committee had reported a rulemaking in order every one of the amendments requested originally, a precedent is still being established and next time the Rules Committee may not be so generous.

Relying on the tender mercies of the Rules Committee is a risky business.

And even if the Rules Committee would in the future act with similar generosity, Members would still be losing the opportunity to come up with amendments on the floor while the bill is being debated, because under this precedent all amendments have to be submitted to the Rules Committee by a deadline in advance of its meeting.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line of all this is that this rule is one more step in taking away the individual Member's right to have his ideas considered. The annual general appropriations bills have long provided the one sure opportunity for amendments on a very broad range of subjects to be considered. Once we set this precedent for restricting the ability of a Member to offer his ideas, democracy is the loser.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] for purposes of debate only.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I thank the gentleman for those fine remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the rule, but I am here today not just to talk about the foreign aid bill. I would like to talk a little bit about America as we move into the bill because we have been asking around this country for all Americans to bite the bullet. And we have, but we are not biting the bullet in foreign aid. We are really not. We are adding \$1.4 billion more to the foreign aid accounts of the appropriation of the House of Representatives for 1989.

Let us take a look at America. We have whole families, in some cases, sleeping on steel grates. And I know we listen to the President say, "Well, those people don't really want to pull themselves up by their bootstraps." There is not really too much choice for some of those families. Whole families with kids along as well.

There are still children that are hungry in America. We have senior citizens who are waking up in the morning not really secure that their pensions will be honored or that they may have hospitalization or life insurance because their companies filed chapter 11's on them. We have many blacks, Hispanics, and minorities that the only way they can get out of ghettos in this country is to sell dope or go to jail. Then we complain about our crime rate.

We have students who drop out of school at record rates and those that do not some of them graduate and actually cannot read.

There are reports before committees of senior citizens who eat dogfood in some of the big cities.

There was a woman in the city of Youngstown in the late seventies who froze to death, 81 years old, a black woman.

I think what also compounds this debate, if we are going to look at America once in a while, is that there are many young people who will probably never be able to own a home. That is what our statistics show us.

So let us talk about spending now, let us talk about priorities and \$1.4 billion more for foreign aid.

Last year we had \$13 billion in the foreign aid account. When it went over to the Senate, the CR, it came back with another \$401 million in foreign aid.

Some Senator put in \$8 million for a school in France. Someone else put in \$6 million.

I think we understand what is happening. We have cut housing, we have cut drug money, we have cut education, we have cut the Coast Guard. We not only cut the urban development action grants and Community Development Block Grant Program, but the President wants to throw them out. He wants to get rid of the Appalachian Regional Commission, he wants to get rid of the Economic Development Administration. My God, the Economic Development Administration is \$230 million. We actually cut out completely the General Revenue-Sharing Program. It was called pork barrel. It was about \$3 billion. It went to American cities, American counties and in my district, hit by the loss of 55,000 steel jobs, they used that money to hire policemen and firemen.

But what are we doing here with this foreign aid appropriation? We are adding money, we really are. I can get the drift, I can get it very well.

I have two amendments today; one cuts 10 percent across the board, treats everybody alike. The only exemption is international narcotics control money.

The second one is 5 percent. I do not know when they will be offered. More than likely you will see a substitute because I doubt if this House will get an opportunity to vote up or down on the record on their stand on priorities of where America's dollars should go.

The rhetoric here does not say what the priorities are for America. America's priorities are in its line-item budget and the line-item budget that is coming before the House today says there will be \$1.4 billion more needed for people overseas for a number of good reasons, but we should continue to bite the bullet and tighten the belts in our own country.

I am saying this type of talk is completely, in my opinion, out of control.

I know that I am standing pretty much alone here today. I do not think it has too much of a shot, these two amendments. I have been asked to pull them. I am not knocking our chairmen, I think they do a fine job and this is not a simplistic issue and I am not trying to make it that. But I will

tell you this, if we are going to cut we should treat everybody alike.

And like Willie Davis, the great Green Bay Hall of Famer, when asked about the great coach Lombardi, he said, "What do you think about the coach?" And he says, "We love him." And the interviewer asks, "Why?" He said, "Because he treats us all alike, like dogs, but all alike."

I think that our policies and our dollar policies should be the same; what is good for the goose is good for the gander.

If it is good for America it is good for the people overseas.

So I hope you consider this. I hope the Members have a chance to look at this. I do not know if you will really get a chance to vote up or down, but I appreciate the time and yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Bosco). The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute additional to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, did I understand the gentleman to say he was asked to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. TRAFICANT. There are people who mentioned to me that maybe I should not offer my amendment.

Mr. LATTA. So the gentleman yielded to their request?

Mr. TRAFICANT. No. I will be offering both of my amendments today. At some particular point I expect a substitute in on it that would cut about \$276 million totally. My first amendment would cut about \$1.4 billion which would leave a little bit less than last year. My second amendment would cut \$713 million but would still leave more than \$600 million more than was in foreign aid last year.

And I am going to offer my amendments, to the distinguished minority leader. I do not know what the status will be with respect to a substitute.

Mr. LATTA. I was curious because we had 30 amendments and then suddenly we had only 18 overnight. They dropped from 30 to 18, as I indicated in my statement earlier.

I am just kind of curious who might have asked the gentleman to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I think there are a number of people that have called and asked me to pull my amendments. I have made a decision I would offer the amendment and call for a vote on them.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I particularly want to thank the gentleman for the statement he made a few minutes ago because I think it outlines a problem with this rule that probably the House is not going to focus on, but it should. It ought not just be focused on by minority Members, it ought to be focused on by the majority as well.

There is sometimes in this House a degree of arrogance which is nearly unparalleled.

Just last night the Republican leadership brought to the floor numerous Republicans to talk about how the Jeffersonian traditions of this House are being obliterated. There was a long discussion about how principles of legislative behavior had been steadily violated over the last couple of years.

Today, what do we bring to the floor? A rule that goes one step further than we have ever gone before. One of the basic Jeffersonian traditions in this House is that each individual representative should have the ability to have impact on the spending measures of the Federal Government.

This rule, for the first time, moves us outside that tradition. This rule says that the Rules Committee is now going to decide who has the ability to have impact on spending bills.

That is a very, very bad precedent. I find it particularly appalling then to hear the gentleman from Ohio mention a minute ago that in addition to the rule that does that evidently Members of his leadership have come to him asking him to withdraw his amendments. In other words, we compound a bad rule with a standard that twists Members' arms not to offer amendments that would cut funding.

I think we would make a mistake to adopt this rule and I guess I am just kind of interested in why this rule is necessary. I am wondering if the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] who is paying rapt attention to what the gentleman is saying, to explain to the House exactly why for the first time in history we have to have a rule that limits the Jeffersonian tradition of Members being able to offer any amendment they wanted on spending bills? Can the gentleman tell me? For the first time in history, why are we going to do that?

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK].

Mr. DERRICK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the primary reason is that we had a bipartisan agreement on it, both sides of the aisle. We made every amendment that was offered in order. I do not see what the problem is.

Mr. WALKER. Let me say to the gentleman the problem is that we know from past experience that once you get a precedent like this we tend to see it come in ways which will not have bipartisan agreement. Can the gentleman tell me that we will never have a rule on the floor like this with these kinds of limitations in them that is not the result of a bipartisan agreement?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, let me tell the gentleman this bill has not been to the floor in 6 or 7 years. You know, I think most of us ought to be pleased that we are going to have an opportunity to vote on it whether we support it or not, and to vote on all of the amendments. You know, I cannot give you some guarantee about what the precedent is going to be for the rest of the time we are in Congress. But as far as I am concerned, I think this is a very good rule and another example of an excellent rule coming out of the Committee on Rules.

□ 1220

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have to disagree with the gentleman in that the Committee on Rules has been an absolute abomination in this Congress. We have more restrictive rules in this Congress than ever before in the history of the House. You all have decided that the Members of this House should be subjugated to the will of the Democratic leadership and primarily to the will of the Committee on Rules, in fact.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DERRICK. Let me say that the problem of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is not the Committee on Rules. His problem is that under the leadership of our Speaker that we are getting a lot done and getting legislation moved through this House.

That is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] does not like.

Mr. WALKER. No. If the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] would look at the record of this Congress, he will find out that most of what this Congress has done is pass commemorative legislation, that the vast majority of the legislation that we have passed in this Congress have been commemorative bills. That is not exactly doing the work of the people, and in fact what happens in most of these restrictive rules is that it is not a case of whether or not something gets done. It is whether or not the minority is kept from being able to do things. Much of what is done is an attempt to freeze out the minority from having its day in court, from being able to offer the amendments that it wishes to bring to the national attention, and

so, therefore, we have restrictive rules aimed at attempting to keep the minority from offering its programs on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is another in that tradition.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, let me first compliment the gentleman on a very excellent statement, but let me also point out that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. JAMIE WHITTEN, never requested this rule.

I have a copy of the letter, and I ask to insert it at this point in the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,

Washington, DC, May 20, 1988.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,

Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Appropriations has reported the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1989, H.R. 4637. The bill is below the budget request, and consistent with the House passed Budget Resolution for FY 1989.

It has become necessary, in order to meet deadlines, that we include appropriations for a number of programs for which legislation has not been enacted and for which a waiver of Clause 2 and Clause 6, Rule XXI is requested.

With respect to the lack of authorization for appropriations, representatives of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Banking Committee have been contacted and we know of no objections. The bill contains a general provision "Sec. 555" (p. 74, lines 16-19), which prohibits the expenditure of any funds appropriated in this bill until authorizing legislation for such funds has been enacted. This provision was included to preserve the prerogatives of the various legislative Committees because the authorizing legislation for the numerous programs funded in the bill are in various stages of the legislative process.

With respect to Clause 6 of Rule XXI the Committee requests the rule waive points of order for the following items: "Private Sector Revolving Fund" (p. 19, lines 1-14), "Inter-American Foundation" (p. 28, lines 6-25) and "Deobligation/Reobligation Authority, Sec. 515" (p. 47, lines 6-20).

Your continued cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

JAMIE WHITTEN,
Chairman.

Mr. LATTA. But let me also say, Mr. Speaker, that it is not only the minority that is penalized under this rule. The entire House membership is penalized because, if somebody comes to the floor wanting to offer an amendment, he cannot do it, and it might be a very important amendment. A succession of these type rules is going to be seen in the future. Amendments are going to have to be in by a certain time, and that is wrong. I think the opportunity to offer amendments ought to be left open to the membership.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] is absolutely correct.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would have to say, if I were to take the remarks of the previous speaker seriously. Let me simply say it is very difficult to take those remarks very seriously because the facts are that not a single Member who asked to have an amendment made in order was precluded from having an amendment made in order. We have not had a foreign aid bill on the floor since 1981, a freestanding appropriation bill. They have always in the past been subsumed in continuing resolutions, and so Members have not had an opportunity to vote on them at all. The only thing that this rule provides is courtesy to the individual Member.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to say it, but very frankly anybody who served here for more than a day and a half and does not have a particular axe to grind, recognizes that this place can get pretty whacko if any individual Member decides that he is going to out of the blue, with no notice to anyone, with no thought, simply going to offer an amendment. People have to go on record on that amendment without having any idea what the contents are, without having any idea what the implications are. The only thing this rule does is to say to each and every Member of the House that, if they are interested enough to offer an amendment to this bill, they should have enough courtesy toward their colleagues so that it is offered ahead of time, so that individual Members who have to vote on it can have the time to analyze it, can have the time to read it, and have the time to understand it. So that they do not walk through one of these doors and ask, "What is this thing?", and we say, "We do not know; it was just offered; we do not have the foggiest idea what it really does because nobody has any notice of it."

Mr. Speaker, if anybody thinks that it is abusive of the legislative process to try to give individual Members notice on the subjects on which they are going to have to vote, they have a pretty strange idea of what constitutes order and courtesy.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I look upon this rule in much the same way as the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Ohio who is managing this rule on the Republican side. It is for us a radical departure from the past practice in which Members were able to offer amendments and the House was able to work its will on the bills that are of greatest importance to our constituents. That is the bills that spend the taxpayers' money, much of which is spent without ap-

proval of the majority of the taxpayers.

The rule is a radical departure. The gentleman from Pennsylvania correctly pointed out that we have done that which at least none of us here present have ever seen done before. We have been given a rule which has the usual waivers of points or orders which is, I think, a terrible aberration of the process and an admission that the House is not being managed correctly and that the process does not work.

In addition, we have had only a few amendments made in order for the most privileged of us who have friends on the Committee on Rules or friends in the Democratic leadership or who may have been alert enough to know that this was the kind of a rule that was going to be laid upon us.

As the gentleman from Ohio correctly pointed out, it does not just degrade the minority. This rule degrades the whole House. It says that we are not men and women enough to stand up and look at unusual amendments or amendments which may occur to the Members as we go through the bill.

The gentleman from Wisconsin would protect us from all of that, and we are going to be terribly grateful for that protection. We would not have to express ourselves on important points that Members think ought to be raised on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I think the most distressing part about this rule is that the manager of the rule from the Committee on Rules, the manager of the bill from the Committee on Appropriations, distinguished Members for whom I have great respect, admiration and even affection, are not even embarrassed by this rule, and that to me is the greatest shame of the whole day. We continue to go forward in our dissent, our accelerating dissent, into tyranny and czarism in this House in which the common Members and mostly Members of the minority are increasingly irrelevant, and this, of course degrades even the most powerful Members and the Members of the leadership who in this case happen to be the doers rather than the doers.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the rule is indignantly rejected.

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Bosco). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FRENZEL. 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 246, nays 154, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—246

Ackerman	Gejdenson	Oakar
Alexander	Gephardt	Oberstar
Anderson	Gibbons	Obeys
Andrews	Glickman	Olin
Annunzio	Gonzalez	Ortiz
Anthony	Gordon	Owens (NY)
Applegate	Gradison	Owens (UT)
Atkins	Grant	Panetta
AuCoin	Gray (IL)	Patterson
Barnard	Gray (PA)	Pease
Bates	Guarini	Pelosi
Beilenson	Hall (TX)	Penny
Bennett	Hamilton	Pepper
Berman	Harris	Perkins
Bevill	Hatcher	Pickett
Bilbray	Hawkins	Pickle
Bilirakis	Hayes (IL)	Price
Billey	Hayes (LA)	Rangel
Boggs	Hefner	Ray
Boland	Hertel	Richardson
Bonior	Hochbrueckner	Rinaldo
Bonker	Horton	Robinson
Borski	Hoyer	Rodino
Bosco	Hubbard	Roe
Boucher	Hughes	Rose
Boxer	Hutto	Rostenkowski
Brennan	Johnson (CT)	Rowland (CT)
Brooks	Johnson (SD)	Rowland (GA)
Broomfield	Jones (TN)	Roybal
Brown (CA)	Jontz	Russo
Bruce	Kanjorski	Sabo
Bryant	Kaptur	Savage
Bustamante	Kastenmeier	Sawyer
Byron	Kennedy	Scheuer
Campbell	Kennelly	Schroeder
Cardin	Kildee	Schulze
Carper	Kleczka	Sharp
Carr	Kolter	Shays
Chapman	Kostmayer	Sikorski
Chappell	LaFalce	Sisisky
Clarke	Lancaster	Skelton
Clay	Lantos	Slaterry
Clement	Leath (TX)	Slaughter (NY)
Coelho	Lehman (CA)	Smith (FL)
Coleman (TX)	Lehman (FL)	Smith (IA)
Collins	Leland	Solarz
Conyers	Lent	Spratt
Cooper	Levin (MI)	St Germain
Coyne	Levine (CA)	Staggers
Crockett	Lewis (GA)	Stallings
Darden	Lipinski	Stark
de la Garza	Lloyd	Stokes
Dellums	Lowry (WA)	Stratton
Derrick	Luken, Thomas	Studds
Dicks	Mack	Swift
Dingell	Manton	Synar
DioGuardi	Markey	Tallon
Dixon	Martinez	Thomas (GA)
Donnelly	Matsui	Torres
Dorgan (ND)	Mavroules	Torricelli
Dowdy	Mazzoli	Towns
Downey	McCloskey	Trafiacant
Durbin	McCurdy	Traxler
Dwyer	McHugh	Udall
Dymally	McMillen (MD)	Valentine
Dyson	Meyers	Vander Jagt
Early	Mfume	Vento
Eckart	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Edwards (CA)	Miller (WA)	Volkmeyer
Erdreich	Mineta	Walgren
Espy	Moakley	Waxman
Evans	Mollohan	Weldon
Fascell	Montgomery	Wheat
Fazio	Morella	Whitten
Feighan	Morrison (CT)	Williams
Foglietta	Mrazek	Wilson
Foley	Murtha	Wise
Ford (MI)	Nagle	Wolpe
Ford (TN)	Natcher	Wortley
Frank	Neal	Wyden
Frost	Nelson	Yates
Gaydos	Nichols	Yatron

NAYS—154

Archer	Gregg	Pursell
Arney	Gunderson	Quillen
Badham	Hammerschmidt	Rahall
Baker	Hastert	Ravenel
Ballenger	Hefley	Regula
Bartlett	Henry	Rhodes
Barton	Herger	Ritter
Bateman	Hiler	Roberts
Bentley	Hopkins	Rogers
Bereuter	Hunter	Roth
Boehlert	Hyde	Saiki
Brown (CO)	Inhofe	Saxton
Buechner	Ireland	Schaefer
Bunning	Jacobs	Schneider
Burton	Jeffords	Schuette
Callahan	Jenkins	Sensenbrenner
Chandler	Kasich	Shaw
Cheney	Kolbe	Shumway
Clinger	Konnyu	Shuster
Coats	Kyl	Skaggs
Coble	Lagomarsino	Skeen
Coleman (MO)	Latta	Slaughter (VA)
Combest	Leach (IA)	Smith (NE)
Conte	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Coughlin	Lewis (FL)	Smith (TX)
Courter	Lightfoot	Smith, Denny
Craig	Livingston	(OR)
Crane	Lott	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	(NH)
Daub	Lukens, Donald	Smith, Robert
Davis (IL)	Lungren	(OR)
Davis (MI)	Madigan	Snowe
DeFazio	Marlenee	Solomon
DeLay	Martin (IL)	Stenholm
DeWine	Martin (NY)	Stump
Dickinson	McCandless	Sundquist
Dornan (CA)	McCollum	Sweeney
Dreier	McCrery	Swindall
Edwards (OK)	McDade	Tauke
Emerson	McEwen	Tauzin
English	McMillan (NC)	Taylor
Fawell	Michel	Thomas (CA)
Fields	Miller (OH)	Upton
Fish	Molinari	Vucanovich
Flippo	Morrison (WA)	Walker
Frenzel	Murphy	Weber
Galleghy	Nielson	Whittaker
Gallo	Oxley	Wolf
Gekas	Packard	Wyllie
Gingrich	Parris	Young (AK)
Goodling	Pashayan	Young (FL)
Grandy	Petri	
Green	Porter	

NOT VOTING—31

Akaka	Holloway	Myers
Aspin	Houghton	Nowak
Biaggi	Huckaby	Ridge
Boulter	Jones (NC)	Roukema
Duncan	Kemp	Schumer
Flake	Lujan	Spence
Florio	MacKay	Stangeland
Garcia	McGrath	Watkins
Gilman	Mica	Weiss
Hall (OH)	Moody	
Hansen	Moorhead	

□ 1249

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Moody for, with Mr. Boulter against.

Messrs. EMERSON, BADHAM, and PURSELL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. KAPTUR changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO OFFER GILMAN AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4637, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1989

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to offer, instead of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] who cannot be here today and who was designated in the rule, the Gilman amendment relating to earmarking of drug money from the International Narcotics Bureau to H.R. 4637.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Bosco). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM THURSDAY, MAY 26, 1988, TO WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1988, AND ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM FRIDAY, MAY 27, 1988, OR SATURDAY, MAY 28, 1988, TO MONDAY, JUNE 6, 1988

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 306) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 306

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That when the House adjourns on Thursday, May 26, 1988, it stand adjourned until 1 o'clock post meridiem on Wednesday, June 1, 1988, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first, and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Friday, May 27, 1988, or on Saturday, May 28, 1988, pursuant to a motion made by the majority leader, or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand adjourned until 11 o'clock ante meridiem on Monday, June 6, 1988, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the minority leader of the House and the minority leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the gentleman from Wyoming reserves the right to object to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object simply for the purpose of giving the distinguished

majority leader an opportunity to explain what we are doing here.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished acting Republican leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is the standard adjournment resolution covering the Memorial Day recess which has been scheduled now for some time. It calls for the House to adjourn at the close of business tomorrow and to resume its sitting at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, June 1, 1988, subject to a second section which allows the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the Senate after consultation with the Republican leaders of the House and the Senate to call Members back if there is a special emergency reason for that recall.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is it reasonable at this point to ask of the majority leader what he would anticipate by way of the schedule for next week in terms of what will be on the program?

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, we are planning to announce the schedule tomorrow and we are not quite prepared at this time to advise Members in a definitive way about next week's schedule, but I would remind Members that when we, in consultation with the minority, announced the schedule for the remainder of this month and next month we indicated that Friday, June 3, 1988, would be one of the two Friday sessions where votes would be taken. We would anticipate returning next Wednesday at 1 p.m. as this resolution calls for, having votes on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, and adjourning by 3 p.m. on Friday. But the precise legislative schedule is still under consideration and will be announced tomorrow.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ALLOW DESIGNEE TO OFFER GILMAN AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4637, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1989

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be modified to permit a designee of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] to offer the amendment printed in the RECORD under his name on May 23, 1988, to H.R. 4637, the For-

sign Assistance Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1989.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to that request. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] has already requested that authority with respect to one of the amendments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. I have no objection to that request. I would object to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

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. 4637) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes; and that I might include tabular and extraneous material and charts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1989

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4637) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1256

ON 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. 4637, with Mr. TORRES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 16 minutes.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, I am probably as surprised by this fact as the administration and as would be the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS], but I think it is useful to note that for the first time in 7 years we have a foreign aid appropriation bill which is supported unanimously by the subcommittee. This bill is supported by the administration. It is supported by the leadership of both parties. It is supported unanimously by the subcommittee, and I think it is useful to put that agreement in context so that people on both sides of the aisle of whatever philosophical persuasion can understand how we have gotten here.

Over the last 7 years the administration has pursued a budget policy which has increased military spending by approximately 50 percent in real-dollar terms and has reduced domestic discretionary spending by 20 percent in real-dollar terms. In my mind Congress has sadly acquiesced in that change. Because the thrust of those changes was accompanied by simultaneous reduction of revenue, we have seen deficits triple over that same period of time.

I personally fought that policy. I offered amendments in 1981 and 1982 to both the budget spending proposals of the administration and the revenue proposals of the administration. I got beat. The Congress saw fit to follow the President's lead, in the main, over that 7-year period.

We have continued to have very strong differences about what happens in foreign aid. Over the last 3 years since I became chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriation, I think it is fair to say that the committee has fought to slow the administration's requested growth for military aid paid for with borrowed dollars. As a consequence we have produced foreign assistance bills which 3 years in a row drew an objection from the fiscal arm of the White House, the Office of Management and Budget. For 3 years in a row the OMB sent letters to the Congress indicating that they would recommend that the President veto our bill, because we did not

spend enough money. I think it is fair to say I am the only chairman in the history of the Congress to receive one of those letters from OMB much less three. The Secretary of State and a number of other administration officials routinely over the past 3 years attacked the product produced by the committee suggesting that a great country had to meet its obligations in terms of foreign aid spending around the world.

My response to that was that a great country also had to pay its bills.

Last year alone this subcommittee made the largest percentage cut of any committee in the administration's budget request. We wound up reducing the administration's foreign aid request by \$2.3 billion, a 16-percent reduction. When it left the House it was \$2.6 billion. We were able to move that \$2.3 billion which we saved on the foreign aid side of the ledger into agriculture programs, education programs, health programs and job programs here at home.

After 3 years of fighting, the sands have shifted and we finally have uncovered ground on which we can all stand, and as I have indicated, this bill is supported unanimously by the Republican and Democratic leadership, by the State Department, by OMB, by the President, and by our subcommittee.

There are two questions which ought to be asked to put this bill in perspective. The first question is: Why was this subcommittee so stingy over the past 3 years? I would think that the subcommittee would need make no apologies for being that stingy, because there was no way that the administration could expect us to add large dollars for foreign assistance while in the act of crunching investment programs for people here at home.

The other question which people would ask on the other side of the ledger is: Why should there be any foreign aid bill at all? I think the answer to that is determined simply by whether you think the United States ought to be a leader or a follower in international affairs.

Some people think that if you just abolish the Foreign Aid Program we could balance the budget. The fact is that we provide a little over 1 percent of our entire Federal budget for foreign aid. We provide far less than 1 percent of our total national income for foreign aid. The fact is if we eliminated the entire Foreign Aid Program, our Federal deficit would still be \$145 billion, reduced only about \$14 billion. The cost to the average citizen for our entire foreign aid operation is equivalent to the cost of about one martini or one hamburger a week. The fact is that the military budget is 21 times

more expensive to American taxpayers than is the foreign aid budget.

You do not buy many missiles with the foreign aid bill, but you do buy three things. First of all, we meet our moral responsibilities to help many poor souls who happen to share this globe with us. One of the most distressing things to me as I go into high schools around the country is that I see Americans take almost for granted the fact that we were born as Americans. The fact is that we need to humbly recognize that we did not earn our way into being born in this country. God was simply good enough to infuse our soul in a body which happened to be born in the good old U.S. of A. If it had been different, we could just as easily have been born in Bangladesh. This bill helps in a small way to meet our obligation to share a tiny bit of our resources with the poorest and most wretched of souls on the face of the globe.

As just one example, 4 million kids die worldwide every year from diseases from which they could easily be immunized, diseases that we take for granted in this country. This bill helps in a small way to change that.

This bill also helps to strengthen the ability of Third World economies to grow. Our economy badly needs expanded exports to Third World countries if we are to produce the jobs that our citizens need. This bill helps create markets for those products by helping to develop those economies.

This bill also helps to directly finance exports to the entire world through the funds that it provides for the Export-Import Bank and the Trade Assistance Program, for instance.

The bill also accomplishes a third end in that it helps allies strengthen their ability to defend themselves. It is aimed at creating political and economic stability which can create markets for American products. It is aimed at creating military allies in a troubled world, and it is aimed at strengthening fledgling democracies.

Sometimes these programs work; sometimes they fail. The only thing you can do is to keep trying and to keep changing programs that do not work and try to develop them into programs that do. That is what the authorizing committee has tried to do for years, and that is what we have tried to do.

We have seen military spending double, but, frankly, many of the challenges which this country faces cannot be met with tanks; they cannot be met with intercontinental missiles. This bill is crucial in trying to develop and expand this country's capacity to deal with those kinds of threats, the kind that cannot be met with those weapons.

This bill is in full compliance with the summit agreement which was

reached between the President and the Congress. Compared to last year for the IFI's, it is up \$156 million. For development assistance bilaterally, it is up \$49 million; for ESF, it is up \$60 million; for military aid, it is up \$23 million; \$20 million of which is directly targeted to drug problems.

In comparison to the President's budget, this bill is \$128 million over the President for bilateral development programs. It is \$38 million over the President's request for IFI's. It is \$14 million over for international organizations and programs, and it is \$20 million below the President in ESF funding. Overall it is \$8 million below the President's request. That still leaves us \$1.6 billion below the level the President requested for fiscal 1988. It means that we took \$23 billion last year and moved out the foreign aid to domestic programs, and it means that this year we are moving \$1.6 billion from that amount out of foreign aid requests for last year and continuing to make them available for domestic programs.

To put in perspective some other numbers, in 1987 the administration requested \$15.2 billion, a 70-percent increase over 1981. We have cut that to \$13.6 billion, or 52 percent growth over 1981, which means we have cut the growth in foreign assistance which the administration asked us to approve by 26 percent.

In military procurement items, we were spending \$5.7 billion in 1985. This bill provides \$4.7 billion, a full \$1 billion less than we were providing in 1985, a 20-percent cut.

□ 1310

If we had approved past administration requests for foreign assistance increases, today grant military assistance would be up by 850 percent. We have scaled back the administration's requested increases by 150 percent.

The total discretionary military funding under the bill, if we had followed the administration's request the past 3 years, would have been increased by 111 percent over 1981. We have reduced that rate of increase by 60 percent through the reductions we have made in the President's budget requests through the years.

In ESF we have provided a reduction of 40 percent in the increase which the administration had asked the Congress to approve over the years. And for development assistance on the economic side, bilateral development assistance and multilateral development assistance we have provided worldwide an increase of 6 percent over the administration's overall request. The administration asked for a 20-percent increase. We gave the administration a 26-percent increase. So we have moved those priorities around significantly through the years.

In the bill this year the biggest change from the administration is that the administration wanted to convert all military loans to grants, adding \$940 million to grant military assistance. We denied all but \$230 million of that, targeted it exclusively for Pakistan, and then we offset that \$230 million in grants with a \$210 million reduction in loans, leaving them with a net increase of about \$22 million.

For Central America we have essentially continued the compromise which was hammered our last year.

For the Middle East, we have provided a new initiative for West Bank development to assist the Palestinian community and the West Bank in economic development. We have provided an additional \$23 million in that program for this year.

The second major difference that we have with the administration is in the area of base rights. The administration asked for substantial increases in base rights contributions to our NATO allies, and we simply refused to provide much by way of those increases because the fact is that today the United States spends on average about 6½ percent of its GNP to defend the Western World. Our European allies on average spent 3½ percent. With that 3½ percent gap they have enormous resources which they can invest in new plants, new equipment, job training, worker training, in order to improve their own competitive posture, and in doing so they can knock our socks off on trade. So for that reason we have decided that there is no justification for a significant increase in base rights contributions around the world.

Basically those are the differences between the administration's proposal and the committee action. I am very pleased that we because of the work of a tremendous number of people, have been able to come up with a bill which is supported on a bipartisan basis. The President has sent a very strong letter in support of this bill without change.

I would like to thank also at this point all the members of the subcommittee, most especially the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS], who serves as the ranking Republican on the committee, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. McHUGH], who serves sometimes as almost a second chairman on the subcommittee.

I would also like to thank the subcommittee staff and the associate staff of the members who make up the subcommittee, and certainly those administration representatives who have worked to help put together a coalition which could support for the first time in 7 years a freestanding foreign aid bill.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the chairman of the authorizing commit-

tee, for their assistance most especially.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I simply want to say I rise in strong support of this legislation and to commend the gentleman and the subcommittee for bringing the bill to the floor. They have done an outstanding job particularly, it seems to me, not only with the readjustments within the bill, but for their strong support of the normal legislative process. As the chairman of an authorizing committee, I cannot stress too much how important it is that the position taken by the gentleman's subcommittee is helping restore the normal processes in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4637, the foreign operations appropriation bill for fiscal year 1989.

I would like to commend the leadership of the House, and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. OBEY, for moving expeditiously to bring this bill to the floor and for moving to restore the normal legislative process of authorizations and appropriations.

As Members are aware, the House has twice passed H.R. 3100, the bill authorizing foreign assistance programs for fiscal year 1989. Unfortunately, the other body has not yet taken action on this measure. However, the bill currently under consideration, H.R. 4637, includes a provision—section 555—which prohibits obligation of any of the funds in the bill which have not been authorized. So this bill supports the normal requirements of the rules of the House that funds must be authorized before they are appropriated.

I also support the rule under which this bill is being considered. Amendments which would violate rule XXI, which prohibits legislation on appropriations bills, are not protected under this rule. This further supports the normal legislative process, whereby legislation is contained in the authorization bill while appropriations bills concern funding levels. Points of order will therefore be raised against any amendment which is legislative in intent.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in my 12 years in the Congress I have very rarely voted for a foreign aid bill, but this bill is in our clear national interest.

To begin with, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the chairman of our subcommittee, for his leadership role in putting together a bipartisan bill that in fact both of us and both parties and the administration are able to support. As this chairman has said, this bill is supported by every member of the subcommittee, both Democrat and Republican. The Republican leadership supports it and the Democratic leader-

ship supports it and the President supports it.

This bill meets the most important security needs of our best friends and allies, and it does so in complete agreement with the budget summit. Passage of this legislation will send a clear signal about America's leadership and its commitments throughout the world.

The bill will help us provide military support to others who, while defending themselves, often provide our first line of defense, and because a strong military alliance is an essential component of effective diplomacy, this bill will help secure U.S. interests. It helps assure us that countries essential to the military advantage of the Soviet Union will not fall into pro-Soviet hands, and at the same time it demonstrates that the United States, by responding to dramatic and urgent need in time of flood, famine, and earthquake and other disasters that strike other countries around the world, that the United States cares about other people and that too is a help to the United States in terms of diplomacy.

This bill halts the decline in security assistance which has threatened our ability to help our friends and allies over the past several years. It provides \$5.8 billion in military assistance. That is a \$431 million increase over last year's level.

In addition, this bill increases the grant component of aid to our nearest allies which helps those dollars go farther.

The committee declined by bipartisan agreement to provide funding for the World Bank's general capacity increase specifically due to lack of authorization and a decision to take care of past arrearages before launching any new commitments.

In addition, we supported the administration's request to hold off any appropriation for the Inter-American Development Bank until we reach an agreeable conclusion on United States voting rights and IDB management practices and our concerns about the continued disbursement of past loans to Nicaragua.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other items in this bill which support our national interests, but the point that I want to make in conclusion is that this is a responsible foreign aid bill. It does not make any major policy changes. It does not commit us to any new programs that we either cannot afford or cannot justify on national security grounds.

It allows us to pursue both economic and military interests in base rights countries, military access countries and with our close friends and allies throughout the world. It will help promote regional stability not only by keeping our friends from falling into pro-Soviet hands, but by moving our allies toward democracy, to reduce the

potential foothold of Communist insurgencies.

In short, this bill contributes substantially to the achievement of America's foreign policy objectives.

If my colleagues listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], our chairman, they heard him emphasizing one side of what this bill does, and they can hear me emphasizing the other side of what this bill does to address the concerns that many Republican Members have. The truth is it is a bill in which the Democrats on the committee and the Republicans on the committee can honestly say it addresses the real concerns that we have all had, and for that reason is the best foreign aid bill that we have produced in all of the time that I have been in the Congress. We have done so not only by cooperation between ourselves, but in cooperation with the executive branch, and I would repeat that we have one of those rare things, a letter from OMB in support of what we have done, a letter from the Secretary of State and a letter from the President asking this Congress to support this bill as it was reported out of committee.

So I urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to support this bill. As some of the members of the Appropriations Committee have said, maybe we have seen the arrival of the millennium. We have a bill here that I think all Members of the House ought to be able to support, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McHUGH].

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and urge its adoption by the House.

This legislation results from months of hearings by the Foreign Operations Subcommittee and represents what the Appropriations Committee believes is necessary to meet the global responsibilities of the United States during the coming year.

In making these recommendations, we are sensitive to the many pressing problems in our own country and to the importance of exercising budgetary restraint. At the same time, the international position and interests of the United States require an active foreign policy, which must be supported with resources to be effective. The funds appropriated in this bill represent only 1.4 percent of the total budget, the minimum necessary to safeguard U.S. interests abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. This is the first

regular foreign aid appropriations measure to reach the floor since 1981, and the chairman has worked diligently to put together a proposal with broad bipartisan support.

That was not easy given the diverse views represented in the committee. Foreign aid is never popular and we have had some very intense debates about aid legislation in the past. However, working closely with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS], Mr. OBEY succeeded in fashioning a bipartisan compromise and I think that both he and the ranking minority member deserve the thanks of the House. I also want to thank the representatives of the administration who worked with the committee in putting this bill together. We are pleased to have the administration's support today.

FUNDING LEVELS: OVERVIEW

Mr. Chairman, the bill recommends \$14.3 billion in new budget authority, including \$980 million in mandatory spending. If one excludes those items that are mandatory, the bill provides for a modest increase in discretionary foreign assistance funding.

That increase was agreed to in the budget summit agreement negotiated last December between Congress and the administration, and I would hope that the House will honor that commitment. This increase also should be seen in the context of the substantial reductions that have been made in foreign aid in recent years.

In fiscal year 1985, the United States spent approximately \$20.9 billion on the various programs and activities funded in this bill. Thus, even if our recommendation of \$14.3 billion is approved, foreign aid will have been cut by more than 30 percent since fiscal year 1985. Indeed, using comparable accounting methods, we are spending less on foreign assistance today than we did in fiscal year 1981, the last year of the Carter administration.

To be sure, the priorities of the program have changed in recent years. At the administration's urging, we are spending substantially more on security assistance today than in 1981, a trend that many of us on this side of the aisle have questioned. Fortunately, however, this bill continues the effort begun when Mr. OBEY became chairman to move back toward a more balanced foreign aid program, one that better recognizes the importance of development and humanitarian programs.

For example, this bill increases discretionary spending over last year by almost \$300 million. Of that amount, \$213.5 million is directed to development and humanitarian aid programs, \$60.2 million to the ESF account, and only \$23.9 million to the military aid accounts. Therefore, those of us who have been concerned about the relative growth of military aid in the early

Reagan years can support the priorities reflected in this legislation.

FOREIGN AID AND AMERICAN INTERESTS

Many of our constituents question why we spend money on foreign aid at all. Foreign aid lacks broad popular support and it is an easy target for those who do not make the connection between the funds contained in this bill and the important interests they serve.

While most Americans oppose foreign aid in general, many can be persuaded to support the activities funded in this bill when those activities are explained. For example, one of the items in the bill is our International Narcotics Control Program, which is designed to help stem the flow of dangerous drugs into the United States. While we might debate how effectively those funds are used, most Americans strongly support this fundamental foreign policy objective.

As this example suggests, our Foreign Aid Program encompasses many different kinds of activities. We provide funds to some countries in exchange for the use of overseas military bases that are important to our own national defense. We support international agencies like UNICEF that are seeking to eliminate the causes of death and disease among the world's children, or to alleviate the plight of victims of famine and disasters.

We also provide funds to poor countries to promote their economic development, which helps to create new markets for American goods and services. Continued economic growth, especially market-oriented growth, contributes to political stability in the developing nations, and to our own economic strength as well.

In short, foreign aid is an essential tool of American foreign policy. Properly framed and competently administered, it does serve vital American interests.

MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

A good example of how U.S. interests are advanced by this bill is the funding it contains for the multilateral development banks. The United States is a member of four development banks: The World Bank and the regional development banks for Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Each of these institutions has a "hard" and "soft" loan window.

The hard windows typically lend at commercial rates to middle-income developing countries and to poorer countries with good credit ratings. The soft loan windows lend at concessional rates to the very poorest countries. In addition, a number of specialized agencies of the banks promote investment in developing nations.

Collectively, these institutions seek to build and maintain an international economic framework that is open, predictable, growth-oriented and equitable. The development banks are

among the most cost effective but least well understood instruments through which the United States attempts to pursue its foreign policy objectives abroad.

U.S. humanitarian interests are served by development bank lending for activities designed to alleviate poverty, promote basic human needs, and foster equitable economic growth in the world's poorest nations. Consider, for example, the International Development Association [IDA], the soft-loan window of the World Bank. Today IDA is the largest source of concessional finance available to the poorest countries. More than 96 percent of its lending is provided to countries with per capita incomes of \$400 or less. About half of its loans assist nations in sub-Saharan Africa, which collectively constitute the largest group of poor countries in the world today.

Most Americans understand that in this interdependent world we cannot long enjoy security and economic growth in the face of human suffering and economic stagnation abroad. In contributing to IDA, therefore, we are not simply engaging our humanitarian values. We are advancing our own interests.

While poverty alleviation in the poorest countries is a major objective of the soft-loan windows of the banks, the hard-loan windows play an equally critical role in assisting middle-income developing nations. These nations are an important market for U.S. exports. To the extent that they grow and develop, prospects for continued economic growth in the United States are enhanced.

Recently, the Treasury Department reported that prior to 1981 the developing countries were the fastest growing market for U.S. exports. Between 1981 and 1983, however, U.S. exports fell dramatically. This contributed to a loss of American jobs and to the resulting recession in our own Nation. In examining the issue, the Treasury Department concluded that almost two-thirds of the decline in U.S. exports could be attributed to the developing nations.

The United States also has important political and security interests in many of the developing nations. The development banks play a critical role in promoting those interests. For example, of total World Bank lending in fiscal year 1987, the last year for which data are available, 75 percent was provided to countries that received some form of bilateral U.S. security assistance that year.

Of the remaining 25 percent, about half was provided to countries such as Argentina and Brazil that do not receive United States security assistance but which are nonetheless extremely important to the United States. Most

of the balance went to countries with which the United States has good relations, such as China and Hungary. The United States has an interest in encouraging more Western-oriented economies in these countries, and in fostering less dependence upon the Soviet Union.

Collectively, the development banks provide far more economic assistance to important U.S. friends and allies than we do directly. In 1986 and 1987, for example, the development banks provided more than \$4 in economic aid to countries that provide base or other military facilities to the United States for every \$1 that we provide directly.

The banks provided more than \$6 in economic aid to frontline states such as Tunisia and Thailand in 1986 and 1987 for every \$1 the United States provided directly. While the banks provided less assistance to Central America than the United States during the same 2 years, the United States provided no economic assistance to Argentina, Brazil, or Mexico. By contrast, the development banks provided more than \$8.7 billion to these countries during that same 2-year period.

Taking all of these countries together, the development banks provided more than \$5.50 in economic aid for every \$1 the United States provided directly in 1986 and 1987. This is not to suggest that the United States is not doing enough, but only to note that the cost of our duplicating bilaterally what the development banks provide multilaterally would be excessive.

Given current budget constraints, the role of the development banks takes on added importance precisely because other nations do share the financial burden and because the banks are able to use their resources to raise additional funds in private money markets. Between 1982 and 1986, every \$1 the United States provided in paid-in capital to the World Bank generated \$110 in bank lending.

American firms also benefit directly from U.S. participation in the development banks. In fiscal year 1987, for example, the Treasury Department reports that American firms received \$1.6 billion in disbursements for foreign procurement from the World Bank alone.

In short, U.S. participation in the development banks advances a broad range of U.S. interests in a cost-effective manner by promoting economic growth and political stability abroad. While I am disappointed that this bill does not include funding for the general capital increase of the World Bank or for U.S. commitments to the Inter-American Development Bank, it does a much better job of adequately funding the development banks than in the recent year.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, while I have taken this opportunity to explain in some detail how the development banks advance U.S. interests, I am convinced that most of the programs and activities funded in this bill do the same.

This bill includes military aid for NATO allies, such as Greece and Turkey, to help modernize their forces in the wake of the INF Treaty, and for important friends like Israel and Egypt. It includes economic and military assistance to help the government of President Corazon Aquino in the Philippines, which is under assault by Communist guerrillas. We all recognize our interest in helping her government resist that assault and address the economic problems her country faces, as well as the interest we have in maintaining continued access to the important facilities at Subic Bay and Clark.

The bill also includes \$550 million in direct U.S. assistance to promote long-term development in the nations of sub-Saharan Africa, the poorest group of nations in the world today. The American people responded with great generosity to the famine afflicting much of that continent just a few short years ago. These new funds will help to prevent a repetition of that tragedy or, if drought returns, to limit the damage. The Agency for International Development is just now developing a comprehensive program to address these long-term needs, and we should resist the temptation to micro-manage the program.

Many other important initiatives are funded in this bill as well, Mr. Chairman. While I certainly do not agree with every single recommendation it contains, this is a good bill on balance and one that deserves our support. I urge its enactment.

□ 1325

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation to the chairman of our subcommittee and my colleague, the ranking member, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS], as well for a rather sensational and almost unprecedented effort that they put together on this bill. To say the least, one of the most difficult challenges we have in the Congress is to face squarely the reality that one of the reasons to have a national government is to recognize that America must live and exist and be a leader in the world.

In the field of foreign affairs, it is most difficult for Members in a body who stand for reelection every 2 years, in the face of that responsibility, to

work with a constituency that often would prefer that we could build a wall around our country. Indeed, the history of our country has reflected that reality. Our people have been basically isolationist in their philosophy and attitude. That is often reflected in our town-hall meeting where people wonder why we are throwing so much money down the rat hole which is foreign assistance.

The average citizen presumes that we are spending a very high percentage of our national budget on a thing called foreign aid, in reality we spend only about 1½ percent of our annual budget of some \$1 trillion. It is a relatively small percentage of our national commitment and yet it is fundamental to our responsibility to lead for freedom and for peace in the world.

In the past, argument and debate has swirled around the contest within the House in which many a Member feels we should give our greatest priority to helping the poorest of the poor help themselves with their own economies and their future role in the world.

Others who feel that the foreign assistance package should play a dominant role whereby we assist our friends in defending themselves and play a role in preserving freedom in the world.

That debate ebbs and flows. Oftentimes it divides us enough that it is almost impossible to pass a bill on the floor without attaching it to some other package.

For the first time in my experience in the short 10 years that I have been in the House we have a package this year in which there is virtually unanimous agreement among those people who participated in the debate within the committee. A very important leadership job has been played out by the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member. It is to their credit that we find ourselves in this position on the floor today.

I would like to mention just a couple of things about this measure that I wish my colleagues would focus upon.

First and foremost, this bill does reflect a reasonable balance between our responsibility to aid countries to improve their economies as well as to improve their future economic opportunity.

Beyond that, this bill reflects relative priorities in terms of America's strategic interests in the world. That balance is critical. And when you recognize that both must be a part of a package and that both must go forward successfully, those are the foundations by which we establish, at least within the House, long-term, potentially, bipartisan role in the field of foreign policy.

The second item that I would mention is that this bill focuses too little

in a positive way about one of our most important challenges for the rest of this century. Much of our discussion in committee and often in debate spends too much time focusing upon crises. This year, the crises in the region that I care most about pay attention to the problems of Panama and the problems of Nicaragua. The fact is, ladies and gentlemen, that in the decade ahead of us if we do not develop a long-term bipartisan foreign policy in Latin America that makes sense in terms of American interests, that also makes sense in terms of the interests of the developing countries there, indeed America may very well find before it the crises of our lifetime.

Central America is a reflection only of the beginning of the fundamental problem. Virtually millions of our neighbors to the south who are on the edges of starvation cry for opportunity and change with very little leadership, long-term, coming from the United States. It is long overdue that we recognize that it is not good enough to look to our Latin American neighbors only when we have got a problem; it is not good enough to ask that they spend their time in the closet otherwise. America must provide its force, its good will, and its leadership in helping those countries make it into the 21st century with grace and with a chance to lead themselves. It is indeed our responsibility in this next decade to make certain that our friends in the Americas do participate in that success which we have enjoyed for so long.

The third item that I would mention is that this bill focuses relatively little and spends very little money in that area that involves multilateral organizations. As some of my colleagues know, in the past I have been a rather intense critic of the policies of some of those multilaterals, the World Bank, IDB, some of the other regional development banks.

Frankly, I think it is too bad that we find ourselves in a circumstance where we are not either able on the one hand in terms of the finances but indeed willing on the other because of the policy to put in the kind of dollars that would benefit those establishments.

It is my view that many an American purpose can be served well by way of the multilaterals. Indeed, we can multiply the impact of our own dollars if those dollars are used well in developing countries. My problem is that in the past we have often delivered money to the multilateral organizations only to have it thrown at problems in developing parts of the world.

America must insist and indeed lead in terms of seeing that those organizations in the future play a role that will cause those dollars to improve economies, to lead the policies in developing countries that make sense for those

people but also sense in terms of America's interests.

I would hope that the next time we bring a bill that has the kind of success as a result of the work of these two gentlemen that we see today, that among the success we will count multilateral organizations not only funded by the United States in terms of our relative share, but which reflect policies that involve hope and common sense in terms of the economic growth and the opportunity and the need of the developing world.

I thank my colleague for the time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER].

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and I support, especially, a provision inserted by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS], based on legislation he and I introduced to provide the democratic opposition in Nicaragua with \$1 million through the National Endowment for Democracy. This is an important time in Nicaragua, it is a fragile time in which peace will either survive or perish. I think this funding, to be directed to the democratic opposition in Nicaragua, can help peace to flourish in Nicaragua. I am delighted it has been inserted in the foreign assistance bill.

More generally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that if this bill is adopted today without any cuts, we will have reduced America's commitment abroad in terms of our foreign aid by nearly \$5 billion since 1985. In that year, 1985, our foreign aid budget was \$18.8 billion; in 1986, \$16.9 billion; in 1987, \$12.9 billion; in 1988, \$13.7 billion; this year in this bill, \$14.3 billion is appropriated, a \$4.5 billion reduction in foreign aid in the last 5 years.

Without any additional cuts, this foreign aid bill already provides 24 percent less funding than the 1985 foreign assistance bill.

Given all of this, I think that the committee should reject, when they are offered later in the day, two amendments to be offered by our colleague from Ohio, Mr. TRAFICANT, one of which will cut the bill by 10 percent and another by 5 percent.

In my judgment, the bill provides too little developmental assistance and should not be reduced any further.

Mr. Chairman, Pope John XXIII once said, "In a world of want, there can be no peace." We are not going to have peace in the world unless we can help countries in the Third World, poor countries, with the means to help themselves, with the means to sustain their developing economies. Unless these countries can build strong economies they are not going to be able to build lasting political systems.

When we accept amendments which reduce the total amount of money in the bill we are lowering America's pro-

file in the world and enhancing the Soviet profile in the world.

I think we ought to reject that notion. I think the United States has an obligation, I think the United States has a responsibility to stand tall, to be heard around the world when it is necessary to make our position clear.

If we do not do it, then the Soviets will. No one else will uphold this responsibility, it is our responsibility and we must meet it.

I hope that the House will do so today, the House in particular, in passing a strong foreign aid bill which will represent the very best our country has to offer.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of the appropriation for foreign assistance and congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

Actually, both are friends, both have done a magnificent job of working on a piece of legislation along with other subcommittee members and staff that can be, I think, supported by both sides of the aisle, can be supported by both liberals and conservatives.

It is a remarkable job that they have done.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to ruin the reputation of the gentleman from Wisconsin to get all this praise from a conservative Republican, but he and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] deserve the support of the Members of the committee of the Whole and, as I said, they have fashioned a compromise within the budget agreement. It is prudent, it is responsible, it meets, in my view, needs of the base rights countries; it certainly meets the needs of the Camp David accord countries. It is, I think, generous to our allies and friends and neighbors in Latin America and recognizes the reality of living in a global economy in that it protects economic development.

I must say at this point, Mr. Chairman, I want to be on the record as suggesting that foreign aid in and of itself is not a recipe for economic development. The greatest recipe for economic development, the greatest foreign aid, is open markets, sound economic policies.

□ 1340

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] is going to have an amendment that I am going to support strongly a little later which suggests that there shall be a Presidential submission to the Congress of a report analyzing the impact of foreign aid bills over the last preceding three fiscal years as to the

effectiveness of foreign aid. I want to suggest that I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], but that should not take away from this bill and think it is consistent to support both the Hyde amendment and the committee bill.

I do not think it should be cut. The inclination of many conservatives is to support an across-the-board cut in foreign aid. So I am going to oppose the Traficant amendment because I think it is going to hurt, not help, some very important parts of the world, not the least of which is Central America, the Middle East, base rights countries, and countries that are operating very frantically in the global economy with regard to their need for security, military and economic assistance.

So just suffice it to say at this point that the Traficant amendment would cut 10 percent across-the-board or 5 percent, as the case would be in the Camp David accord countries or in Central America. That would be a mistake, and as I suggested earlier, I think the committee has done a good job in meeting the needs of America's security interests and the needs of nations with which we would like to have our country more closely associated.

That does not preclude the possibility of other amendments, but I did want to identify myself as being in strong opposition to the Traficant, across-the-board cuts and in support of what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] have done.

Mr. Chairman, let me make one other comment about economic development, on which I stand as a proponent of foreign aid. Yesterday we considered a trade bill that I think, if it passes the Senate without the veto being overridden in the Senate, is ultimately going to have a counterproductive impact upon some of the good things that this bill promotes. For one thing, the trade bill encourages retaliation, in my view encourages protectionism, and is at odds with the passage of this bill. Honest men and women who disagree can do so without being disagreeable, but I do want to make the point that if we look at the history of the Marshall plan in post World War II Europe, its greatest benefit was not from foreign aid in terms of dollars. I might be incorrect in this, but I think the greatest recipient of foreign aid since World War II was Great Britain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] has expired.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, the greatest recipient of foreign aid since World War II was Great Britain, so

West Germany got less foreign aid money than Great Britain. But West Germany accomplished an economic miracle, and Britain after the war turned to socialism.

The greatest recipe for economic development is open trade, a world trading system, private property, democratic governments, low tax rates on labor and capital, and entrepreneurial capitalism. I would suggest that would be a recipe for economic development in Africa, Asia, and particularly Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. I favor a Marshall Plan aid approach for Central America, but it should be predicated on alliance for progress, alliance for prosperity, a common market, common currency, low taxes, and entrepreneurial capitalism.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] has expired.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, and I would ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] to stay in the well for just 1 moment.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say again what I said at the time of the subcommittee markup. As everybody knows, the gentleman in the well will be leaving the House at the end of this term, and he has served on this subcommittee for many years. He served for several terms as ranking member of the subcommittee, in fact, before the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] took over 2 years ago.

I simply wanted to say that as the gentleman knows, he and I have disagreed often and loudly.

Mr. KEMP. But, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, always with humor and good grace.

Mr. OBEY. Almost always.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that there are two Members of this House who have cared enough about the future of the country to seek the office of the Presidency, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP], who is in the well. One does not have to agree with all of their prescriptions for the country to simply note that it says something very good about a human being if they do care enough about the country to seek the highest office in the land. And I know, as far as the gentleman in the well is concerned, it is his passionate belief in his own convictions that caused him to do that, and I want to say that I think he did the House honor by the fact that he did run and by the manner in which he did run, as did the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]. So I wanted to take this occasion to again publicly express my thoughts on that subject and congratulate the gentleman once again.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin very much.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding time to me.

So far, Mr. Chairman, all the speakers have been in favor of this legislation, and I thought it is important to hear the other side, so I have asked to address the House.

Let me suggest that there are many reasons why we should oppose this foreign aid legislation. First of all, we could rightly argue that we have huge deficits. This bill is over \$14 billion, which will add another \$14 billion to our deficit. One could contend that at this time, when we are cutting back on our own domestic programs that benefit our own people, this bill represents an increase of over \$700 million in foreign aid. I do not see how we can vote for the bill and still say we are concerned about the deficit.

Under this bill \$14 billion will have to be borrowed and paid for by the American taxpayer. All the future interest will have to be paid for by our taxpayers, people that you and I represent. Basically, I am opposed to this bill because I do not think it is fair to the people you and I represent, and, after all, it is their money we are spending.

Allow me to illustrate. We have talked about our friends here on the floor this afternoon. With this bill, \$289 million will go to the Philippines. I question the wisdom of that. The reason I say that is this: Their Secretary of State, Raul Manglapus, has said that we here in Washington have to pay more, much more. Manglapus has said that we need "To pay much more." He stated: "It's up to the United States. If they can afford it, they can stay. If they cannot, they should go."

He is lucky I am not in charge, because I would be waving good-bye.

One-third of the money in this bill goes to two countries—\$3 billion to Israel and \$2.1 billion to Egypt. That is as much money as ever. Yet are we closer to a peace agreement in the region? Are we getting cooperation with the Shultz peace initiatives? If we are, it is the best kept secret in Washington.

In this bill \$1.4 billion goes to the World Bank and other international lending institutions. That is a 13-percent increase. And how is this money loaned? Well, loans are given sometimes at zero-percent interest, the term is 50 years, and the first 10 years is a grace period. Think about that. That is 50 years, no interest, with a 10-year grace period. Can the people you and I represent get a loan like that? Can the people in Wisconsin obtain a

loan under those terms or can anyone in any of the other 49 States? Hardly.

And where do these loans go? For example, Ethiopia last year received \$91 million on a loan such as this and \$50 million is in the pipeline now. In the last 5 years Ethiopia has received almost half a billion dollars, \$456 million. That is money that is going right down the drain. American taxpayer money at no interest for 50 years. This is not fair to the hard working men and women of America. In this bill we are providing a 440-percent increase in funds for the Asian Development Bank to assist countries that are now our most dedicated competitors in world trade and finance. This money will go the Asian Development Bank.

No, I am not in agreement with this bill. As I see it, we are Members of Congress.

□ 1350

We are entrusted by the American people as their sentries. We stand on the ramparts. We are the watchmen and the watchwomen of our Republic, and, if we do not look out for our people, who will?

No, this bill in my opinion is not in the best interests of our country. I do not think it is in the best interests of our people. I think basically what this bill does is make Uncle Sam out of Uncle Sam, and I do not think we should do that. Let us take care of our own people and our own problem first for a change.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply respond to the gentleman who just spoke by observing the following:

A vote against this bill is not going to save the taxpayer one dime because everybody, unless they want to fool the public, knows that foreign aid will eventually be provided by the President and the Congress. They know that we would have severe security problems if it were not provided. The only thing that happens, if my colleagues voted against this bill, is that it will be slipped into the continuing resolution when the continuing resolution is brought to the Congress at the end of the year.

Mr. Chairman, I would also point out that this bill is 30 percent below the appropriation for foreign aid in 1985. It is \$1.6 billion below the amount that the President himself asked us 2 years ago to spend on foreign aid.

In terms of Ethiopia, we do not have the money in this bill that the gentleman mentioned. That is Public Law 480 funds that is found in the Agriculture Subcommittee bill, and, as far as the ADB is concerned, to which the gentleman referred, every single dollar referred in this bill for the ADB is a dollar which was committed to by President Reagan when the Reagan

administration negotiated those replenishments, and we have, as the gentleman well knows, no choice but to eventually provide that money.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the work of our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and our ranking minority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] for producing a strongly bipartisan bill. We have not seen such a cooperative effort since the 97th Congress. Our bill is prodevelopment, prodemocracy and pro-U.S. allies. It has the strong support of both sides of the aisle, and we have received letters from Jim Miller at the OMB, George Shultz at State and the President endorsing this bill.

We stood by our Camp David commitments and provided for Israel's well-being. Under this bill Israel will continue to have the means to improve its economy and provide for its external defense while it deals with unrest at home. Under this bill Israel can move to its upcoming elections with the support of the United States firmly behind it.

Mr. Chairman, I was pleased that the committee reaffirmed our commitment to voluntary family planning by providing last year's level for centrally funded programs recommending 10 percent of the child survival funds be used for family planning and making a strong recommendation that AID expand family planning programs in Africa. Frankly, I would have liked to have seen stronger action supporting family planning in Africa, a continent that has the world's fastest growing population, but funds are in short supply, and the committee has done an excellent job of meeting its responsibility to work within budgetary constraints. The bill is extremely tight, and there should be no across-the-board cuts here. AID's progress on voluntary family planning will greatly influence the committee's direction on these programs next year.

Mr. Chairman, we provided additional funding for the AIDS prevention and control program. This program is our international response to one of the worst potential plagues facing the world, and particularly Africa, today. The World Health Organization estimates 3 billion people may be infected with the virus. Many of those victims are among the most educated and well-trained people upon whom the future of many African countries depends. Our \$35 million contribution, half to support bilateral activities through AID and half to support the World Health Organization's global program on AIDS, run by our own Dr.

Jonathan Mann on loan from CDC, is the largest amount spent on this problem by any country.

I was also pleased, Mr. Chairman, that the committee continued its support for a solution to the division of Cyprus. We maintained our aid of \$15 million and our commitment to bicomunal projects adding new emphasis to their importance. We also continued our very important restrictions on weapons transfers to Cyprus and took a stand against the continued presence of settlers in the northern occupied area. Our work on improving the environmental performance of the multilateral development banks has also continued highlighting the roles of AID's early warning system in identifying project loans that damage the environment. We also restated our call for the banks to begin environmental structural adjustments lending and to facilitate the arrangements of debt for nature swaps.

This bill supports our allies under siege from Communist insurgencies such as those in the Central American democracies and the Philippines. It also supports allies in key locations such as our southern flank NATO allies, Turkey and Greece, and Pakistan, a country that has provided a safe haven for the millions of Afghan refugees who are now winning their fight for independence.

In short, Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for development through the MDB's and AID, supports democracy through the economic support funds and military aid funds and trade promotion through the Exim bank. It is a good bill, Mr. Chairman, and I strongly support it and urge its adoption.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time. If the gentleman has any additional speakers, I would request that he have them take the time now, and then I will make closing remarks in about 1 minute.

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Chairman, I support the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the bipartisan efforts contributing to the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 1989, to provide assistance for our allies who oppose Communist aggression in their countries. In addition, I strongly support economic and military aid earmarked for our loyal ally, Israel.

However, I must oppose any aid to World Bank affiliates, specifically the International Development Association [IDA]. The IDA consistently provides loans to terrorist and Communist countries despite the opposition of the U.S. Executive Director. The U.S. Executive Director opposes loans to those countries that violate human rights, expropriate U.S. property, and otherwise cause harm to American interests. I would like to submit for the record a partial list of loans which the United States has opposed in recent years.

Aid to the International Development Association has drawn bipartisan opposition when introduced as separate legislation since 1979,

yet has been passed when buried in omnibus bills, such as this, the foreign operations appropriations bill. I am concerned about the 50-year, zero-interest development credits being given to countries such as Ethiopia, China, and India, which often take openly anti-American positions and actions. I do not think that the American taxpayer appreciates it when their tax dollars are sent abroad, at interest rates and under terms to which no citizen or business of the United States has access, for the sole purpose of aiding foreign countries and foreign industries in their efforts to compete directly with our own U.S. interests.

Therefore, I cannot support the bill in its present form.

NOTES—The U.S. voted "no" for every one of the following, yet in each case the loan was approved:

PARTIAL LISTING OF U.S. NEGATIVE VOTES IN THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION OF THE WORLD BANK GROUP: 1983-87

(In million of dollars)

Date, borrower, and project	Amount	Reason for negative vote
May 1983, Ethiopia—Urban development	\$20.0	Expropriation.
June 1983, Ethiopia—Petroleum export promotion and geothermal study	7.0	Do.
July 1983, Ethiopia—Roads	70.0	Do.
December 1983, Ethiopia—Second coffee processing and marketing	35.0	Do.
June 1984, India—National coop. development	220.0	Inadequate sector reform conditionality.
April 1985, Ethiopia—Drought recovery program	30.0	Expropriation.

PARTIAL LISTING OF U.S. ABSTENTIONS IN THE IDA OF THE WORLD BANK

June 1985, Yemen, PDR—Highways IV	\$14.4	Human rights.
March 1986, China—Third industrial credit project	25.0	Unsustainable textile export trend given bilateral quota agreements.
May 1986, Burma—Gain storage and processing	30.0	Inadequate sector reform and private sector role.
April 1987, China—Fourth industrial credit project	50.0	Same as March 1986.
April 1987, Ethiopia—Livestock project	39.0	Human rights.
June 1987, Yemen, PDR—Highways V	16.8	Do.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4637 for several reasons I wish to share with my colleagues.

First, let me note that up to this point I have voted against every omnibus foreign aid authorization and appropriation bill since being elected to Congress. I opposed these measures primarily because of budgetary concerns and also because of my objection over how some of the funds were being used. However, I believe my concerns in these areas are adequately addressed by the bill before us today, H.R. 4637.

The funding level contained in this bill meets the strict budgetary guidelines set as a result of the budget summit between the President and members of the congressional leadership last fall. In fact, the funding level contained in this bill is 8 percent below the fiscal year 1981 level. It is because this bill has met the most stringent test of fiscal responsibility that it is the first bipartisan foreign aid appropriations bill since 1981.

Another concern I have had with previous foreign aid bills has been their continued support for the United Nations and other international organizations despite their use of the funding for purposes that run counter to our

efforts to foster democracy and stop the spread of Communist domination throughout the world. In that regard, I am pleased that this bill reduces funding for the United Nations by \$30 million and it denies all funding for the World Bank's general capital increase and for the Inter-American Development Bank. These measures will place the burden of proof on these organizations to show they share our dedication to freedom and democracy before they come to us for funding.

I am also supporting this bill because it contains funding that is critical to Secretary of State Shultz' new initiative aimed at a peaceful, negotiated settlement to the conflict in the Middle East. The present escalation of turmoil in the West Bank and Gaza threatens to undermine what stability there is left in the Middle East. This turmoil also underscores the urgency of the need to reach an agreement that will ensure Israel's security while recognizing and dealing with the plight of the Palestinian people. The Shultz plan is currently being considered seriously on all sides, and its success will depend largely on the United States' role as its principal guarantor.

Mr. Chairman, I am also encouraged to note that this bill provides an adequate level of funding for famine victims in drought-stricken regions of Africa. Although it's the best we can do at this point, it is only a drop in the bucket of what is needed to address the needs of the 13 to 14 million residents of sub-Saharan Africa who are at serious risk of starvation. The bill also earmarks funds under the Agency for International Development to be used to assist children who are orphans as a result of this devastating drought. I believe we have a moral obligation to assist these orphans, which currently are estimated to number 20,000 in Ethiopia and 10,000 in Mozambique alone.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 4637 because I believe it shifts our priorities toward programs that are in our clear national interest. By passing this bill, we are simply upholding our obligation and commitment to Western values and freedom throughout the world, and for the first time in years we are doing it in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is really something. We are participating in history here this afternoon. This is a foreign aid—repeat, foreign aid—appropriations bill, and every member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee supports it. The chairman and ranking member are even speaking to each other.

The Secretary of State supports the bill. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget supports the bill. The President of the United States supports the bill. We have so many letters of support flying around the floor, it looks like a blizzard. The only way I can explain this phenomenon is that it must be finally snowing in Hell.

Mr. Chairman, I served on this subcommittee for 20 years, and for the last 10 years I have been an ex-officio member. I have always supported foreign aid. Sometimes it has been a little lonely, especially over here on this side of the aisle. But I have supported foreign aid requests sent up here by every President since Eisenhower. I am savoring

this moment of constructive truce. And I plan on remembering it, because it may never come our way again.

But before I go into ecstasy, I want to mention a couple of down-to-Earth reasons why I will vote for this bill.

One of those reasons is that the bill continues and expands the World Child Health campaign. It includes \$54 million for UNICEF and \$100 million for the Child Survival Fund.

Because of such efforts, over the last 5 years 2 million kids didn't die; another 2 million kids are not disabled. This record is slowly but surely leading to lower birth rates on an entirely voluntary basis, as parents gain confidence that their children will survive.

I have to admit that these improvements in child health in some of the poorest countries in the world make me very proud of my years of leading the fight for humanitarian assistance. But I will mention another reason to vote for this bill.

Voting for this bill is one of the most constructive ways that you can improve our trade balance. If the United States is ever going to be a net exporter again, the additional exports will have to be sold to the developing world. Talk all you will, we are not likely to improve significantly our trade balances with our major developed competitors. We can get a better balance, but that is not where the potential for growth in exports lies.

You want to sell your feed grains, your construction equipment, your farm equipment, road-building equipment, school books and technology. Developing countries want to buy your products, but they don't have the money. If they don't develop, they will never have the money.

It doesn't get any more complicated than that. Economic development in the Third World will lead to more U.S. exports. Stagnation in the Third World, as we have seen, leads to stagnation in U.S. exports.

Title IV of this bill is entitled "Export Assistance." That section provides \$690 million in direct loans and \$10.2 billion in guaranteed loans for the Export-Import Bank. Those funds go directly for U.S. exports.

That section also provides \$25 million for the Trade and Development Program which is using U.S. expertise for projects which lead to U.S. export and business opportunities. And the section provides for a \$200 million Trade Credit Insurance Program.

You can vote for this bill.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer the following amendments, however, given my responsibilities as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means, I am unable to offer these amendments today. House and Senate conferees are currently considering the Canada Free Trade Agreement and I must concentrate my time on this most important issue today. I look forward to attaching these two fine amendments to another appropriate bill in the future.

The formal initiation of the United Nations in 1945 instilled in many Americans hope that this organization would help usher in an era of peace and freedom worldwide. Unfortunately, this has not been the case. In fact, the United Nations has been guilty of maintaining a hypo-

critical double standard at the expense of both the Western democracies and the U.N. Charter. Small nations of the Third World and the Communist bloc have made U.N. membership an excellent economic and political investment by gaining considerable advantage at minimal expense.

Many critics of the United Nations point out that peace and freedom in this world can hardly be maintained by the United Nations when the very nations that most threaten it are members of the Security Council. Even more alarming is the fact that the United States feels that consequences of acts of aggressions by these members. The crisis in Iran and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan exemplify actions that the United Nations "deplores," but on which the body fails to take appropriate, decisive action. That sort of "nonaction" is particularly disconcerting to the United States which alone pays 25 percent of the total U.N. budget. In contrast, the Soviet Union only contributes a mere 10 percent to the annual budget.

If the United States continues to pay an unduly large share of U.N. expenses each year while other nations fail to honor their obligations, we can expect to see a deepening of the hypocrisy that has so blatantly marked U.N. sessions. Why should U.S. taxpayers finance the operations of an organization which is threatening the values and interests of Western nations as well as world peace? They deserve assurance that when their tax dollars are spent to aid a foreign nation that that aid goes to a country which acts as our friend.

In view of the current situation, a number of suggestions have been made to re-evaluate our Nation's relationship with the United Nations. Addressing the level of United States financial support is one alternative. In the interest of limiting United States financial support of repeated acts of aggression by pro-Communist, pro-Soviet countries, as you may know, I introduced H.R. 117, that redefines our Nation's financial commitment to the United Nations. Given past performance, it is logical that the United States adopt a new contribution formula that would be fair to the United States and other member nations and fiscally responsible insofar as the future of the United Nations is concerned. Further, it should be reflective of the U.N. representative nature.

Instead of a formula based on GNP, H.R. 117 would base our annual U.N. contribution on a percentage equal to that of our population amongst that of all U.N. member nations. The new formula might be described as "one man, one buck." The People's Republic of China and the U.S.S.R., along with other densely populated countries, should bear a greater portion of the financial burden of the United Nations and should contribute amounts proportional to their greater respective populations. The United States contributes more than twice the amount committed by the U.S.S.R., while the American population is less than that of the Soviet state.

Proportional population assessment would reduce U.S. monetary support of the United Nations and thus force Communist and Third World countries to shoulder a fairer share of the U.N. budget. The result of this proposal would be financial obligations consistent with

the amount of power within the United Nations that each country commands. Thus, the United States would no longer contribute disproportionate amounts to the United Nations, only to have the funds used to promote Communist aggression throughout the world. Moreover, GNP cannot properly be determined in a slave state.

I wanted to offer H.R. 117, as an amendment to the foreign operations, export financing, and related programs appropriations bill, 1989, to alleviate the monetary burden placed on the United States to finance the United Nations. These contributions will fund such programs as the U.N. Developmental Program [UNDP], U.N. Childrens Fund [UNICEF], and the U.N. High Commissioner For Refugees. America does shoulder an inordinate burden of the financing of these programs when one considers the following figures: In 1986 the United States paid 22 percent of the UNICEF budget while Japan paid 6 percent and the Soviet Union paid only 0.5 percent. For the same year, the United States paid 31 percent of the bill for the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees while the Soviet Union paid nothing. While I recognize that passage of my amendment would have reduced American support for these programs, I am nevertheless confident that other countries would have started paying their fair share to guarantee the solvency of these programs.

Mr. Chairman, current law prohibits us from giving foreign aid to most of the repressive and Marxist-Leninist countries of the world. Examples of such countries include the following: North Korea, the Mongolian People's Republic, Ethiopia, and the countries of Eastern Europe. The members of the Committee on Appropriations showed great wisdom when they expanded the number of countries which would not be eligible for foreign aid assistance for the next year. Section 512 of the foreign operations, export financing, and related programs appropriations bill, 1989, contains a prohibition against direct funding for the following countries: Angola, Cambodia, Cuba, Iraq, Libya, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, South Yemen, Iran, and Syria. I would like to commend my colleagues for adding these countries to the list of countries which may not receive aid under this bill. All of the countries are repressive regimes which seek no friendship with the United States.

However, I am saddened by the fact that the foreign aid appropriations bill does not also contain language to prohibit Guyana and Benin from receiving foreign aid moneys for the next fiscal year. Hence, I had intended to offer an amendment which would have added these two countries to the list of countries which would have been prohibited from receiving any assistance from moneys appropriated by this bill. I would like to add, for the record, that I would have included many more countries to the list, but I chose not to do so because my good friend, BOB DORNAN, will offer an amendment that will prohibit all countries which have signed peace and friendship agreements with the Soviet Union to receive moneys from this appropriations bill. Both of the countries mentioned in my amendment are run by repressive, Marxist governments which have a consistent record of opposing the United States. In fact, Congress has al-

ready expressed its opposition to providing American aid to these same countries when it amended the Export-Import Bank Act in 1986 by adding them to the list of Marxist-Leninist regimes which would not be eligible for Export-Import Bank assistance.

The Government of Benin limits freedom of speech, the ability of its citizens to own property, and open political discussion. Benin's foreign policy remains closely linked with Libya and the Soviet Union. So far as relations with Libya are concerned, the highpoint came after the United States bombing of that country. The Government-controlled publication, "Hannoria", described the attack as "ignoble and barbaric aggression" and a result of "warlike maneuvers of American imperialism". Benin has consistently spoken out in support of the Soviet Union. Accordingly to Soviet Military Power, there are several hundred Soviet military and technical personnel currently in Benin.

A resolution adopted at the 22d Congress stated that the Communist Party of Guyana, which rules the country, had completed a 16-year process of transforming itself from a nationalist mass party into a disciplined Marxist-Leninist organization. Guyana has consistently adopted international positions that parallel those of the Soviet Union. It has stated that the Reagan administration poses a growing threat to world peace and that it stands firm in its solidarity with the Cuban and Nicaraguan revolutions, and with the Communist guerrillas of the MFLN-FDR of El Salvador.

Despite the aggression that Benin and Guyana exhibit toward our basic values of freedom, this appropriations bill provides these countries with a limited degree of assistance. It provides some military assistance to both Guyana and Benin and some money for Peace Corps activities in Benin. I hope that my colleagues will agree with me that it is improper for us to provide aid to these two countries.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman. I rise in strong support of the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 1989 and I commend my good friend from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, on developing a firm bipartisan consensus, transforming that consensus into legislation, and guiding this measure through the committee process ably and effectively. This is a fragile political consensus, however, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it, lest we lose what ground we have gained in negotiations during the last several months.

The agreements of the budget summit in December 1987 have made possible this bipartisan bill, and I support it. I am also pleased to see that the priorities reflected in the economic and military aid mix reflect deep concern of the gentleman from Wisconsin, which I share, for the world's poor and at least a partial shift away from the military aid priorities of the administration.

I am particularly gratified by the levels of support provided for the high priority hunger assistance programs in the bill, which I believe are among the most important development programs supported by the United States. For example, the committee has included \$54 million for UNICEF, an increase of \$22.4 million over the administration's request. The commit-

tee again wisely chose to repeat its requirement that the administration disburse these critical aid funds to UNICEF within 30 days of enactment of the bill, and this year threatened to withhold \$50 million in military aid if the President again fails to comply. While such persuasion should not be necessary, it is an effective and responsible means of enforcing congressional policy decisions.

The child survival fund this year has been funded at \$100 million, an increase of \$20 million over last year's level. A portion of these funds—\$29 million—is earmarked exclusively for Africa. The vitamin A earmark has remained at \$8 million, and microenterprise funding for small loans to the poorest of the poor in countries in which the U.S. Agency for International Development operates has been increased from \$50 million to \$75 million. All of these programs, and the many other U.S. aid programs designed to alleviate human suffering around the world, deserve the vigorous support of each member of this body.

While I support these development assistance programs, I am increasingly troubled by the extent to which the continually rising levels of foreign military assistance threaten to displace scarce U.S. resources that might otherwise be applied to basic human needs of poor populations around the globe. Fully one-third of the world's population is mired in near hopeless poverty; 15 percent of Americans live in poverty, 15 million of them children, pushed over the poverty line since 1981—29 million in all. Yet, we continue to give more military aid than economic and humanitarian assistance to other nations.

In 1981, as this administration took office, we spent approximately \$5.2 billion in security assistance; today we will vote on a bill containing over \$9 billion in security assistance to our allies, principally in the Third World. In 1981, the United States spent an estimated \$110 million on military assistance. This year the Reagan administration requested almost \$767 million for the same program—a startling 696-percent increase in just 8 years. U.S. international military education and training programs have increased over 80 percent during this period, sales of military equipment and technology by 46 percent, further clear signals of our willingness to project and employ military power and influence abroad, often without regard for the social and political effects of such intervention. Simultaneously, we have dropped our contributions to multilateral international organizations during the same 8-year period by 25 percent, another ominous signal of our disdain for a foreign policy which works in concert with other countries through international organizations, which values consultation over confrontation, multilateral initiatives over bilateral political and economic coercion.

We have become the arms merchant to the Third World, and under this administration have largely abandoned our commitment to human rights and the rule of law in our own hemisphere. Blatant disregard of World Court decisions, illegal funding of irregular Contra forces in a country with which we are not at war and have maintained diplomatic relations, negotiating away our last shred of international credibility in the drug war by offering to drop indictments against Panamanian strongman

Manuel Noriega, support for right wing military regimes in the name of political stability—symptoms of a oddly antidemocratic attitude among many U.S. foreign policymakers within this administration an attitude which has at times undermined democratic values and institutions even as it claims to uphold and strengthen them.

The economic assistance provided for in this measure, though much less than I would have wished, is a strong signal to our allies and friends around the world that we are still willing to offer support for developing nations to pull themselves out of abysmal poverty and develop the economic, social, and political infrastructures necessary to build sustainable democratic societies. Nascent democracies must be able to look upon the United States not in envy, but for inspiration. In the Pacific rim, in Latin America, in Africa, and elsewhere, we must continue to offer generously the resources—both human and material—which will assist in the great enterprise of the post-colonial period, the development of independent democratic nations able to shape their own destinies.

In Haiti a country which first declared its independence in 1804, these democratic processes have never been a part of the national policy. Haiti has historically been ruled by brutal military and economic elites oblivious to the needs of the poor. While we have officially suspended all aid to the Manigat government, administration officials have in recent months reportedly tried to persuade other donors—the French, the Canadians, the Swiss, and several international financial institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF—to increase their aid to supplant United States aid suspended by my amendment to last year's continuing resolution.

The Haitian people have consistently demonstrated they prefer the turmoil of democracy over the brutal tranquility of dictatorship. While the Haitian Government has begun to feel the budget pinch from this suspension of United States assistance and the accompanying drying up of international credit, administration officials have allegedly attempted to circumvent the aid suspension by persuading some of these other donors to increase their grant and loan assistance to the Manigat government. By mitigating the economic effects of the suspension of United States assistance, I am concerned that administration officials may squander the last significant leverage over the main political and economic decisionmakers in Haiti. While the Haitian budget shortfall this year reportedly could be as high as \$50 to \$60 million in an overall budget of approximately \$250, due in part to a massive \$70 million loss in balance of payments support, the Manigat government still has not initiated significant political reforms which would warrant a reconsideration of this aid suspension. This foreign aid bill wisely continues the suspension of aid under current law, and again urges the administration to develop a regime of trade and financial sanctions that would be imposed on the Manigat government unless it begins to initiate genuine political reforms and moves to stem the persistent pattern of human rights abuses by Haitian military and paramilitary forces during the last several months. The measure continues to allow

United States aid to flow to nongovernmental and private voluntary organizations serving the basic needs of the Haitian poor.

This is the first foreign aid bill brought to the floor since 1982, and I believe it is a bill with which we can live. The general program freeze levels contained in the bill balance the obligations and commitments of a superpower with the realities of our \$154 billion budget deficit. The decision to fund arrearages in our international obligations to international financial institutions on the theory that we should pay old bills before incurring new ones cannot be rebutted, even though it has cut into program funding in other areas. I urge my colleagues to study carefully the programs and projects contained in this bill, and to vote for its passage later this afternoon to send a signal to our friends and allies around the world that we remain a committed and loyal friend in the international arena, and that Congress will continue to support adequate funding for these critically important foreign aid programs.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4637. I want to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, and the chairman of the authorizing committee, Mr. FASCELL, for their leadership and commitment to bringing this bill to the floor.

Foreign aid is not a popular subject—in fact for many of us, it's a political lightning rod. But, I think that this bill demonstrates that a modest commitment in foreign aid—less than 2 cents of every Federal dollar—serves to advance our interests across the globe. Foreign aid means security. It means emergency relief to those who are poor. And it means opening up markets for American business.

Perhaps it's an astrological coincidence that we consider this bill during the same week we consider the trade bill. For these two issues are linked. Our ability to foster growth and development through U.S. foreign aid programs means more demand for U.S. goods, more opportunities for U.S. exporters. These opportunities belie the popular misconception that foreign aid is a simple handout.

I am particularly pleased to support this bill because it addresses some particularly pressing needs. I am pleased that the bill retains the Foreign Affairs Committee's commitment to channeling aid to microenterprise. Microenterprise is the future of development, giving economic self-sufficiency to those who otherwise would go hungry.

I am pleased to support the commitments we are making throughout the world to bolster our allies. In Western Europe, we will spend over \$4 billion in those countries where we maintain important base rights. In the Middle East, the bill explicitly underlines the Camp David accords and the Israeli-Egyptian Peace Treaty as the centerpiece of American policy and acknowledges the value of strengthening these two partners in the region.

Finally, I am pleased to support the full request for international narcotics control. The committee rightly recognizes the immense drug problem that we face and the need to channel funds to stem the tide of illegal narcotics that flows into this country. As a co-chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee

Task Force on International Narcotics Control, I hope this measure will complement the action taken by the committee in our authorizing bill and in our prospective work in omnibus drug legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill—a modest, sensible, and comprehensive foreign aid bill that helps the United States achieve a number of our shared policy goals.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in recent years it's a rare event indeed when the House gets to vote on a foreign aid appropriations bill. Since I began serving in Congress this is only the second regular foreign aid appropriations bill which we have considered.

I am, therefore, a little troubled that so few perfecting amendments have been encouraged or offered. Although this bill accounts for only 1.5 percent of all Federal spending, it encompasses a very controversial \$15 billion.

The controversy stems from many quarters. One is how we can justify even a modest increase in foreign aid spending when many

worthy domestic programs have been either eliminated or sharply cut. Another is how we can justify any foreign aid increase in a time of \$150 billion Federal deficits. Then there is the further questions of balance in foreign aid: How does one justify a 700-percent increase in the Military Assistance Program [MAP] while food aid has actually declined by 17 percent in the last 8 years. The appended chart shows this imbalance.

The bill before the House did not completely ignore these painful issues. The committee reported recommendation makes some small improvements. But it is not enough. It gives a much higher priority for UNICEF and child survival—the kind of foreign aid which helps people—than did the administration's request. It earmarks needed resources for key allies like Israel and the Philippines. My overall concern about the bill in no way diminishes my support for those essential humanitarian and allied support programs.

Nevertheless, this foreign aid bill does not put us on the right track for world leadership.

The best way to advance the growth of developing countries is to expand our own economy so as to awaken export opportunities for the Third World, and the jobs that accompany export growth. But we can't put in order our own economy until we tackle our budget deficits. Regretably, this bill increases spending over fiscal year 1988 by at least \$600 million and thereby becomes part of the budget problem, not its solution.

The other sure way to lead in the world is join the developing world as a partner in rooting out the scourges of disease, illiteracy, and hunger. Yet our foreign aid has moved in exactly the wrong direction to do this. Since 1980, the ratio of security aid to economic aid has doubled from 1 to 1 to 2 to 1. While the MAP account has grown sevenfold, food aid has dropped 17 percent—even though our grain bins burst with farm surpluses and a second continental famine grips the hungry of Africa. The priorities in this bill are simply out-of-whack and that is why I have decided to cast a "no" vote.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS: FISCAL YEAR 1981-89

[In millions of current dollars]

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	House Appropriation Committee 1989	1989 +/- 1988	1989 +/- 1988 (percent)	1989 +/- 1981	1989 +/- 1981 (percent)
Multilat Aid	\$1,214	\$1,477	\$1,806	\$1,639	\$1,907	\$1,409	\$1,444	\$1,450	\$1,577	\$127	8.8	\$363	29.9
Bilat Develop	1,276	1,389	1,397	1,525	1,780	1,542	1,531	1,698	1,637	-61	-3.6	361	28.3
Food Aid ¹	1,229	1,000	1,028	1,377	1,964	1,243	1,083	1,060	1,023	-37	-3.5	-206	-16.8
Other Econ Aid	1,069	1,075	1,098	1,071	1,301	1,026	1,277	1,256	1,355	99	7.9	286	26.8
Econ Supp Fund	2,105	2,926	2,926	3,254	6,084	3,541	3,851	3,188	3,249	61	1.9	1,144	54.3
Military aid	3,210	4,243	5,567	6,526	5,954	5,800	5,091	5,361	5,792	431	8.0	2,582	80.4
Of which:													
MAP	(110)	(179)	(383)	(712)	(805)	(748)	(905)	(701)	(877)	(176)	(25.1)	(767)	(697.3)
(FMS)	(3,046)	(3,884)	(5,107)	(5,716)	(4,940)	(4,967)	(4,053)	(4,049)	(3,893)	(-156)	(-3.9)	(847)	(27.8)
Total	10,103	12,110	13,822	15,392	18,990	14,561	14,277	14,013	14,633	620	4.4	4,530	44.8

¹ Not included in House reported Foreign Assistance Appropriations bill. Reflects pending Executive branch request for fiscal year 1989.

² Includes Guaranty Reserve Fund replenishment.

Prepared by Larry Nowels, CRS/FAND, May 24, 1988.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I was just going to make another remark of my own, so I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I only wanted to repeat in strong support of this bill that we have put together a very careful bipartisan agreement, and it hinges upon the fact that we are going to be able to meet not only great concerns that we have in terms of economic commitments around the world, but in terms of our being able to meet our military commitments to our allies. There will be amendments offered, in particular by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], to make indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts which would have a very serious effect on the piece of legislation we have put together so carefully that has been able to win the support of the Democratic side of the aisle, the Republican side and the administration.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues not only to support this bill, but to oppose the Traficant cuts. They would be very harmful to what we have been able to achieve to this point.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

In closing I would simply like to read from two letters that we received from the President and from the Director of OMB.

The letter from the President says as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 23, 1988.

Hon. DAVID R. OBEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DAVE: As the House begins consideration of the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1989 (H.R. 4637), I want to express my strong support for passage of the bill reported from the Committee on Appropriations. The bill provides funds for U.S. foreign assistance and export financing programs that are crucial to the successful conduct of our foreign policy. The recommendations of the House Appropriations Committee represent a truly bipartisan, effective approach to the funding of U.S. foreign policy requirements.

The bill is vitally important in meeting U.S. commitments to our allies and friends abroad. The bill also strengthens U.S. security assistance programs, which have suf-

fered disproportionately from budget reductions in recent years. Of particular importance, the bill is responsive to the needs of the four democracies in Central America and the need to promote democracy in Nicaragua.

While we reserve the opportunity to seek improvements in the bill once it reaches the Senate, I want to emphasize that H.R. 4637 is a strong and balanced bill produced in a spirit of bipartisan cooperation that will contribute substantially to the achievement of U.S. foreign policy objectives.

I urge you and your colleagues in the House to support H.R. 4637 as reported by the Committee on Appropriations when the House considers the bill.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

From the letter from the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, I would like to simply quote one paragraph:

The Subcommittee recommendations strike a balance between our economic and security assistance concerns worldwide and represent a highly commendable effort to produce a truly bipartisan foreign policy bill. At a time when U.S. leadership is more critical than ever, the draft bill provides the Administration with most of the basic tools with which to respond to the challenges of

aggression as well as the opportunities for peace, economic development, and export promotion.

Therefore, while the Administration may seek changes in the Senate, we seek your help, Mr. Chairman, in ensuring that this bipartisan effort be continued in Full Committee and on the floor of the House by adoption of the Subcommittee bill without amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the two letters speak for themselves.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 1989.

I have traditionally opposed foreign aid because I believe our own domestic programs must take precedent over our financial contributions to the economies of other nations. Programs such as education, housing, health care, veterans benefits, Social Security, and general science, space and technology are critical to the future of our own country and our resources must be directed toward those entities—not toward foreign aid.

As a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee I am particularly committed to the future of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA] and the general science programs of the Department of Energy. I believe that their continued success is incumbent upon adequate Federal funding. This funding is critical if our Nation is to meet global competition, provide for national security, and improve the quality of life for all our citizens. There is no question that such critical, domestic programs must continue to take precedence over foreign assistance.

I am a strong supporter of the State of Israel and am committed to ensuring the security of the state which America helped bring into existence. I would support legislation to provide financial assistance for Israel should it be considered separately from the total foreign operations appropriations. I regret that I could not do so in the context of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, if there are no other requests for time on that side of the aisle, I yield back the remainder of my time.

□ 1400

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered by titles as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each title shall be considered as having been read.

No amendments are in order, except the amendments printed in House Report 100-648, which shall be considered only in the order specified and only if offered by the designated Member. Said amendments are not subject to amendment except as specified and are debatable for not to exceed 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto.

After each title is designated, the Chair will announce the number of the amendment made in order by the rule and the name of its sponsor in order to give notice to the Committee of the Whole as to the order of recognition.

The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ARREARAGES

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

For payment to the International Development Association by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$43,333,334, for the United States contribution to the replenishments, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no such payment may be made while the United States Executive Director to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is compensated by the Bank at a rate 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 the alternate United States Executive Director to the Bank is compensated by the Bank 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.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

For payment to the International Finance Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$20,300,000, for the United States share of the increase in subscriptions to capital stock, to remain available until expended.

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), \$190,964,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no such payment may be made while the United States Director to the Bank is compensated by the Bank 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 the Bank is compensated by the Bank 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.

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

For payment to the International Development Association by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$951,666,666, for the United States contribution to the replenishment, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no such payment may be made while the United States Executive Director to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is compensated by the Bank at a rate 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

the alternate United States Executive Director to the Bank is compensated by the Bank 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.

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), \$41,868,609, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no such contribution may be made while the United States Director of the Asian Development Bank is compensated by the Bank 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 the Bank is compensated by the Bank 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.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

For payment to the African Development Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$105,000,000, for the United States contribution to the fifth replenishment of the African Development Fund, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be made available until authorized.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the African 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, \$8,999,371, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no such payment may be made while the United States Executive Director to the Bank is compensated by the Bank at a rate 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 the alternate United States Executive Director to the Bank is compensated by the Bank 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.

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the African 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 \$135,062,946.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of sections 301 and 103(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and of section 2 of the United Nations Environment Program Participation Act of 1983, \$214,958,666: *Provided*, That no funds shall be available for the United Nations Fund for Science and Technology: *Provided further*, That the total amount of funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available only as follows: \$110,000,000 for the United Nations Development Program; \$54,400,000 for the United Nations Children's Fund: *Provided further*, That the

funds made available for UNICEF (less amounts withheld consistent with section 307 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and section 526 of this Act) shall be obligated and expended no later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That if the previous proviso is not complied with, then \$50,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act for necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall be immediately transferred to the general fund of the United States Treasury; \$980,000 for the World Food Program; \$1,500,000 for the United Nations Capital Development Fund; \$220,000 for the United Nations Voluntary Fund for the Decade for Women; \$2,000,000 for the International Convention and Scientific Organization Contributions; \$1,960,000 for the World Meteorological Organization Voluntary Cooperation Program; \$22,000,000 for the International Atomic Energy Agency; \$9,000,000 for the United Nations Environment Program; \$784,000 for the United Nations Educational and Training Program for Southern Africa; \$500,000 for the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa; \$110,000 for the United Nations Institute for Namibia; \$450,000 for the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species; \$220,000 for the World Heritage Fund; \$90,000 for the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture; \$245,000 for the United Nations Fellowship Program; \$400,000 for the United Nations Center on Human Settlements; \$250,000 for the UNIDO Investment Promotion Service; \$7,349,666 for the Organization of American States; and \$2,500,000 for the International Fund for Agricultural Development: *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.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against title I?

If not, does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] desire to offer his amendment?

Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] desire to offer his amendment, or are there any points of order?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II—BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes, to remain available until September 30, 1989, unless otherwise specified herein, as follows:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND NUTRITION, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 103, \$488,715,000: *Provided*, That up to \$5,000,000 shall be provided for new development projects of private entities and cooperatives utilizing surplus dairy products: *Provided further*, That not less than \$8,000,000 shall be provided for the Vitamin A Deficiency Program: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, up to \$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall

be made available, and remain available until expended, for agricultural activities in Poland which are managed by the Polish Catholic Church or other nongovernmental organizations.

POPULATION, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 104(b), \$197,940,000: *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 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.

HEALTH, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 104(c), \$119,000,000: *Provided*, That of this amount \$2,500,000 shall be made available for the River Blindness Program of the World Health Organization.

INTERNATIONAL AIDS PREVENTION AND CONTROL PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter I of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$35,000,000, which shall be made available only for activities relating to research on, and the treatment and control of, acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) in developing countries: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading \$17,500,000 shall be made available to the World Health Organization to finance the Global Program on AIDS, including activities implemented by the Pan American Health Organization.

CHILD SURVIVAL FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 104(c)(2), \$71,000,000.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

DEVELOPMENT, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 105, \$117,000,000: *Provided*, That \$1,500,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for the Caribbean Law Institute.

PRIVATE SECTOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND ENERGY, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 106, \$120,709,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$5,000,000 shall be made available only for cooperative projects among the United States, Israel and developing countries: *Provided further*, That not

less than \$5,000,000 shall be made available only for the Central American Rural Electrification Support project.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 106, \$8,662,270.

MICRO-ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT

Of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, not less than \$75,000,000 shall be made available for programs of credit and other assistance for micro-enterprises in developing countries: *Provided*, That local currencies which accrue as a result of assistance provided to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 may be used for assistance for micro-enterprises: *Provided further*, That such local currencies which are used for this purpose shall be in lieu of funds earmarked under this heading and shall reduce the amount earmarked for assistance for micro-enterprises by an equal amount.

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106 and section 121 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$500,000,000, for assistance only for Sub-Saharan Africa, which shall be in addition to any amounts otherwise made available for such purposes: *Provided*, That any of the funds which are appropriated under this heading may be used for assistance for Sub-Saharan Africa to carry out any economic development assistance activities under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That assistance made available under this heading shall be used to help the poor majority in Sub-Saharan Africa through a process of long-term development and economic growth that is equitable, participatory, environmentally sustainable, and self-reliant: *Provided further*, That these objectives may, in part, be achieved through the integration of women in the development process, appropriate consultation with private voluntary organizations, African and other organizations with a local perspective on the development process, and inclusion of the perspectives and participation of those affected by the provision of assistance: *Provided further*, That assistance made available under this heading shall be provided in accordance with the policies contained in section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That assistance made available under this heading should be provided, when consistent with the objectives of such assistance, through African, United States and other private and voluntary organizations which have demonstrated effectiveness in the promotion of local grassroots activities on behalf of long-term development in Sub-Saharan Africa: *Provided further*, That assistance made available under this heading should be used to help overcome shorter-term constraints to long-term development; to promote reform of sectoral economic policies to support the critical sector priorities of agricultural production and natural resources, health, voluntary family planning services, education, and income generating opportunities; to bring about appropriate sectoral restructuring of the Sub-Saharan African economies; to support reform in public administration and finances and to establish a favorable environment for individual enterprise and self-sustaining devel-

opment: *Provided further*, That assisted policy reforms should take into account the need to protect vulnerable groups: *Provided further*, That assistance made available under this heading shall be used to increase agricultural production in ways which protect and restore the natural resource base, especially food production; to maintain and improve basic transportation and communication networks; to maintain and restore the renewable natural resource base in ways which increase agricultural production; to improve health conditions with special emphasis on meeting the health needs of mothers and children, including the establishment of self-sustaining primary health care systems that give priority to preventive care; to provide increased access to voluntary family planning services; to improve basic literacy and mathematics especially to those outside the formal educational system and to improve primary education; and to develop income-generating opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed in urban and rural areas: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Agency for International Development should target the equivalent of 10 percent of the funds appropriated under this heading for each of the following: (1) maintaining and restoring the renewable natural resource base in ways which increase agricultural production, including components of agriculture activities which are consistent with this objective, (2) health activities, and (3) voluntary family planning: *Provided further*, That local currencies generated by the sale of imports or foreign exchange by the government of a country in Sub-Saharan Africa from funds appropriated under this heading shall be deposited in a special account established by that government: *Provided further*, That these local currencies shall be available only for use, in accordance with an agreement with the United States, for development activities which are consistent with the policy directions of section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and for necessary administrative requirements of the United States Government: *Provided further*, That in order to carry out the purposes of this heading, section 604(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and similar provisions of law, shall not apply with respect to the implementation of assistance activities consistent with the purposes of this heading: *Provided further*, That the funds made available under this heading shall be provided only on a grant basis.

SOUTHERN AFRICA, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$50,000,000, which shall be made available, without regard to section 518 of this Act and section 620(q) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, only to assist sector projects supported by the Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference (SADCC) to enhance the economic development of the nine member states forming that regional institution: *Provided*, That this amount shall be made available for one or more of the following sectors: transportation; manpower development; agriculture and natural resources; energy (including the improved utilization of electrical power sources which already exist in the member states and offer the potential to swiftly reduce the dependence of those states on South Africa for electricity); and industrial development and trade (including private sector initiatives): *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be in addition

to any amounts otherwise made available for such purposes and shall be in addition to amounts made available for Africa under the heading "Sub-Saharan Africa, Development Assistance": *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for activities in Angola: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for activities in Mozambique unless the President certifies that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so.

CHILD SURVIVAL ACTIVITIES FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Of the aggregate of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out sections 103 through 106 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, not less than \$29,000,000 shall be made available for child survival activities for Sub-Saharan Africa: *Provided*, That this amount shall be in addition to any amounts otherwise made available for such purposes by this Act.

ASSISTANCE FOR DISPLACED CHILDREN

Of the aggregate of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, not less than \$1,500,000 shall be made available for programs and activities for children who have become orphans as a result of the effects of drought, civil strife, and other natural and man-made disasters: *Provided*, That assistance under this heading shall be made available in accordance with the policies and general authorities contained in section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT

In recognition that the full participation of women in, and the full contribution of women to, the development process are essential to achieving economic growth, a higher quality of life, and sustainable development in developing countries, not less than \$5,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be used to encourage and promote the participation and integration of women as equal partners in the development process in developing countries: *Provided*, That the Agency for International Development shall seek to ensure that country strategies and, where appropriate, projects and programs, are designed so that the percentage of women who receive assistance is, at a minimum, in approximate proportion to their traditional participation in the targeted activities and, wherever possible and appropriate, so that this percentage is likely to increase.

PHILIPPINES, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Of the aggregate of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out sections 103 through 106 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, not less than \$40,000,000 shall be made available only for the Philippines for project and sector assistance primarily in support of the Government of the Philippines' efforts to promote economic recovery and attain sustained growth through increased rural productivity in both farm and off-farm enterprises, and other activities consistent with the purposes of chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided*, That of the funds made available for the Philippines under section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, not less than \$1,000,000 shall be made available to fund technical assistance to strengthen nonprofit private organizations and cooperatives in conjunction with projects using local currencies generated by

sale of Public Law 480 and section 416 commodities.

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.

PRIVATE SECTOR REVOLVING FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 108 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, not to exceed \$9,000,000 to be derived by transfer from funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of chapter 1 of part I of such Act, to remain available until expended. During fiscal year 1989, obligations for assistance from amounts in the revolving fund account under section 108 shall not exceed \$12,000,000.

During fiscal year 1989, total commitments to guarantee loans may be made only to the extent that the total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, shall not exceed \$25,000,000.

AMERICAN SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS ABROAD

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 214, \$30,000,000.

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 491, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That up to \$500,000 may be made available for assistance for children who have become orphans as a result of drought and famine in Sub-Saharan Africa.

PAYMENT TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the "Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund", as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1980, \$40,532,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667, \$414,000,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$15,000,000 of this amount shall be for Foreign Affairs Administrative Support: *Provided further*, That except to the extent that the Administrator of the Agency for International Development determines otherwise, not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate of the funds made available for the fiscal year 1989 to carry out chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be made available only for activities of economically and socially disadvantaged enterprises (within the meaning of section 133(c)(5) of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1977), historically black colleges and universities, colleges and universities having a student body in which more than 40 percent of the students are Hispanic Americans, and private and voluntary organizations which are controlled by individuals who are black Ameri-

cans, Hispanic Americans, or Native Americans, or who are economically and socially disadvantaged (within the meaning of section 133(c)(5) (B) and (C) of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1977). For purposes of this proviso, economically and socially disadvantaged individuals shall be deemed to include women.

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

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667, \$23,970,000, which sum shall be available only for the operating expenses of the Office of the Inspector General notwithstanding sections 451 or 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any other provision of law.

HOUSING AND OTHER CREDIT GUARANTY PROGRAMS

During the fiscal year 1989, total commitments to guarantee loans shall not exceed \$125,000,000 of contingent liability for loan principal: *Provided*, That the President shall enter into commitments to guarantee such loans in the full amount provided under this heading, subject only to the availability of qualified applicants for such guarantees: *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 223(e)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 borrowing authority provided therein may be exercised in such amounts as may be necessary to retain an adequate level of contingency reserves for the fiscal year 1989.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II, \$3,248,500,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$1,200,000,000 shall be available only for Israel, which sum shall be available on a grant basis as a cash transfer and shall be disbursed within 30 days of enactment of this Act or by October 31, 1988, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That not less than \$815,000,000 shall be available only for Egypt, which sum shall be provided on a grant basis, of which not more than \$115,000,000 may be provided as a cash transfer with the understanding that Egypt will undertake significant economic reforms which are additional to those which were undertaken in previous fiscal years, and not less than \$200,000,000 shall be provided as Commodity Import Program assistance: *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 of the funds appropriated under this heading not less than \$220,000,000 shall be available for Pakistan: *Provided further*, That not less than \$124,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the Philippines: *Provided further*, That not less than \$20,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for Morocco: *Provided further*, That not less than \$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for Tunisia: *Provided further*, That not less than \$40,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for Portugal:

Provided further, That not less than \$15,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for Cyprus: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading up to \$35,000,000 but not less than \$10,000,000 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 further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading \$185,000,000 only shall be available for El Salvador, \$80,000,000 only shall be available for Guatemala, \$90,000,000 only shall be available for Costa Rica, and not less than \$85,000,000 shall be available for Honduras: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading for Honduras, \$2,500,000 may not be expended until the Secretary of State notifies the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Honduras has agreed to reimburse the United States Government for recent damage done to the United States Embassy facility in Tegucigalpa, Honduras: *Provided further*, That not less than \$34,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for Jordan, of which not less than \$11,000,000 is for programs in Jordan and not less than \$23,000,000 is in support of Jordan's development program for the West Bank and Gaza: *Provided further*, That not less than an additional \$7,500,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for the West Bank and Gaza Program through the Asia and Near East regional program: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$90,000,000 shall be available for Sub-Saharan Africa: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 up to \$1,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to assist the Government of El Salvador's Special Investigative Unit for the purpose of bringing to justice those responsible for the murders of United States citizens in El Salvador: *Provided further*, That a report of the investigation shall be provided to the Congress: *Provided further*, That \$20,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available to carry out the Administration of Justice program pursuant to section 534 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That if funds made available under this heading are provided to a foreign country as cash transfer assistance, that country shall be required to maintain these funds in a separate account and not commingle them with any other funds: *Provided further*, That such funds may be obligated and expended notwithstanding provisions of law which are inconsistent with the cash transfer nature of this assistance or which are referenced in the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference accompanying House Joint Resolution 648 (H. Rept. No. 98-1159): *Provided further*, That all local currencies that may be generated with such funds provided as a cash transfer shall be deposited in a special account to be used in accordance with section 609 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That at least 15 days prior to obligating any such cash transfer assistance to a foreign country under this heading, the President shall submit a notification to the Committees on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the

Senate, 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 the cash transfer assistance): *Provided further*, That not more than \$5,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading may be available to finance tied aid credits, unless the President determines it is in the national interest to provide in excess of \$5,000,000 and so notifies the Committees on Appropriations through the regular notification procedures: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used for tied aid credits without the prior approval of the Administrator of the Agency for International Development: *Provided further*, That, except as provided by this Act, none of the funds appropriated under this heading by this Act or the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1988, shall be made available for tied credits in accordance with any provision of law enacted after May 19, 1988: *Provided further*, That \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, only for the independent Polish trade union "Solidarity" of which \$1,000,000 is to support its Social Fund project, and \$1,000,000 is to support Solidarity through the AFL-CIO's Free Trade Union Institute to promote democratic activities in Poland: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law to the National Endowment for Democracy for the promotion of democracy in Nicaragua: *Provided further*, That these funds are to be administered consistent with the Agreement between the Government of Nicaragua and the Nicaraguan Resistance signed March 23, 1988 at Sapoa, Nicaragua ("Sapoa Agreement") and the Guatemala Peace Accords of August 7, 1987: *Provided further*, That such assistance (1) shall be provided to internal groups that have renounced violence and support a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Nicaragua, including independent elements of the press, independent labor unions, independent business groups, and independent human rights groups, and (2) may not be provided to any group that is affiliated with or supportive of any armed opposition group: *Provided further*, That the manner in which these funds are used shall not be inconsistent with the Sapoa Agreement, as its terms are applied and monitored for acceptability by the Verification Commission established by that Agreement: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 1990.

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, \$7,140,000: *Provided*, That, when, with the permission 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

ed in the United States Treasury if the grantee uses the resulting interest for the purpose for which the grant was made. This provision applies with respect to both interest earned before and interest earned after the enactment of this provision.

**INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

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, \$16,600,000: *Provided*, That \$11,000,000 of the funds appropriated to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be transferred to and consolidated with funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That the amount transferred shall be reduced by (1) the amount transferred from the Inter-American Development Bank to the Foundation's Social Progress Trust Fund, and (2) the use by the Foundation of local currencies made available through the Agency for International Development which accrue as a result of assistance provided to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds available to it and in accordance with law (including not to exceed \$35,000 for official reception and representation expenses), and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year.

During the fiscal year 1989 and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the amount of direct loans shall not exceed \$23,000,000.

During the fiscal year 1989, total commitments to guarantee loans shall not exceed \$200,000,000 of contingent liability for loan principal.

Except as provided in this Act, no provision of any other Act not enacted into law by May 19, 1988, shall be construed to require the exercise of authority to provide direct loans or to make commitments to guarantee loans contrary to the limitations contained under this heading.

PEACE CORPS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), \$152,000,000, including the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for administrative purposes for use outside of the United States: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to pay for abortions.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$101,000,000.

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 Intergovern-

mental 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; \$361,950,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$27,500,000 shall be available for Soviet, Eastern European and other refugees resettling in Israel: *Provided further*, That not less than \$23,500,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for Refugee Entrant Assistance: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be administered in a manner that ensures equity in the treatment of all refugees receiving Federal assistance: *Provided further*, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used to assist directly in the migration to any nation in the Western Hemisphere of any person not having a security clearance based on reasonable standards to ensure against Communist infiltration in the Western Hemisphere: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading not less than \$15,000,000 shall be available for costs of the expedited resettlement of Vietnamese Amerasians and their family members eligible for refugee benefits: *Provided further*, That not more than \$8,000,000 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)), \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ANTI-TERRORISM ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 8 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$9,840,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] for the purpose of offering an amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. INHOFE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. INHOFE: Page 21, line 15, strike "\$3,248,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,249,100,000"; and page 27, line 7, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That \$600,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available only to assist in the restoration of the parliament building in Dominica, which was destroyed in 1979."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for reserving the point of order. I recognize that what I am bringing in is a little bit late under the

rule; however, I did have an opportunity to present it to the Rules Committee. It was very favorably received. It is my intention that we will see this project in the ultimate bill when it is returned to us.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today on behalf of the island nation of Dominica in the Caribbean. November 3, 1988, will represent the 10th anniversary of Dominica's independence from Great Britain. Prime Minister Eugenia Charles of Dominica has written a letter to Secretary of State George Shultz asking for help from the United States to rebuild the parliament building that was destroyed during Hurricane David in 1979. The Agency for International Development estimates that the project will cost \$1.2 million.

Dominica under the capable leadership of Prime Minister Charles is firmly committed to promoting democracy throughout the Caribbean. We all recall her courageous support of the Grenada rescue mission in 1983. Because of her help she played a major role in nurturing Grenada's return to democracy.

Assistant Secretary of State Elliott Abrams has asked Ambassador Holland Coors to take on the responsibility of raising 50 percent of the money from private sources. The remaining 50 percent would be raised by approval of this amendment. This would be a public private partnership from the people of the United States of America to the people of Dominica.

My interest stems from my personal involvement with Dominica. Back in 1979, after Hurricane David ravaged the island while serving as mayor of Tulsa, I lead a mercy mission of 10 airplanes loaded with food, medicine and emergency supplies to Dominica. They were the first relief supplies to reach the island after the storm.

It just so happens that Dominica was also experiencing political turmoil back in 1979. After gaining independence, Dominica had an interim left-leaning government. The election of Eugenia Charles in 1980, marked a major turning point for democracy in Dominica. Prime Minister Charles is firmly committed to maintaining a truly pluralistic democracy in Dominica and throughout the Caribbean.

The Law Court/House of Assembly was built in 1810. It is the oldest stone structure in the capital city of Roseau. Because of Hurricane David the structure was virtually destroyed. Only the front facade and part of the north and south walls remain. Restoration of this important symbol of democracy is very important to Prime Minister Charles. She asks our help in rebuilding the parliament building to stand as a symbol of eternal friendship between the United States and Dominica.

For the sake of our friends in Dominica and throughout the island nations of the Caribbean I urge my colleagues to join with me in approving this amendment to provide \$600,000 which is the public portion of the public private partnership to help Dominica's elected parliament return to their rightful home.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

As the Chair knows, there were a number of speeches this morning insisting that regular order be followed, and that requires that points of order be lodged against amendments that are not in order on an appropriation bill, even if they do not have any substantive problem.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an increase appropriation for an unauthorized program and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

Clause 2 of rule XXI states in pertinent part:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.* * *

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal 1989 authorization for this program has not been signed into law. Although the rule protects the amounts appropriated by the bill as reported, it does not waive points of order against amendments making unauthorized appropriations. By proposing to increase the ESF appropriation, the amendment violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

Mr. Chairman, I also make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule again states in pertinent part:

No amendment to a general appropriation bill shall be in order if changing existing law.* * *

The amendment gives affirmative direction in that it requires that a specified amount of ESF funds be reserved for a specific purpose.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mr. INHOFE. No, Mr. Chairman, I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma concede the point of order?

Mr. INHOFE. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained for the reasons stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including administrative expenses and purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only for use outside of the United States, \$876,750,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading not less than \$125,000,000 shall be made available only for the Philippines: *Provided further*, That if any of the funds appropriated under this heading are made available for Turkey, then not less than \$30,000,000 of such funds shall be available for Greece: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading not more than \$40,000,000 shall be used for general costs of administering the Military Assistance program: *Provided further*, That any material assistance provided with funds appropriated under this heading for Haiti shall be limited to non-lethal items such as transportation and communications equipment and uniforms: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading for Haiti shall be made available only through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *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 proviso under this heading in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1988, prohibiting the use of military assistance funds after September 30, 1989, for the purposes of section 503(a)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, is repealed: *Provided further*, That no military assistance funds appropriated by this Act that have not been committed for the payment of any sale under the Arms Export Control Act during the period ending at the end of the second fiscal year after the fiscal year for which such funds were appropriated shall be committed for such purpose thereafter unless the Committees on Appropriations of each House of Congress are given a fifteen-day prior notification of the amount of funds involved, the reasons why no commitment was made thereof, and the proposed sales to be financed with such funds: *Provided further*, That military assistance funds appropriated by this or any Act that have been expended into the account designated in section 503(a)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to finance particular sales shall be available, subject to all applicable reprogramming provisions, to finance other sales in the event of sales cancellations, reductions, excess funds at case closeout, or other reasons relating to the implementation of sales programs: *Provided further*, That the Committees on Appropriations shall be furnished on March 1 of each year a complete report of the status of military assistance funds appropriated by this or any future Act committed for the payment of any sales under the Arms Export Control Act as regards the individual sale, item description, and estimated sales price: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1989.

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 541, \$51,254,750.

FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, \$3,893,000,000, of which not less than \$1,800,000,000 shall be available only for Israel, not less than \$1,300,000,000 shall be available only for Egypt, \$240,000,000 shall be available only for Pakistan: *Provided*, That to the extent that the Government of Israel requests that funds be used for such purposes, credits made available for Israel under this heading shall, as agreed by Israel and the United States, be available for advanced fighter aircraft programs or for other advanced weapon systems, as follows: (1) up to \$150,000,000 shall be available for research and development in the United States; and (2) not less than \$400,000,000 shall be available for the procurement in Israel of defense articles and defense services, including research and development: *Provided further*, That Israel, Egypt, and Pakistan shall be released from their contractual liability to repay the United States Government with respect to all credits provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 1989, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, exclusive of loan guarantee defaults, shall not exceed \$3,893,000,000: *Provided further*, That any funds made available under this heading, except as otherwise specified, may be made available at concessional rates of interest, notwithstanding section 31(b)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further*, That the concessional rate of interest on foreign military credit sales loans shall be not less than 5 percent per year: *Provided further*, That all country and funding level changes in requested concessional financing allocations shall be submitted through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds previously obligated for the Philippines but uncommitted on the date of enactment of this Act shall be used only to finance sales made 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 total funds provided to carry out the provisions of sections 503 and 541 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and the provisions of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act allocated to Greece and Turkey shall be provided according to a 7 to 10 ratio.

FOREIGN MILITARY SALES DEBT REFORM

Funds made available by the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, Appropriations Act, 1988, for obligation and expenditure after October 1, 1988, subject to a Presidential budget request, under the heading "Foreign Military Sales Debt Reform", subsection (b) "Interest Rate Reduction" shall be available, subject to the same conditions and provisos, only after October 1, 1989.

GUARANTY RESERVE FUND

(a) If during fiscal year 1989 the funds available in the Guaranty Reserve Fund (Fund) are insufficient to enable the Secretary of Defense (Secretary) to discharge his responsibilities, as guarantor of loans guaranteed pursuant to section 24 of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) or pursuant to the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1988, under the heading "Foreign Military

Sales Debt Reform", the Secretary shall issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or obligations may be redeemed by the Secretary from appropriations and other funds available, including repayments by the borrowers of amounts paid pursuant to guarantees issued under section 24 of the AECA. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase any notes or other obligations issued hereunder and for that purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act are extended to include any purchase of such notes or obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this heading. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

(b) If during fiscal year 1989, the Secretary of Defense is required under paragraph (a) to issue notes or other obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury in excess of \$643,196,000, then, notwithstanding any other provision of law, such necessary excess amounts instead shall be made available directly from uncommitted balances previously made available to carry out the provisions of section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of fiscal year 1961 and for expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, unless the President submits a supplemental budget request for the additional borrowing authority necessary for the Guaranty Reserve Fund.

SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Not to exceed \$236,865,000 may be obligated pursuant to section 51(c)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act for the purposes of the Special Defense Acquisition Fund during fiscal year 1989, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1991: *Provided*, That section 632(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be applicable to the transfer to countries pursuant to chapter 2 of part II of that Act of defense articles and defense services acquired under chapter 5 of the Arms Export Control Act.

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 551, \$31,689,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding sections 451, 492(b), or 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or any other provision of law, these funds may be used only as justified in the Congressional Presentation Document for fiscal year 1989: *Provided further*, That, to the extent that these funds cannot be used to provide for such assistance, they shall revert to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against title III?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

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.

LIMITATION ON PROGRAM ACTIVITY

During the fiscal year 1989 and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall not exceed \$690,000,000: *Provided*, That at the discretion of the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, up to \$110,000,000 of that amount may be available, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, as tied-aid credits in accordance with the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act Amendments of 1986: *Provided further*, That there is appropriated to the Export-Import Bank of the United States an amount equal to the grant amount of tied-aid credits which are made available from time to time, but not to exceed \$110,000,000, which shall be subject to the limitation on gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans specified under this heading: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1989, total commitments to guarantee loans shall not exceed \$10,200,000,000 of contingent liability for loan principal: *Provided further*, That the direct loan and guaranty authority provided under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 1990.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$19,890,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) shall be available during fiscal year 1989 for administrative expenses, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and not to exceed \$16,000 for official reception and representation expenses for members of the Board of Directors: *Provided*, That (1) fees or dues to international organizations of credit institutions engaged in financing foreign trade, (2) necessary expenses (including special services performed on a contract or a fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Export-Import Bank or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, or the investigation or appraisal of any property in respect to which an application for a loan has been made, and (3) expenses (other than internal expenses of the

Export-Import Bank) incurred in connection with the issuance and servicing of guarantees, insurance, and reinsurance, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes of this heading.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 661 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That except as provided in this or any other Act appropriating funds for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, no provision of law enacted after May 19, 1988, may transfer funds to, or otherwise make available funds for, the Trade and Development Program.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

TRADE CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAM

During fiscal year 1989, total commitments to guarantee or insure loans for the "Trade Credit Insurance Program" shall not exceed \$200,000,000 of contingent liability for loan principal.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against title IV?

If not, the Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

COST BENEFIT STUDIES

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated in this Act (other than funds appropriated for "International Organizations and Programs") shall be used to finance the construction of any new flood control, reclamation, or other water or related land resource project or program which has not met the standards and criteria used in determining the feasibility of flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the United States of America under the principles, standards and procedures established pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act (42 U.S.C. 1962, et seq.) or Acts amendatory or supplementary thereto.

OBLIGATIONS DURING LAST MONTH OF AVAILABILITY

SEC. 502. 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 AGAINST PAY TO FOREIGN ARMED SERVICE MEMBER

SEC. 503. None of the funds appropriated in this Act nor any of the counterpart funds generated as a result of assistance hereunder or any prior Act shall be used to pay pensions, annuities, retirement pay, or adjusted service compensation for any person heretofore or hereafter serving in the armed forces of any recipient country.

TERMINATION FOR CONVENIENCE

SEC. 504. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used for making payments on any contract for procurement to which the United States is a party entered into after the date of enactment of this Act which does not contain a provision authorizing the termination of such contract for the convenience of the United States.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENTS TO UNITED NATIONS MEMBERS

Sec. 505. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used to pay in whole or in part any assessments, arrears, or dues of any member of the United Nations.

PROHIBITION OF BILATERAL FUNDING FOR MULTILATERAL PROGRAMS

Sec. 506. 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.

AID RESIDENCE EXPENSES

Sec. 507. 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.

AID ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES

Sec. 508. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, not to exceed \$11,500 shall be for entertainment expenses of the Agency for International Development during the current fiscal year.

REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

Sec. 509. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, not to exceed \$115,000 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 total funds made available by this Act under the headings "Military Assistance" and "Foreign Military Credit Sales", not to exceed \$2,875 shall be available for entertainment expenses and not to exceed \$75,000 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 \$125,000 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 \$2,875 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 \$4,600 shall be available for entertainment expenses: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Trade and Development Program", not to exceed \$2,300 shall be available for representation and entertainment allowances.

PROHIBITION ON FINANCING NUCLEAR GOODS

Sec. 510. 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 to finance the export of nuclear equipment, fuel, or technology.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Sec. 511. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be obligated or expended to provide assistance to any country for the purpose of aiding the efforts of the government of such country to repress the legitimate rights of

the population of such country contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

PROHIBITION AGAINST DIRECT FUNDING FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES

Sec. 512. 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 Angola, Cambodia, Cuba, Iraq, Libya, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, South Yemen, Iran, or Syria.

MILITARY COUPS

Sec. 513. 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. 514. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated under an appropriation account to which they were not appropriated without the prior written approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

DEOBLIGATION/REOBLIGATION AUTHORITY

Sec. 515. 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, 1989, 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.

PROHIBITION ON PUBLICITY OR PROPAGANDA

Sec. 516. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not authorized before the date of enactment of this Act by the Congress.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

Sec. 517. 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 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.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES IN DEFAULT

Sec. 518. 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.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS—NAMES OF BORROWERS

Sec. 519. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be available to any international financial institution whose United States governor or representative cannot upon request obtain the amounts and the names of borrowers for all loans of the international financial institution, including loans to employees of the institution, or the compensation and related benefits of employees of the institution.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS—DOCUMENTATION

Sec. 520. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be available to any international financial institution whose United States governor or representative cannot upon request obtain any document developed by or in the possession of the management of the international financial institution, unless the United States governor or representative of the institution certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that the confidentiality of the information is essential to the operation of the institution.

COMMERCE AND TRADE

Sec. 521. 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.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

Sec. 522. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 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. 523. For the purposes of providing the Executive Branch with the necessary administrative flexibility, none of the funds made available under this Act for "Agricul-

ture, rural development, and nutrition, Development Assistance", "Population, Development Assistance", "Child Survival Fund", "Health, Development Assistance", "International AIDS Prevention and Control Program", "Education and human resources development, Development Assistance", "Private Sector, environment, and energy, Development Assistance", "Science and technology, Development Assistance", "Sub-Saharan Africa, Development Assistance", "Southern Africa, Development Assistance", "International organizations and programs", "American schools and hospitals abroad", "Trade and development program", "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", "Military Assistance", "Foreign Military Credit Sales", "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 for the current fiscal year 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 chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or 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, 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.

CONSULTING SERVICES

SEC. 524. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order pursuant to existing law.

PROHIBITION ON ABORTION LOBBYING

SEC. 525. None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used to lobby for abortion.

LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 526. 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, the Southwest African Peoples Organization, Libya, Iran, or, at the dis-

cretion of the President, Communist countries listed in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

UNITED NATIONS VOTING RECORD

SEC. 527. (a) Not later than January 31 of each year, or at the time of the transmittal by the President to the Congress of the annual presentation materials on foreign assistance, whichever is earlier, the President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a full and complete report which assesses, with respect to each foreign country, the degree of support by the government of each such country during the preceding twelve-month period for the foreign policy of the United States. Such report shall include, with respect to each such country which is a member of the United Nations, information to be compiled and supplied by the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, consisting of a comparison of the overall voting practices in the principal bodies of the United Nations during the preceding twelve-month period of such country and the United States, with special note of the voting and speaking records of such country on issues of major importance to the United States in the General Assembly and the Security Council, and shall also include a report on actions with regard to the United States in important related documents such as the Non-Aligned Communiqué. A full compilation of the information supplied by the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations for inclusion in such report shall be provided as an addendum to such report.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance to a country which the President finds, based on the contents of the report required to be transmitted under subsection (a), is engaged in a consistent pattern of opposition to the foreign policy of the United States.

(c) The report required by subsection (a) of this section shall be in the identical format as the "Report to Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations" which was submitted pursuant to Public Law 99-190 and Public Law 98-164 on June 6, 1986.

LOANS TO ISRAEL UNDER ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT

SEC. 528. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Israel may utilize any loan which is or was made available under the Arms Export Control Act and for which repayment is or was forgiven before utilizing any other loan made available under the Arms Export Control Act.

PROHIBITION AGAINST UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES RECOGNIZING OR NEGOTIATING WITH PLO

SEC. 529. In reaffirmation of the 1975 memorandum of agreement between the United States and Israel, and in accordance with section 1302 of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-83), no employee of or individual acting on behalf of the United States Government shall recognize or negotiate with the Palestine Liberation Organization or representatives thereof, so long as the Palestine Liberation Organization does not recognize Israel's right to exist, does not accept Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, and does not renounce the use of terrorism.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUNDS FOR ISRAEL

SEC. 530. 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.

CEILINGS AND EARMARKS

SEC. 531. Ceilings and earmarks contained in this Act shall not be applicable to funds or authorities appropriated or otherwise made available by any subsequent Act unless such Act specifically so directs.

NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT ON FUNDING FOR LEBANON

SEC. 532. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act for the "Economic Support Fund" or for "Foreign Military Credit Sales" shall be obligated or expended for Lebanon except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

NOTIFICATION CONCERNING AIRCRAFT IN CENTRAL AMERICA

SEC. 533. (a) During the current fiscal year, the authorities of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act may not be used to make available any helicopters or other aircraft for military use, and licenses may not be issued under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act for the export of any such aircraft, to any country in Central America unless the Committees on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified in writing at least 15 days in advance.

(b) During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of State shall promptly notify the committees designated in subsection (a) whenever any helicopters or other aircraft for military use are provided to any country in Central America by any foreign country.

GUATEMALA—RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 534. Funds provided in this Act for Guatemala may not be provided to the Government of Guatemala for use in its rural resettlement program, except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

SEC. 535. (a) It is the policy of the United States that sustainable economic growth must be predicated on sustainable use of natural resources. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors of the Multilateral Development Banks (MDB's) to—

(1) promote the adoption of internal guidelines requiring the use of least-cost

planning techniques in evaluating proposed energy loans, and consider refusal to support power generation, utilization or energy sector loans unless cost-effective conservation measures have been fully evaluated and considered;

(2) encourage each MDB to offer technical assistance to borrower nations in preparing national energy plans. Special emphasis shall be given to least-cost analysis in making decisions on energy use and development, and such analyses shall take into account all demand-side as well as supply-side options;

(3) promote expansion of MDB expertise in the areas of energy conservation and renewable energy sources;

(4) promote the adoption of lending strategies which place increased emphasis on energy conservation and efficiency as opposed to merely increasing generating capacity;

(5) promote adoption of policies which minimize emissions of greenhouse gases;

(6) promote the adoption of lending strategies that place increased emphasis on energy efficient transportation programs. Such strategies shall consider alternatives to conventional mechanized transport such as nonmotorized vehicles, public transport and increased energy and cost efficiency of transportation systems; and

(7) promote the use of existing and the development of new mechanisms to promote conservation of biological diversity. Existing resources to be consulted shall include but not be limited to Conservation Data Centers.

(b) The Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall—

(1) in the submission of future "early warning system" reports, as required by the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1988, make use of resources that promote the conservation of biological diversity, such as Conservation Data Centers;

(2) submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations, by January 15, 1989, on the Agency's activities and practices which encourage or discourage the use of renewable energy technologies overseas, and on ways to correct or refocus those efforts. This report shall include but is not limited to Agency activities which could be directed to develop a stronger interface with the private sector through the establishment of a United States Renewable Energy Industry Advisory Council;

(3) issue guidance to all Agency missions stating that renewable energy resources and conservation are to be the centerpiece of its energy efforts, and meeting energy needs through these means shall be discussed in every Country Development Strategy Statement; and

(4) take steps to implement recommendations set forth by a report of the Committee on Health and Environment on opportunities for the Agency to assist developing countries in the proper use of agricultural and industrial chemicals.

PROHIBITION CONCERNING ABORTIONS AND INVOLUNTARY STERILIZATION

SEC. 536. 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.

AFGHANISTAN—HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

SEC. 537. Not less than \$45,000,000 of the aggregate amount of funds appropriated by this Act, to be derived in equal parts from the funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and chapter 4 of part II of that Act, shall be available for the provision of food, medicine, or other humanitarian assistance to the Afghan people, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS—DOCUMENTATION

SEC. 538. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be available to a private voluntary organization which fails to provide upon timely request any document, file, or record necessary to the auditing requirements of the Agency for International Development, nor shall any of the funds appropriated by this Act be made available to any private voluntary organization which is not registered with the Agency for International Development.

EL SALVADOR—INVESTIGATION OF MURDERS

SEC. 539. Of the amounts made available by this Act for military assistance and financing for El Salvador under chapters 2 and 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and under the Arms Export Control Act, \$5,000,000 may not be expended until the President reports, following the conclusion of the Appeals process in the case of Captain Avila, to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of El Salvador has (1) substantially concluded all investigative action with respect to those responsible for the January 1981 deaths of the two United States land reform consultants Michael Hammer and Mark Pearlman and the Salvadoran Land Reform Institute Director Jose Rodolfo Viera, and (2) pursued all legal avenues to bring to trial and obtain a verdict of those who ordered and carried out the January 1981 murders.

REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

SEC. 540. It is the sense of the Congress that all countries receiving United States foreign assistance under the "Economic Support Fund", "Foreign Military Credit Sales", "Military Assistance", "International Military Education and Training", the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), development assistance programs, or trade promotion programs should fully cooperate with the international refugee assistance organizations, the United States, and other governments in facilitating lasting solutions to

refugee situations. Further, where resettlement to other countries is the appropriate solution, such resettlement should be expedited in cooperation with the country of asylum without respect to race, sex, religion, or national origin.

IMMUNIZATIONS FOR CHILDREN

SEC. 541. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) reports that four million children die annually because they have not been immunized against the six major childhood diseases: polio, measles, whooping cough, diphtheria, tetanus, and tuberculosis;

(2) at present less than 20 percent of children in the developing world are fully immunized against these diseases;

(3) each year more than five million additional children are permanently disabled and suffer diminished capacities to contribute to the economic, social and political development of their countries because they have not been immunized;

(4) ten million additional childhood deaths from immunizable and potentially immunizable diseases could be averted annually by the development of techniques in biotechnology for new and cost-effective vaccines;

(5) the World Health Assembly, the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund, and the United Nations General Assembly are calling upon the nations of the world to commit the resources necessary to meet the challenge of universal access to childhood immunization by 1990;

(6) the United States, through the Centers for Disease Control and the Agency for International Development, joined in a global effort by providing political and technical leadership that made possible the eradication of smallpox during the 1970's;

(7) the development of national immunization systems that can both be sustained and also serve as a model for a wide range of primary health care actions is a desired outcome of our foreign assistance policy;

(8) the United States Centers for Disease Control headquartered in Atlanta is uniquely qualified to provide technical assistance for a worldwide immunization and eradication effort and is universally respected;

(9) at the 1984 Bellagio Conference it was determined that the goal of universal childhood immunization by 1990 is indeed achievable;

(10) the Congress, through authorizations and appropriations for international health research and primary health care activities and the establishment of the Child Survival Fund, has played a vital role in providing for the well-being of the world's children;

(11) the Congress has expressed its expectation that the Agency for International Development will set as a goal the immunization by 1990 of at least 80 percent of all the children in those countries in which the Agency has a program; and

(12) the United States private sector and public at large have responded generously to appeals for support for national immunization campaigns in developing countries.

(b)(1) The Congress calls upon the President to direct the Agency for International Development, working through the Centers for Disease Control and other appropriate Federal agencies, to work in a global effort to provide enhanced support toward achieving the goal of universal access to childhood immunization by 1990 by—

(A) assisting in the delivery, distribution, and use of vaccines, including—

(i) the building of locally sustainable systems and technical capacities in developing countries to reach, by the appropriate age, not less than 80 per centum of their annually projected target population with the full schedule of required immunizations; and

(ii) the development of a sufficient network of indigenous professionals and institutions with responsibility for developing, monitoring, and assessing immunization programs and continually adapting strategies to reach the goal of preventing immunizable diseases; and

(B) performing, supporting, and encouraging research and development activities, both in the public and private sector, that will be targeted at developing new vaccines and at modifying and improving existing vaccines to make them more appropriate for use in developing countries.

(2) In support of this global effort, the President should appeal to the people of the United States and the United States private sector to support public and private efforts to provide the resources necessary to achieve universal access to childhood immunization by 1990.

ETHIOPIA—FORCED RESETTLEMENT, VILLAGIZATION

SEC. 542. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be made available for any costs associated with the Government of Ethiopia's forced resettlement or villagization programs.

SUDAN, SOMALIA, AND JAMAICA NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 543. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be obligated or expended for Sudan, Jamaica or Somalia except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

DEFINITION OF PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

SEC. 544. 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; Military Assistance; and Foreign Military Credit Sales, "program, project, and activity" shall also be considered to include country, regional, and central program level funding within each such account; for the functional 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, as amended.

CHILD SURVIVAL AND AIDS ACTIVITIES

SEC. 545. Of the funds made available by this Act and appropriated for the "Child Survival Fund" and "Health, Development Assistance", up to \$6,000,000 may be used to reimburse United States Government agencies, agencies of State governments, and institutions of higher learning for the full cost of employees detailed or assigned, as the case may be, to the Agency for International Development for the purpose of carrying out child survival activities and activities relating to research on, and the treatment and control of, acquired immune deficiency syndrome in developing countries:

Provided, That personnel which are detailed or assigned for the purposes of this section shall not be included within any personnel ceiling applicable to any United States Government agency during the period of detail or assignment.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK—COORDINATION OF PROJECTS

SEC. 546. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank to work with the representatives, and with the ministries from which they receive their instructions, of other donor nations to the Inter-American Development Bank, to develop a coordinated economic development program for the assistance activities of the Bank. Such program should be developed in cooperation with the Department of State and the Agency for International Development to ensure that the bilateral economic assistance programs of the United States are effectively coordinated with the activities of the Inter-American Development Bank.

CHILE—LOANS FROM MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 547. (a) It is the sense of Congress that pursuant to section 701 of the International Financial Institutions Act of 1977, the United States Government should oppose all loans to Chile from international financial institutions, except for those for basic human needs, until—

(1) the Government of Chile has ended its practice and pattern of gross abuse of internationally recognized human rights;

(2) significant steps have been taken by the Government of Chile to restore democracy, including—

(A) the implementation of political reforms which are essential to the development of democracy, such as the legalization of political parties, the enactment of election laws, the establishment of freedom of speech and the press, and the fair and prompt administration of justice; and

(B) a precise and reasonable timetable has been established for the transition to democracy.

(b) None of the funds made available by this Act for the "Economic Support Fund" or for title III shall be obligated or expended for Chile.

COMMODITY COMPETITION

SEC. 548. 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 section 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.

PROHIBITION OF FUNDING RELATED TO COMPETITION WITH UNITED STATES EXPORTS

SEC. 549. 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, 19 U.S.C. 1202, 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)).

PROHIBITION AGAINST INDIRECT FUNDING TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES

SEC. 550. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated to finance indirectly any assistance or reparations to Angola, Cambodia, Cuba, Iraq, Libya, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, South Yemen, Iran, or Syria unless the President of the United States certifies that the withholding of these funds is contrary to the national interest of the United States.

ASSISTANCE FOR LIBERIA

SEC. 551. (a) Funds appropriated by this Act under the heading "Military Assistance" or "Economic Support Fund" may be made available for assistance for Liberia only if the Secretary of State certifies to the Congress that the Government of Liberia—

(1) has taken significant steps to: reduce extra-budgetary expenditures; reduce borrowing from any source (whether local or foreign) in anticipation of future tax receipts, profit sharing, maritime revenues, or other revenues; reduce the use of off-shore funds for the financing of domestic expenditures; and reduce the extent to which public expenditures exceed allocations;

(2) has ceased diverting and misusing United States assistance, and has paid all amounts owed to the local currency accounts (established pursuant to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954) for the shortfalls in its payments for the fiscal years 1983 and 1984; and

(3) is making significant progress toward—

(A) permitting all political parties to freely organize, assemble, and disseminate their views as provided for by the Liberian constitution;

(B) respecting constitutional guarantees of freedom of the press and freedom of speech;

(C) maintaining the independence of the legislative branch in accordance with the Liberian constitution;

(D) establishing and maintaining an independent judiciary;

(E) providing full access to all political prisoners by internationally respected human rights organizations for the purpose of investigating human rights abuses; and

(F) improving the human rights situation.

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

(c) The requirements of this section are in addition to any other statutory requirements applicable to assistance for Liberia.

RECIPROCAL LEASING

SEC. 552. Section 61(a) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by striking out "1988" and inserting in lieu thereof "1989".

LIMITATION ON DEFENSE EQUIPMENT
DRAWDOWN

SEC. 553. Defense articles, services and training drawn down under the authority of section 506(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall not be furnished to a recipient unless such articles are delivered to, and such services and training initiated for, the recipient country or international organization not more than one hundred and twenty days from the date on which Congress received notification of the intention to exercise the authority of that section: *Provided*, That if defense articles have not been delivered or services and training initiated by the period specified in this section, a new notification pursuant to section 506(b) of such Act shall be provided, which shall include an explanation for the delay in furnishing such articles, services, and training, before such articles, services, or training may be furnished.

NOTIFICATION ON EXCESS DEFENSE EQUIPMENT

SEC. 554. 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 such Committees shall also be informed of the original acquisition cost of such defense articles.

AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENT

SEC. 555. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be obligated unless an Act authorizing the appropriation of such funds has been enacted.

NOTIFICATION CONCERNING EL SALVADOR

SEC. 556. (a) The Congress expects that—
(1) the Government of El Salvador and the armed opposition forces and their political representatives will be willing to pursue a dialogue for the purposes of achieving an equitable political settlement of the conflict, including free and fair elections;

(2) the elected civilian government will be in control of the Salvadoran military and security forces, and those forces will comply with applicable rules of international law and with Presidential directives pertaining to the protection of civilians during combat operations, including Presidential directive C-111-03-984 (relating to aerial fire support);

(3) the Government of El Salvador will make demonstrated progress, during the period covered by each report pursuant to subsection (b), in ending the activities of the death squads;

(4) the Government of El Salvador will make demonstrated progress, during the period covered by each report pursuant to subsection (b), in establishing an effective judicial system; and

(5) the Government of El Salvador will make demonstrated progress, during the period covered by each report pursuant to subsection (b), in implementing the land reform program.

(b) *REPORTS*.—On April 1, 1989, and September 30, 1989, the President shall report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on the extent to which the objectives described in subsection (a) are being met. With respect to the objective described in paragraph (4) of that subsection, each report shall specify the status of all cases presented to the Salvadoran courts involving human rights violations against civilians by members of the Salvadoran security forces, including military officers and other military personnel and civil patrolmen.

NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS ON DEBT RELIEF
AGREEMENTS

SEC. 557. The Secretary of State shall transmit to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress and to such other Committees as appropriate, a copy of the text of any agreement with any foreign government which would result in any debt relief no less than thirty days prior to its entry into force, other than one entered into pursuant to this Act, together with a detailed justification of the interest of the United States in the proposed debt relief: *Provided*, That the term "debt relief" shall include any and all debt prepayment, debt rescheduling, and debt restructuring proposals and agreements.

MIDDLE EAST REGIONAL COOPERATION

SEC. 558. Middle East regional cooperative programs which have been carried out in accordance with section 202(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 shall continue to be funded at a level of not less than \$5,000,000 from funds appropriated under the heading "Economic Support Fund": *Provided*, That of this amount up to \$500,000 shall be made available for scholarships for support of Israeli students studying in institutions of higher education in Arab countries and up to \$500,000 shall be made available for scholarships for support of Arab students studying in institutions of higher education in Israel: *Provided further*, That such scholarships shall be called "Arab-Israeli Peace Scholarships".

ASSISTANCE FOR THE PEOPLE OF LEBANON

SEC. 559. The Congress recognizes that the people of Lebanon have suffered greatly during much of the past two decades from the effects of natural disasters and civil strife. The Congress further recognizes that assistance provided through nongovernmental organizations has had a significant impact in mitigating the adverse consequences of these unfortunate events on the Lebanese people. Therefore, up to \$5,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be made available to provide assistance for the people of Lebanon. Such assistance shall be made available only through the United Nations Children's Fund, indigenous nongovernmental organizations, or international organizations, and shall be provided in accordance with the general authorities contained in section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

MEMBERSHIP DESIGNATION IN ASIAN
DEVELOPMENT BANK

SEC. 560. It is the Sense of the Congress that the United States Government should use its influence in the Asian Development Bank to secure reconsideration of that institution's decision to designate Taiwan (the Republic of China) as "Taipei, China". It is further the Sense of the Congress, that the Asian Development Bank should resolve this dispute in a fashion that is acceptable to Taiwan (the Republic of China).

DEPLETED URANIUM

SEC. 561. 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, or (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.

EARMARKS

SEC. 562. Funds appropriated by this Act which are earmarked may be reprogrammed for other programs within the same account notwithstanding the earmark if compliance with the earmark is made impossible by operation of any provision of this or any other Act: *Provided*, That any such reprogramming shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

HAITI

SEC. 563. (a) *SUSPENSION OF ASSISTANCE*.—During fiscal year 1989, none of the funds made available by this Act or by any other Act or joint resolution may be obligated or expended to provide United States assistance (including any such assistance appropriated and previously obligated) for Haiti (other than the assistance described in subsection (b) of this section) unless the democratic process set forth in the Haitian Constitution approved by the Haitian people on March 29, 1987, especially those provisions relating to the provisional Electoral Council, is being fully and faithfully adhered to by the Government of Haiti.

(b) *EXCEPTIONS*.—The term "United States assistance" does not include—

(1) assistance under chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 insofar as such assistance is provided through private and voluntary organizations or other nongovernmental agencies;

(2) assistance which involves the donations of food or medicine;

(3) disaster relief assistance (including any assistance under chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961);

(4) assistance for refugees;

(5) assistance under the Inter-American Foundation Act;

(6) assistance necessary for the continued financing of education for Haitians in the United States;

(7) assistance provided in order to enable the continuation of migrant and narcotics interdiction operations; or

(8) activities under the National Endowment for Democracy Act.

(c) *OTHER SANCTIONS*.—It is the sense of the Congress that, in order to further encourage the Government of Haiti to adhere to the constitutionally mandated transition to democracy, the President should—

(1) suspend Haiti's eligibility for benefits under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act; and

(2) seek international cooperation to encourage such adherence by the Government of Haiti through the imposition of an international arms embargo and comprehensive trade and financial sanctions.

ASSISTANCE FOR PANAMA

SEC. 564. (a) Unless the President certifies to Congress that—

(1) substantial progress in assuring civilian control of the armed forces has been demonstrated and that the Panama Defense

Forces and its leaders have been removed from non-military activities and institutions;

(2) an impartial investigation into allegations of illegal actions by members of the Panama Defense Force is being conducted;

(3) a satisfactory agreement has been reached between the governing authorities and representatives of the opposition forces on conditions for free and fair elections; and

(4) freedom of the press and other constitutional guarantees, including due process of law, are restored to the Panamanian people;

then no United States assistance (including any such assistance appropriated and previously obligated) shall be obligated or expended for programs, projects or activities which assist or lend support for the Noriega regime or ministries of government under the control of the Noriega regime in this fiscal year and any fiscal year thereafter, and none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act, or any other Act, shall be used to finance any participation of the United States in joint military exercises conducted in Panama during the fiscal year 1989.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that if the conditions described in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a) have been certified as having been met, then not only will United States assistance be restored, but increased levels of such assistance should be considered for Panama.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "United States assistance" means assistance of any kind which is provided by grant, sale, loan, lease, credit, guaranty, or insurance, or by any other means, by any agency or instrumentality of the United States Government, including—

(1) assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including programs under title IV of chapter 2 of part I of such Act);

(2) sales, credits, and guarantees under the Arms Export Control Act;

(3) sales under title I or III and donations under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 of nonfood commodities;

(4) other financing programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation for export sales of nonfood commodities;

(5) financing under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; and

(6) assistance provided by the Central Intelligence Agency or assistance provided by any other entity or component of the United States Government if such assistance is carried out in connection with, or for purposes of conducting, intelligence or intelligence-related activities except that this shall not include activities undertaken solely to collect necessary intelligence;

except that the term "United States assistance" does not include (A) assistance under chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 insofar as such assistance is provided through private and voluntary organizations or other nongovernmental agencies, (B) assistance which involves the donations of food or medicine, (C) disaster relief assistance (including any assistance under chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961), (D) assistance for refugees, (E) assistance under the Inter-American Foundation Act, (F) assistance necessary for the continued financing of education for Panamanians in the United States, or (G) assistance made available for termination costs arising from the requirements of this section.

(d) The Secretary of Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors

to the International Financial Institutions (the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the Inter-American Development Bank) to vote against any loan to Panama, unless the President has certified in advance that the conditions set forth in subsection (a) of this section have been met.

ELIMINATION OF THE SUGAR QUOTA ALLOCATION OF PANAMA

SEC. 565. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no sugars, sirups, or molasses that are products of Panama may be imported into the United States after the date of enactment of this Act during any period for which a limitation is imposed by authorities provided under any other law on the total quantity of sugars, sirups, and molasses that may be imported into the United States: *Provided*, That such products may be imported after the beginning of the last week of any quota year if the President certifies that for the entire duration of the quota year, freedom of the press and other constitutional guarantees, including due process of law, have been restored to the Panamanian people.

(b) REALLOCATION OF QUOTA AMOUNTS.—For any quota year for which the President does not certify for the entire duration of the quota year, freedom of the press and all other constitutional guarantees, including due process of law, have been restored to the Panamanian people, no later than the last week of such quota year, the United States Trade Representative shall reallocate among other foreign countries the quantity of sugar, sirup, and molasses products of Panama that could have been imported into the United States before the date of enactment of this Act under any limitation imposed by other law on the total quantity of sugars, sirups, and molasses that may be imported into the United States during any period.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—The provisions of subsections (a) and (b), and the amendments made by subsection (c) of section 571 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs, Appropriations Act, 1988, shall cease to apply if the President certifies to Congress pursuant to section 564(a) of this Act.

STINGERS IN THE PERSIAN GULF REGION

SEC. 566. (a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no Stinger anti-aircraft missiles may be provided, directly or indirectly, by sale, lease, grant or otherwise, during fiscal year 1989 to any country in the Persian Gulf region.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding the prohibition in subsection (a), such missiles may be provided to Bahrain if the President certifies to Congress that—

(1) such missiles are needed by the recipient country to counter an immediate air threat and/or to contribute to the protection of United States personnel, facilities or operations;

(2) no other appropriate system is available from the United States;

(3) the recipient agrees to safeguards as required in the Letter of Offer and Acceptance by the United States Government to protect against diversion; and

(4) the recipient country has agreed to a United States buyback of all the remaining missiles and components which have not been destroyed or fired in order to return them to the possession and control of the United States when another United States air defense system which meets the military

requirements can be made available or not more than 18 months from the date of enactment of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1988.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—Before issuing any letter of offer to sell or provide Stinger missiles (without regard to the amount of the sale or transfer) the President shall notify the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Majority Leader of the Senate. Any such notification shall contain the information required in a certification under section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act.

OPPOSITION TO ASSISTANCE TO TERRORIST COUNTRIES BY INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 567. (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, and the African Development Fund.

PROHIBITION ON BILATERAL ASSISTANCE TO TERRORIST COUNTRIES

SEC. 568. 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 fiscal year 1989—

(1) shall not be obligated or expended for assistance to a country listed in section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 on the date of enactment of this Act or placed on that list thereafter,

(2) if obligated before such date assistance for such country, shall not be disbursed, and

(3) if expended before such date for assistance to be delivered to such country from the United States or by United States nationals, then no such delivery shall be made, unless such assistance is for humanitarian purposes.

MAINTENANCE OF MILITARY BALANCE OF EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

SEC. 569. (a) UNITED STATES POLICY.—The Congress intends that excess defense articles be made available under this section consistent with the United States policy, established by section 620C of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, of maintaining the military balance in the eastern Mediterranean.

(b) MAINTENANCE OF BALANCE.—Accordingly, the President shall ensure that, for each fiscal year, the ratio of—

(1) the value of excess defense articles made available for Turkey under this section, to

(2) the value of excess defense articles made available for Greece under this section, closely approximates the ratio of—

(A) the amount of military assistance and financing provided for Turkey, to

(B) the amount of military assistance and financing provided for Greece.

(c) EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (b) shall not apply if either Greece or Turkey ceases to be eligible to receive excess defense articles.

DETENTION OF CHILDREN

SEC. 570. It is the sense of the Congress that the practice of detaining children without charge or trial is unjust, inhumane, and is an affront to civilized principles. The Congress further believes that it should be the policy of the United States to make the ending of the practice of detaining children without charge or trial a matter of the highest priority. Therefore, the Congress believes the Secretary of State should convey to all international organizations that ending the practice of detaining children without charge or trial should be a policy of the highest priority for those organizations.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO MOZAMBIQUE

SEC. 571. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act may be used to provide military assistance to Mozambique.

RELATIVELY LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

SEC. 572. During fiscal years 1990 and 1991, the President may use the authority of paragraphs (A) and (B) of section 124(c)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 with respect to such aggregate amounts of principal and interest payable during each of these fiscal years as the President may determine, except that that authority may be used with respect to a relatively least developed country only if—

(1) an International Monetary Fund standby agreement is in effect with respect to that country; or

(2) a structural adjustment program of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or of the International Development Association is in effect with respect to that country.

RESOLUTION OF JAPANESE BEETLE PROBLEM

SEC. 573. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to fund any programs to assist in solving the Japanese beetle problem in the Azores. It is the sense of the Congress that this problem was created by the Department of Defense which should fund any program to resolve it.

HONDURAS—RAMIREZ CASE

SEC. 574. It is the sense of the Congress that, pursuant to the procedures contained in section (j) under the heading "Assistance for Central America" enacted in Public Law 100-71, the Honduran Government appears to have made a reasonable and good faith settlement offer based on a factual analysis by third parties, and the owner of the property in question is strongly encouraged to accept the proposed settlement. Therefore, notwithstanding the provisions of such section, \$10,000,000 of the Economic Support Funds made available by Public Law 100-71 for Honduras but withheld from expenditure shall be available for expenditure upon enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That if a settlement is reached on the property in question, then the additional \$10,000,000 withheld from expenditure pursuant to such section shall then be available for expenditure.

CONGRESSIONAL PRESENTATION FOR SECURITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 575. Unless the fully printed final version of the fiscal year 1990 Congressional Presentation for Security Assistance Pro-

grams is received by the Congress by March 1, 1989, \$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this Act for the Military Assistance Program shall be returned immediately to the General Fund of the United States Treasury.

SOUTH AFRICA—SCHOLARSHIPS

SEC. 576. Of the funds made available by this Act, not less than \$20,000,000 shall be made available for scholarships for disadvantaged South Africans: *Provided*, That these funds shall be made available in equal amounts from funds earmarked for Sub-Saharan Africa within the Economic Support Fund, and from funds made available for Sub-Saharan Africa, Development Assistance.

THIRD PARTY TRANSFER

SEC. 577. Section 3(d)(2)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by striking out "law" and inserting in lieu thereof "joint resolution, as provided for in sections 36(b)(2) and 36(b)(3) of this Act".

NARCOTICS CONTROL PROGRAM

SEC. 578. (a)(1) Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading "Economic Support Fund" \$61,000,000 shall be made available only as follows: \$25,000,000 shall be available for Bolivia, \$9,000,000 shall be available for Ecuador, \$25,000,000 shall be available for Jamaica, and \$2,000,000 shall be available for Peru.

(2) Of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to the military assistance program) \$16,500,000 shall be made available only as follows: \$5,000,000 shall be available for Bolivia, \$3,000,000 shall be available for Ecuador, \$3,500,000 shall be available for Jamaica, and \$5,000,000 shall be available for Colombia.

(3) Of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$3,500,000 shall be made available in accordance with the general authorities contained in section 481(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, only for the procurement of weapons or ammunition for foreign law enforcement agencies, and paramilitary units organized for the specific purposes of narcotics enforcement, for use in narcotics control, eradication, and interdiction efforts, notwithstanding section 482(b) of such Act: *Provided*, That funds made available under this paragraph shall be made available only for Bolivia, Peru, Colombia, Ecuador, and for the regional air wing pursuant to sections 482 and 484 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and shall be in addition to amounts earmarked for the countries contained in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(4) Funds made available under this subsection shall be available for obligation consistent with the provisions of section 481(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to International Narcotics Control) except as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be available for any country during any three-month period beginning on or after October 1, 1988, immediately following a certification by the President to the Congress that the government of such country is failing to take adequate measures (including satisfying the goals agreed to in applicable bilateral narcotics agreements as defined in section 481(h)(2)(A)(ii) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) to prevent narcotic drugs or other controlled substances (as listed in the

schedules in section 202 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse and Prevention Control Act of 1971 (21 U.S.C. 812)) which are cultivated, produced, or processed illicitly, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to United States Government personnel or their dependents or from entering the United States unlawfully.

(c) In making determinations with respect to Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru pursuant to section 481(h)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the President shall take into account the extent to which the Government of each country is sufficiently responsive to United States Government concerns on coca control and whether the provision of assistance for that country is in the national interest of the United States.

(d) If any funds appropriated by this Act for "Economic Support Fund," "Military Assistance," "International Military Education and Training", or "Foreign Military Credit Sales" are not used for assistance for the country for which those funds were allocated because that country has not taken adequate steps to halt illicit drug production or trafficking, those funds shall be reprogrammed for additional assistance for those countries which have met their illicit drug eradication targets or have otherwise taken significant steps to halt illicit drug production or trafficking: *Provided*, That any such reprogramming shall be subject to the notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(e)(1) Of the funds appropriated under title II of this Act for the Agency for International Development, up to \$10,000,000 should be made available for narcotics education and awareness programs (including public diplomacy programs), of the Agency for International Development, and up to \$15,000,000 of the funds appropriated under title II of this Act should be made available for narcotics related economic assistance activities.

(2) Section 481(i)(4)(E) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by—

(A) inserting "(vii) assistance for narcotics education and awareness activities under section 126 of this Act;" after "this Act," and

(B) redesignating clause (vii) as clause (viii).

(f) In order to maximize the participation of other countries in the effort to promote international narcotics control, the Secretary of State is directed to urge the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control to develop a more comprehensive program for enlisting greater multilateral support for coca control programs and related development activities in South America.

(g)(1) Section 481(h)(2)(A)(ii) is amended to read as follows:

"(ii) A bilateral narcotics agreement referred to in clause (i)(I) is an agreement between the United States and a foreign country whereby the foreign country agrees to undertake specific activities including, where applicable, efforts to reduce drug production, drug consumption, and drug trafficking within its territory, including activities to address illicit crop eradication and crop substitution; drug interdiction and enforcement; drug consumption and treatment; identification and elimination of illicit drug laboratories; identification and elimination of the trafficking of precursor chemicals for the use in production of illegal drugs; cooperation with United States drug

enforcement officials; and, where applicable, participation in extradition treaties, mutual legal assistance provisions directed at money laundering, sharing of evidence, and other initiatives for cooperative drug enforcement."

(2) Section 585(c) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1988 (as contained in Public Law 100-202) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Beginning with certifications with respect to fiscal year 1989 and each subsequent year, a country which in the previous year was designated a major drug producing or drug transit country may not be deemed as cooperating fully unless it has in place a bilateral narcotics agreement with the United States, or a multilateral agreement which achieves the objectives of this section."

(3) Section 481(h)(2)(A)(i)(I) is amended by inserting "or multilateral agreement which achieves the objectives of this subsection," after "(ii)".

(h) Section 481(h)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting before "Subject" the following: "Not later than October 1 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Congress of those countries identified by the Secretary as being major drug producing or major drug transit countries (including the definition used to determine such drug transit countries) for purposes of the withholding requirements contained in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and the certification requirements contained in paragraph (2) of this subsection."

TURKISH AND GREEK MILITARY FORCES ON CYPRUS

SEC. 579. Any agreement for the sale or provision of any article on the United States Munitions List (established pursuant to section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act) entered into by the United States after the enactment of this section shall expressly state that the article is being provided by the United States only with the understanding that it will not be transferred to Cyprus or otherwise used to further the severance or division of Cyprus. The President shall report to Congress any substantial evidence that equipment provided under any such agreement has been used in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of this section.

COMMERCIAL LEASING OF DEFENSE ARTICLES

SEC. 580. 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 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.

CAMBODIAN NON-COMMUNIST RESISTANCE FORCES

SEC. 581. If the President makes available funds appropriated by this Act for the Cambodian non-Communist resistance forces, such funds shall be derived from funds appropriated under the headings "Military Assistance" and "Economic Support Fund",

and shall be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided*, That funds made available for this purpose shall be obligated in accordance with the provisions of section 906 of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-83).

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CUBA

SEC. 582. The Congress finds that—

(1) the United Nations Human Rights Commission was established by the Economic and Social Council in 1946 to investigate and make recommendations concerning the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

(2) the United Nations, the United Nations Human Rights Commission, and the Chairman of the Commission are to be commended for Decision 1988/106 as interpreted by the Chairman which establishes a working group on Cuba to conduct an on-site investigation and prepare a report for consideration under agenda item 12(h) at the forty-fifth session of the Commission in 1989; and

(3) the President, the Secretary of State, the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, and the Representative of the United States to the United Nations Human Rights Commission are to be commended for their efforts to place Cuba on the agenda of the Commission and are strongly encouraged to continue to support and assist the Commission in its implementation of Decision 1988/106.

This Act may be cited as the "Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1989".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against title V?

Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] desire to offer his amendment?

If not, does the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] desire to offer his amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under a unanimous consent request and approval, I have an amendment at the desk designated the Gilman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Florida that that is the second Gilman amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the first Gilman amendment is not offerable on the grounds that a unanimous consent request for a designee was denied by the House upon objection of a Member?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was merely giving the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] a chance, if he wished to offer the amendment, that he might do so.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF FLORIDA

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment designated Gilman amendment No. 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Florida: In section 578, on page 91, line 6, strike "as follows:" and everything that follows to the period on page 9, line 9, and insert in lieu the following: "for Bolivia, Ecuador, Ja-

maica, and Peru; but not more than \$25 million shall be available to any one country"

In section 578, on page 91, line 13, strike "as follows:" and everything that follows to the period on page 91, line 716, and insert in lieu thereof "for Bolivia, Ecuador, Jamaica, and Colombia, but not more than \$5 million shall be available for any one country".

Mr. SMITH of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the capability to be designated for the purpose of offering this amendment which was originally submitted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], who unfortunately cannot be with us today.

I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] who have done an excellent job in bringing to the floor a bill that I hope will pass and a bill which reflects to a large degree the kinds of important programs which the United States must carry on around the world.

This particular amendment deals with a subject with which I am very much familiar. As the chairman of the International Narcotics Task Force of the Foreign Affairs Committee, a chore which is shared by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] with me as the ranking Republican, we have worked very diligently in the countries of South America to provide some capability for those countries to be given as much as they can in terms of help from the United States in the fight against drugs.

One of the controlling factors which is most important is whether or not there are programs available at the time we have our funds available for use by these countries, programs that can absorb the funds which we are then going to be giving these countries. In that regard, we try to give the agencies of the administration that deal with these problems as much flexibility as possible so that too much or too little money is not given to any area because a program may or may not be available to utilize those funds.

In this case what we are doing, Mr. Chairman, is removing the earmark on the additional funds provided under the bill for narcotics growing or transit countries under the ESF, the Economic Support Fund, and the MAP, or Military Assistance Program.

The amendment limits the countries which may receive the added funds to

the same list of countries contained in the committee bill, so there is no change.

It also retains the per country ceiling of \$25 million for the ESF funds and \$5 million for the MAP funds.

This amendment is being submitted because in the view of many we ought to be giving as much flexibility to the administration and we ought to be doing it so that recognition can be made whether or not programs are available to be able to utilize these funds.

I realize that this is a slight change from the original administration request, but frankly, situations have changed in the regions and in those countries. Now we need to be able to make distinctions between those countries for the purpose of utilizing this money well.

Again, I want to salute the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Oklahoma.

These are important funds, funds that need to be utilized to help these countries rid themselves of this terrible dangerous problem, because Mr. Chairman, if they rid themselves of the drug problem in Peru, in Bolivia, in Colombia, in Ecuador, in Jamaica, and other countries, we will be able to see a reduction in the problems which we are facing here in the United States and this money will provide, with the administration's discretion, the capability to be able to get a continuing forward progress on these funds.

So I do want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to do this.

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I have no objection to the amendment. I think it strengthens what the committee was trying to do.

As the gentleman indicates, all it really does is to provide the administration with somewhat greater flexibility.

At least on behalf of this side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, I am certainly happy to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] desire to offer his amendment?

Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] desire to offer his amendment?

Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] desire to offer his amendment?

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] has another amendment. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to offer that amendment?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for the purpose of offering an amendment.

□ 1415

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 98 after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 583. No funds appropriated under this Act shall be expended in any workplace that is not free of illegal possession or use of controlled substances which is made known to the federal entity or official to which funds are appropriated under this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the same amendment that I have been offering to other appropriation bills. I think in this particular case it has some implications beyond the bills that we have had before. This particular amendment says that they have to have a drug-free workplace in order to receive Federal moneys. It does in fact refer to illegal use and illegal possession of drugs. In the case of a foreign operations bill, it seems to me then that we have to determine what we mean by that word "illegal."

In the consultations I have had with attorneys, they feel as to what that does is brings us under the obligations of international law, so therefore we will have in fact a standard that not only applies the restrictions of legality with regard to domestic law to those people that would be covered under the domestic content, but also we would have a standard that would say to foreign nations that we expect you to also comply with all relevant international laws that your country is a signatory to.

Mr. Chairman, once again it is a standard which is not difficult to apply if one looks at the language of the amendment. This is an amendment that has become I understand controversial over the last few weeks. We have had people come out and describe it as nonsense and all kinds of things, but the bottom line is that what they are saying about the amendment just has no basis in fact.

I remind my colleagues again that we have an amendment here which is not on full face the only language that we have with regard to this matter. We have a whole body of underlying Federal law which also governs the situation and so as we try to have drug-free workplaces we are also dealing with the whole due process procedures that are a part of Federal law.

It seems to me very important that we understand that as we apply this standard that we are not applying a standard which is unworkable. In fact I think it is an extremely workable standard if we understand that we have to give people due process, that we have to provide an operational kind of mode. I think that this is an amendment that should be adopted on this particular bill as it has been adopted in previous appropriation bills, and I would hope that whatever controversy we have had before we will not have in this particular instances.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt the drug-free workplace amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for offering his amendment. As I understand, this is a similar amendment to amendments which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has offered to a series of other bills, is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. That is exactly right. This is the same language we have previously adopted in the House, and I have offered again on this particular bill in the knowledge that it will have impact on our program.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman give an example? It looks like a very straightforward amendment, in that no funds appropriated under this act shall be expended in any workplace that is not free of illegal possession or use of controlled substances which is made known to the Federal entity or official to which funds are appropriated under this act.

Mr. WALKER. The agencies that would be in the process of distributing the funds would have to maintain a drug-free environment in order to continue to get those funds and send them out. It seems to me that that is a standard that executive orders have already indicated should be maintained and that this particular language would simply build upon those executive orders that are already in place.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield further, offices would be drug free, they would have programs with managers to implement those programs?

Mr. WALKER. The intent is to make certain that contractors, subcontractors, and grantees and those Federal Government agencies are kept drug free.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WALKER:

SEC. . No funds appropriated under this Act shall be expended in any workplace, including a workplace within any government or military force, that is not free of any illegal use or possession of controlled substances, which is made known to the federal entity or official to which funds are appropriated under this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that I think every serious person in this country and certainly every Member of this body recognizes that drug use is a tragedy and certainly anyone who uses drugs has to be incredibly misguided. But my favorite philosopher, as people who know me know, is a fellow named Archy the Cockroach. And Archy wrote an old book back in the 1920's which is my bible when it comes to human nature and human foibles.

One of the things that Archy said is, "did you ever notice that when a politician does get an idea, he usually gets it all wrong?"

Let me simply say that I fully respect the gentleman from Pennsylvania's [Mr. WALKER] concern about the drug problem and his desire to try to create a social atmosphere in this country which pressures people through social mores and other devices into refusing to use drugs. Certainly everybody applauds that intention.

Mr. Chairman, my problem is that I take this job seriously. In fact some people, I suppose, think I take it too seriously. But my concern with this amendment as offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is that I really believe that it diverts attention from the real action which is needed if we are going to engage in a real, as opposed to a sham, war against drugs. We need massive drug education in the early grades; we need more resources committed to prosecutors' offices, to the courts, to the Coast Guard; and we need more help to governments who are fighting to reduce the control of the Medellin cartel and other drug cartels around the world. We need more tough action in this country. But this Walker amendment sort of reminds me of the "folk song" army back in the 1960's, the people who would sing a song about the war rather than trying to debate seriously about it.

There was a song written about them, and Tom Lehrer used to sing it

and he talked about the folk song army and the theme of the song was "Ready, Aim, Sing."

I would suggest that the motto for the Walker amendment would be, "Ready, aim, pose for political holy pictures" because I think that while its intention is certainly good, it is so carelessly thought out and so wacky in its implementation that it weakens long-term support for serious efforts to get at drug abuse.

No one can take it seriously if a contractor is required, as the result of one employee using drugs, that contractor loses his Federal contracts, or if a company for instance which has worked for 3 years to get a union to accept a collective bargaining agreement under which drug testing is required and drug rehabilitation is required if anyone is found guilty of using drugs in a plant, is then told, "Sorry but that is not enough, you have to lose your Federal contract if one worker decides to get out of line."

Mr. Chairman, I have had a good many Members come up to me and simply say that they know that the Walker amendment is unworkable, that it is outlandish, but they say, "Please leave it alone. Just fix it up in conference."

I have to say, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing so pitiful as a group of panicked politicians in full flight. It just seems to me that within a few weeks Members of this House will sober up, but meanwhile I want to make sure that, if the Walker amendment is adopted, that it is not applied selectively. And it seems to me that if we are really serious in applying this business to American industry and to American government and to the American military then we ought to apply it to foreign governments, to foreign military entities who receive taxpayers' money under this bill. That is all this amendment does. It clarifies the Walker amendment to make sure that it is applied also to any government that receives Federal money under this foreign aid bill and to any military which would be using American taxpayers' funds as a result of that appropriation.

What it says is that if we are going to screw up an American businessman's operation because of the underlying conduct of one worker then what it says to Honduras is, "Sorry, but if your Ambassador to Panama is going to try to bring cocaine into this country you get no money from us."

It says that if we really want to play King Canute and pretend we can tell this country that the drug tide shall not rise simply by having a missive like on the floor of the House of Representatives, then what it says is "If you are going to send that kind of a message to this country, send it to the entire world."

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment as a substitute to the Walker amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased, I think, to welcome the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] aboard to this concept. He talks about politicians being in full flight and then offers a broadening language, so I guess I am in favor of that. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] does I think misrepresent the facts and I do not believe he knowingly is doing that. I respect him too much for that.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] does not want to work at trivializing the issue because the fact is we have in many instances in this country used the power of Federal funding to get desired conduct in the country. We do it all the time. We do it in appropriation bills all the time.

No funds may be spent for a particular purpose, is what we say in legislation, and we apply it broadly to the whole country. That is exactly what we are doing here and I think that if we want action on drugs, we can get action on drugs. To suggest that one employee is going to lose a full contract is utterly absurd. They trivialize it by raising some absurd example so that they think they will make people shy away from the amendment. That is an utterly absurd case. If they will read the amendment, my amendment says "cannot be expended in any workplace which is not free of illegal possession of drugs or use of drugs." Once the workplace is cleaned up of that abhorrent behavior from the person that has done wrong, there is then a drug-free workplace again, and the money can continue to flow under my amendment.

The things said by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] he has said before and they are ridiculous, and they are inane on the face of what the language says.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that Members adopt my amendment. It is a way of assuring that within the due process procedures of this country we sent a very strong signal saying that we are not going to tolerate Federal moneys being used in places where drugs are also used. That is all this amendment is saying. That is the kind of statement that Congress has made over and over and over again. We have made it with regard to abortion, we have made it with regard to many, many social issues that this Congress abhors, and we are now making it with regard to drugs.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] yield?

□ 1430

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

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

I want to pursue with the gentleman the change that was made by the gentleman who offered the substitute amendment. It appears to me if you have a contractor, for example, who is laying a foundation for a Federal building, and he has got his cement workers out there, and it becomes apparent that one of them is using narcotics on the job, that contractor does not lose his contract for all time, but that the work would be suspended until he got rid of that individual and moved those narcotics off the scene and basically created a drug-free workplace.

Mr. WALKER. Clean up the workplace. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HUNTER. That could take a matter of minutes or perhaps hours if I understand the gentleman? Is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman has to understand under this standard that particular usage would have to be made known to the Federal Government before any action could be taken anyhow. It would have to be made known to the officials administering the act. You have to have a made-known kind of standard before any action can be taken, period.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me pursue with the gentleman one other point. We use similar legislation to prevent discrimination, racial discrimination, for example.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will not avail myself of all of that time.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has raised a valid substitute to the extent that it carries to really the absurd what is a move in that direction by the original underlying amendment.

While I, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, promote everything that this Congress can do to bring the drug problem under control, and I have stood on the floor of this House year after year after year talking about the problem of drugs, you cannot reduce that problem by mere rhetoric and a wave of a magic wand.

I am afraid that the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is really an attempt at a wave of a magic wand. A workplace where Federal funds are used may contain thousands upon thousands of workers. We know that in this country today there is a very good chance that even a small

percentage of those thousands may be illegal users of drugs. This amendment would have the most chilling effect not upon the use of the drugs by those employees but upon the capability of these business people to control their workplace in terms of knowing whether or not Federal funds will be flowing. There are no parameters in the bill to determine what is reasonable and what is not in terms of a drug-free workplace. It is something we all aspire to, but there is no standard in the bill. There is no suggestion that so many people using it would be valid but so many would not be, so many who are not on drugs against those that you have in a rehabilitation program, if you have a rehabilitation program and you find a new one, then do you lose your Federal funds? If you have standards set out in employee guidebooks or a set of rules and conduct and somebody breaks those as will happen in the workplace with thousands, as happens right here in this workplace, do you lose your Federal funding? According to the amendment, probably you do, because if you knew that someone was using drugs under the terms of the amendment, it has got to be someone that ends up to be the drug user, and it is absolutely vague. It is absolutely without substance, although it points in the right direction. Nobody takes exception to what he wants to do in the long term.

The problem is you cannot solve this huge, terrible situation with this kind of magic wand and approach. "We decree there shall be no drugs in the workplace," and, therefore, they are not there. It does not work. It is going to take the American people a long time and a lot of hard work to defeat the problem of drugs, and simplistic approaches will not work, although they sound real good, Mr. Chairman, but unfortunately the people who have this drug problem are not listening to us.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

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

I do not think either moral indignation or political maneuvering should be a substitute for precise legislating. I was wondering if the gentleman from Pennsylvania could explain to me in the context of the foreign assistance appropriation and in the realization that we have an Agency for International Development that contracts with private and voluntary organizations to promote and finance a variety of development assistance programs in countries throughout the world just how he envisions this amendment which has no specifics, no implementation procedures, no clue whatsoever as to how this would apply in the context of the Agency for International Development. What is AID's obligation? What is the Federal Government's ob-

ligation to determine whether on the site of a poultry farm in South America that is a private voluntary organization financed at least in part by AID, what are the obligations? How is this process possibly going to work?

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. First of all, the obligation of the Agency does not even come into play unless drug use or drug possession in that particular site is made known to them. If you read the amendment, the officials of AID would have to find out from independent sources that in fact there was drug use going on at that site. If they found out that there was drug use going on at that site, they would have to at that point confirm it and then they would have to cut off moneys unless they were given information that what had been drug use has in fact been eliminated and the workplace is again drug free, because all the obligation here is is that it be flowing to a drug-free workplace, so you have a made-known standard, and then you also have the ability of the Agency to determine whether or not the workplace is drug free. That is what it says.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, what we are dealing with here, as the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] has indicated, is a totally unconstitutional, unenforceable, unworkable piece of legislation which, in my estimation, really is a very unfortunate way to tackle the problem, because it really does trivialize the problem of drugs.

I stood on the floor of this House last week and said that I thought the Surgeon General of this country had made a grave error in making a comparison between heroin and cocaine and nicotine, because while both are addictive, there are gulfs of difference between them, and I believe that this kind of thing also trivializes the real problem.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] has indicated that there really is not a standard, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has only confirmed that.

I would urge my colleagues to adopt the substitute at least which is so far to that point on the outskirts that I am sure no one will ultimately want to include that in the conference.

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

I rise to again speak in support of my amendment to the Walker amendment under the remaining time I have available.

I simply want to read my amendment. My amendment simply adds the words "including a workplace within any government or military force," so

that makes clear that what we are applying to American businessmen and American contractors we are also applying to international programs, other countries who are recipients of aid and their militaries.

I happen to think, as I have indicated, that the amendment that is before us is unenforceable. I think it is wacky, but I recognize that the House has adopted it on two previous occasions, and so if they are going to do it, I want to make certain it applies to everybody.

In considering whether or not the basic Walker amendment should be adopted, I would simply bring to Members' attention a letter from the National Association of Manufacturers which reads in part:

We urge you to reject the impracticable approach embodied in the Walker amendment. The Walker amendment, while well-intentioned, is seriously misdirected. It could well have the unintended effect of depriving thousands of law-abiding citizens of their livelihood when their employer cannot meet the payroll due to Federal withholding of payment under a grant or contract as would be authorized by the Walker amendment.

It goes on to say:

The NAM would support an approach whereby assurances are given by the contractor or grantee at the start of the contractual relationship that a policy to ensure a drug-free environment is in place and will be administered in good faith. This would include education and awareness programs and employee-assistance programs. We urge you to oppose the Walker amendment and its attendant negative impact upon American workers and to adopt instead a realistic and workable approach to this critical problem of drug abuse.

My suggestion to the House is: Adopt the Obey amendment, if Members are going to vote for the Walker amendment at all. As far as I am concerned it is all goofy, but at least if they are going to pass it, adopt it so that it applies to everyone equally, foreign country and American alike.

□ 1440

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

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words. We cannot legislate on an appropriation bill, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is getting a little bit of a bad rap here. I think he is trying to do something with some integrity, and we should not make light of the efforts.

I realize we cannot legislate on an appropriation bill, but the gentleman has not had too many other opportunities, and the mechanics should be there to ensure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has that chance and other Members have that chance on an authorization level so that we can bring it to the appro-

priation level to where it could be constructed with a little bit more sense.

This is the only thing under the circumstances that this gentleman could do, so I do not want to give the impression that everybody on this side of the aisle is opposed at least to those efforts.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take my time back.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply suggest I would never, in the slightest, attempt to make light of anything done by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

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

I can see the same arguments coming forth here that came forth in the civil rights legislation. The argument was made that we cannot use the workplace to enforce antidiscrimination laws, and in fact we did. If one refused on the basis of racial discrimination to hire certain people, one could not be a contractor of the Federal Government.

We have had a lot of ideas that have come forth on the drug wars and ways we can employ the assets of the Federal Government in the drug wars. This in fact is a very appropriate leverage that we are applying with the Walker amendment. It is the workplace. It is the taxpayer dollars that are flowing out in many different areas, and so if we have a secretary in an AID office and she is smoking pot on the job, it is going to be evident very quickly to her supervisor or her boss, just as in a racial discrimination situation, that it is not to their benefit, it does not accrue to their benefit to tolerate that type of behavior.

So we are going to get supervisors involved, we are going to get bosses involved, we are going to get managers involved, and that is the way that we are going to move this thing with the sense that it is not OK to just use narcotics in the workplace out of the United States and out of the Federal programs.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California is exactly right. We are going to get bosses and supervisors involved. We are also going to get co-workers involved and we are going to be having a lot of people say no to drug use by their coworkers because they know what is at stake.

So I think the amendment is far from trivial. It is very serious, and it is something we should adopt.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to say I rise in very strong support of the Walker amendment. If it is with the Obey language, that is fine too. But I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is right on target and I support him very strongly.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the arguments from the other side, and in all honesty they strike me as being a little ludicrous.

I think it is particularly interesting that the gentleman from Wisconsin has now become a great defender of the National Association of Manufacturers. Maybe it tells us how the parties are evolving here in the House.

All of a sudden the Republicans are the populist party standing with the American people to do something about the usage of drugs, and the Democrats have become the defenders of the National Association of Manufacturers. It tells us something about what is happening around here.

But I think it is extremely important also to focus on this amendment. This amendment would in fact tell employers the same thing we have told many people many times out of this Government, that if they are going to use Federal funds there are certain conditions connected with those funds. This particular condition says that we are going to make policy that assures that the workplace is drug free, and I think that that is a very important standard.

I realize it has very broad implications. But it also is something which I think the American people are looking for, and that is that we apply the pressures that are available to us to bring down the drug problem.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has referred to all kinds of things like enforcement and getting tough. We do not get tough until we go after users. The \$140 billion a year industry in this country will not be brought down unless we go after users. One place to go after users is in the workplace.

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 Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman

man from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be expended in any workplace, including a workplace within any government or military force, that is not free of any illegal possession or use of controlled substances, or bribery, tax evasion, graft, or price fixing, which is made known to the federal entity or official to which funds are appropriated under this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, now that the House has decided to wave a magic wand and declare a drug-free world, I think that we ought to go a little further. The House has declared that no contractor who receives Federal money can continue to receive that contract if a single worker is convicted of a drug offense. At least that is the way I interpret the amendment to read.

This amendment says, and it is very simple, it says that if we are going to declare that no funds in the foreign assistance bill shall be used in any workplace which is not drug free, it says we shall also say that no foreign assistance funds may go to any party that is convicted of bribery, tax evasion, graft or price fixing. If we are against the "baddies" of this world, we might as well be against them all. I was thinking of putting sin into the amendment as well, frankly, but I could not figure out how to define it to meet the agreement of the House.

The amendment simply says that if under the amended Walker amendment we are going to cut off contracts for American businessmen if one of their workers or some of their workers get out of line on drugs, then it says we ought to do the same thing if people at those same operations get out of line in terms of bribery, in terms of price fixing, in terms of tax evasion and graft.

Let me simply point out that since 1982 the following contractors have been convicted of some of the offenses named in the amendment: Sperry, General Electric, Gould, Motorola, Litton, Harris, Olin Corp., National Semiconductor, Avco Division of Textron, TRW, Rockwell, GTE, and Martin Marietta and several more.

It simply seems to me that if we are concerned about the corroding effect of drugs on this society and the corroding effect of drugs upon the use of taxpayers' money that we also ought to be worried about the corroding ef-

fects of tax evaders and bribers and price fixers and grafters on any Federal money which is expended either in the United States or abroad. And it seems to me therefore that since we have gone down the Walker road we ought to go all the way and be pure as the driven snow on all of the baddies known to mankind, and it is in that spirit that I offer the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to speak in opposition?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to rise in opposition, but to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman from Oklahoma that is not in order under the current rule.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HYDE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HYDE:

TITLE VI—LIMITATION

SEC. 601. (a) EFFECTIVENESS OF UNITED STATES ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE.—No fund appropriated by this Act may be expended after December 31, 1988 until the President submits to the Congress a report which analyzes, on a country-by-country basis, the impact and effectiveness of the United States economic assistance provided during the preceding 3 fiscal years. Such report shall include the following for each recipient country:

(1) An analysis of the impact of United States economic assistance during the preceding 3 fiscal years on economic development in that country, with a discussion of the United States interests that were served by the assistance. This analysis shall be done on a sector-by-sector basis to the extent possible and shall identify any economic policy reforms which were promoted by the assistance. This analysis shall—

(A) include a description, quantified to the extent practicable, of the specific objectives the United States sought to achieve in providing economic assistance for that country, and

(B) specify the extent to which those objectives were not achieved, with an explanation of why they were not achieved.

(2) A description of the amount and nature of economic assistance provided by other donors during the preceding 3 fiscal years, set forth by development sector to the extent possible.

(3) A discussion of the commitment of the host government to addressing the country's needs in each development sector, including a description of the resources devoted by that government to each development sector during the preceding 3 fiscal years.

(4) A description of the trends, both favorable and unfavorable, in each development sector.

(5) Statistical and other information necessary to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of United States economic assistance on development in the country.

(6) A comparison of the analysis provided in the report with relevant analyses by international financial institutions, other

international organizations, other donor countries, or nongovernmental organizations.

(b) LISTING OF MORE AND LESS SUCCESSFUL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—The report required by this section shall identify—

(1) those countries in which United States economic assistance has been more successful, and

(2) those countries in which United States economic assistance has been less successful, and

For each country listed pursuant to paragraph (2), the report shall explain why the assistance was not more successful and shall specify what the United States has done as a result.

(c) REPORT TO BE A SEPARATE DOCUMENT.—The report required by this section shall be submitted to the Congress as a separate document.

(d) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "United States economic assistance" means assistance under chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to development assistance) or chapter 4 of part II of that Act (relating to the economic support fund).

Mr. HYDE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment calls for accountability in foreign aid. The toughest program to sell back home in the district, and I dare say that is true with all Members, is foreign aid. People fail to understand what we get out of sending millions of dollars, billions of dollars, forgive me, around the globe when we have so many needs and wants and problems in our own country.

I believe in foreign aid. I believe it is an extension of our foreign policy, that we need friends in the world, we need to help underdeveloped countries become developed. We need allies. We need access to raw materials. We need customers for our exports. We cannot sit in a plexiglas bubble, isolated from the world and expect to survive as leaders of the free world.

But by the same token, I have observed in my 13½ years in Congress that foreign aid is kind of a given. We just shovel it out almost indiscriminately around the globe and we really never get an accounting as to where it is doing some good, where it is not doing some good, where it is helping and indeed where it is harming the alleged recipients.

Most people think foreign aid involves immense waste, and where it does not involve immense waste it involves facilitating corruption. Are these millions of dollars or these billions of dollars ending up in somebody's pocket or are they really going for the poor, are they really helping develop the industries, the agriculture, the resources of these underdeveloped countries?

It seems to me that our foreign aid programs have no rigorous standard of accountability. It is indeed a leap in the dark.

I would think we would like to know whether this multibillion-dollar program serves U.S. interests, whether indeed it serves the interests of the recipients of this foreign aid.

So this amendment simply requires from the administration a report every 3 years that will provide us with country-by-country information as to what aid is being given, what other aid that country is getting from other donor countries, how effective is that aid, what are the trend lines in determining whether the country is developing or whether it is going down, it is regressing. All of this is a report card on a country specific basis on our foreign aid.

That would permit us then instead of just blindly shoveling the money out to make more discriminating decisions on who should get the aid, how much aid they should get, what countries the aid is being wasted in, being ineffectively absorbed, assimilated, and it seems to me this is just common sense accountability in our big, multibillion-dollar Foreign Aid Program.

This amendment was adopted in the authorization bill which will never see the light of day. It is over in the Senate in somebody's drawer because the foreign aid authorization bill doubtless will never see the light of day, although I am eternally optimistic. But I think the American people are entitled to some accounting on how their billions of foreign aid dollars are spent, and that is all this asks for.

□ 1455

Now I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] such time as he may consume.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should support this amendment. All it does really is to say that our foreign aid dollars should be used effectively and efficiently and they should be used for the good of this Nation.

So I commend the gentleman and hope that my colleagues will join in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. HYDE, that

would institute a "foreign aid effectiveness test." I believe we owe it to American taxpayers to ensure that their hard-earned dollars are being used efficiently and effectively for the good of the Nation.

This amendment would require the President to submit an analysis, on a country-by-country basis, of the impact of U.S. economic assistance provided during the previous 3 fiscal years. It is important to know, for the record, what are the most and least successful assistance programs and know the reasons for the success and failure of these programs.

We have a responsibility to the taxpayers to ensure that their foreign aid dollars achieve the results that are intended. Furthermore, this report will allow us to focus increasingly scarce foreign aid dollars on programs that provide the most benefit and serve our Nation's interests best. We must ensure that U.S. foreign aid is not being wasted or used to line the pockets of corrupt foreign officials. Simply put, U.S. taxpayers deserve an accounting of the aid programs they pay for. Mr. HYDE's amendment, and incidentally, the similar freestanding legislation entitled the "Foreign Aid Impact Assessment Act" of which I am a cosponsor and was previously introduced by Mr. HYDE, does just that. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of what I hope to be a successful Hyde amendment to this appropriations bill. As I said in the well just a few moments ago, this is, as the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, an issue of great concern to the American people as to the efficacy of foreign aid. Let us face it, like all other programs, some programs are good and some are bad. I would say to my friend from Illinois we do this with regard to how people vote in the United Nations. We tell the U.N. ambassador we want to know which countries in the United Nations to whom we give foreign aid are supporting, roughly, the foreign policy goals of this country. That has been a welcome change. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] has been a strong supporter of that as well as Jeane Kirkpatrick when she was ambassador, and myself, Senator KASTEN and certainly the gentleman from Illinois.

This amendment is very important. I hope it is allowed to go through. I hope it is supported.

I just want to say one other thing: Do not ask the State Department to do the study. Does anybody think we will get from the State Department the right type of a study? The State Department and USAID in effect have given billions of dollars in Latin America; some have been successful. But as in the case of El Salvador, we have

almost collectivized the economy of El Salvador and caused Jose Napoleon Duarte, the ruling Democratic Christian Party or the Christian Democratic Party very serious problems, some of which are of their own making, but some of which are the making of the USAID. But in some cases it has been successful.

So we do need the Hyde amendment. I am a strong supporter of it. I congratulate the gentleman for his wisdom not only on this but on other foreign policy issues as well.

Mr. HYDE. I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the Chair. I just want to say that we need desperately to explain to our constituents, to explain to ourselves, to rationalize, to convince our own consciences that these billions of dollars, hard-earned tax dollars are being well spent on behalf of our interests and on behalf of the interests of hunger and freedom and economic development around the world. I have learned in my sitting on the Committee on Foreign Affairs some countries get money because we have always given it to them and they would be mad if we did not. I want those countries identified and stop it. Other countries do not get enough. Base countries, where we have bases, that are desperately poor, they need more. But under our formula they do not get any more.

So I want a good look at this from people who are professionals so that we know whether we are getting a bang for the buck.

In the limited time I have left I want to appeal to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], about his point of order that he would withhold his point of order and I will tell you why. In this rule 11 times the gentleman has waived the very section that he is going to assert against this as legislating on an appropriation; 11 times you have legislated in there, that suited you and that is fine. And the last amendment indeed, which I would say was more frivolous than not, but I know the point the gentleman was making, was certainly legislating on an appropriation.

So under the doctrine of equitable estoppel, what you use you cannot deny me using.

And there is another doctrine called the doctrine of necessity. The only way we can legislate is on this bill because nothing happens to the authorization bill.

So if you think that accountability in this program that we both believe in and support is worthwhile and

useful I would appeal to the gentleman's better nature, which I know is in there lurking around, that it come to the floor and that he withdraw his point of order and this accountability measure, which the American people want as much as they want a drug free work place, could become the law.

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

Mr. HYDE. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] if he is going to support my amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. This gentleman is going to support the idea of it.

Implicit in the gentleman's argument is the notion that it is just as wrong to automatically be for foreign aid simply to be for foreign aid and without regard to what is happening as a consequence of our foreign assistance.

Mr. HYDE. No, I would say I am for foreign aid as a concept but for this country in this amount under these circumstances with that government, I would like to know more; that is all.

Mr. BERMAN. Well, this leads to the point, if the gentleman would continue yielding: It is as wrong to be automatically for something just because we have done it in the past as it is to react automatically against it because it might make good politics in one's own constituency.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs under the leadership of Chairman HAMILTON and ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], are going through just this kind of rigorous examination of each feature of the foreign aid program on a long-term and serious and bipartisan basis, to come to the same kind of approach that the gentleman is suggesting here.

Mr. HYDE. If I may reclaim my time, I know what the gentleman is saying, but they will never have the opportunity that AID has, that the State Department has, that the rest of the Government has, the resources and the people in place and the people in the country. I have great confidence in DANTE FASCELL and HOWARD BERMAN and the rest, but you will never get the job done.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] insist on his point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would insist on my point of order and if I could say to the Chair or to the gentleman from Illinois through the Chair, that the reason I lodged the point of order—there are two reasons for lodging the point of order. No. 1 is that in substantive terms I find it interesting that the amendment seeks to have a study of the economic aid programs in the bill but not the military programs; No. 2, I would suggest that

the administration has the authority to do any study that they want to do at any time. Third, I would simply suggest that in spite of that, I do not have any real problem substantively with what the gentleman is suggesting except that I would point out that the provision which the gentleman is offering is already in H.R. 3100, the foreign assistance authorization bill that passed the House in December. We are trying to see to it that that bill is not buried. And if we dump every item into this bill, every good item in this bill is coming out of that bill, there would be no reason to ever pass that bill and we are trying to keep the leverage on it.

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

Mr. OBEY. If I can under these circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on his point of order.

Mr. OBEY. I would simply say, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the committee would certainly be happy to consider including this kind of a study when we come back from conference if we find out that the authorization bill was still not passed, but I would hope it would be a balanced study, including all programs, not just the economic programs.

Because of that, I make a point of order, Mr. Chairman, against the Hyde amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in part:

No amendment to a general appropriation bill shall be in order if changing existing law, the amendment establishes a contingency not specifically required by law because it requires the withholding of funds until a report is submitted.

And I ask for a ruling from the Chair unless the gentleman wants to be heard further.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HYDE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I would just point out to the Chair that this bill that is before this body is replete with legislation on an appropriation. Eleven times in this bill that very section is waived.

Now it seems to me that you establish a practice, you ought to be estopped from barring somebody else to legislate on an appropriation.

In addition, as I say, 3100, the chances of it surviving are very slim. And if this is a good idea, let us pass it here and let us make sure it gets into law.

And as for the suggestion on the military study, I am all for that too. The big one, of course, it seems to me that troubles people is the foreign aid

that is given away. But I am all for increasing it to military, too. That should not be a problem. I do not think he should be entitled to urge that and I ask the Parliamentarian to so rule.

Mr. OBEY. If I could be heard further, Mr. Chairman, I would simply again insist on my point of order on the grounds I just raised and point out that if ever there were any giveaways in this bill it is the military side of the bill. The administration, in fact, sought to make all foreign military loans grant assistance which would be even more reason to include military programs as well as economic in any study suggested by the gentleman.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, once more in response to what my friend just said: Certainly if including in this bill an amendment that says no funds shall be appropriated to a work place, that it somehow is tainted with bribery, tax evasion, graft or price fixing is adequate and can become part of this law, it seems to me getting a report card on foreign aid for the American people is valid and ought to be a part of this law, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that the waiver in the rule against provisions in the bill does not carry over to amendments. For the reasons stated in the point of order by the gentleman from Wisconsin, the amendment constitutes legislation and is in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI calling for a report not required by law.

Therefore, the Chair would sustain the point of order.

For what reason does the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] rise?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I had contemplated offering an amendment to H.R. 4637 today on the issue of cash transfer to Egypt under the ESF program. After discussing this amendment with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] in his capacity as chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I withdrew my amendment from consideration before the Rules Committee. However, I had requested that the gentleman engage in a brief colloquy at this time because of my conviction that a carefully managed cash transfer program can play a vital role in assisting Egypt to reform its economy, develop more efficiently and maintain stability.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I appreciate my colleague's willingness to work on this issue.

As I have explained to my colleague, I regret that the budget constraints operating on the foreign aid program this year do not allow us to provide for more flexibility in Egypt's ESF program. I would be happy to work with the gentleman from New York as well as the administration to review the Egyptian program in order to see if a different more beneficial program structure might be achieved in the future.

If in fact we see a tough comprehensive economic reform program which, as the gentleman knows, is the criterion in the House authorization bill, then it might be possible to review changes in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

The gentleman may proceed for an additional minute.

Mr. GILMAN. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. I was finished.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Egyptian Government has made progress in the implementation of a program of comprehensive economic reforms signed with the IMF in early 1987 and is currently involved in negotiations for a second standby agreement. However, all of these measures involve painful austerity for the Egyptian people, the great majority of whom are impoverished. At the same time, the Government is faced with the difficult challenge of trying to bring down Egypt's birth rate while not offending the traditional sensibilities of its conservative population. All of these problems combine to make the task of economic reform an extremely delicate one for the Egyptian Government. At a time when Egypt is undertaking a radical overhaul of its economy with the encouragement of the United States, we need flexibility in our aid program to meet the changing needs of Egypt's economy. I believe that the increased cash transfer, over the \$115 million earmarked in the bill, would help meet those needs by providing crucial balance of payments support during Egypt's transition away from skewed pricing systems and subsidies to a more free market approach.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORNAN of California: At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE VI—LIMITATION

SEC. 601. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for assistance to any country which has in effect a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with the Soviet Union, except to the extent that the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

□ 1510

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I understand completely why the majority side has reserved a point of order on my amendment, and all I do at this point is underscore everything that the prior speaker, the eloquent and distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] said about the subcommittee chairman's exercising the right to waive this provision of not legislating on an appropriation bill because of the authorization process being bogged down.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is designed to clarify U.S. priorities in supplying hard to-come-by tax dollars to foreign nations. It does not make sense to provide foreign aid to a country which maintains scientific, technical, and security obligations with the Soviet Union. American taxpayers would not support such aid, nor does the House of Representatives. An identical amendment passed unanimously on H.R. 3100, the foreign aid authorization bill to limit foreign aid to countries which maintain currently operative Treaties of Friendship and Cooperation with the Soviet Union.

The list of countries with such a treaty relationship with the Soviet Union include: Afghanistan, Angola, Ethiopia, Iraq, North Korea, Syria, Vietnam, the Congo, India, and Mozambique. My amendment would subject three countries to an executive review: the Congo, India, and Mozambique.

It is critical to note that my amendment contains a "Presidential waiver." If the President determines that these countries merit United States aid in spite of treaty and security obligations to the Soviet Union, then the President can waive this provision. This is not an attempt to micromanage Presidential authority. Instead, my amendment adds a new dimension of leverage to the executive branch dealings with nations which have close working relationships with the Soviet Union.

SOVIET UNION'S TREATIES OF FRIENDSHIP AND COOPERATION

The United States shall not provide economic or military aid to any coun-

try which maintains a current, and formal Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with the Soviet Union unless the President determines that such aid is in the national interest of the country.

For the purposes of this provision, Treaties of Friendship and Cooperation are intended to give formal expression to existing relationships. Soviet Treaties of Friendship and Cooperation invariably include security commitments including: First, a pledge to consult each other in order to coordinate positions in the event of a threat to or a breach of peace; second, a prohibition against joining alliances or groupings directed against the other party; and third, a commitment to cooperation in the military sphere, to be realized through appropriate bilateral agreements.

A secondary component of Soviet Treaties of Friendship and Cooperation provides for friendly exchanges in such areas as economics, science, culture, education, the arts, news media, health services, and sports. There is generally an effort made to include provisions for increasing contacts between parties and political organizations.

Mr. Chairman, India is no friend of the United States—The \$500 million in United States aid to India has bought the following track record:

First, 80 percent of Indian military equipment is either Soviet made or produced in India with Soviet permission.

Second, a large Soviet presence for military training and equipment upkeep—Soviets also work closely with Indian industrial complex. Soviet-Indian bilateral trade increased by 2.5 times in the past 5 years. In May this year India announced the visit of the most powerful team of Soviet scientists that the U.S.S.R. has ever sent to any country.

There is talk of a Soviet-built nuclear powerplant. Mr. Gandhi stated also in May that India and the Soviet Union were embarking on a "totally new phase of collaboration."

Third, in August this year rampaging supporters of India's ruling Congress hurled homemade bombs at the USIA Calcutta office in an anti-United States demonstration. Commonplace.

Fourth, Rajiv Gandhi, Prime Minister of India states that the "Soviets are keen to pull out of Afghanistan" but are unable to do so because "Pakistan appears to have a vested interest in keeping the Afghan problem alive."

Fifth, India has stated several times that the Soviets 115,000-man occupation force in Afghanistan is not a regional security threat. Perhaps because they have such a close working relationship with the Soviets. India's External Affairs Minister describes his Government as sharing the Kremlin's

"common aspirations for peace and nation building."

Sixth, in March 1987, Cuba won a reprieve from a resolution of condemnation pending before the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva. The escape came when India introduced a procedural motion to prevent action on the resolution, after explicit promises not to do so.

Seventh, India provides \$10.4 million aid package to Communist Nicaragua. For his efforts Mr. Gandhi received the Order of Augusto Cesar Sandino, Nicaragua's highest civilian award, generally reserved for their best Communist allies like Fidel Castro.

Eighth, Angola, which is blessed by the presence of Soviet and Cuban military advisers which combined surpass 45,000 has benefited from Indian efforts to increase commercial, technical, and economic cooperation between the two nations.

Ninth, India is anti-Semitic. India has no diplomatic mission in Israel but allows the PLO terrorists to maintain at least one official mission in India.

Mr. Gandhi recently congratulated the chairman of the PLO, Yasser Arafat on his reappointment to this coveted chairmanship position.

India denied visas to Israeli table tennis players during the recent world championships.

Tenth, India has a close working relationship with North Korea. In April this year, Indian Defense Minister K.C. Pant joined North Korean President Kim Il Sung for the latter's 75th birthday celebration in Pyongyang, saying that Indian and North Korean Governments have much to gain by "working for disarmament, development, and just world order" together. The Indian Government apparently has no qualms about giving legitimacy to international pariahs like North Korea who maintain a combat ready troop level of some 800,000 soldiers and spend 24 percent of their GNP on the military.

Eleventh, similar justification was given to Indian overtures to the Government of Libya, where External Affairs Minister Tiwari offered cooperation in the areas of industry and trade. He also stated that India shared a commitment with Libya in "creating a more equitable world order."

Twelfth, does India help the forces of freedom in international fora? In the U.N., India voted less than 8.9 percent of the time with the United States in 1985. That is a worse voting record than our adversaries in Moscow.

Thirteenth, India and the Soviet Union coproduce T-72 tanks.

Fourteenth, India and the Soviet Union coproduce Mig-21 fighters.

Fifteenth, India and the Soviet Union coproduce Mig-27 fighters.

Sixteenth, India was one of the first countries to take delivery of the Soviet's Mig-29.

Seventeenth, India was the first country to receive the new Soviet MI-26 HALO Helicopter.

Eighteenth, India in early 1987 granted the Soviets overflight rights to enable them to more rapidly reach their forward bases at Cam Ran Bay, Vietnam.

Nineteenth, the Indian naval base in the Nicobar Islands in the Indian Ocean, built with Soviet help, is now being used by Soviet Navy submarines to prowl Indonesia's territorial waters.

MOZAMBIQUE

Summary: This amendment would restore current law on Mozambique prohibiting military assistance and restricting economic assistance to the private sector.

Mozambique has received over \$1 billion in Soviet military assistance but controls less than one-quarter of its territory; has hundreds of Soviet, East German, Cuban, North Korean, and other East bloc advisers, and thousands of Zimbabwean and Tanzanian troops; was rated as having one of the worst human rights records in the world by the Economist Human Rights Guide and Amnesty International; and has a mural in a main square of the capital city depicting a soldier with a Jewish star on his hat strangling an African.

Mozambique votes against the United States over 92 percent of the time in the United Nations; has a 20-year Friendship and Cooperation Treaty with the Soviet Union—one of only four such treaties in Africa; won't allow the International Red Cross to inspect its prisons; and ignores pleas from the Catholic Bishops to bring a negotiated end to the civil war.

President Chissano has clearly stated that his acceptance of Western aid in no way implies that he is reducing his ties to the Soviet Union or is liberalizing his political system.

Chissano says:

We have been holding talks with the IMF and World Bank. One might feel that we are having doubts about the socialist option. We chose socialism and we did not do it arbitrarily because of some dream. . . . We have combined [our] experiences with the scientific teaching of Marxism-Leninism.—speech before Prelimo Party Secretariat, 3 Feb 87, reported by FBIS.

According to the latest SIPRI [Stockholm International Peace Research Institute] Yearbook, Mozambique's sole source of weaponry is the Soviet Union. Since 1981, according to SIPRI, Mozambique's major arms purchases include: 50 BTR-60P armored personnel carriers, 60 T-55 tanks, and 2 SO-1 class personnel carriers.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, who has done such an expert job on this legis-

lation. I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] if he would respond to a question on the Cambodian language in the bill.

Mr. OBEY. Surely, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to clarify the language in section 581 of this bill which deals with the non-Communist Cambodian resistance. I felt the need to have this colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, because the language in this bill does not constitute a clear earmark of aid to the Cambodian resistance.

Currently, the language of the bill only attempts to be consistent with the authorization language and states "If the President makes available funds appropriated by this act for the Cambodian non-Communist resistance forces. * * * The operative word here is "If," leaving it up to the administration to determine the worth of funding this program. I think it remains to be seen whether or not the administration is really committed to the Cambodian resistance. I would like to see this administration spend the full authority of \$5 million on this worthy program for several reasons.

First, Lack of commitment to the non-communist Cambodian resistance will be misinterpreted by the Vietnamese as a weakening in congressional bipartisan support to pressure the Communists in Hanoi to withdraw their 140,000 combat troops from Cambodia by their self-imposed deadline of 1990.

Second, ASEAN nations, who have always questioned the degree of United States commitment to the Cambodian Resistance would quickly withdraw their vital support to the resistance if they perceive a lack of commitment by the United States. As regional settlements to low-intensity warfare seem to be the order of the day in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, and soon in Angola, I believe that now is the best time to send a message of solid U.S. support for a Vietnamese withdrawal from Cambodia.

Third, Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is critical the Western aid to the Cambodian resistance be increased from present levels to counterbalance aid to the Communist Khmer Rouge coming from China. Without Western aid, the barbaric Khmer Rouge will be well positioned to assume a strong position in a coalition government in Cambodia in 1990.

Therefore, I would like, Mr. Chairman, for the administration to understand that the congressional intent of this section of the bill means full funding for the program to aid the Cambodian resistance. It is my understanding that the chairman of the subcommittee is willing to withhold the

approval of the reprogramming request to the Agency for International Development, pending an administration commitment to fully fund the Cambodian resistance.

I thank the chairman for the time and especially for his commitment to the liberation of Cambodia from the Vietnamese occupation forces and puppet government which is not even recognized by the United Nations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, let me simply say that under the bill the administration will have the authority to provide whatever amount they want for this purpose. The committee did not specifically earmark it for one very good reason, and that is that the committee does not want to be on record in support of funding which has any problems associated with it relating to corruption. I do not feel free to discuss the actual problem in this kind of a session because the matter we are concerned about is classified, but if the gentleman would care to take a look at the classified document, I think he will see why we did not provide for an earmarking for this activity this year.

Mr. DORNAN of California. I will, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the gentleman very much.

As we do in many cases, we sometimes affix blame on Members of this House when it is a role of leadership in the executive branch at the State Department to figure out what to do about these areas of Communist expansion.

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I support the amendment the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has offered. I hope it is not ruled out of order, but I am not very optimistic.

The language in the bill concerns me a great deal. It indicates that there have been 100,000 civilians that have been murdered by Renamo. I do not agree with the State Department's assessment. I do not agree with that report. I think part of this is disinformation.

The massacre that took place in a town called Homoine in southern Mozambique was attributed to Renamo. The fact of the matter is, from eyewitness accounts, that the people that were murdered in that massacre were murdered by soldiers in new uniforms. Renamo does not have any new uniforms. They are a rump kind of military organization. They do not have the luxury of new uniforms. Many people who were there believe that those were either Zimbabwean troops or Communist Frelimo troops. Yet this atrocity was attributed to Renamo forces.

Dr. Dhlakama, the head of Renamo, I believe is a patriot who wants freedom for his country, who has been fighting the Marxist-Communist government of Mozambique, and he has been doing it with overwhelming odds facing him.

I think it is very unfortunate that the State Department and Melissa Wells, our new Ambassador to Mozambique, continues to send this kind of trash back and attributes it to being factual information. The fact of the matter is that I do not believe it is factual. Renamo has not killed 100,000 civilians over there; the Communists have. They have murdered 7,000 of their own countrymen in relocation and reeducation camps, and this document should reflect that.

Mr. Chairman, I take issue with that, and I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] insist on his point of order?

Mr. BERMAN. I do, Mr. Chairman. I insist upon my point of order against the Dornan amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part, "No amendment to a general appropriation bill shall be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment prohibits assistance to a country having a friendship treaty with the Soviet Union subject to a Presidential waiver. This imposes additional duties in that it requires the executive branch to determine which countries have a friendship treaty with the Soviet Union. In addition, it establishes a contingency.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

□ 1520

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TORRES). Does the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I just believe that in fairness, because we have waived it for other positions, but that is the power of the Chair, that I was hoping that with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and myself we would understand that it kind of solidifies us all behind a very difficult issue to sell to the taxpayers anyway, that, when we are so heavily in debt, we can find money to spread around to help other people in the world who are in great need, and I think that next year, if we try to work a language such as mine on the so-called treaties of friendship and analysis like that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] into the bill, I think we will have less problems

getting these foreign appropriations bills passed, but I understand the gentleman's objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the exceptions stated in the amendment would impose new duties on the President and under the precedents constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2, rule XXI. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I was unable to be on the House floor when my amendments were called. They are germane. They were scheduled at the end of the bill, and I was not here on the floor at the time they were called, but I was here shortly thereafter, and I asked for parliamentary inquiry that these amendments be considered to be in order and be allowed to be brought at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state at this time that the rule prescribes an order, and, as the Committee of the Whole at this time cannot change that procedure, that is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want it understood that I would object to any attempt to offer the amendments by unanimous consent, and I would withdraw my reservation only if the gentleman is recognized solely for the purposes of debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already announced that the Committee of the Whole cannot change the procedure.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that this is the first appropriation bill I have seen since I have been in Congress that I did not have the opportunity to have one vote to cut, not one vote to cut it, the dollar amount. This is the only one. I am going to take the blame. The General Electric plant closed in my district, and I was meeting with officials in my office, and I did not realize that not one amendment of mine was called for a vote because I forgot this is foreign aid. And I was here, I think, 3 minutes late, and I had the only amendment that would cut this down to its appropriation levels last year.

So, Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that, if I am here, I will try again next year. But I think the House should

recognize that we are dealing with a sacred piece of the American budget, foreign aid. We can screw Americans, but, man, do not touch foreign dollars.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 1 minute.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply point out that, despite the last remarks that we have heard, this bill, which the House is about to vote on, retains 87 percent of the cut which the House made last year in the President's foreign aid budget. That means that this bill is 30 percent lower than it was in fiscal 1985. It means that we have been able to move from foreign aid programs, to domestic programs such as agriculture, education, health, rural development and jobs, about \$4 billion over the past 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, to me that is doing good business for the taxpayer. To me that is seeing to it that we put the needs at home ahead of needs everywhere else, and I do not think anyone has to apologize for support of this bill.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, in response to the comments from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] let me only point out that in fact amendments to cut this bill were in order just as they are on appropriation bills all the time. The gentleman just was not here in order to offer it, and that is not the fault of the committee. That was not the fault of the House. It is not a sacred cow. The amendments were in order. The gentleman just was not here, and I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] that it should be pointed out again that this bill is in complete agreement with the budget summit agreement.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now arise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALL of Ohio, having assumed the chair, Mr. TORRES, 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. 4637) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MYERS OF INDIANA

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MYERS of Indiana moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4637, to the Committee on Appropriations.

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 rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. 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 328, nays 90, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—328

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Armey
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Baker
Ballenger
Bartlett
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Bonior
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante

Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Cheney
Clarke
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Combest
Conte
Cooper

Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Darden
Davis (IL)
Davis (MI)
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dornan (CA)
Dowdy
Downey
Durban
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Garcia
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Grandy
Grant
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Henry
Hertel
Hiller
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Horton
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jeffords
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jontz
Kanjorski

Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Konnyu
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lukens, Thomas
Lukens, Donald
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinar
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Nelson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Patterson
Pelosi
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell

NAYS—90

Barton
Bennett
Brooks
Brown (CO)
Coats
Coleman (MO)
Conyers
Craig

Rangel
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Sabo
Sailer
Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schumer
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Sikorski
Siskisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slatery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Upton
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmner
Vucanovich
Walgren
Waxman
Weber
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wyllie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)

Crane	Jones (TN)	Russo
Crockett	Kolter	Savage
Dannemeyer	Latta	Schaefer
Daub	Lloyd	Schulze
DeFazio	Marlenee	Sensenbrenner
DeLay	McCandless	Shumway
Dickinson	Miller (OH)	Shuster
Dorgan (ND)	Mollohan	Smith (NE)
Dreier	Montgomery	Smith, Denny
Early	Moorhead	(OR)
Emerson	Murphy	Smith, Robert
English	Myers	(NH)
Fawell	Neal	Smith, Robert
Fields	Nichols	(OR)
Frenzel	Nielson	Solomon
Gaydos	Olin	Staggers
Gekas	Pashayan	Stallings
Gregg	Pease	Stump
Hammerschmidt	Penny	Swindall
Hayes (IL)	Perkins	Tauke
Hefner	Petri	Taylor
Herger	Quillen	Trafiacant
Hopkins	Rahall	Valentine
Hubbard	Ray	Walker
Jacobs	Roberts	Watkins
Jenkins	Rogers	Whittaker
Jones (NC)	Roth	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Biaggi	Lujan	Pepper
Boulter	MacKay	Spence
Duncan	McGrath	Weiss
Hansen	Mica	
Houghton	Moody	

□ 1551

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McGrath for, with Mr. Boulter against.

Mr. Houghton for, with Mr. Hansen against.

Messrs. BROWN of Colorado, KOLTER, and HAYES of Illinois changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HUNTER, DONALD E. LUKENS, BONIOR, and STARK changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

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. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained earlier today because I was accompanying Vice President Bush at the U.S. Military Academy for the West Point commencement exercises, and as a result I was not able to cast my votes on rollcall No. 152, approving the Journal, and rollcall No. 153, agreeing to House Resolution 457, the rule for H.R. 4637, fiscal year 1989 foreign operations appropriations. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 152 and "nay" on rollcall 153.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the Members of the plan for the remainder of this day and for tomorrow.

It is our intention to call up the rule on the lottery bill and to consider that bill this afternoon. We believe that it will not be a long consideration and that the House should be through with its legislative business before 6 o'clock.

Tomorrow the House will meet at 10 a.m. and we will consider the rule and the authorization for the Intelligence Authorization Act, and at the conclusion of that program tomorrow the House will begin its Memorial Day recess, with the single exception to that being if the budget resolution on the conference report is ready. I am not sure that that will be the case but if it is we will take up the budget resolution following the intelligence authorization. If it is not ready we will proceed directly into the Memorial Day recess, reconvening as the Members know at 1 p.m., on Wednesday, June 1, 1988.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader yield to me?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, can the Members expect votes on that Wednesday after we come back at 1 o'clock, just so that we might reassure the Members?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, the gentlewoman is correct. We informed the Republican leader and I think he has informed each of the Republican Members as we have informed the Members on this side of those days for the remainder of this month and for next month on which votes are expected.

Votes are expected on Wednesday, June 1, Thursday, June 2, and Friday, June 3. Friday, June 3, and Friday, June 10, the following Friday, are the only two Fridays in this 1½-month period on which there will be votes, and no votes are expected on any Monday. Because those two Fridays are part of weeks in which both Monday and Tuesday are not voting days, we have decided to have 3 days in those weeks where there are then votes on Fridays. That is again, June 1, June 2, and June 3, and then June 8, June 9, and June 10. Friday, June 3, and Friday, June 10, are the Fridays on which there will be votes.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. We thank the majority leader, and wish him a good Memorial Day weekend.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4561, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 100-652) on the resolution (H. Res. 458) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4561) to

authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4418, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1989 AND 1990

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 100-653) on the resolution (H. Res. 459) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4418) to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1989 and 1990, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4505, CIVILIAN ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 100-654) on the resolution (H. Res. 460) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4505) to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian research and development programs for fiscal year 1989, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OR ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 268, BUDGET FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT, FISCAL YEARS 1989, 1990, AND 1991, AND AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF SUCH CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 100-655) on the resolution (H. Res. 461) waiving certain points of order against the conference report on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 268) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1989, 1990, and 1991 and against the consideration of such conference report, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1600

LOTTERY ADVERTISING CLARIFICATION ACT OF 1988

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 448 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 448

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 the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3146) to clarify certain restrictions on distribution of advertisements and other information concerning lotteries and similar activities, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule and each section shall be considered as having been read. 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, and 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 (Mr. RAHALL). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 448 is an open rule providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3146, the Lottery Advertising Clarification Act of 1988.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The rule also provides that it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill as original text for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule. The substitute will be considered by sections and each section shall be considered as having been read.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 448 provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3146 the lottery advertising bill, would allow for the advertising and distribution of information concerning all legal lotteries, gift enterprises, and other activities, such as casino gambling, and church-sponsored bingo halls. Currently, the law permits only the broadcasting of lottery advertisements and information regarding lotteries that are conducted by States acting under the authority of State law. The law forbids the interstate advertising of charitable raffles, church bingo games, and casino gambling, even if these activities are legal in the State that they are being conducted.

The bill also allows information and advertising concerning lotteries, gift enterprises, and other activities to be mailed anywhere in the United States as long as the activity that is being advertised is legal in the State in which it is being conducted.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the bill includes an 18-month delayed effective date. This provision would allow States that prohibit gaming activities time to enact legislation that would prohibit advertisements within the States boundaries. The bill only removes the Federal restrictions and is in no way intended to limit the States of their individual rights.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was originally considered on the Suspension Calendar it did not receive the necessary two-thirds votes for passage. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] had a legitimate concern regarding his inability to offer amendments to the bill. Under this open rule any germane amendments to the bill will now be in order. I urge my colleagues to adopt the resolution and to support final passage of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill was on the House floor under suspension but failed to receive the necessary two-thirds majority. It was then sent to the Committee on Rules and granted an open rule as requested by Mr. WOLF of Virginia, who opposed the bill under suspension. Under this open rule, Mr. WOLF will be allowed to offer his amendment and really, Mr. Speaker, I see nothing wrong in permitting the media to receive advertising on games of chance as is prohibited now. State lotteries have the privilege of advertising, and it seems to that it should be in order to allow the media to accept advertising on games of chance.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this open rule, and I urge the adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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. Pursuant to House Resolution 448 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. 3146.

□ 1605

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. 3146) to clarify certain restrictions on distribution of advertisements and other information concerning lotteries and similar activities, with Mr. PICKLE 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 Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

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

Members will remember that when this bill was debated, it received the votes of a large majority, somewhere over 60 percent, but not two-thirds.

In conversations, it seems to us that the controversy did not affect much of the bill. There was one particular part affecting casino gambling that was somewhat controversial. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will be offering an amendment later to deal with that. Whatever controversy exists, I believe, exists only over that amendment.

I do not believe that there is any need for any prolonged general debate, and I, therefore, yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman from Massachusetts is quite correct. This bill, some Members felt, was flawed when it first came to the floor because of the fact that we had a closed rule, being under suspension, and we were unable to get at some of the objections, and I think some of the good objections that were made by some of the Members, specifically referring to the amendment that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] wanted to offer which was precluded under the rule under which we were proceeding.

I have only one request for time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewomen from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3146, the Lottery Advertising Clarification Act of 1988, as written. I think it is unfortunate that we have to revisit this issue since we have already considered the measure under suspension of the rules and were a mere 12 votes short of the two-thirds necessary for passage.

As you know, in 1895, the Federal Government prohibited the importation of lottery tickets or prize lists into the United States, as well as the transportation and mailing of such materials. The Government did this because lotteries were primarily privately run and unregulated. After several States adopted lotteries in the 1960s and 1970s, the law was amended to allow advertisement of State-conducted lotteries in States where the lottery was conducted or in adjacent States conducting lotteries. However, to date interstate advertisement remains prohibited.

The bill has strong State rights protections. The bill would have no preemptive effect on State laws. The bill will simply allow for the advertising of legal lotteries by removing the Federal prohibition to such activity. It does not involve the current Federal restriction on conducting lotteries through the mail.

Such activities are strictly regulated today, therefore, there is no compelling reason to continue to prohibit the advertisement of these activities. I urge that the House pass this bill as written.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DENNY SMITH].

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support passage of H.R. 3146. This is a free enterprise, free speech measure which cuts out the kind of bureaucratic regulation members like me came to Congress to help eliminate.

Let me give you one example of why this measure is needed.

Put yourself in the position of a small market radio station interviewer. On live radio, he asks the local fire chief about their fire station's open house.

During the interview, the fire chief mentions they're having a raffle with proceeds to pay for new fire equipment.

Oops. The radio station has just violated the law because the fire chief promoted his lottery over the air.

Time and again, small fraternal and charitable organizations hold raffles and drawings to raise money to benefit their communities.

From churches to Elks' Clubs, from bingo to quilt raffles, local folks try to come up with private donations to help needy individuals.

If you're in the news media, you can't help them in their efforts. In fact, you can't even report on their efforts.

We all know what goes on in Reno, Las Vegas, and Atlantic City. It's unfortunate that people can't find out what's going on in their church or fire station.

Let's eliminate red tape. Let's lend a hand to our favorite charities. And let's pass H.R. 3146.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WORTLEY].

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lottery Advertising Clarification Act. We need to clarify the current law which makes the mailing of certain information concerning legal game wagering a Federal offense. With the exception of State-run-and-owned lotteries, legal gaming establishments are restricted or otherwise impaired in distributing their information.

I find it difficult to understand why we allow the advertisement of State-sponsored lotteries, while not permitting the advertisement of private sector charity events such as a church bingo or a veterans' raffle. This is obviously unfair to the private gaming establishments. It is time to clarify this discrepancy.

I also would like to reiterate to my colleagues the important States rights clause. This measure specifically grants States an 18-month period to consider a State law to prohibit gambling advertising within its borders from the broadcast media. I commend my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations for including this important States rights clause.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider the legal differences of gambling advertisement between State supported events and private events. I urge my colleagues to support this clarification.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H.R. 3146, a bill to lift the ban on advertising of games of chance and lotteries, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the measure. This bill would bring current law up to date and make it more consistent. Under current law, limited interstate advertising of State-run lotteries is legal, but advertising of legal charitable raffles and church bingo games is not. This inconsistency needs to be addressed. Also, current law permits broadcasters to announce that a church bingo game has been canceled due to bad weather, but announcing the game in the first place is not allowed. What sense does that make? That law was originally drafted when lotteries were illegal in most States and it followed that advertisement of an illegal activity should be prohibited as well. But current law approves of the activity on the one hand and prohibits its promotion on the other.

Finally, this bill simply lifts the Federal ban on advertising. States may address this issue as they see fit, according to their treatment of lotteries.

I urge you to vote yes for a bill that establishes consistency and is sensitive to States rights.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time under general debate, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Is the bill open for amendment at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill maybe open to amendment if all time is yielded back.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I have yielded back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the reported bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purposes of amendment, and each section shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Lottery Advertising Clarification Act of 1988".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

Would it be in order to ask unanimous consent that amendments be offered at any point to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I would so request.

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

There was no objection.

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

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO IMPORTATION, TRANSPORTATION, MAILING, AND BROADCAST OF ADVERTISEMENTS FOR LEGAL LOTTERIES AND SIMILAR ENTERPRISES OFFERING PRIZES DEPENDENT ON CHANCE.

(a) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Subsection (a) of section 1307 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "conducted by" and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "gift enterprise, or similar scheme offering prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance, if the lottery, gift enterprise, or similar scheme is not prohibited by the State in which it is conducted."

(b) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 3005(d)(1) of title 39,

United States Code, is amended by striking out "a newspaper" and all that follows through "such a lottery," and inserting in lieu thereof "(A) an advertisement, list of prizes, or information concerning a lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme for the distribution of money or of real or personal property, by lottery, chance, or drawing of any kind, if the lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme is authorized or not otherwise prohibited by the State in which it is conducted, or (B) a newspaper of general circulation containing an advertisement, list of prizes, or information referred to in clause (A)."

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Chapter 61 of title 18, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The section heading of section 1307 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1307. Exceptions relating to certain advertisements and other information and to State-conducted lotteries".

(2) The item relating to section 1307 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 61 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1307. Exceptions relating to certain advertisements and other information and to State-conducted lotteries".

(3) Subsection (d) of section 1307 is amended by inserting after "purposes of" the following: "subsection (b) of".

(4) The first sentence of section 1304 is amended by inserting after "radio" the following: "or television".

(b) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE.—Subsection (d)(2) of section 3005 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "such a lottery" and inserting in lieu thereof "a lottery conducted by a State acting under authority of State law".

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK: Page 4, lines 17 and 18, strike out "not prohibited by the State in which it is conducted" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "authorized or not otherwise prohibited by the State in which it is conducted. In a case in which such a prohibition by a State would not apply to Indian country located in that State, the provisions of section 1304 of this title shall apply with respect to such Indian country."

Mr. FRANK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is totally noncontroversial. It was reviewed by members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has an interest in it.

We have in this country, because of the status of the American Indians, the native Americans, who have in some cases been legally granted the

right to conduct gambling activities in particular States which go beyond what that particular State would allow. The scheme of this bill is to grant to the States, if they choose to act, some control over the kinds of advertising allowed within State borders. This amendment simply clarifies what we think was always the intent of the bill. It makes it explicit that an Indian nation that has the right to do gambling activities over and above State law does not by that fact automatically get the right to advertise in defiance of State law.

□ 1610

State law with regard to advertising would govern even where State law with regard to actual activity would not.

Mr. SHAW. I would like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for his amendment as a clarifying amendment. It is a good amendment and we support it on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]. The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK: Page 6, insert the following after line 5 and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly:

SEC. 1. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or the amendments made by this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and the application of such provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances, shall not be affected by such invalidation.

Mr. FRANK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, this is fairly routine. We deal here with questions that touch on the first amendment. We therefore thought it wise, and again this is I think agreed upon by all the parties, to explicitly put in the kind of severability clause that sometimes is made explicit because we deal here with the first amendment rights. And we believe that everything we are doing in this bill is wholly constitutional, but because courts are not entirely predictable therefore we thought it wise to have a severability clause.

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

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if this is a colloquy or did the gentleman have an actual amendment?

Mr. FRANK. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. SHAW. I do not believe we have it on this side. I think I am familiar with the subject matter. I think we have discussed it. But I was under the impression that this was going to be a colloquy.

Mr. FRANK. I apologize to my colleague. The colloquy had to do with another matter. This is just boilerplate severability.

Mr. SHAW. This is technical, yes, and we certainly agree with this amendment and certainly support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]. The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLF: Page 4, line 18, insert the following after the first period: "This subsection shall not apply with respect to any casino gambling game conducted or operated by a gambling establishment. For purposes of the preceding sentence—

"(1) the term 'casino gambling game' means roulette, blackjack, craps, slot machines, and any similar game of chance or device which is played for money or other thing of value; and

"(2) the term 'gambling establishment' means an establishment which is engaged in for profit and is operated primarily for the purpose of gaming or gambling, including accepting, recording, or registering bets for money or other thing of value."

Page 4, strike out line 19 and all that follows through page 5, line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 3005(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (1) by striking out "a newspaper" and all that follows through "such a lottery," and inserting in lieu thereof "(A) an advertisement, list of prizes, or information concerning a lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme for the distribution of money or of real or personal property, by lottery, chance, or drawing of any kind, if the lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme is authorized or not otherwise prohibited by the State in which it is conducted, except that this subparagraph shall not apply with respect to any casino gambling game conducted or operated by a gambling establishment, or (B) a newspaper of general circulation containing an advertisement, list of prizes, or information referred to in subparagraph (A)."; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the term 'casino gambling game' means roulette, blackjack, craps, slot machines, and any similar game of chance or device which is played for money or other thing of value, and the term 'gambling establishment' means an establishment which is engaged in for profit and is operated primarily for the purpose of gaming or gambling, including accepting, recording, or registering bets for money or other things of value."

Mr. WOLF (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering with the gentleman from Florida addresses a fairness issue in H.R. 3146. Our amendment gives a State the right to protect its citizens from Las Vegas and Atlantic City casino gambling advertising.

In the hearings and debate held on H.R. 3146, there was strong support on every side for protection of States rights. As my colleagues well know, there is great diversity and divergent views among the 50 States regarding the legalization and advertising of the various forms of gambling. For example, the most popular forms of gambling are State lotteries and bingo contests. But some States also permit parimutuel betting on horses, while other States permit betting on dogs. Sports betting, low-limit blackjack, and poker are legal in some States; betting on jai alai is lawful in other States. Nevada and New Jersey allow casino gambling, and I understand Hawaii, Mississippi, Indiana, and Utah ban all types of gambling activities and advertising. The point is, Mr. Chairman, each State has very different views on what kind of gambling should be legal and advertised. H.R. 3146 should, at the very least, allow each State to make this determination. Unfortunately, the opposite is true.

H.R. 3146 says that a gambling activity need only be legal in the State where it's being conducted. The bill does not require that the gambling activity be legal in the State where it's being advertised. I believe this focus is wrong. The onus should be on the gamblers to convince a State that advertising should be allowed, rather than on concerned citizens to prove that it should not. As drafted, H.R. 3146 stacks the deck in favor of the gamblers. If the casinos want to advertise in a State, I say let them convince that State to advertise gambling. For even if a State somehow manages to devise gambling advertising restrictions on its television, radio, and newspapers in the 18-month grace period provided in the bill, it still could not prohibit mailed gambling advertisements by casinos.

For the first time in this century, Mr. Chairman, casinos such as Trump's, the Golden Nugget, and Caesar's will be able to hire slick Madison Avenue advertising firms to develop gambling ad campaigns for the purpose of attracting business from around the country. Parents and children in the privacy of their own home will learn how easy it is to win millions

of dollars by playing roulette, blackjack, craps, and the slot machines. Also, for the first time in this century, Governors and legislatures will not be able to take action—either before or after the 18-month deferred enactment date provided in this bill—to prevent this type of gambling advertising by casinos in their States.

Mr. Chairman, this is wrong. In addition to violating States rights, which are supposedly protected in this bill, I object to the casino bill language for the following reasons:

A 1976 survey by the Commission on the Review of the National Policy Toward Gambling estimates that there are 1.1 million compulsive gamblers in the United States. Other authorities place the figure between 6 and 8 million. Each compulsive gambler affects 10 to 12 others—family, friends, employees, fellow workers—with his or her problem. White-collar crime such as embezzlement, forgery, and Federal fraud committed to support compulsive gambling costs American businesses more than \$40 billion yearly.

Second, I disagree with those who believe casino gambling advertising will have no effect on the size and scope of legal gambling activity in this country. Direct and forceful gambling advertisement by casinos through television, radio, the print media, and mail could profoundly impact the views of citizens toward legalizing casinos and other forms of gambling in their State. As gambling becomes more attractive through advertising, pressure will increase on those holdout States to legalize casinos and other gambling activities. I am not suggesting that passage of this bill will serve as some kind of national catalyst for nongaming States to approve every form of gambling. I am saying that legislators will be forced to tolerate and respond to pressures from outside their State on a matter which they had no voice in approving or regulating to begin with.

Third, States should have unlimited time to study the implications of interstate casino gambling advertisement. States should have time to work closely with interested individuals and groups to prepare voluntary standards for advertising of casino gambling activities, if such standards are deemed necessary and desirable. Each State has the right to regulate truthful, tasteful, and properly targeted advertising for every audience.

Mr. Chairman, Atlantic City and Las Vegas casinos are, at the very least, controversial to most Americans. Many find them objectionable and offensive. One thing I hope we all can agree on is that they don't belong in this bill. If you believe as I do that the issue in this legislation is not the rights of powerful, profit-motivated casino owners, but the right of church groups and charities to advertise in

local newspapers, I hope you will support this amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Virginia for his efforts. This bill would have gone through under suspension without this important amendment had it not been for the efforts of the gentleman from Virginia. I am glad to join him in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the care the gentleman from Virginia has taken, and he has I think narrowed our differences considerably. I should say that while I am not for this amendment, if it should pass we would still have a bill that would be worth a great deal.

I myself hold to a very expansive view perhaps in the minds of some as to the first amendment. I think most adults should be able to say most things to most people most of the time, and I would include in this things that if adults would like to pay to have them said to each other, it should be allowed as well. I realize that this is a more difficult issue for some Members.

I would like to engage my ranking minority member in a bit of a colloquy because in the event that this should pass some question was raised. I assume that it would not be the intent, and I would ask the gentleman from Virginia as well as the gentleman from Florida, it would not be the intent of this amendment to in any way impinge on the right of the media to report in the news sense any such activities, that it would deal with advertising?

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

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. FRANK. I would ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] if he agrees with that?

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

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, certainly that is constitutionally correct and we could not affect that in any way nor would we want to.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say that I personally think this is a bad amendment, or not a bad amendment, but not a good amendment. But I think it will still leave the bill worth something, and I understand where a lot of Members are.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an unfair and hypocritical amendment. It strikes at two States, Nevada and New Jersey. It allows all sorts of organizations throughout the country to advertise whatever type of gaming they so have and continue to have that advertising anywhere they want to.

It is not fair. The majority of this body when we had this up under suspension voted in favor of the bill, they supported this bill, and we fell just barely short of a two-thirds majority.

Again, it is a hypocritical amendment, it strikes at two States, at legitimate industries that pay taxes to the Federal Government, pay taxes to the States. We pay a lot of money to the Federal Government in taxes and these are legitimate industries recognized by our States.

I do not think it is fair. It is hypocritical and I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment which should not be a part of this bill.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Shaw-Wolf amendment to H.R. 3136, the Lottery Advertising Clarification Act of 1988. I see no reason to weaken this legislation by amending it to exclude private gambling establishments from interstate advertising of their gambling activities.

This amendment affects only two States, Nevada and New Jersey. Gambling in these two States is legal and a legitimate industry providing major benefits to the economies of both States. The gaming industries pay taxes to the States and to the Federal Government and are strictly regulated. I believe this amendment unfairly discriminates against these industries and the States in which they are located.

Mr. Chairman, this provision is important to the State of Nevada and the people of Nevada. I urge my colleagues to oppose this unfair amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Wolf].

The amendment was agreed to.

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. MURTHA] having assumed the chair, Mr. PICKLE, 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. 3146) to clarify cer-

tain restrictions on distribution of advertisements and other information concerning lotteries and similar activities, pursuant to House Resolution 448, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3146, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MINT FOOT DRAGGING RESULTS IN LOST DIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Santayana once wrote that "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." The U.S. Mint has recently provided an illustration of the wisdom of that observation. The mint lost 44 coin dies, used to strike coins, in a shipping incident in 1986 as a result of its failure to use secure means of shipping the dies. The mint did not change its shipping methods, and in January of this year, another 24 dies disappeared in transit.

In April 1986, 44 coin dies used to manufacture Statue of Liberty commemorative \$1 coins disappeared in transit while being shipped to the Royal Canadian Mint in Ottawa, Canada, for polishing. These dies were shipped via ordinary freight carriers. Only one of these dies was recovered. That die had been purchased from an unidentified party by a Canadian coin dealer, who returned it to the mint in August 1987. That incident should have warned the mint of the dangers of shipping dies via ordinary carrier.

When I became aware of the incident, I wrote to U.S. Mint Director Donna Pope concerning it and asked about the mint's shipping procedures. She replied that armored carriers were being used to transport dies to Canada. What she neglected to say, however, was that ordinary freight carriers continued to be used for shipping dies within the United States. These shipments account for the vast majority of die shipments made by the mint.

In January of this year, the inevitable occurred. The mint shipped 24 dies used to make 1 ounce American Eagle gold bullion coins from the San Francisco Mint to the West Point, NY, Mint. The dies were shipped by Federal Express. Incredibly, the mint failed to require that the dies be under even signature control. They were shipped as ordinary freight, as if they were a crate of oranges. Someone apparently figured that a package going from one mint to another mint would be valuable. The dies never reached the West Point Mint and are still missing. The U.S. Secret Service is investigating the loss. None of the dies have been recovered.

Despite this loss, the mint continued to use ordinary carriers to ship these valuable dies around the Nation. Not until last month, 3 months after the gold dies had disappeared, did the mint decide to ship all dies by armored carrier. Had the mint learned its lesson from the lost Statue of Liberty dies, there would not now be a desperate scrambling to try to locate the American Eagle dies.

The mint's foot dragging on switching to a secure method of shipping dies is inexplicable. Having lost the Statue of Liberty dies in transit to the Royal Canadian Mint, it took a half-hearted measure and began to use armored carriers to transport dies going to Canada. Did the mint think there was more risk of loss in Canada than in the United States? Was the mint trying to pinch pennies by using a cheaper, but less secure carrier? Quite frankly, I do not have the answers.

The Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee will hold hearings later this year on the mint's budget authorization, and I can assure the Members of this House that we will get answers. The U.S. Mint is responsible for the security of our Nation's gold reserves and our Nation's coins. I intend to find out why security for the dies used to make coins was so deliberately lax. Losing dies once because of slack shipping procedures is inexcusable; losing dies a second time is unpardonable.

CARGO PREFERENCE KILLS GRAIN DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, in the past a number of debates on the issue of cargo preference requirements have occurred on this floor. The most recent one occurred last fall when the House considered the Foreign Assistance Act. During that debate, this House voted overwhelmingly to limit the expansion of cargo preference by exempting the export agricultural commodities from additional cargo preference requirements when those commodities are purchased with U.S. cash transfers to foreign countries.

It was the opinion of most of my farm colleagues in the House that the cargo preference issue had been again laid to rest. However, like a bad penny which continues to turn up, so does cargo preference.

Today, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an example of why cargo preference is detrimental to the development of new foreign markets for U.S. agricultural exports.

Last month, it came to my attention that the AID mission in Pakistan was attempting to put together a financing package which for the first time would have enabled private sector buyers in Pakistan to purchase approximately 200,000 metric tons of corn from the United States. This quantity is equivalent to almost 7,400,000 bushels of corn worth over \$22 million.

If this sale had been made, it would have been the first major commercial sale of corn to Pakistan, and it could have opened a significant new market for United States producers.

The key to the sale was the financing package that would have enabled private sector buyers to consummate the purchase. Under AID's proposal, funds would have been available through private sector window of the Commodity Import Program [CIP]. Through the CIP, private sector Pakistani buyers would have been able to borrow money from a CIP account to purchase United States grain. In turn, the Pakistani buyers would have marketed the corn commercially in that country.

All was proceeding well, however, until it was discovered that U.S. cargo preference requirements applied to the shipment of the corn. Like food assistance programs, such as the Public Law 480 program, cargo preference laws require that between 50 to 75 percent of the cargo be shipped on U.S. flagships. Under current cargo preference requirements, the higher cost of U.S. flagships must be picked up by the private buyers. This would have increased the cost of the United States corn to the point that it could not have been sold profitably in the Pakistani market.

The end result in this case was that nobody benefited from cargo preference. No United States corn was sold to Pakistan. U.S. farmers lost an opportunity to gain a new foreign market. And, no grain moved on U.S. ships.

On the surface it may seem reasonable, even patriotic, to require a portion of food exports which are financed with U.S. dollars to be hauled on U.S. ships. However, when we lose foreign sales, when cargo preference interferes with our ability to enter new markets, and when the maritime industry itself gains nothing, then cargo preference requirements should either be waived or eliminated entirely.

Under certain circumstances, cargo preference requirements can be waived, such as the nonavailability of ships at reasonable rates. However, there is currently no waiver available under our cargo preference laws that would allow MARAD, or the Depart-

ment of Transportation, to shift the cargo preference requirement from a private sector foreign purchase of grain to a government subsidized sale to the same country.

This Congress should seriously consider legislation that would create a specific waiver or transfer of cargo preference requirements when that waiver or transfer would facilitate initial sales of U.S. commodities to new foreign markets.

I can assure you that this Member of Congress, and others who represent agricultural constituencies, will be vigilant in opposing any further expansion of cargo preference requirements, and in modifying particularly unreasonable provisions of existing law relating to cargo preference.

□ 1625

ON THE PLANT-OPENING AND JOBS CREATION ACT OF 1988

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, for months now, debate in Washington has had an air of unreality.

To read the newspapers, you'd think the biggest issue we face is whether notice of plant closing should be mandatory, or very strongly encouraged.

But it does say something about what's on the minds of the liberal Democrats. In fact, one of the clearest choices Americans will be asked to make this fall is between a Democratic Party that is hoping and planning for economic collapse, and a Republican Party that is working and planning to continue economic growth.

Despite unemployment falling to the lowest level in 15 years, the liberal Democrats think the issue facing our country is how to manage economic decline.

That may be the biggest issue in Massachusetts right now, which has lost 96,000 manufacturing jobs in less than 4 years to other States with better economic policies.

But for the rest of the country which has gained jobs, the issue is not "plant closing." The real issue is "plant opening." How do we keep creating new jobs, investing to open new plants, and making sure that workers find the jobs we help create?

Today Senator BOB KASTEN and I are introducing comprehensive legislation designed to answer those questions. Our bill is called the Plant-Opening and Jobs Creation Act of 1988.

The first part of our plant-opening bill contains tax incentives for new jobs, new investment, and new training. It would:

Repeal the 1990 payroll tax increase on employers and employees, which will otherwise raise the cost of hiring and working, and is unnecessary because of the mushrooming Social Security trust fund surplus;

Eliminate the temporary Federal unemployment insurance [FUTA] tax increase that took

effect this year, which is also counterproductive and unnecessary;

Cut the capital gains tax rate to a maximum of 15 percent to encourage new investment; and

Provide tax-free treatment of educational assistance to workers to encourage new education and training.

We are also working on a reform of unemployment insurance that would make it much easier for unemployed workers to get jobs and training, which we hope to introduce shortly.

The second part of our bill would focus tax incentives in the hardest hit urban and rural areas. It would provide tax incentives for hiring, working, or investing in enterprise zones. Congress has talked about designating the zones, but has never authorized the incentives.

Finally, the third part of our plant-opening bill provides an alternative to protectionism, with an approach aimed at opening, not closing markets. The bill:

Gives the President fast-track authority to negotiate a GATT agreement to open foreign markets for American goods;

Provides expanded authority to negotiate a North American free trade area—the United States, Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean Basin—as well as reciprocal free-trade agreements with other countries;

Provides for reporting on, and taking action against, unfair trading practices by other countries; and

Would require a "consumer impact statement" for all Federal trade legislation, which would state the additional cost that would be imposed on American families.

Revenue provisions include: capital gains tax cut, repeal of temporary 1988–90 FUTA tax increase, repeal of 1990 payroll tax hike, restoring the educational assistance exclusion, and enterprise zone incentives. Except for the payroll tax, all these changes begin in 1988.

Total revenue cost. Other than the capital gains tax cut and Social Security tax-hike repeal, the total cost is \$1 to \$2 billion a year. The Social Security tax provision would start in 1990 and cost about \$9 billion a year by 1991. But this is off budget and would only slightly reduce the \$70 billion trust fund surplus in that year. Based on the latest academic research, cutting the capital gains tax to its optimum rate would raise enough revenue to pay for the static losses.

Capital gains. The bill cuts the top tax rate to 15-percent. Estimates of the revenue-maximizing tax rate range from 9 percent—Martin Feldstein, to 28 percent—Joseph Minarik; 15 percent is roughly halfway in between.

Lawrence Lindsey of Harvard has estimated that cutting the rate to 18 percent would raise between \$27 billion and \$105 billion over 5 years. On his assumptions, our 15 percent rate would easily raise enough revenue to offset initial revenue losses from other provisions.

FUTA. Repealing the temporary 0.2 percent increase in the FUTA tax would cost about \$1 billion a year, but only for 3 years, 1988–90. This would not hurt the unemployment insurance funds, since the purpose was to increase the reserves, not to cover a shortfall.

Payroll tax. The estimated cost is \$5.5 bil-

lion in fiscal year 1990; \$9.2 billion in fiscal year 1991. However, it must be measured against a \$70 billion annual surplus in 1991 in the Social Security trust funds.

Educational assistance exclusion. The cost is about \$400 million a year.

Enterprise zones. The static revenue loss is estimated to be less than \$1 billion a year.

In short, there are two ways to go. The liberal Democratic leadership of the Congress says the issue is plant closing. We believe the real issue is plant opening. Anyone who cares about our economic future should support our approach, which will produce more jobs and more growth for years to come.

DESCRIPTION OF PLANT-OPENING BILL

The "Plant-Opening and Jobs Creation Act of 1988" contains several key provisions designed to encourage new jobs and new enterprises.

TITLE I—TAX INCENTIVES FOR JOBS, INVESTMENT AND TRAINING

Sec. 101. Cuts the capital gains tax rate from a maximum of 33 percent to a maximum of 15 percent.

Sec. 102. Reinstates tax-free treatment for educational assistance provided by employers to employees.

Sec. 103. Repeals 1990 payroll tax increases on employers (0.14 percent), employees (0.14 percent) and the self-employed (0.28 percent).

Sec. 104. Eliminates the temporary 0.2 percent increase in federal unemployment (FUTA) tax in 1988-1990.

TITLE II—ENTERPRISE ZONES

Sec. 201-213. Establishes enterprise zones in poor urban and rural areas.

Sec. 221. 10 percent credit for hiring disadvantaged workers.

Sec. 222. 5 percent credit for zone workers.

Sec. 223. 10 percent investment tax credit.

Sec. 224. Repeal of capital gains tax on investments.

Sec. 225. Deduction for purchase of enterprise stock.

Sec. 226. Exception for private activity bonds.

Sec. 227. Ordinary loss deduction.

Sec. 228. Increase in research credit.

Sec. 229-233. Provisions for tax simplification, streamlining of regulatory requirements, federal co-ordination, etc.

Sec. 241. Foreign-trade zone status.

TITLE III—TRADE LIBERALIZATION

Sec. 301-306. Expands the President's authority to negotiate multilateral (GATT, North American Free Trade Area) and bilateral free-trade agreements and reciprocal expanded-trade agreements.

Sec. 311-312. Requires reporting on, and outlines strategy for elimination of, unfair trading practices.

Sec. 321. Requires consumer impact estimates of federal trade legislation.

Sec. 322. Mandates trade liberalization for multilateral development banks funded by U.S. taxpayers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MacKAY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MacKAY. Mr. Speaker, due to a previous commitment I missed several

votes. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted for approving the Journal, for the rule to H.R. 4637, and for H.R. 4637 on final passage.

I appreciate having this opportunity to state my position on these measures.

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 Mrs. VUCANOVICH) to revise and extend their remarks and included extraneous material:)

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ERDREICH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SWIFT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MacKAY, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 10 minutes, on May 26.

Mr. SLATTERY, for 60 minutes, on June 8.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MRAZEK and to include extraneous material notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$3,751.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. VUCANOVICH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. RITTER in two instances.

Mr. BADHAM in two instances.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. BARTLETT in two instances.

Mr. KONNYU.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. SHUETTE.

Mr. LENT in two instances.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. BEREUTER in three instances.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida in two instances.

Mr. GALLO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ERDREICH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CLARKE.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. YATRON in two instances.

Mr. CARDIN in two instances.

Mr. DYSON.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. MAVROULES.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. WISE.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2167. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide for Federal energy conservation standards for fluorescent lamp ballasts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 2426. An act to designate 16th Street, Northwest, in front of the Polish Embassy as "Solidarity Corner"; to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 26, 1988, 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:

3694. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 7-183, "Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Effective Date Amendment Act of 1988", and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3695. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 7-184, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 253, S.O. 86-202, Act of 1988", and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3696. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of D.C. ACT 7-185, "District of Columbia Minors Theatrical Employment Permit Amendment Act of 1988", and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3697. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a bi-monthly report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3698. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs; transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by William Andreas Brown, of New Hampshire, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary-designate to Israel, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3699. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting a report on the financial audit of the organization for the period ending August 31, 1987, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(23), 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3700. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting two reports concerning the "Potential for Application of Ignition Interlock Devices to Prohibit Operation of Motor Vehicles by Intoxicated Individuals" and the "Potential for Application of Corneal Retinal Potential Measurements to Detect Alcohol and Drug Use", pursuant to Public Law 100-17, title II, 203(c) (101 Stat. 219); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES 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. LaFALCE: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 3718. A bill to authorize the refinancing of certain small business debentures, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 100-651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 458. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4561, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction for facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes. (Rept. 100-652). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BEILENSEN: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 459. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4418, a bill to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1989 and 1990, and for other purposes (Rept. 100-653). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 460. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4505, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian research and development programs for fiscal year 1989 (Rept. 100-654). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 461. Resolution waiving certain points of order against the conference report on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 268) setting forth the congressional budget for

the United States Government for the fiscal years 1989, 1990, and 1991 and against the consideration of such conference report. (Rept. 100-655). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORD of Michigan: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 4150. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to the budgetary treatment of the Postal Service Fund, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. 100-656, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

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. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. WORTLEY):

H.R. 4680. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to take into account monthly earnings in determining the amount of disability benefits payable under title II, to provide for continued entitlement to disability and Medicare benefits for individuals under disabled and working status, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 4681. A bill relating to the reporting of trade statistics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FIELDS:

H.R. 4682. A bill to provide that certain service of members of the U.S. merchant marine during World War II constituted active military service for purposes of any law administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 4683. A bill to suspend for 3 years the duty on ADC-6; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4684. A bill to suspend for 3 years the duty on Diflunisal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Florida:

H.R. 4685. A bill to repeal the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to encourage and foster air commerce in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LEWIS of Florida (for himself, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. McCURDY):

H.R. 4686. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to aviation research; to the Committee on Science, Space and Technology.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. SMITH of Florida):

H.R. 4687. A bill to establish a trust fund using civil penalties collected under the Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1970 to compensate victims of the collapse of the L'Ambiance Plaza in Bridgeport, CT; jointly, to the Committee on Education and Labor and the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself and Mr. MOLINARI):

H.R. 4688. A bill to amend the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years

1989 and 1990; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):

H.R. 4689. A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 with respect to the Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator; jointly, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 4690. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives, to authorize the negotiation of a North American free-trade area, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 4691. A bill to acquire additional lands for Manassas National Battlefield Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.J. Res. 577. Joint resolution designating July 3 through 9, 1988, as "National Drug and Alcohol Abuse Treatment Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. TAUZIN):

H.J. Res. 578. Joint resolution designating August 7, 1989, as "National Lighthouse Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H. Con. Res. 306. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House until June 1 and a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate until June 6; considered and agreed to.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

395. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to effective shared management over the U.S. exclusive economic zone; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. KONNYU, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 39: Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. WALGREN.

H.R. 535: Mr. CRAIG, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 593: Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BOSCO, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 632: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 639: Mr. KASTENMEIER.

H.R. 1794: Mr. LENT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SWINDALL, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 1957: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 1990: Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS.

H.R. 2052: Mr. McCLOSKEY.

H.R. 2125: Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 2532: Mr. FROST, Mr. LEHMAN of California, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2743: Mr. HAWKINS.

H.R. 2800: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2852: Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 2999: Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. St. GERMAIN, Mr. McCollum, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 3204: Ms. OAKAR.

H.R. 3392: Mr. LELAND.

H.R. 3486: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. ANNUNIZO.

H.R. 3588: Mr. EVANS, Ms. OAKAR, and Miss SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 3699: Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 3703: Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut.

H.R. 3742: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 3840: Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 3892: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 3944: Mr. GREGG and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 4012: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 4060: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NAGLE, and Mr. BATES.

H.R. 4062: Mr. DREIER of California.

H.R. 4127: Mr. YATES, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. BONKER, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. WILLIAMS, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MADIGAN, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. SYNAR.

H.R. 4190: Mr. TALLON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 4198: Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 4302: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. KONNYU, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 4335: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MOODY, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4352: Mr. UDALL, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ROE, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. AU COIN.

H.R. 4364: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 4409: Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 4446: Mr. BOULTER.

H.R. 4450: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 4451: Mr. AU COIN, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MC HUGH, Mr. OLIN, Mr. MRÁZEK, Mr. STARK, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BATES, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. PEASE, and Mr. KASTENMEIER.

H.R. 4455: Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 4489: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 4519: Mr. MACK.

H.R. 4526: Mr. COYNE, Mr. WISE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PEASE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GRANT, and Mr. GRAY of Illinois.

H.R. 4543: Mr. McCURDY and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 4635: Mr. DYSON, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. ROE, and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H.J. Res. 317: Mr. DYSON, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. HORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BONKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.J. Res. 390: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.J. Res. 438: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. WEBER.

H.J. Res. 475: Mr. CARR, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. INKOFEMR. GORDON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.J. Res. 485: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr.

CLAY, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. IRELAND, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LAGOMARINO, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SABO, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.J. Res. 510: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ATKINS, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. GARCIA, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WEISS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. RUSSO.

H.J. Res. 543: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. GEPHARDT.

H.J. Res. 553: Mr. MFUME, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.J. Res. 567: Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. HORTON.

H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. DE LUGO.

H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. ERDREICH, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H. Con. Res. 302: Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. BUECHNER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. Con. Res. 285: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.